

Viewing and Listening on the Novelist's Page

EWEN BOWIE
Corpus Christ College, Oxford

This paper explores the different ways in which the five surviving 'ideal' Greek novels approached the problem of conveying to their readers the aural elements of the scenes and events they described and narrated. I take it that the typical mode of 'consumption' of an imperial Greek novel was reading – sometimes aloud, sometimes silently, often or almost always by a solitary reader, closeted with a papyrus roll or with a codex in some room, courtyard or *hortus conclusus*, or perhaps occasionally in some outdoor *locus amoenus*. Modern readers of our extant novels will recall that only in Achilles Tatius do we have a scene in which a book is being read, and that there the reader, Clitophon, does so while perambulating the courtyard off which the door to Leucippe's room leads (1,6). There may have been occasions when an individual or a small group was read to by a slave, and perhaps there were even reading circles in communities where literacy was low,¹ though we have no firm evidence for this phenomenon. Whereas audiences of longer-standing performance genres – rhapsodic performances of hexameter poetry, solo and choral performances of melic poetry, sympotic recitations of *iamboi* and epigrams, and of course the various dramatic genres – could be prompted to recreate in their imagination sound effects in the performances that they heard, an imperial Greek reader had to work entirely from lines of letters in columns on a roll or codex – lines in which words were not divided and in which there was usually little or no punctuation.

The reader's task will not necessarily have been facilitated by the fact that some of writers and readers of the novels will have been trained in an

¹ For arguments in favour of this practice see Hägg 1994; for some arguments against, Bowie 1996, 95–100.

oral performance medium – that of epideictic and symbouleutic rhetoric – and indeed may themselves have actually performed as epideictic sophists. For in doing this they will have been trained to privilege the re-creation of the visual, deploying well-honed techniques of *ecphrasis*. Imperial Greek handbooks of rhetoric clearly identify the purpose of an *ecphrasis*. ‘*Ecphrasis* is a descriptive account bringing what is shown vividly before one’s vision’ (λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ’ ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον).² The whole issue was well discussed by Shadi Bartsch.³ She compared the remark of a late second-century rhetor ‘for putting thoughts into words ought virtually to contrive the effect of vision though the medium of hearing’ (δεῖ γὰρ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς σχέδον τὴν ὄψιν μηχανᾶσθαι),⁴ and that of Nicolaus of Myra that *ecphrasis* ought to make the audience into spectators.⁵ Alongside vividity is set the ability to move the audience. Despite this focus in rhetorical education upon recreating in words what the audience is asked to visualise, we can also see how in different ways novelists developed a corresponding procedure of re-creation for their readers of what – if they had been actors in the narrative – they would have been able to hear.

Chariton

The earliest of our extant novelists, Chariton, handles lively scenes involving spectacle and sound in a way that does not depart significantly from the narrative tradition that descends through historiography from Homer. The hetero-diegetic narrative is regularly punctuated by speeches, and less often by monologues, and the reader of an ancient book was at liberty to imagine in silent reading or to represent in reading aloud the various tones that might appropriately and conventionally match the characters’ emotions, arguments and words. But there are no signals to suggest that the aural quality of such speeches was a feature to which Chariton expected his readers to give *special* emphasis.

So too with descriptions of spectacle where there is a distinct sound or aural component. Chariton offers us several such spectacles, all or most of

² Theon 118,6 = Patillon 66.

³ Bartsch 1989, chapter 4 entitled ‘Spectacles’.

⁴ Hermogenes 2,16 Spengel.

⁵ 3,491 Spengel.

which ancient rhetoric would have classified as an *ecphrasis*. His recipe regularly involves drawing attention briefly to sounds but not taking any special steps to re-create them for our viewing ears. Thus in the first assembly at Syracuse, where Hermocrates is brought under pressure to agree to the marriage of his daughter Callirhoe to Chaereas, Chariton quotes (*verbatim*, we are to understand) what the *demos* shouted (ἐβόα):

καλὸς Ἑρμοκράτης, μέγας στρατηγός, σῶζε Χαιρέαν. τοῦτο πρῶτον τῶν τροπαίων. ἡ πόλις μνηστεύεται τοὺς γάμους σήμερον ἀλλήλων ἀξίων. (1,1,11)

Handsome is Hermocrates! Mighty is our general! Save Chaereas! This will be the finest of your spoils of victory! The city plays suitor for the marriage today of those who are worthy of each other.

We find similar acclamations later, for example at Callirhoe's wedding to the Milesian nabob Dionysius:

πάντες οὖν ἀνεβόησαν ἡ Ἀφροδίτη γαμεῖ'. (3,2,17)
So all shouted out: 'The bride is Aphrodite.'

Such brief descriptions of sounds are understandably especially prominent in Chariton's accounts of processions. Thus at Callirhoe's first wedding (to Chaereas) we read that the wedding hymn was sung throughout the city:

ὑμέναιος ἤδετο κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν, μεσταὶ αἱ ῥύμαι στεφάνων, λαμπάδων, ἐρραίνετο τὰ πρόθυρα οἴνω καὶ μύροις. (1,1,13)

The wedding hymn was sung throughout the whole city, the streets were filled with garlands and torches, the porches streamed with wine and perfumes.

The pendant scene of Callirhoe's funeral has corresponding sound effects:

τούτων (sc τὸ πλῆθος) δὲ θρηγνούντων μάλιστα Χαιρέας ἠκούετο. (1,6,5)

And when these uttered lamentations Chaereas' voice was heard above them all.

Likewise, when a crowd accompanies Callirhoe to the temple of Aphrodite and Dionysius has prayed to the goddess, the crowd 'followed up his prayer with pious utterances' (ἐπηυφήμησε τὸ πλῆθος, 3,8,5).⁶

Another context in which Chariton punctuates his narrative with crowd noises is that of the trial in Book 6 which must decide whether Callirhoe is to go to Dionysius or Mithridates. The supporters of each shout 'You are the better man. You are the winner' (σὺ κρείττων. σὺ νικᾷς, 6,2,2). This is followed up by a description of a thirty-day period of public festivity in which the role of music is picked out:

αὐλὸς ἤχει καὶ σὺριγξ ἐκελάδει καὶ ἄδοντος ἠκούετο μέλος. (6,2,4)

A pipe rang out and a pan-pipe trilled and there was heard the song of a man singing.

Earlier too, at the party which Dionysius has thrown to entertain leading citizens in a characteristic act of euergetism, and at which Chaereas' letter to Callirhoe is produced, we get a bare descriptive hint that music was just beginning:

ἦδη δέ που καὶ αὐλὸς ὑπεφθέγγετο καὶ δι' ὠδῆς ἠκούετο μέλος. (4,5,7)

And a pipe must just have been beginning to raise its voice and a song could be heard being chanted.

Of course this is only a selection of passages where readers encounter spoken or sung words, or music produced by instruments. In all cases, however, Chariton communicates these phenomena with considerable economy. This contrasts with a much less restrained presentation of visual aspects. To take an extreme case – Chariton's only extended *ecphrasis* of material objects⁷ – consider his account of the Persian king setting off to hunt in the hope of distracting himself from his passion for Callirhoe:

πάντων δὲ ὄντων ἀξιοθεάτων διαπρεπέστατος ἦν αὐτῶν ὁ βασιλεύς. καθῆστο γὰρ ἵππῳ Νισαίῳ καλλίστῳ καὶ μεγίστῳ χρύσειον ἔχοντι χαλινόν, χρύσεια δὲ φάλαρα καὶ προμετωπίδια καὶ προστερνίδια. πορφύραν δὲ ἠμφίεστο Τυρίαν - τὸ δὲ ὕφασμα Βαβυλώνιον - καὶ τιάραν

⁶ For crowds in Chariton cf. Billault 1996, 116 and Kaimio 1996, 60.

⁷ In 7,2 there is a shorter description of the island city of Tyre.

ὑακινθινοβαφῆ, χρύσειον δὲ ἀκινάκην ὑπεζωσμένος δύο ἄκοντας ἐκράτει, καὶ φαρέτρα καὶ τόξον αὐτῷ παρήρητο, Σηρῶν ἔργον πολυτελέστατον. καθῆστο δὲ σοβαρός, ἔστι γὰρ ἴδιον Ἔρωτος <τὸ> φιλόκοσμον. ἤθελε δὲ μέσος ὑπὸ Καλλιρρόης ὄραθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τῆς πόλεως ἀπάσης ἐξιὼν περιβλεπεν εἴ που κάκείνη θεᾶται τὴν πομπήν. ταχέως δὲ ἐνεπλήσθη τὰ ὄρη βοώντων, θέοντων, κυνῶν ὕλασσόντων, ἵππων χρεμετιζομένων, θηρῶν ἐλαυνομένων. (6,4,1–2)

Whereas they were all a sight worth seeing, the most striking of them was the King. For he was seated on the biggest and most handsome Nisaeian horse, which had a golden bit, and golden cheek-pieces and frontlets and breastplates. He was dressed in a cloak of Tyrian purple – the cloth had been woven in Babylon – and a turban dyed the colour of hyacinth, he had a golden sword in his belt and two spears in his hand, and slung at his side were a quiver and bow, a most extravagant piece of Chinese craftsmanship. He sat proudly on his mount, for love of ornament is a special feature of Eros. He wanted to be seen by Callirhoe surrounded by his retinue, and as he made his way out through the whole city he looked around to see if by chance she too was watching the procession. Soon the mountains were filled with people shouting and running, dogs barking, horses neighing, beasts being pursued.

Chariton's attention to magnificent and costly armour falls into a tradition again going back to Homer, but here it is combined with some lexicographically signalled intertextuality⁸ and exotic name-dropping. If we ask why here he has gone beyond his practice in the novel hitherto, he may give us the answer in a phrase that can be read self-reflexively: ἔστι γὰρ ἴδιον Ἔρωτος <τὸ> φιλόκοσμον. A liking for κόσμος is a characteristic of 'Eros', that is of the erotic narrative one strand of whose pedigree Chariton here allusively traces back to Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*, albeit he is pioneering the form of the novel into which he has drawn it.⁹ Within this ornamentation, however,

⁸ The repetition of the epithet 'golden' (χρύσειον), the frontlets and breastplates (προμετωπίδια καὶ προστερνίδια) and the epithets 'worth seeing' (ἀξιοθεάτων) and 'dyed the colour of hyacinth' (ὑακινθινοβαφῆ) all evoke a single passage in Xenophon's account of the love of Abradatas and Pantheia, *Cyropaideia* 6,4,1–4: here it is the helmet-plume of Abradatas that is 'dyed the colour of hyacinth' (ὑακινθινοβαφῆ).

⁹ This too recalls but reworks *Cyropaideia* 6,4,4, where Abradatas asks Pantheia if she has cut up her finery (κόσμον) in order to make his armour, to which she replies: 'not my

attention to the visual greatly outbalances representation of the aural, so that what might be heard is conveyed in just a few words: 'shouting...barking...neighing' (βοώντων...ύλασσόντων...χρημετιζομένων).

Xenophon of Ephesus

Xenophon of Ephesus merits less discussion. His look-alike narrative opening of his *Anthia and Habrocomes* does indeed have a full-scale procession (πομπή) from the city to the temple of Artemis. The procession is described in detail to paint an opulent backdrop for the handsome Habrocomes, who leads the epebes, and the dazzling Anthia, who leads the παρθένου:

So the procession filed past – the sacred objects, the torches, the baskets and the incense; then horses, dogs, hunting equipment...some for war, most for peace. And each of the girls was dressed as if to receive a lover. Anthias led the line of girls...Anthia's beauty was an object of wonder, far surpassing the other girls'. She was fourteen, her beauty was burgeoning, still more enhanced by the adornment of her dress. Her hair was golden – a little of it plaited, but most hanging loose and blowing in the wind. Her eyes were quick; she had the bright glance of a young girl yet the austere look of a virgin. She wore a purple tunic down to the knee, fastened with a girdle and falling loose over her arms, with a fawnskin over it, a quiver attached, and arrows for weapons; she carried javelins and was followed by dogs...And so on this occasion too the crowd gave a cheer when they saw her (άνεβόησε τὸ πλῆθος) and there was a whole clamour of exclamations from the spectators (καὶ ἦσαν ποικίλαι παρὰ τῶν θεωμένων φωναί): some were amazed and said it was the goddess in person; some that it was someone else made by the goddess in her own image. But all prayed and prostrated themselves and congratulated her parents. 'The beautiful Anthia' was the cry on all the spectators' lips (ἦν δὲ διαβόητος τοῖς θεωμένοις ἅπασιν Ἐνθία καλή?). When the crowd of girls came past, no one said anything but 'Anthia!' (Ἐνθία). But when handsome Habrocomes came in turn with the epebes, then, although the spectacle of the women had been a lovely sight, everyone forgot about

most valuable adornment, to be sure...for you will be my greatest adornment' (μὰ Δί, ἔφη ἡ Πάνθεια, οὔκουν τόν γε πλείστου ἄξιον. σὺ γὰρ ἐμοίγε...μέγιστος κόσμος ἔση).

them and transferred their gaze to him and were smitten at the sight. ‘Handsome Habrocomes!’ they exclaimed. ‘Incomparable image of a handsome god!’ (καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ). And at this point some added ‘What a match Habrocomes and Anthia would make!’ (οἷος ἂν γάμος γένοιτο Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας).¹⁰

Here Xenophon makes similar moves to Chariton in picking out *verbatim* the exclamations of the spectating crowd (cf. Chariton 1,1,11, discussed above).¹¹ But whereas Chariton was describing a civic assembly, Xenophon describes a religious procession, yet gives no hint that in this seven-stage procession a single musical note was sounded – the participants in the procession itself seem to be imprisoned in a silent film. This is at first sight surprising: if Xenophon had been intent on recreating a classical procession, one would have expected him to have it sing a *paean* or *prosodion*, or at least a something more broadly described as a ὕμνος. If he was drawing on his personal knowledge of Ephesus in the first century A.D., he should have known of the ὕμνωδοί who seem to have been attached to the cult of Artemis from at least as early as the reign of Tiberius.¹² On the other hand it is possible that these ὕμνωδοί sang only inside the temple precinct, and it does indeed seem that the elaborate procession set up by C. Vibius Salutaris in A.D. 104 involved the carrying of statues around the city without any accompanying singing.¹³ Perhaps Ephesian readers would, after all, think Xenophon was getting it right. I am more inclined to think, however, that Xenophon simply displays less imagination in recreating festive situations than Chariton.¹⁴ True, elsewhere he does note the singing of the wedding-song (ὕμέναιος): at Anthia’s much-desired wedding to Habrocomes – ‘they led the girl into the bedchamber with torches, singing the wedding-song, and following it with utterances of good omen’ (ἤγον τὴν κόρην εἰς τὸν θάλαμον μετὰ λαμπάδων, τὸν ὕμέναιον ἄδοντες, ἐπευφημοῦντες, 1,8,1, recalled at 3,6,2) – and again at

¹⁰ Xenophon 1,2,4–8 (trans. Anderson in Reardon 1989, adapted).

¹¹ The signature exclamation ‘Anthia’ (Ἀνθία) is uttered again by Habrocomes himself in the final scene of the couple’s reunion at 5,15,2. Less vivid is Xenophon’s description, without quotation, of bustle and shouting at 1,10,4.

¹² Picard 1922, Rogers 1991, 55.

¹³ See Rogers 1991.

¹⁴ We may also observe the oddity that the ferocious dogs with whom Anthia is shut up in a trench at 4,6 seem at no point to bark. Contrast the barking dogs at Chariton 6,4,2 (above) and Longus 2,13,4.

her forced marriage to Perilaus – ‘they struck up the wedding song’ (ἀνευφήμησαν τὸν ὑμέναιον, Xenophon 3,6,1 cf. 3,5,3). But the wedding-song (ὑμέναιος) is so central a part of a Greek wedding that it demands to be mentioned (and is sometimes metonymic for the whole ceremony): it is not surprising that once introduced it leads Xenophon to convey its singing with the terms ἄδοντες and ἀνευφήμησαν.

Achilles Tatius

Achilles Tatius plays more creatively with this *topos* of the wedding-song (ὑμέναιος): in Melite’s fantasies of her union at sea with Clitophon she exclaims:

λιγυρὸν δὲ συρίζει περὶ τοὺς κάλους καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. ἐμοὶ μὲν ὑμέναιον ἄγειν δοκεῖ τὰ τῶν ἀνέμων ἀλλήματα. (5,16,5)

the wind, as it whistles through the rigging, sounds to my ears like the pipe picking out the notes of the wedding melody.

This passage in itself shows Achilles’ eye for new twists in old rope.¹⁵ So too do his two scenes of citharodic song: in reading these we must remember that in the first and second centuries A.D. the citharode was the most highly regarded of all performing artists, being rewarded more highly with money and statues by cities and emperors and receiving the highest level of monetary prizes at ἀγῶνες μουσικοί. Achilles describes two such performances, and in both cases leaves his reader quite uncertain about the nature of the tune or the actual words of the song.

First, during the dinner and symposium at which Clitophon’s passion for Leucippe develops, one of his father’s young slaves

παῖς ἔρχεται κιθάραν ἁρμολογούμενος, τοῦ πατρὸς οἰκέτης, καὶ ψιλαῖς τὸ πρῶτον διατινάξας ταῖς χερσὶ τὰς χορδὰς ἔκρουε. καὶ τι καὶ κρουμάτιον ὑπολιγύνας ὑποπιθυρίζουσι τοῖς δακτύλοις, μετὰ τοῦτο ἤδη τῷ πλήκτρῳ τὰς χορδὰς ἔκρουε καὶ ὀλίγον ὅσον κιθαρίσας συνῆδε τοῖς κρούμασι· τὸ δὲ ᾄσμα ἦν Ἀπόλλων μεμφόμενος φεύγουσαν τὴν Δάφνην καὶ διώκων

¹⁵ Achilles Tatius also plays with the *topos* of the lament (θρήνος) being sung instead of the wedding song (ὑμέναιος) at 1,13,5; 3,10,5; 5,11,2.

ἄμα καὶ μέλλων καταλαμβάνειν, καὶ γινομένη φυτὸν ἢ κόρη, καὶ Ἀπόλλων τὸ φυτὸν στεφανούμενος.¹⁶

entered and tuned a lyre. For a while he simply strummed the chords, his bare hands playing idly over the strings; then, as his fingers caressed the instrument, a melody gradually emerged. He began to use a pick on the strings and after playing a while he added lyrics to the melody. The song was Apollo's complaint at Daphne's running away from him, his pursuing and almost capturing, how she was transformed into a tree and he wove her leaves into a wreath for himself.

Achilles Tatius presents us with different types of sound, and when describing the movement of the boy's fingers and the notes they generate he teasingly uses the regular term for a vocal sound, 'whispering,' ὑποψιθυρίζουσι τοῖς δακτύλοις. The writer's attention to several details in the performance helps a reader to re-create a sense of the musical event that cannot be transmitted in writing.

Second, we hear (or rather we may think we hear, but in fact do not hear) Leucippe herself singing in a sequence prominently placed at the beginning of Book 2:

ἢ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἦσεν Ὅμηρου τὴν πρὸς τὸν λέοντα τοῦ συὸς μάχην, ἔπειτά τι καὶ τῆς ἀπαλῆς μούσης ἐλίγαινε. ῥόδον γὰρ ἐπήνει τὸ ἄσμα. εἴ τις τὰς καμπὰς τῆς ὤδῆς περιελὼν φιλὸν ἔλεγεν ἀρμονίας τὸν λόγον, οὕτως ἂν εἶχεν ὁ λόγος· 'εἰ τοῖς ἄνθεσιν ἤθελεν ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπιθεῖναι βασιλέα, τὸ ῥόδον ἂν τῶν ἀνθέων ἐβασίλευε. γῆς ἐστὶ κόσμος, φυτῶν ἀγλάϊσμα, ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθέων, λειμῶνος ἐρύθημα, κάλλος ἀστράπτων. ἔρωτος πνέει, Ἀφροδίτην προξενεῖ, εὐώδεσι φύλλοις κομᾶ, εὐκινήτοις πετάλοις τρυφᾷ, τὸ πέταλον τῷ Ζεφύρῳ γελᾷ.' ἢ μὲν ταῦτα ἦδεν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδόκουν τὸ ῥόδον ἐπὶ τῶν χειλέων αὐτῆς <ἰδεῖν>, ὡς εἴ τις τῆς κάλυκος τὸ περιφερὲς εἰς τὴν τοῦ στόματος ἔκλεισε μορφήν.¹⁷

First she sang Homer's passage about the boar fighting the lion,¹⁸ then a more lyrical song in praise of the rose. The gist of the song, in plain language, without the modulations of the music, would be as follows. 'If

¹⁶ Achilles Tatius 1,5,4–6 (trans. Winkler in Reardon 1989).

¹⁷ Achilles Tatius 2,1,2–4 (trans. Winkler in Reardon 1989).

¹⁸ *Iliad* 16,823–826.

Zeus had wanted to place one flower as king over all the rest, the rose would reign supreme: jewel of the earth, a prodigy among plants, most precious of all flowers, the meadow's blush, a stunning moment of beauty, the fragrance of Eros, invitation to Aphrodite; the rose luxuriates in fragrant petals, surrounded by the most delicate leaves, that ripple laughter as the West wind strokes them.' While she sang, I indulged the fantasy of her lips as a rose whose cup was reshaped in the form of a mouth.

In this virtuoso sequence Achilles Tatius produces a snappy sophistic ἔπαινος of a rose while at the same time he parodies the style of his near-contemporary the poet and citharode Mesomedes.¹⁹ He explicitly draws our attention to his text's inability to reproduce the music, and in compensation moves from the highly metaphorical and therefore mostly non-visual language of the ἔπαινος (ἀγλάϊσμα ὀφθαλμὸς ἐρύθημα πνέει κομῆ τρυφῆ γελῶ) to an intensely visual and sexually charged close-up of Leucippe's rose-like and – we must assume – constantly moving mouth. Achilles Tatius has displayed how powerfully the words on the page can evoke the object of the gaze, while conceding their inability to convey the quality of sounds.

Longus

The varying levels of alertness to sound prompted by Longus' text are well brought out by its different handling of the pan-pipe (σῦριγξ) – the instrument whose inventor, Pan, and paradigmatic players, herdsfolk, are central to the story, and whose music is used to underscore various aspects of the couple's relation to their universe. Pan-pipes first appear as soundless dedications in the cave of the nymphs (1,4,3). Next, whereas Chloe's childish games include making a cricket-cage, those of Daphnis include making a pan-pipe by cutting, boring and sticking together reeds, and then playing it until nightfall (1,10,2): noise that we, like Daphis, take for granted. Soon Chloe, in love, wonders if Daphnis' pan-pipe is the cause of his attraction, plays them herself in the hope of becoming attractive too, and wishes she could become Daphnis' pan-pipe so that he would blow into her (1,13,4;

¹⁹ On Mesomedes cf. Bowie 1990, 85–89.

1,14,2–3): here the power of the pan-pipe’s music is hinted at, but since we know that Chloe’s diagnosis is wrong, the precise quality of that music matters little. This is also true of Dorcon’s gift of a pan-pipe to Daphnis (1,15,2), of Daphnis’ abandonment of his pan-pipe when smitten by desire (1,17,4; 1,18,2), and of Daphnis’ giving Chloe a music lesson in playing the pan-pipe with the aim of transmitting a kiss to her *via* the instrument (1,24,4). The next chapter reminds us that pan-piping is a constant background to the couple’s play (1,25,1), but reflection on the different *sounds* a pan-pipe might make comes only when pirates have kidnapped Daphnis and beaten up Dorcon: Dorcon has trained his cows to respond to his pan-pipe’s music, and if Chloe uses the pan-pipe he now gives her to play the tune that Dorcon once taught Daphnis, and he her, his cows will react – as indeed they do, capsizing the pirate boat when Chloe plays the pan-pipe as loudly as she can (1,29,2–1,30,2).

Book 1, then, has introduced the notions that pan-pipes can make their player attractive (false), and that they can be played especially loudly, and can evoke responses from herded animals (true). These ideas are re-run early in Book 2. Philetas’ pan-piping, like Dorcon’s, was able to control his cattle (2,3,2) but was unable to win him Amaryllis (2,7,6, cf. 2,5,3). Longus now adds the important idea that the pan-pipe (σῦριγξ) is specially linked to Pan: it is to Pan that Philetas used to play (2,3,2). After the couple’s encounter with Philetas we read nothing of pan-pipes for almost half the book: kissing has replaced playing the pan-pipe as the couple’s mode of communication. They reappear in a major role when the Methymnaeans abduct Chloe: Daphnis finds her abandoned pan-pipe (2,21,2) and mentions her dedication of a pan-pipe (Dorcon’s?) in his angry outburst to the Nymphs (2,22,1). The Nymphs assure him of Pan’s aid (2,23,2–5), and that by the next day they will again be herding and pan-piping together – their shared musical activity is paired with and given equal importance in their lives with herding (καὶ νεμήσετε κοινῇ καὶ σῦρίσετε κοινῇ, 2,23,5). When Daphnis runs to pray to Pan and vows to sacrifice a billy-goat, we read (for the first time) that the cult-statue of Pan represents him holding a pan-pipe (2,24,2).

This sets the scene for the terror inflicted by Pan on the Methymnaean admiral and his men. They hear strange nocturnal noises – ‘a thud could be heard of oar upon waves’ (κτύπος δὲ ἠκούετο ῥόθιος κωπῶν, 2,25,4) – and then an eery and apparently invisible pan-pipe is heard the next day:

ἠκούετο δέ τις καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀρθίου πέτρας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν ἄκραν σύριγγος ἦχος, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἔτερπεν ὡς σύριγξ, ἐφόβει δὲ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὡς σάλπιγξ. (2,26,3)

And there began also to be heard, over the the beetling crag below the headland, a sort of pan-pipe noise; but it did not instill pleasure like a pan-pipe, but instilled panic into those who heard it, like a war-trumpet.

Pan appears to the admiral in a dream, assuring him he will not escape the pan-pipe that caused their panic (τὴν σύριγγα τὴν ὑμᾶς ταράξασαν) with Chloe and her flock on his ship (2,27,2). Ultimately, once Chloe is released and back on land, the terrifying pan-pipe is succeeded by one that is peaceful and pastoral and that leads Chloe's flock from the ships and then guides both them and Chloe home:

σύριγγος ἦχος ἠκούετο πάλιν ἐκ τῆς πέτρας, οὐκέτι πολεμικὸς καὶ φοβερὸς ἀλλὰ ποιμενικὸς καὶ οἶος εἰς νομὴν ἠγεῖται ποιμνίων... (2,28,3)

The noise of a pan-pipe again began to be heard from the crag, no longer martial and panicking but pastoral and of the sort that leads flocks to their grazing...

τῶν δὲ αἰγῶν καὶ τῶν προβάτων ἠγεῖτο σύριγγος ἦχος ἥδιστος καὶ τὸν σύριττοντα ἔβλεπεν οὐδεὶς, ὥστε τὰ ποιμνία καὶ αἱ αἰγες προήεσαν ἅμα καὶ ἐνέμοντο τερπόμενοι τῷ μέλει. (2,29,3)

The goats and the sheep were led by a most pleasant noise of a pan-pipe, and the piper was seen by nobody, so that the flocks of sheep and the goats moved forward together and stopped to graze all at the same time, taking pleasure in the tune.

Chloe's account of her adventure to Daphnis includes mention of 'both kinds of pan-piping, the warlike and the peaceful' (τὰ συρίσματα ἀμφοτέρα, 2,30,3). We now know, then, that pan-pipes' music may differ not only in loudness but in ethos. Longus soon encourages us to form more precise ideas. At the party celebrating Chloe's rescue Philetas boasts that he is second only to Pan in piping (2,32,3); encouraged to play at Pan's feast the instrument Pan likes (2,33,1) Philetas finds Daphnis' boy-size pan-pipe inadequate to his great art, and sends his son Tityrus off for his own. During this interlude Lamon tells the myth of Pan and Syrinx, to some extent 'ex-

plaining' the element of violence in one mode of pan-piping. Tityrus returns with Philetas' 'mighty instrument with mighty pipes' (μέγα ὄργανον καὶ αὐλῶν μεγάλων, 2,35,1). The party can now enjoy a performance by old Philetas on his mighty syrinx, and in describing *this* performance Longus does indeed zoom in on sound-quality:

αὐλῶν ἅν τις ᾄθηθῃ συναυλόντων ἀκούειν, τοσοῦτον ἴχει τὸ σύριγμα. κατ' ὀλίγον δὲ τῆς βίας ἀφαιρῶν εἰς τὸ τερπνότερον μετέβαλλε τὸ μέλος καὶ πᾶσαν τέχνην ἐπιδεικνύμενος εὐνομίας μουσικῆς ἐσύριττεν οἷον βοῶν ἀγέλην πρέπον, οἷον αἰπολίῳ πρόσφορον, οἷον ποιμνίαις φίλον. τερπνὸν ἦν τὸ ποιμνίων, μέγα τὸ βοῶν, ὄξυ τὸ αἰγῶν. ὅλως πάσας σύριγγας μία σύριγξ ἐμιμήσατο. (2,35,3–4)

you might think you were listening to several pipes piping together, so strong was the sound of his pan-pipe. Gradually reducing his force, Philetas changed the tune to a sweeter sound and displayed every kind of skill in musical herdsmanship: he played pan-pipe music of the sort that fitted a herd of cows, of the sort that suited a herd of goats, of the sort that flocks of sheep would love. Pleasant was the one for flocks of sheep, loud was the one for cows, shrill was the one for goats. Altogether that single set of pan-pipes imitated all the pan-pipes that there are.

This passage develops the idea that the pan-pipe can produce different sorts of music, and encourages us to speculate (perhaps using our own experience of pan-pipes to cash-out the bare epithets *τερπνόν...μέγα...ὄξύ*) what these different types 'really' sound like. A few lines later Longus takes us through a similar exercise when the couple mime the story of Syrinx in a ballet: when Chloe, miming Syrinx, flees to the woodland,

Δάφνις δὲ λαβὼν τὴν Φιλητᾶ σύριγγα τὴν μεγάλην ἐσύρισε γοερὸν ὡς ἐρῶν, ἐρωτικὸν ὡς πείθων, ἀνακλητικὸν ὡς ἐπιζητῶν. (2,37,3)

Daphnis took Philetas' mighty pan-pipe and piped a tune of lament like one experiencing desire, a tune of desire like one trying to persuade, a tune of recalling like one repeatedly seeking.

We emerge from these two performances with an awareness that pan-pipe music has different tunes with different effects, and that a set of tunes to command animals is balanced by a set addressed to human objects of desire.

The remaining chapters re-emphasise that dual role of music in the couple's daily life, guiding their animals and (like kisses) expressing their feelings for each other (2,38).

The winter near the start of Book 3 silences the pan-pipes just as it separates the couple (3,4,3) so that their resumption of piping in spring symbolises their return to a shared life (3,12,4). That makes Lycaenion's gift of a pan-pipe to Daphnis especially underhand (3,15,3), but we are reassured when Daphnis, once again at Chloe's side, gives his pan-piping an important place in their shared life in the scene preceding the tale of Echo (3,21–22). Here Longus uses a different device to invite us to concentrate on the quality of musical sounds – Chloe is puzzled by the bay's echo of sailors' songs (hence Daphnis' tale of Echo); Daphnis on the other hand tries to remember how the songs went so as to rework them as tunes for his pan-pipe:

καὶ ἐπειράτο τινα διασώσασθαι τῶν ἁσμάτων ὡς γένοιτο τῆς σύριγγος μέλη. (3,22,1)

And he tried to retain some of the songs so that they might become tunes for his pan-pipe.

Daphnis' effort to remember what readers have not even been allowed to hear forces our attention on their inaccessibility. It may also be a *mis-en-abyme* for the claimed activity of the Longan narrator, who had to remember (we must assume) the exposition of the painting in the grove of the Nymphs in order that his labour might turn it into a four-book narrative (*pr.* 3).

The pan-pipe reverts from a minor role in Book 3 to a major role in Book 4, and its first appearance re-opens the issue of how the reader is to interpret brief and imprecise clues to the quality of sounds. That is surely the point of Longus' phraseology in his description of Pan playing his pan-pipes that figures in one of the Dionysiac paintings in the temple of Dionysos in Dionysophanes' luxurious park:

οὐδὲ ὁ Πάν ἡμέλητο, ἑκαθέζετο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς συρίζων ἐπὶ πέτρας ὅμοιον ἐνδιδόντι κοινὸν μέλος καὶ τοῖς πατουμένοις καὶ ταῖς χορευούσαις. (4,3,2)

Nor was Pan neglected, but he too sat playing his pan-pipes on a rock, like somebody providing a common tune both for the grape-trampers and for the dancers.

In this description of a painting – which uniquely in Longus’ narrative might in principle be *exactly* what the narrator saw in the paintings in the Nymphs’ grove – Longus is circumspect: Pan’s piping was *like* (ὅμοιον) that of somebody using his music to help the two groups to leap and dance in time.²⁰ We as readers are left to decide whether that interpretation of 4,3,2 is the right one. Equally, this phraseology reminds us that when we encountered other sounds in the text that were not so circumspectly described, we should conclude (given our knowledge of the preface) that much of the narrative as a whole must have been supplied by the narrator.

That is surely the case for a passage later in Book 4 which reworks on the plane of actions what 4,3,2 has introduced on the plane of artistic representation, at the same time echoing elements in the performances of Philetas at 2,35 and of Daphnis on Philetas’ pan-pipe at 2,37,3. Daphnis’ real mother wants to test the claim of his foster-father Lamon that Daphnis has made his goats ‘musical’ (μουσικάς), so Daphnis arranges his audience as if in a theatre and

στὰς ὑπὸ τῆ φηγῷ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πήρας τὴν σύριγγα προκομίσας πρῶτα μὲν ὀλίγον ἐνέπνευσα, καὶ αἱ αἴγες ἔστησαν τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀράμεναι. εἶτα ἐνέπνευσε τὸ νόμιον, καὶ αἱ αἴγες ἐνέμοντο νευσάμεναι κάτω. αὐθις λιγυρὸν ἐνέδωκε, καὶ ἀθροαὶ κατεκλίθησαν. ἐσύρισέ τι καὶ ὄξυ μέλος, αἱ δὲ ὥσπερ λύκου προσιόντος εἰς τὴν ὕλην κατέφυγον. μετ’ ὀλίγον ἀνακλητικὸν ἐφθέγγετο, καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι τῆς ὕλης πλησίον αὐτοῦ τῶν ποδῶν συνέδραμον. (4,15,2–3)

standing beneath the oak tree and taking out his pan-pipe from his wallet first of all he blew into it gently, and the goats lifted up their heads and stood still; then he blew into it the ‘grazing tune’, and the goats put their heads down and began to graze; then again he gave them a clear, pure note, and all together they lay down; and he also piped some sort of shrill tune, and as if a wolf were approaching they fled into the woodland; after a little while he sounded the ‘recall’ tune, and they came out of the woodland and ran together close to his feet.

Mention of the ‘recall’ tune (ἀνακλητικὴν) ties this description to that of Daphnis’ piping during the pantomime of Syrinx. Readers can now perform a διαίρεσις and construct a stemma of pan-pipe music. Pan’s own intervention

²⁰ For the verb cf. 4,15,2, Heliodorus 5,14.

established a broad division between the polemical and pastoral (πολεμικὸς ... ποιμενικός, 2,28,3). Within the pastoral there are tunes for humans and tunes for animals. Tunes for humans can be contributions to the success and pleasure of group activity – grape-pressing or dancing – or can be a lover's reactions to an individual (desiring, persuading, recalling). Tunes for animals are not simply subdivided, as Philetas' playing might have suggested, into tunes for different types of beast: a sub-division similar to that in the lover's tunes also classifies different types of command to cows (1,30,1–2) or goats (4,15,2–3). This taxonomy may well induce readers to imagine that by 4,15 they have a good understanding of the complexities of pan-pipe music: yet as 4,3,2 warned them, the few descriptive terms offered by the text leave them to make a huge leap of faith.

In reaching any overall interpretation of that text a reader is likely (and certainly well advised) to revert to the preface, where it is claimed that the whole narrative is based on the explication of a painting offered to the narrator by an interpreter (ἐξηγητής): a painting would inevitably fail to convey sounds, and any interpretation or narrative based on a painting would be more likely to privilege the visual over the aural than would a narrative based on autopsy or imagination. The few places where Longus *does* offer his readers some detail on sounds therefore raise epistemological issues: those elements in Longus' narrative that are such as could be *depicted* can be supposed to rest on the secure evidence of the painting, whereas details concerning the quality or intensity of sounds must have been supplied either by the 'interpreter' or by the narrator. Longus will have been well aware of the tradition of *ecphrasis* of works of art (going back to the Homeric description of Achilles' shield in *Iliad* Book 18,483–602) and of the games that might be played by an artist in words when conveying – or refusing to convey – musical and other sounds implied by a scene depicted.

The remaining pan-piping of Daphnis and Chloe is almost in parenthesis: Gnathon fantasises about listening to Daphnis' pan-pipe and being herded by him (he has elided its erotic and herding modes, 4,16,3); Daphnis and Chloe each plays his/her pan-pipe for the last time before dedicating it respectively to Pan (4,26,3) and to the Nymphs (4,32,3–4). Finally we read of Philetas' piping at the rustic wedding-party and unnamed pan-pipers escorting the couple to their bed-chamber as part of a sequence of noise effects in which Longus seems to be challenging the reader to reconstruct his sound-track:

ὁ μὲν ἦδεν οἶα ἄδουσι θερίζοντες, ὁ δὲ ἔσκωπτε τὰ ἐπὶ ληνοῖς σκώμματα. Φιλητᾶς ἐσύρισε, Λάμπις ἠΰλησε, Δρύας καὶ Λάμων ὠρχήσαντο...(4,38,3)

One man began to sing the sort of thing reapers sing, another began to utter the taunts that are taunted at the wine-pressings. Philetas played the pan-pipe, Lampis played the pipe, Dryas and Lamon danced...

Our reading of early iambic texts may help us to guess at the ‘taunts that are taunted at the wine-pressings,’ and scholars contemporary with Longus were interested in reaping songs:²¹ but again the music of the pan-pipe remains elusive. So too the last noise we hear in the work, the bizarrely described wedding-song: in the climactic scene at the end of Book 4 we are offered a wedding-song (ὕμναιος) – as we are by all our other novelists – but one in which Longus stresses that the music is harsh and rustic:

πάντες αὐτοὺς παρέπεμπον εἰς τὸν θάλαμον, οἱ μὲν συρίττοντες, οἱ δὲ αὐλοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δῶδας μεγάλας ἀνίσχοντες. καὶ ἐπεὶ πλῆσιον ἦσαν τῶν θυρῶν ἦδον σκληρῶ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ καθάπερ τριαίναις γῆν ἀναρρηγνύντες οὐχ ὕμναιον ἄδοντες. (4,40,1–2)

Everyone escorted them to the bed-chamber, some playing pan-pipes, others playing pipes, and others holding huge torches aloft. And when they were near the door they began to sing in a harsh and forbidding voice, as if breaking up the ground with tridents, not singing a wedding song.

This is not the place to argue about this scene’s contribution to our interpretation of the novel. For my purposes, however, it stands alongside several other scenes where the close attention to aural effects, contrasting with the ‘white’ sound in much of Longus’ text, prompts readers to ask questions about the quality of the sounds described by the text they are reading. The comparison with ‘people breaking up the ground with tridents,’ which might be expected to illuminate, of course sheds no light at all.

²¹ Longus’ near contemporary Pollux was interested in a reaping song called Lityerses (Pollux 4,54) named after a Lityerses son of Midas, cf. Apollodorus *FGrH* 244 F149 (quoted by the scholia on Theoc. 10,41–2d).

Heliodorus

There are several places in Heliodorus where his handling of scenes involving both sounds and spectacle falls within the spectrum we have already encountered in earlier novels – for example the wedding of his couple Charicleia and Theagenes in Book 10. But one scene is strikingly and interestingly different from anything before. During Calasiris' long narrative to Cnemon setting out for him (and for the novel's readers) the story of who Charicleia and Theagenes are, how they met and why they are now in Egypt, Heliodorus offers us an extended and vivid description of the four-year religious pilgrimage (θεωρία) of Aenianes, Thessalians from Hypata, to Delphi in order to offer sacrifice at the tomb of Neoptolemus (cf. 2,34). Their arrival interrupts the story that Calasiris himself has been hearing from Charicles (Charicleia's foster-father at Delphi) of how it happened that he brought Charicleia from the frontier of Ethiopia to Delphi. When Charicleia's two surrogate fathers make their way to the precinct to observe the arrival of the religious pilgrimage (θεωρία), Heliodorus serves us two tasters of what is shortly to come: first we are offered a close-up of the handsome Theagenes:

Ἀχίλλειόν τι τῷ ὄντι πνέων καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τὸ βλέμμα καὶ τὸ φρόνημα ἀνεφάρων ὀρθὸς τὸν αὐχένα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μετώπου τὴν κόμην πρὸς τὸ ὄρθιον ἀναχαιτίζων, ἢ ρίς ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ θυμοῦ καὶ οἱ μυκτῆρες ἐλευθέρως τὸν ἀέρα εἰσπνέοντες, ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐπω μὲν χαροπὸς χαροπώτερον δὲ μελαινόμενος, σοβαρόν τε ἅμα καὶ οὐκ ἀνέραστον βλέπων, οἷον θαλάσσης ἀπὸ κύματος εἰς γαλήνην ἄρτι λεαινομένης. (2,35,1)

who really did have something redolent of Achilles about him in his expression and dignity. He carried his head erect, and had a mane of hair swept back from his forehead, his nose proclaimed his courage by the defiant flaring of his nostrils; his eyes were not quite slate blue but more black tinged with blue, with gaze that was awesome and yet not unattractive, rather like the sea when its swelling billows subside, and a smooth calm begins to spread across the surface.²²

Second, the great set-piece description of the procession in the festival at Delphi, narrated by Calasiris to Cnemon, also stresses the visual, as we

²² Heliodorus 2,35,1 (trans. Morgan in Reardon 1989).

might expect of a subject which was noted as suitable for *ecphrasis* by the rhetor Nicolaus of Myra.²³ Heliodorus gives us clear guidance on how we should react. In the opening words of Book 3 Calasiris makes a brief allusion to a procession: ‘When the procession and the whole sacrificial ceremony had been completed’ (ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πομπὴ καὶ ἡ συμπᾶς ἐναγισμὸς ἐτελέσθη) – Cnemon stops him excitedly, saying:

καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐτελέσθη, πάτερ, ὑπέλαβεν ὁ Κνήμων. ἐμὲ γοῦν οὐπω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος ἀλλ’ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν ἡττημένον τῆς ἀκροάσεως καὶ αὐτοπτῆσαι σπεύδοντα τὴν πανήγυριν, ὥσπερ κατόπιν ἐορτῆς ἦκοντα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, παρατρέχεις ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ λύσας τὸ θέατρον. (3,1,1)

But in fact it has not been completed, Father, interrupted Cnemon. Your account has not yet made me, for one, a spectator. I am completely in the grip of your performance and am eager to see with my own eyes, but you rush on past me like a late arrival at a festival, lifting and dropping the curtain in one movement.

Thus prompted, Calasiris describes the procession. Shortly he describes two choruses of Thessalian girls, one of which sings a hymn to Peleus and Thetis (3,2,1–2). He is about to move on when Cnemon again interrupts, demanding to hear the hymn and criticising Calasiris as having given *only* a visual picture:

τί Κνήμων, ἔφη ὁ Κνήμων, πάλιν γάρ με τῶν βελτίστων ἀποστερεῖς, ὦ πάτερ, αὐτόν μοι τὸν ὕμνον οὐ διερχόμενος, ὥσπερ θεατὴν μόνον τῶν κατὰ τὴν πομπὴν ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ ἀκροατὴν καθίσας. (3,2,3)

‘What do you mean “Cnemon”?’’, interrupted Cnemon. ‘For a second time, Father, you are trying to cheat me of the best part of the story by not giving me all the details of the hymn. It is as if you had given me a seat where I could only be a spectator of the procession, but not an auditor.’

Not only is Heliodorus focusing our attention on the virtuosity of his own hymnic composition which he now proceeds to give us (3,2,4), but he is playing a complicit game with his rhetorically trained readers. They will

²³ *Rhetores Graeci* 3,492 Spengel.

have observed, as have modern scholars, that Heliodorus' technique, much more often than that of his predecessors, is to present his readers with visual images.²⁴ They know too that the goal of *ecphrasis* is traditionally the more difficult one of rendering a visual image in words, and that what Cnemon asks for is a *prima facie* easier task, simply rendering sung words on a written page. But *is* it an easier task? Only if 'the details of the hymn' are limited to the text, but not if they are to be extended to include its musical setting. As is inevitable, of course, what follows in Heliodorus' manuscripts, and presumably in his own autograph copy, when Calasiris agrees to let Cnemon 'hear' the hymn, is no more than a text:

ἀκούοις ἄν, ἔφη ὁ Καλάσιρις, ἐπειδήπερ οὕτω σοι φίλον. εἶχε γὰρ ᾧδέ πως ἡ ᾠδή.

τὴν Θέτιν ἀεῖδω, χρυσοθήειρα Θέτιν,
 Νηρέος ἀθανάταν εἰναλίιο κόραν
 τὴν Διὸς ἐννεσίη Πηλέα γημαμένην
 τὴν ἄλδς ἀγλαίαν ἀμετέραν Παφίην
 ἃ τὸν δουρομανῆ τόν τ' Ἄρεα πτολέμων
 Ἑλλάδος ἀστεροπὰν ἐξέτεκεν λαγόνων
 δῖον Ἀχιλλῆα, τοῦ κλέος οὐράνιον,
 τῷ ὑπο Πύρρα τέκεν παῖδα Νεοπτόλεμον
 περσέπολιν Τρώων, ῥυσίπολιν Δαναῶν.
 ἰλήκοις ἦρωσ ἄμμι Νεοπτόλεμε,
 ὄλβιε Πυθιάδι νῦν χθονὶ κευθόμενε,
 δέχνυσο δ' εὐμενέων τάνδε θηηπολίην,
 πᾶν δ' ἀπέρυκε δέος ἀμετέρας πόλιος.
 Τὴν Θέτιν ἀεῖδω, χρυσοθήειρα Θέτιν. (3,2,4)

You may hear, since that is what you want. The song went something like this:

Of Thetis I sing, golden-locked Thetis,
 immortal daughter of Nereus, lord of the brine,
 who married Peleus at the behest of Zeus,

²⁴ Cf. the succinct assessment of Morgan 1996, 439: 'In general terms, there is a movement away from telling to showing, from diegesis to mimesis; this is one aspect of the work's explicit theatricality. The omniscient author abstracts himself from most of the text, and the reader is often presented with a visual description of what an observer of an imaginary scene might have seen.'

the glory of the brine, our own Paphian goddess.
 He of the mad spear, the War-god of wars,
 the lightning bolt of Hellas, was born from her loins,
 Godlike Achilles, whose renown reached heaven,
 to whom Pyrrha bore their son Neoptolemos,
 city-sacker for the Trojans, city-saver for the Greeks.
 Be gracious to us, hero Neoptolemos,
 blessed one now buried in Pythian soil,
 and receive with favour this sacrifice,
 and ward off all fear from our city.
 Of Thetis I sing, golden-locked Thetis.

This gambit of Heliodorus places him ahead of his novelistic predecessors, at least so far as is known to us. No earlier novelist had so explicitly drawn attention to the problems of communicating a musical performance through the medium of a written text, and certainly none had adopted Heliodorus' solution – full quotation. Is it, then, simply one of the many sophisticated ways in which his multifarious originality tweaks the tradition? Perhaps not: for we can be almost certain where he is getting the idea from – Philostratus' *Heroicus*, a work of ca. A.D. 214 on which Heliodorus' brief *ecphrasis* of Theagenes in Book 2 had also drawn.²⁵ There the vintner in the Thracian Chersonese who is telling the temporarily landbound Phoenician about the afterlife of Trojan heroes reports a hymn sung to Thetis by pilgrims to the dwelling-place and hero-cult of Achilles on White Island in the Black Sea:

Θέτι κυανέα, Θέτι Πηλεία,
 τὸν μέγαν ἃ τέκες υἱὸν Ἀχιλλέα [τοῦ].
 θνατὰ μὲν ὅσον φύσις ἤνεγκε,
 Τροία λάχε, σᾶς δ' ὅσον ἀθανάτου
 γενεᾶς παῖς ἔσπασε, Πόντος ἔχει.
 βαῖνε πρὸς αἰπὸν τόνδε κολωνὸν
 μετ' Ἀχιλλέως ἔμπυρα
 βαῖν' ἀδάκρυτος μετὰ Θεσσαλίας,
 Θέτι κυανέα, Θέτι Πηλεία

²⁵ Compare 2,35,1 with Philostratus *Heroicus* 19,5; Morgan in Reardon, 1989, 408 n. 75 suggests that both texts 'reflect a well-known work of art,' but even if this were so the verbal proximity seems to me to point to the use of one author by the other.

Dark blue Thetis, Thetis wife of Peleus,
 who gave birth to your mighty son, Achilles:
 his portion that mortal nature produced
 was allotted to Troy, but that portion which your son
 drew from your immortal ancestry inhabits the Black Sea.
 Come to this steep hill
 to the burnt offerings for Achilles,
 come without tears together with Thessaly,
 dark blue Thetis, Thetis wife of Peleus.²⁶

It is ironic that the very author who was the first we know to have uttered a depreciatory comment on the novels²⁷ provided the genre with new way of handling 'listening' and of blending its treatment with that of 'viewing.'

Conclusions

The ways in which the five novels diverge one from another are not surprising when compared with the ways in which modern scholarship has found their other techniques to differ. Chariton seems well aware of the effect that can be achieved by briefly-sketched sound effects: but such brief sketches are all we get, with no hint of problematisation. Xenophon seems almost wholly unconcerned to communicate sound-effects at all. In Achilles Tatius elaborate rhetoric and sometimes striking imagery is offered in compensation for what seems to be conceded as the incapacity of words to render sound on the page. Both Longus and Heliodorus in different ways force their readers to perpend the problem, and each offers them a different solution – that of Heliodorus a striking advance on anything in the earlier novels. It looks like a story of technical progress. I have not discussed surviving fragmentary texts, but nothing I have found in them would suggest a different story. Of course a new papyrus of a novel might require a different reconstruction, but unless or until such a papyrus is published the sort of technical progress I have been claiming seems to fit the phenomena.²⁸

²⁶ Philostratus *Heroicus* 53 = 68,1–9 De Lannoy.

²⁷ Letter 66, to Chariton.

²⁸ A version of this paper was delivered to a conference on 'Viewing and listening' at the University of Crete, Rethymnon, in May 2004. I am grateful to Lucia Athanassaki and

Bibliography

- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bowie, E. L. 1990. 'Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age', in: D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 53–90.
- 1996. 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston – Leiden: Brill, 87–106 (rev. edn. 2003).
- 2007. 'The Ups and Downs of Aristophanic Travel', in: E. Hall, F. Macintosh and O. Taplin (eds.), *Aristophanes in Performance 421 BC–2005 AD: Peace, Birds, Frogs*. Oxford. Forthcoming.
- Billault, A. 1996. 'Characterization in the Ancient Novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston – Leiden: Brill, 115–129 (rev. edn. 2003).
- Hägg, T. 1994. 'Orality, Literacy and the "Readership" of the Early Greek Novel', in: R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of Pre-novel Narrative: the European Tradition*, Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 47–81.
- Kaimio, M. 1996. 'How to Enjoy a Greek Novel: Chariton Guiding his Audience', *Act.Phil.Fennica*. 30, 49–73.
- Morgan, J. R. 1996. 'Heliodorus', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston – Leiden: Brill, 417–456 (rev. edn. 2003).
- Picard, C. 1922. *Éphèse et Claros*, Paris: de Boccard.
- Reardon, B. P. 1989. (ed.) *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.
- Rogers, G. M. 1991. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus*. London – New York: Routledge.

Anastasia Peponi for inviting me to that conference, and to them and other participants for helpful discussion.