Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire

ANCIENT NARRATIVE

Supplementum 9

Subscriptions and ordering
Barkhuis
Zuurstukken 37 9761 KP Eelde the Netherlands
Tel. +31 50 3080936 Fax +31 50 3080934
info@ancientnarrative.com www.ancientnarrative.com

Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire

Steven D. Smith

BARKHUIS &
GRONINGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
GRONINGEN 2007

Book design: Barkhuis
Cover Design: Nynke Tiekstra, Noordwolde
Printed by: Drukkerij Giethoorn ten Brink

ISBN-13 9789077922286

Image on cover: *Socrate arrachant Alcibiade des bras de la volupté*, Jean-Baptiste Regnault, (1754–1829); Location: Paris, musée du Louvre; © Photo RMN / © Gérard Blot

τῷ ἀρίστῳ πάππῳ

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This book began, quite unexpectedly, while viewing Etruscan pottery at the National Museum of Tarquinia, during my participation in the Summer School of the American Academy in Rome in 2001, under the inspirational direction of Ann Vasaly. Jeffrey Henderson, always enthusiastic, encouraging, and gracious with his time, was the ideal guide as I began this project in its nascent form as a dissertation. The Department of Classical Studies at Boston University deserves many, many thanks, especially Wolfgang Haase, Patricia Johnson, Steve Scully, and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Ilaria Marchesi, my friend and colleague at Hofstra University, for her strong, consistent support in both my didactic and scholarly pursuits. Bryan Reardon read this work in its early stages as a dissertation, and has been a most cordial, enthusiastic correspondent. Tim Whitmarsh and Catherine Connors have been careful, sensitive readers, and this book's strengths are due to their recommendations and insights. I extend my most heartfelt gratitude to Maaike Zimmerman, whom I met in Rethymnon in 2005, and who has since been a wonderful colleague and an enthusiastic, nurturing, and scrupulous editor. Bill and Joanne Wilde deserve special mention for their love and support. I will be forever grateful to my parents Steven and Kathleen Smith for giving me the tools to discover and pursue this path. Finally, I express my lasting love and affection to Richard Wilde, without whom none of this would be possible.

1 Introduction: Questions and Context

1 What is Hermocrates Doing in a Love Story?

In the prologue of his novel, Chariton announces to his readers that he will narrate a love story that took place in Syracuse. The narrative begins, however, not with the lovers themselves, but with a figure from Greek historiography: "Hermocrates, the general of the Syracusans, the one who defeated the Athenians, had a daughter named Callirhoe" (Ἑρμοκράτης ὁ Συρακοσίων στρατηγός, οὗτος ὁ νικήσας Ἀθηναίους, εἶχε θυγατέρα Καλλιρόην τοὔνομα, 1.1.1).[1] What is a military general from Greek history doing in a supposedly fictitious love story? One answer is that, despite Chariton's description of his story as a πάθος ἐρωτικόν, the novel is more than just a love story. It is the aim of this book to attempt to define what *else* this novel is. From the very beginning, Chariton declares that Athenian history has shaped his romantic narrative and he invites his readers to consider how his erotic fiction intersects with Athenian historiography. It will become clear though that the novel is far more than a playful response to Athenian historiography, that in fact a whole range of Athenian texts and Athenian discourses participate in the constitution of the novel.

As the narrative continues, readers of Chariton's *Callirhoe*[2] will encounter a marked dissonance between characters who profess to despise Athens

---

[1] All quotations of Chariton are taken from Reardon's Teubner edition (2004). Translations are my own.

[2] I follow Plepelits (1976: 28ff.), Goold (1995: 3–4), Reardon (2004: v), and Whitmarsh (2005b: 590, 600), who take the final words of the novel as an indication of the work's title: Τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα (8.8.16). The 13th century Florentine manuscript known as Conventi Sopressi 627 (F) declares at the beginning of each book: τὰ περὶ χαιρέαν καὶ καλλιρρόην ἐρωτικὰ διηγήματα. But the much earlier Michailidis papyrus (2nd century CE) gives the title as τὰ περὶ Κα[λλιρόην] διηγήματα. The tendency to title the novel in English as *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is understandable, though, since the story is about a romantic pair. Whitmarsh writes of the title τὰ περὶ Καλλιρόης that, "there is an air of intrigue and scandal to the phrase" (2005b: 606), as a woman becomes the subject of an apparently historiographic narrative. Whitmarsh therefore suggests as an ideal English rendering *The Affair of Callirhoe*, "replete with comparable *double entendre*" (2005b: 606).

and a narrative voice which continually quotes and emulates classical[3] Athenian authors. It is precisely that narrative dissonance which this book investigates. Chariton's historical novel, probably written between the mid- to late-1st century CE,[4] unfolds in the Sicilian city of Syracuse and in the eastern cities of Miletus and Babylon in the years following Athens' disastrous military expedition to Sicily (415–413 BC). In her 1992 paper entitled "Images d'Athènes dans les Romans grecs," Estelle Oudot wrote that what little attention is given to Athens in Chariton's novel is an evasive tactic, an intentional trivialization of Athens as a way of avoiding its monolithic presence in the classical past. But given the novel's classical setting, there is

[3] For the concept of Greek classicism in the early imperial period I follow Simon Swain: as a strategy for consolidating the identity of Greek elites under the empire, classicism "found two complementary modes of organization" (1996: 7). First, in terms of language and literature, classicism formalized the grammar of favored authors and genres and established normative literary practices. Second was "a more general classicism characterized by looser and more flexible formulations which reflect the fact that the Greek past was not the preserve of the Greek elite alone but was open to use by other groups including non-Greeks. It is clear that there were attendant risks in this project. The search for cultural and political authority involved idealizing the past, and the result of this idealization was that it was always open to negotiation to say what the past actually was …, and to say what authority it conferred on whom (particularly since non-Greeks could appropriate the Greek past or even suggest that modern Greeks had no real connection with it)" (7). I reject however the notion that the attitude toward and representation of a classical Athens in Chariton's text is univocal. In this respect I follow Whitmarsh: "Literature can be sophisticated, ludic, self-ironizing, and/or irresponsible: it can provoke and tease its readership with ambivalences, contradictions, and gaps. To identify an author's views on Rome [or Athens] from a text risks an arbitrary foreclosure of meaning" (2001: 3). Though Swain and Whitmarsh are concerned mainly with the so-called Second Sophistic, their points can extend back even to a pre-Second Sophistic author like Chariton.

[4] The Michailidis papyrus provides a *terminus ante quem* of about 150 CE. The mid-1st century BC date assigned by Papanikolaou (1973) has been shown by Hernández Lara (1990, 1994) and Ruiz-Montero (1991) to be too early (see Reardon 1996 for a clear synopsis of the problem). Ruiz-Montero suggests a Trajanic date (1989: 147). I remain unconvinced by the early 2nd century CE date assigned by Cueva (2000 and 2004), who tries to argue that Chariton must have used Plutarch as one of his sources. Reardon (1996: 317) is right, I think, to place the composition of Chariton's novel in or around the Neronian period (54–68 CE), based mainly on the evidence of a literary *Callirhoe* in Persius 1.134 (see also Bowie 2002: 54). O'Sullivan places Chariton in this period also, but argues that Chariton was preceded by Xenophon of Ephesus. Whitmarsh is skeptical that the *Callirhoe* of Persius' first satire refers to Chariton's novel on the grounds that Persius' speaker must be referring to a work of poetry, not a novel: "a poetic text, probably a comedy or satire, is needed to establish the distinction from Persius' own satires" (2005b: 590n34). But this need not be the case: despite the atmosphere of *poetic* competition in the satire, Persius would effectively satirize his targets by suggesting as postprandial enjoyment the reading of a work of erotic *prose*.

every reason, Oudot goes on to say, that Athens should become the subject of discourse within the narrative.[5] Oudot concludes that Chariton's narrative diminishes the status of Athens in order to mark the work's literary independence while at the same time cultivating a relationship with historiography, an Athenian genre codified in the classical period.[6]

But Chariton's relationship with the Athenian literary past is far more extensive and complex than that sketched by Oudot. Indeed, the status of Athens is diminished in the novel primarily to elevate the status of Syracuse, victor over the Athenian invaders in 413 BC. But the ways in which the characters themselves talk about Athens reveal how their identities are constructed socially and politically in the depicted world of the novel. Athens furthermore becomes a powerful referent for the complicated interplay between freedom and tyranny, a major theme in the novel[7] and a theme whose associations with Eros go as far back as Archilochus (fr. 19 West, fr. 22 Campbell).[8] When I speak of tyranny I mean not just the political rule of one man in a city or state, but also the unjust abuse of power by an individual endowed with authority. Inextricably associated with *real* or historical tyranny is the *idea* of tyranny, the fearful conception of oppressive despotism that was the great anxiety of classical Athenian democracy.[9] It is this tradition of anti-tyrannical ideology, so much a part of Athenian literature, that is reflected in the politics of Chariton's novel. In fact the word τύραννος and

---

[5] "Athènes est la cité que l'on ne nomme que pour l'éviter quand, pourtant, l'on aurait toutes les raisons de s'y rendre" (Oudot 1992: 101).

[6] Oudot 1992: 107.

[7] Hunter 1994: 1061, 1077–1078; Ruiz-Montero 1994: 1038; Alvares 2001–2002: 118.

[8] Wohl 2002: 220.

[9] Expanding upon the work of Antony Andrewes (1956) and Helmut Berve (1967), James McGlew reassesses the traditional scholarly separation between historical tyranny and the ideology of tyranny. The historian must be wary of believing too much in the discourse about tyranny because that discourse is perhaps the proliferation of the tyrant's own myths about himself: "Only by bracketing the public posture and claims of tyrants as fictions do scholars believe they can avoid committing the historian's worst crime: to be tricked by the subject's own discourse" (1993: 4). But the relationship between tyrant and *dēmos* is not one of simple oppression; rather it is "a process of complicity" (5). McGlew takes "seriously the language that tyrants spoke and the reception their subjects gave them. This tyrannical discourse supports the view that despite the economic, cultural, and political domination of tyrants, tyranny arose through, and was sustained by, a complex interaction between tyrants and their subjects, and that interaction defined tyranny's sources, purpose, and limits" (4–5). McGlew's approach finds its precedent in Plato's description in Books 8 and 9 of the *Republic* of the transformation from democratic citizen into tyrant. I will return to the Platonic theory of the tyrant's evolution in the final chapter. See also Wohl 2002.

its variants appear far more often in Chariton's novel (fourteen times) than in all the other extant Greek novels.[10]

Related to the idea of tyranny in the novel is the idea of Greek freedom, a notion embodied in the modified democracy of the fictional Syracuse.[11] In her book, *Reproducing Athens: Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture, and the Hellenistic City*, Susan Lape has shown how Athenian democratic ideology survived in the 4th century BC through dramatic expression in New Comedy, despite that in 322 the imposition of Macedonian rule put an end to Athenian democracy. By representing the threats to and ultimately the valorization of the reproduction of Athenian citizens within the lawful marriage of citizens, Athenian New Comedy was an important cultural apparatus of the dominant ideology. Menandrian comedies regularly depict a young Athenian man who falls in love, whose erotic desire is thwarted, who overcomes obstacles to satisfy his desire, and whose beloved is finally revealed to be, like himself, an Athenian citizen, thus allowing a socially acceptable marriage and hence the opportunity for the reproduction of new Athenian citizens. The formative influence of Athenian New Comedy on the Greek novel[12] meant the survival of an important apparatus of Athenian democratic ideology in the romantic narratives of the Common Era, which themselves became (despite their many ironies) a technology for reinforcing the civilizing power of marriage within an international, multicultural, imperial context.[13] But 5th century Athenian ideologies survived in the Greek novels also through the influence of Athenian historiography, oratory, and philosophy. Chariton's obsession, for instance, with the vacillation between freedom and tyranny (barbarian or Greek) finds its genealogy in the democratic and anti-democratic theorizing of late-5th and 4th century Athenian authors like Thucydides, Xenophon, and Plato.

Also relevant to the representation of Athens is the question of Atticism in Chariton's text. Antonios Papanikolaou's 1973 *Chariton-Studien*, a lexical

---

[10] The *Lessico dei romanzieri greci* records fifteen appearances of τύραννος or its variants for Chariton (1.1.2; 1.2.2; 1.2.4; 1.2.5; 1.11.7; 4.2.3; 4.4.4; 2.6.3; 5.2.5; 5.6.6; 5.10.5; 6.2.9; 6.5.10; 7.2.4; 7.1.8), two appearances for Iamblichus (9.19; 70.3), eight appearances for Achilles Tatius (2.37.3; 6.20.3; *ib*.; 8.1.5; 8.2.1; 8.8.8; 8.9.7; *ib*.), and five appearances for Heliodorus (5.31.4; 8.4.1; 8.15.4; 9.6.3; 9.21.3).

[11] See Alvares 2001–2002: 132–136.

[12] For the influence of Menander on Chariton, see Borgogno 1971.

[13] Goldhill 1995 provides a necessary corrective to Foucault's prescriptive reading of the Greek novels (1988: 228–232). The ironizing voices in the novels do not, however, altogether negate the genre's normative power. See also Konstan 1994 and Lalanne 2006: 278–279.

and syntactical comparison of Chariton's language with *koinē* usage, found in the novel "keine Spur des Attizismus."[14] But Papanikolaou's findings were challenged by Giuseppe Giangrande,[15] and studies by Carlos Hernández-Lara[16] and Consuelo Ruiz-Montero[17] have since shown significant Atticist usage in Chariton, suggesting that the author from Aphrodisias could write good Attic prose when he wanted to. Of particular interest is Ruiz-Montero's formulation that, "Chariton uses two linguistic styles: that which corresponds to his time and that which was inherited from literary tradition. It is, then, a mixed language in which various levels of language are combined."[18] This means that, at least on the linguistic level, Chariton constructs a hybrid narrative voice, a voice which most of the time speaks to the reader in the common Greek of the 1st century CE, but which also not infrequently summons the language of a distant past, elevating the tenor of the narrative, but also speaking in the tongue of a foreign place and time.[19] Chariton's linguistic duality (or even plurality)[20] corresponds with the hybrid generic texture of his novel. The appropriation and reconfiguration of Athenian discourses in Chariton's novel are not the nostalgic idealization of a classical past, nor just the calling card of a πεπαιδευμένος, but evidence of a widespread cultural process of redefining what it means to be Greek in the Roman Empire of the 1st century CE.

Jennifer Roberts has written that, "The Athenian ethos embraced many opposites. The democracy that put Socrates to death was also the democracy that had facilitated his way of life and of whose restless energy he partook in the most dramatic and demonstrable way … The many paradoxes entailed in the Athenian ethos have made possible a wide spectrum of responses to classical Athens."[21] It is precisely this "wide spectrum of responses" of which

---

[14] Papanikolaou 1973: 161

[15] Giangrande 1974: 197–198.

[16] Hernández-Lara 1987, 1994.

[17] Ruiz-Montero 1991.

[18] Ruiz-Montero 1991: 489.

[19] Cf. Whitmarsh's remarks on the satire of hyper-Atticism in Lucian's *Lexiphanes*: "Is *all* Atticism necessarily a departure from demotic, indigenous, 'natural' language for the sake of something 'alien' (*allokotos*) or 'foreign' (*xenos*)? To the extent that Hellenic *paideia* requires familiarity with the literature of a period separated from the present by an enormous gulf, all *pepaideumenoi* are 'foreigners' to texts they study and seek to replicate" (2001: 127–128).

[20] Ruiz-Montero finds that, "the *koiné* itself is not homogeneous, as together with vulgarisms it contains technical terms (*Fachprosa*, according to Rydbeck) and other terms belonging to the literary tradition" (1991: 489).

[21] Roberts 1994: 95–96.

Chariton's novel takes advantage in the representation of a classical past. If we can speak at all of a single representation of Athens in Chariton's novel, then it is a representation of Athens as a great paradox. Though vanquished, Athens nevertheless inspires fear; though a democracy, Athens is a polis where the magistrates are more severe than tyrants; and though Athens' political status is diminished, the world of Chariton's novel is depicted within a particularly Athenian discourse.

2 History and Empire in the Novel

The most influential trend in Chariton studies has been to gauge the novel's relationship with Greek historiography. This trend has taken a range of approaches, from cataloguing the text's allusions to Thucydides and other historians[22] to hermeneutic considerations of how Chariton appropriates and reconfigures the written past as a means of constructing his world. Rohde, not surprisingly, saw in Chariton's historical décor an imitation of Iamblichus and Heliodorus, novelists considered to be his literary antecedents.[23] Fortunately time would correct and reverse Rohde's chronology. Rohde furthermore saw in the historical background little more than an opportunity for displaying the spectacle of the Persian court and for playing up the old contrast between barbarians and Greeks. Also troublesome to Rohde was that the Syracusan assembly had little to do besides worry over the fate of the *Liebespaar*,[24] a sign of the trivialization of noble Greek institutions and further indication of the decadent tendencies to which Greek culture had become vulnerable. Perry, on the other hand, attempting to account for the origins of the genre, saw the historical background in texts such as the *Ninus Romance* and *Callirhoe* not as products of their authors' inventiveness, but as an extension of the novels' legendary subject matter. For Perry, the novel grew out of a popular desire for the expansion of the legendary past, which helped to determine at least in part the form of Greek romance. For all the novel's allusions to Homeric epic and the unmistakable influence of Greek drama, it was historiography above all else which provided for Chariton the prosaic foundation for his narrative, "because historiography, whatever its

[22] See esp. Zimmermann 1961 and Papanikolaou 1973.
[23] Rohde 1960: 522–523.
[24] Rohde 1960: 527–528.

stylistic modifications may be here and there, is basically narrative relating to men in action and capable of indefinite extension."[25]

While Werner Bartsch stressed the influence of Hellenistic historiography,[26] Franz Zimmermann went further and suggested that Chariton's allusions to history, "setzen ein intensives Studium historischer Texte voraus."[27] Tomas Hägg similarly argued that the historical background of Chariton's novel was more than décor, and more even than a way of announcing the text's literary affiliations. The historical background also produced "that titillating sensation peculiar to historical fiction, which is the effect of openly mixing fictitious characters and events with historical ones. This is not to try to pass the novel off as something else, but, rather, to make the most of the contrast; in his first and last sentences, Chariton shows that he is well aware of the possibilities."[28] Hägg's point was later refined by Richard Hunter, who re-envisioned Chariton's place within the history of the genre. The Greek romances have traditionally been divided into two groups: Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus on the one hand, heavily influenced by the Second Sophistic; and Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus on the other hand, earlier writers who were presumed to be more straightforward, less self-conscious and hence less sophisticated. Hunter, however, recognized the complexity of the relationship between Chariton's text and historiography and argued that, "Chariton exploits his readers' superior knowledge of history to create sophisticated effects which play with notions of truth and fiction. In other words, the general 'plausibility' of the historical setting nevertheless leaves a gap in our willingness to accept it, and it is this gap with which Chariton teases us."[29] Chariton might therefore be just as sophisticated as Achilles Tatius (and infinitely more subtle) in the way he manipulates his readers. Hunter's analysis developed the insightful reading of Aurther Heiserman, who wrote that Chariton's "almost obsessive play with the paradox and the intrigue, his arch comments about drama, recognition, reversal, and catharsis, all suggest that his art derives as much from theories of narrative as from naive imitations of history."[30] These readings do not deny the significance of the historical background as part of what John Morgan has

[25] Perry 1967: 147.
[26] Bartsch 1934; Jones argues for "a hellenistic history behind Chariton's account of Miletos" (1992a: 101).
[27] Zimmermann 1961: 345.
[28] Hägg 1999: 152.
[29] Hunter 1994: 1058.
[30] Heiserman 1977: 87.

called a "strategy of make believe,"[31] but they lead towards a further, stimulating consideration of the novel's place within the wider production of culture in the imperial period. There is much more to be said about the way in which the writing of an imagined world – relevant to considering the imperial reality of Chariton's own time – incorporates and responds to the historiographic tradition which precedes it.

The question of historicity in Chariton has gradually shifted away from accounting for the overall expression of the novel's historical setting (now generally accepted as an impressionistic evocation of the end of the 5th century BC), towards more discrete analyses of the different components in the novel's social and political landscape. Looking at, say, Chariton's representation of the Syracusans or the Persians, or of individual figures who have clearly been influenced by Greek historiography (Hermocrates, for instance, or the Persian King Artaxerxes) has been a productive methodology for describing the novel's complex political texture. In a sense, scholarship of this sort has been mimetic of Chariton's text: as they have focused their readings on Hermocrates and Syracuse on the one hand and Artaxerxes and the Persians on the other, different scholars with different interpretations have replayed the powerful dynamic between east and west in the novel. First, Jacques Bompaire saw in Chariton's Sicilian "décor"[32] a unique departure from a commonplace in the ancient novels. While Sicily figures in Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*, Lucian's *True History*, and even Petronius' *Satyrica* (Trimalchio wants to enlarge his landholdings in Sicily), Sicily remains something of an abstraction in those novels, one more place-name in their stories' expansive universes. In Chariton, by contrast, Sicily (and Syracuse in particular) is an "élément essentiel de la structure du roman."[33] Rather than measure Chariton's narrative against the accounts of historians, Bompaire specified the quality of the represented Syracuse and "le caractère et le style de cette présence."[34] The Sicilian element in the novel is also fundamental for coming to terms with the novel's appropriation of and attitude towards Athenianism. Reminding the reader of Athens' military defeat during the Sicilian expedition is a rhetorical strategy by which Chariton figures Syra-

[31] Morgan 1993; see also Blake 1933–1934: 288, Schmeling 1974: 79–80, Billault 1989: 548.

[32] "J'entends par «décor sicilien» un cadre historique autant que géographique, celui de la Sicile des siècles classiques et plus précisément de la fin du V^e siècle avant J.-C." (Bompaire 1977: 55).

[33] Bompaire 1977: 65.

[34] Bompaire 1977: 59.

cuse as the political center of the novel, the geographical and ideological point of return for the hero and heroine.

Alain Billault has considered how Chariton's representation of Hermocrates, the Syracusan general, is influenced not only by Thucydides and Xenophon, but also by the Hellenistic historians Timeus of Tauromenon,[35] Polybius, Diodorus, and Plutarch.[36] Billault argued that Hermocrates' role in the novel transcends evocation of the Peloponnesian War and that Chariton synthesizes historical, legendary, and philosophical traditions. Billault had in mind particularly the figure of Hermocrates in Plato's dialogue *Timaeus*, in which he is a tacit participant.[37] Chariton's Hermocrates is therefore nearly an abstraction, idealized by his leadership and his past military actions, and, like Plato's Hermocrates, "il parle rarement et peu,"[38] and has little to do with the novel's action. He provides the representation of Syracuse with an air of "incontestable" nobility. Billault's approach is attractive, for the question of how Chariton's novel constitutes leadership is fundamental for considering the novel as a social and political expression. But Billault stops short with Chariton's synthesis of literary history and he is not interested in addressing how the idealized representation of Hermocrates is interrogated and potentially destabilized at the end of the novel, when Chaereas is installed beside Hermocrates as a leading man of the state.

As Chaereas and Callirhoe move from west to east in the novel, so too has scholarly interest in the novel's political representations. Saundra Schwartz has addressed Chariton's Persia as a mélange of all that is exotic: "luxury, prostration, harem life, eunuchs, satraps, court intrigue, hunts, *magi*, the *paradeisos*."[39] Cécile Daude has similarly written of Chariton's Persian King that, "On voit en effet que la somptueuse broderie polychrome qui fait apparaître Artaxerxès … doit être située, non pas dans un espace terrestre, géopolitique … mais dans un espace artistique orienté, dont la finalité optative est devenue radicalement différente de celle d'un récit historique."[40] Artaxerxes figures not just as the culmination of Callirhoe's suitors and Chaereas' doomed erotic rivals, but as the ultimate opponent of "valeurs héritées de la Cité grecque, valeurs que Chaeréas et Callirhoé ont pour mission de sauvegarder jusque dans un au-delà des mondes."[41] Marie-Françoise

---

[35] Cited by Plutarch as the source of Hermocrates' genealogy from the god Hermes (*Nic*. 1).
[36] Billault 1989: 540.
[37] Billault 1989: 545–548.
[38] Billault 1989: 548.
[39] Schwartz 2003: 378; see also Alvares 1993.
[40] Daude 2001: 139.
[41] Daude 2001: 141.

Baslez has meanwhile recognized that Chariton's representation of Persia draws upon contemporary, popular ideas of the east and a pastiche of various classical authors.[42] But there is much more going on here than a restaging of the classical trope distinguishing good, familiar Greeks from bad, exotic *barbaroi*.

Jean Alvares has provided a complete survey of the different political entities in the novel, including not only Syracuse and Persia, but also the Italian tyrannies represented by Callirhoe's suitors, the outlaws represented by Theron[43] and his pirate crew, Athens, Miletus, and Egypt. Alvares' conclusion is enlightening: Chariton's treatment of Persia in particular allows readers to "recognize in the romance a treatment of important issues of their own period."[44] Alvares' analysis of the representation of Athens in the novel is understandably brief, given that his approach has been to identify explicit representations of the different forms of political life in the novel. According to Alvares, Chariton "associates Athens with the excesses of popular and radical democracy as well as imperialism," a negative representation to be contrasted with the representation of Syracuse, "a government of one ideal leader ruling in close cooperation with the aristocracy and *demos*."[45] The representation of Athens has also been treated by Estelle Oudot, but, as mentioned above, Oudot's study is preliminary at best and does not fully consider the pervasiveness of Athenian discourses in the novel.[46]

Understanding that the representation of the novel's political entities is inextricably linked to the political context of the 1st century CE has led to new considerations about the potential presence of Rome in the novel – a tantalizing notion, despite the absence of any explicit mention of Rome in any of the canonical Greek romances. But, as Catherine Connors has written, "just because Chariton's novel doesn't mention Rome doesn't mean that it is not about – or at least a response to – Rome."[47] This approach has ranged from looking for verbal clues to more theoretical reflections on how imperial power has shaped the discursive composition of the novel. Considering Theron's decision to rob Callirhoe's tomb, Karl-Heinz Gerschmann has examined the historical resonance of Theron's exclamation, ἀνερρίφθω κύβος

[42] Baslez 1992.
[43] See Kasprzyk 2001 for the powerful role which Theron plays in the narrative.
[44] Alvares 2001–2002: 140.
[45] Alvares 2001–2002: 120.
[46] Oudot's 1996 dissertation focuses on authors of the Second Sophistic, with whom Chariton would have much in common. Oudot sees these authors as drawing upon a rich, contradictory tradition to depict an Athens that is appropriate for their rhetorical purposes.
[47] Connors 2002: 15.

("let the die be cast," 1.7.1), a Menandrian half-line that comes down to us from Athenaeus.[48] Plutarch reports that this is also what Caesar declares when he has decided to cross the Rubicon, thus instigating civil war (*Caes*. 32.6). In both Plutarch and Chariton, the phrase signals the culmination of a *logismos*, an argument with the self.[49] Since the phrase had become so connected with the scene of Caesar crossing the Rubicon, Gerschmann suggests that a reader of Chariton's text would be duly motivated to associate Theron's decision to rob the tomb with Caesar's own fateful decision to march on Rome. Suddenly we are in a world beyond Chariton's romanticized Syracuse, and the possibility has been opened up that the novelist from Aphrodisias is doing more than merely evoking a bygone classical past. The seemingly insignificant Menandrian half-line ἀνερρίφθω κύβος becomes a locus for examining the trans-historical, contemporary relevance of Chariton's novel. Gerschmann writes that, "Theron, der sich als Feldherr fühlt, ordnet wie Caesar eine rationale Entscheidung dem Zufallsrisiko unter; Therons Tyche als die des Romans und Caesars Fortuna als die Roms stehen nebeneinander."[50]

Another method for locating the Roman presence in the text has been suggested by Marcelle Laplace, who has argued that Chariton's novel is informed primarily by the cycle of legends about the Trojan War, a tradition shared by Greeks and Romans alike: "Chariton se réfère à la fois au passé des Grecs – la guerre de Troie –, et au passé des Romains – le destin du Troyen Énée."[51] Laplace's conclusion is eloquent: Chariton's novel is "une histoire symbolique, qui raconte à travers les vicissitudes, puis les joies de deux Syracusains, l'avènement de l'âge d'or romain, après l'intermède grec des temps de la Discorde."[52] Laplace is, however, too rigid in her zealous coordination of elements from the Helen legend with elements from Callirhoe's story. Chariton's novel is a sophisticated literary composition that resists allegorical interpretation. *Callirhoe* may well allude to the Aeneas myth and to the ancestral origins of the foreign dynastic power under which Chariton himself lived. But the novel demands an approach that is sensitive to its many ambiguities.

---

[48] The metaphorical usage of the phrase can in fact be traced as far back as Aristophanes (fr. 673). For Menander's influence on Chariton, see Borgogno 1971.

[49] It is repeated in similar accounts by Petronius (122, v. 174), Suetonius (*Iul.* 32), Plutarch (*Pompey* 60.2), and Appian (*B. Civ.* 2.35).

[50] Gerschmann 1974: 15. See also Connors 2002: 21–23.

[51] Laplace 1980: 83.

[52] Laplace 1980: 124–125.

Douglas Edwards has focused on the correlation between the novel's representation of Aphrodite and material evidence from Aphrodisias from the 1st century CE. The language in the novel describing Aphrodite is solemn, but Edwards asserts that *Callirhoe* is not a *Mysterientext*. Neither, however, is it purely popular entertainment. Rather, Chariton's novel "reflects civic and religious pride in the cult of Aphrodite and therefore fosters a stronger sense of identity for Aphrodisians and those attracted to the cult within the empire."[53] Aphrodisias was privileged as the home of the *promētōr*, or "ancestral mother," the cosmic force from which the Julio-Claudians claimed descent. Aphrodisias therefore took advantage of its religious and mythical ties to Rome and to the imperial family through iconography, coinage, sculpture and architecture. Chariton's novel therefore fits into a whole process of self-definition occurring in Aphrodisias under Roman imperial rule. Edwards has also argued that Chariton's "narrative would resonate with members or aspiring members of elite groups at Aphrodisias and elsewhere who found attractive the notion that within even the Roman 'web of power,' the ultimate power broker remained Aphrodite."[54]

The influence of Roman power has also been located in representations of the geographical (ideological?) extremes of the novel, in both the ostensibly idealized state of Syracuse and the corrupt, decadent Persian empire. Alvares' survey of the various expressions of political life in the novel reveals a complex attitude towards Greek freedom: despite the oppression of eastern monarchy, "the leaders of the ruling power have sufficient excellence and virtue to allow willing Greek cooperation with them."[55] As tempting as it is to point to Chariton's Persia as a disguise for Rome in the novel, Saundra Schwartz rightly points out however that this equation, "was complicated by Hellenism's recruitment of Roman power to its side of the conventional antithesis between the civilized self and the barbarian other … Chariton's novel illustrates the ambivalent attitudes of the Greeks towards their Roman rulers and the complex processes that went into forming an identity in a multicultural universe."[56] Even the purportedly idealized picture of Syracuse – the stronghold of Greek values in the novel – is vulnerable to a postcolonial reading which identifies in the idealization of the *polis* the formative influence of Roman hegemony. Syracuse is for Connors a cultural symbol rife

[53] Edwards 1994a: 712.

[54] Edwards 1998: 46.

[55] Alvares 2001–2002: 140. See also Alvares 2001: "description of Persian settings by means of Roman detail would have encouraged some readers to see in the events narrated by Chariton a meaningful commentary on Roman-era conditions" (11).

[56] Schwartz 2003: 391.

with evocations of imperial power, both Dionysian and Augustan.[57] And though not every ancient reader may have been sensitive to the novel's sophisticated play with imperial history, "some – especially those aware of Aphrodisias' special links to the founders of Rome's empire – would enjoy this additional layer in [Chariton's] historical collage."[58] As Schwartz has aptly put it, Rome "is both nowhere and everywhere"[59] in the novel.

3 Narratology and Focalization

In 1971, Tomas Hägg published his *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, a comparative study of Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, and Achilles Tatius that applied a narrative theory about the difference and relationship between fictional time and narrative time. Fictional time, simply put, is the invented chronology of a story, whereas narrative time is the actual time elapsed by the telling of the story and "is most conveniently expressed in the number of the lines and the pages of the printed text."[60] Recognizing the artificial, constructed quality of a narrative, that there is in fact a difference between the material of a story and the way in which that material is expressed, compels a reader to acknowledge that there is a conscious subject organizing the material. Contrary to Rohde's suggestion,[61] the story does not speak for itself.

Confirming Perry's claim that Chariton's novel is more concerned with character than with merely narrating events, Hägg's analysis reveals Chariton's tendency to narrate events swiftly and to elaborate upon dramatic moments.[62] Since a full 44% of Chariton's text is direct speech,[63] Hägg argues that omniscient narrative in Chariton's novel serves mainly to introduce dramatic scene. The reader is allowed to share the point of view of the omniscient narrator, so that he or she can fully appreciate the irony of any given

---

[57] Connors 2002: 16–21.
[58] Connors 2002: 23.
[59] Schwartz 2003: 391.
[60] Hägg 1971: 23.
[61] "Chariton hat es gewagt, seine erotische Erzählung rein durch sich selber wirken zu lassen" (Rohde 1960: 526).
[62] "Whereas Chariton usually covers the whole sequence of time by changing the tempo rapidly between the time identity of the direct speech in the scenes and concise mentions of what happens in between, Achilles prefers to leave gaps in his following of the events, starting the new scene by a subordinate statement which simply shows that there has been an interval" (Hägg 1971: 83).
[63] Hägg 1971: 294.

situation; the reader "is not made to share the participating characters' ignorance and surprise at many turns of the action but is able to look at it all from a superior position."[64] Hägg also finds that, despite the varied background and the large cast of characters in the novel, Chariton is primarily concerned with telling the story of his heroine and hero. The narrator informs us, for instance, that Theron is a pirate and that Dionysius is mourning the death of his first wife, but we are not privileged to learn extensively about their own stories prior to the action of the romance. Chariton's focus on the two main lines of his story (the simultaneous, separate adventures of both Callirhoe and Chaereas) does not, however, produce a tedious shifting back-and-forth between the parallel plots. There are not only two discrete focalizations within the narrative; rather the "omniscient narrator guides his reader's attention from place to place, from person to person,"[65] a strategy which Hägg terms narrative "gliding."[66]

Chariton's focus shifts beyond the time frame of the plot only briefly and to describe a character by analogy to myth or the poetic tradition (e.g., Callirhoe's likeness to Ariadne at 4.1.8 or the numerous quotations of Homer). The extra-narrative event to which the narrator and his characters most frequently allude is Hermocrates' victory over the Athenians. These moments in the narrative offer tantalizing glimpses into the world beyond the romance and motivate a reader to question how the πάθος ἐρωτικόν might be integrated into an understanding of larger historical forces. Hägg asserts that when the narrative alludes to a character's past life or, more importantly, to an historical event, "it is always the generally relevant facts, the still valid consequences of an earlier course of action, that are stressed."[67] Consequently allusions to the Athenian defeat of 413 BC suggest that the effects of that historical moment are still felt by the characters in the novel. As Chapter 3 will make clear, Chariton's narrative is informed at its core by a general notion that the characters live in the wake of Athenian decline.

Bryan Reardon's 1982 article, "Theme, Structure and Narrative in Chariton," responds to Hägg's 1971 narratological study, which Reardon consid-

---

[64] Hägg 1971: 295.

[65] Hägg 1971: 293.

[66] "What we see is a continual gliding motion on a scale extending from great distance and general narrative over medium distance and individualized narrative to a nearness which involves quoting the 'exact' words of the persons talking, and, at times, even going a step further to reporting the simultaneous inner mental processes, using more time in the narration than the material narrated 'actually' took" (Hägg 1971: 38).

[67] Hägg 1971: 190.

ers the statistical counterpart to Perry's more "instinctive"[68] reading of Chariton. Extending Hägg's conclusion that Chariton's main narrative technique is to recount narrative action efficiently and then slow down the narrative to dwell on dramatic scene, Reardon suggests that the same narrative technique that Chariton employs on a small scale is the same technique that he uses to organize the novel as a whole. While the general structure of the novel is a series of *agōnes* between Chaereas and his rivals, the trial scene near the end of the novel slows down the pace of the plot and contrasts all the foregoing action with the story's emotional, melodramatic content. The trial scene is after all the first time that both hero and heroine have confirmation that the other is still alive, and so the scene re-charges the story emotionally. More recently, John Morgan has provided an overview of the narrative dynamics of Chariton's text. Chariton's narrator is, as Morgan puts it, "the most obtrusive of his kind in the extant genre,"[69] positing a vivid sense of communication between narrator and narratee. The narrator's main functions are to alert the reader to the structure of the story and to elicit the reader's response by such means as strategically placed rhetorical questions that highlight narrative ironies. The primary narrator may also position secondary narratees within the story as models for the reactions of the reader, or primary narratee. When for example Callirhoe narrates the story of her own travails, Chariton's primary narrator indicates the tearful reaction of Dionysius, the narratee of Callirhoe's story (2.5.11). In effect, "these narrated responses are also signs to the primary narratee, at least in the sense that the story invites from him an unashamedly emotional response (even if the emotions do not coincide with those of the secondary narratee)."[70]

Such sensitivity to narrative dynamics is not however always apparent in modern interpretations of Chariton's text. This has been particularly problematic in scholarly responses to the representation of Athens in the novel. One may see in Gerschmann's approach a reader who is careful not to let himself confuse narrative levels. Consider for instance his treatment of a specific moment in the novel, when Theron and his fellow tomb-robbers anchor off the coast of Attica to debate what they should do with their booty, the recently resurrected Callirhoe. The majority of the sailors think that nearby Athens would be the best spot for selling her. But Theron is quick to point out that Athens would be too dangerous a place for them, citing the περιεργία and πολυπραγμοσύνη of the Athenians (1.11.4–7). Gerschmann

[68] Reardon 1999: 165. I refer to the Reardon's paper as reprinted in Swain 1999.
[69] Morgan 2004: 479.
[70] Morgan 2004: 487.

states that with the sailors' debate about Athens, Chariton not only shifts "den historischen Hintergrund wieder in das Blickfeld," but also passes judgment on Athens' historical reputation. But that negative judgment cannot necessarily be taken as the sentiment of the author himself. The criticism of Athens is, after all, focalized through a robber and a pirate, from whom we would expect such caution: "Theron hat einen guten Grund, geläufige Negativurteile über Athen sich zu eigen zu machen, weil er diskrete Helfer, wie er sie sucht, hier nicht finden wird."[71]

It would, though, be imprecise – if not misleading – to attribute Theron's anti-Athenian sentiments to the narrator himself, and yet this is exactly what some of Chariton's best interpreters have done. Of this same scene, Bompaire writes, "L'hostilité, toute gratuite, de Chariton à l'égard d'Athènes s'y manifeste."[72] Even Bryan Reardon attributes to Chariton an anti-Athenianism: "he feels the need to show that he knows Athens, and an equal need to affect to despise it."[73] Jean Alvares has correctly noted that, "Theron is a flawed commentator whose very unreliability prompts the reader, no matter what he thinks of Athens, to reconsider the truth of the matter."[74] Elsewhere however Alvares claims that regarding the Athenian presence in the novel Chariton's narrator "stresses the negatives of the tradition."[75] He cites as evidence Theron's criticisms of Athenian litigiousness and curiosity, seeming to forget that Theron does not speak for the narrator. But this accords with Alvares' larger point that Chariton appears "to locate the true stream of Greek virtue among the Dorians," while Athens is associated "with the excesses of popular and radical democracy as well as imperialism."[76] But things are not so straightforward as the idealizing tendency of the narrative might suggest.

The ambivalence of Theron's criticism of Athens (are we supposed to agree with him or not?) is indicative not only of the ambivalence which pervades references to Athens throughout the novel, but also of the novel's thoroughgoing ambivalence towards notions of freedom and tyranny. Most scholars would probably agree with Alvares' identification of Syracuse as the novel's political ideal, "a government of one ideal leader ruling in close cooperation with the aristocracy and *demos*."[77] This book will demonstrate,

---

[71] Gerschmann 1974: 20.
[72] Bompaire 1977: 62
[73] Reardon 1999: 186.
[74] Alvares 1993: 170.
[75] Alvares 2001–2002: 119.
[76] Alvares 2001–2002: 120.
[77] Alvares 2001–2002: 120.

however, that there is an alternative voice in the novel capable of dismantling the strategies of the idealizing narrator, that even the idealized representation of Syracuse may trigger the political suspicions of the wary reader. But to be aware of this alternative voice, one must also be sensitive to the novel's sophisticated strategies of focalization. It is ultimately insufficient to read Athens as a sign of the negative traditions associated with Greek freedom, namely radical democracy and aggressive imperialism.[78] In fact, Chariton's reader must determine *cui bono* any narrative reference is made to Athens, positive or negative. It is clear why Theron despises Athens, but what is at stake in Challirhoe's persistent emphasis on her father's defeat of the Athenians at Syracuse, or in the Egyptian king's reminder of Athenian defeat as he prepares to rebel against Persian tyranny? What, furthermore, is at stake when, despite his characters' apparent hatred of Athens, Chariton's narrator frames his story by allusion to authors and texts that are recognizably Athenian? The narrator, as it will become clear in Chapter 3, is far less opposed to Athens than are his characters.

By implication, of course, the sophisticated reader must also ask *cui bono* Syracuse is apparently idealized as a benevolent guided democracy. This book will demonstrate that Chariton's novel provides many strategies by which the willing participant may read against both the romantic ideology and the political idealization of Syracuse. The most important of these strategies is the problematization of the binary opposition between freedom and tyranny, a process which begins appropriately enough with the ambivalent representation of Athens, the *polis* famously plagued throughout history by its tyrannical and radically democratic tendencies. The ambivalent representation of Athens in the novel is emblematic of the ambivalence between these two apparent political extremes. Most characters in Chariton's world, and by implication most readers of Chariton's text, fall somewhere in between, positioning themselves on the political spectrum depending on a given context and only by a process of rationalization and self-definition. The meaning of any reference to Athens depends entirely on the character through whom it is focalized.

[78] Despite his emphasis on Athens' negative representation, Alvares concedes that there are moments in the novel when Athens is referred to as an exemplar "of civilized life and *paideia*, and Greece's preeminent defender against the barbarians … it is wealthier than Syracuse, credited with noble victories over Persia (6.7.10), and, like Syracuse, is free from external oppression" (2001–2002: 119).

4 Callirhoe and Chaereas

Despite the novel's title, probably τὰ περὶ Καλλιρόης,[79] Chariton's novel is about both the young woman and the young man, Chaereas. And yet scholarly attention is usually focused on one protagonist or the other. The reason for this phenomenon has been best articulated by Bryan Reardon, who sees the divided scholarly attention as the result of the distinction between the novel's theme and structure. Structurally, the novel represents the series of erotic opponents whom Chaereas must overcome in order to reunite with his beloved Callirhoe, a series of episodes which culminates in the trial at Babylon and then the Egyptian rebellion, a military context in which the hero may prove his mettle. Thematically, however, Challirhoe is at the center of the novel: "the *theme* is really the emotional situation; and in that respect it is Callirhoe who predominates."[80]

Callirhoe has inspired influential work from scholars interested in gender theory and the dynamics of vision and spectacle in the Roman imperial period. Helen Elsom has argued against the traditional interpretation that the Greek novels were written primarily for a female audience, suggesting instead that by exposing a woman to public gaze, "a structure common to romance and pornography,"[81] Chariton's novel re-affirms an insecure male subjectivity. Brigitte Egger has sought out a "female text" inscribed in Chariton's novel, a collection of "female fantasies" which "resemble some of the more repressed constructs of femininity typically embraced by women in dominant patriarchal societies."[82] In her survey of the female heroines in the Greek novels, Katharine Haynes describes Callirhoe as the central focus of the novel, and even when the narrative shifts to Chaereas, it is Callirhoe who retains the reader's emotional interest. As Haynes puts it, "The spotlight may indeed fall on Kallirhoe, but the camera angles are constantly shifting."[83] Callirhoe's identity is constructed in the novel not only by the dynamics of the erotic gaze, but also by "the coding of physical and social space and the representation of the manipulation of chastity."[84] Contextualizing Callirhoe within the cultural landscape of the 1st century CE, Froma Zeitlin has argued that the imaging and figuring of Callirhoe within Chariton's text drew upon a "cultural storehouse of a visual repertoire, available in the ubiquitous pres-

[79] See above n1.
[80] Reardon 1999: 174.
[81] Elsom 1992: 213.
[82] Egger 1994: 34.
[83] Haynes 2003: 46.
[84] Haynes 2003: 46–51.

ence of works of art, in both private and public contexts, as well as in theatrical performances."[85]

Chaereas has, by contrast, received less scholarly attention. But the attention that he has received has been intriguing. Rohde had little use for Chaereas, whose development as a character he found unbelievable. Rohde furthermore found Chaereas a weak hero who pales in comparison to Callirhoe, who is far stronger and more intelligent than her husband.[86] Gareth Schmeling however has shown how the characterization of Chaereas corresponds with and simultaneously breaks from traditional concepts of heroism from epic and drama. Schmeling defines the traditional Greek hero as possessing "a self-destructive nature and an intimacy with the gods."[87] Paradigmatic of this kind of austere heroism are the figures of Ajax and Achilles. Even though he is motivated only by an inner drive, the traditional hero is an active individual whose power rails against cultural and divine boundaries. Set against this background, Chariton's Chaereas is certainly "a new kind of hero."[88] For while he, like Ajax, is bent on self-destruction, Chaereas' suicidal tendency arises from an inability to cope with the circumstances surrounding him.[89] Chaereas longs for death because Callirhoe is out of his reach, whereas Ajax "shapes events to fit his personal outlook … It is the active force of Ajax which dooms him; for Chaereas it is his passive role."[90] The transformation which Chaereas undergoes in the final two books of the novel are therefore somewhat startling, as perceived by Rohde. As if by magic Chaereas suddenly becomes that traditionally active epic-style hero, leading an army and sacking a city. War is the crucible in which he can forge his heroic identity, and Schmeling sees these final episodes of the romance as a rite of passage.[91] By the end of the novel, Chaereas finally "deserves Callirhoe and his famous father-in-law; his adventures and trials have made him a worthy hero, to be admired by his parents, loved by his wife, and worshipped by the common people of Syracuse, desperately in need of a hero."[92]

---

[85] Zeitlin 2003: 72.
[86] Rohde 1960: 527.
[87] Schmeling 1974: 130.
[88] Schmeling 1974: 130. This is the title of his sixth chapter.
[89] Cf. Toohey 2004: 162–171, who provocatively reads Chaereas' attempts at suicide as a performative means of paradoxically re-affirming the will to live.
[90] Schmeling 1974: 132.
[91] See also Lalanne 2006.
[92] Schmeling 1974: 135.

Chaereas' story may thus be read as an archetypal quest myth like that outlined by Joseph Campbell.[93]

More provocative is the suggestion that Chaereas is modeled on the Athenian Chabrias, who led an Egyptian revolt against Persia in 360 BC.[94] Such a suggestion, drawing upon an historical framework that is consistent with the overall design of Chariton's novel, complicates (and rightly so) Chariton's perceived anti-Athenianism. It is tempting to look for historical analogues for the character of Chaereas, especially as his father-in-law Hermocrates seems to be taken directly from the pages of Greek history. Molinié even connects our Chaereas with the Hermocrates legend posited by Perry as a source for Chariton's narrative: "Il n'est pas impossible qu'il existe des bribes d'un cycle pseudo-historique, à caractère de politique syracusaine, autour de l' «avènement» de Denys l'Ancien."[95] My own reading of Chaereas certainly draws upon the character's relationship with historiography, specifically Athenian historiography, and the suggestion that Chariton's Chaereas is inspired in part by the Athenian Chabrias is sensitive to the novel's pervasive concern with tyranny and Greek freedom. But Chariton need not have had this particular figure from Greek history in mind as he wrote his novel. In fact, the novel responds to and replays a number of recurrent themes from Greek historiography, the struggle against an imperialist power being the most significant. Furthermore, if we are to look for specific models for the figure of Chaereas in the novel, we need not look very far from the words of the narrator, who at the very beginning of the novel describes Chaereas as "the kind of Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytos, and Alcibiades that sculptors and painters depict" (οἷον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἱππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς ⟨ἀπο⟩δεικνύουσι, 1.1.3).

Ryan Balot, meanwhile, is not so much interested in the historical background as he is in detecting the "technologies of the self" with which Chariton's male characters construct their ethical identities. Balot's Foucauldian analysis is especially attractive for his reading of the characters Dionysius and Artaxerxes, who must account for the gap between social expectations of their behavior and their own personal desires.[96] For Dionysius and Artaxerxes, "external disruption depends in each case on internal psychological breakdown."[97] Balot's conclusions regarding Chaereas parallel Schmeling's

[93] Campbell 1949. For the mythical representation of Callirhoe, see Schmeling 2005.
[94] Salmon 1961: 365–376. See also Molinié 1989: 6 and Alvares 2001: 12–13.
[95] Molinié 1989: 6.
[96] Balot 1998: 145–154.
[97] Balot 1998: 154.

myth-based interpretation: at the end of the novel, "masculine virtue is not defined so much in terms of self-restraint and rationality, which were central in Dionysius' and Artaxerxes' civic contexts; rather, there is a new emphasis on martial valor, and on the bravery and loyalty which, in this novel at least, supersede any erotic attachment."[98] Balot's assessment of Chaereas' military transformation at the end of the novel shares the disappointment and disbelief felt by Rohde a century before: "It is as if the powerful god Eros can only be legitimately overpowered by Tyche, but not by the subjective ethical work of human beings themselves. In mapping out the transformations of these characters, Chariton abandons his investigation of human psychology in favor of a *deus ex machina*." The strength of Balot's analysis, though, is in the elucidation of how the representation of Chaereas contributes to the novel's many ethical ambiguities and how those ambiguities destabilize the text's apparently straightforward generic pattern.

My own interpretation of Chaereas attempts to augment a Foucauldian analysis with an historiographic approach, thereby reconnecting the ethical construction of Chariton's male protagonist with the literary tradition that is so formative to the composition of the text. I will suggest in the final chapter of this book that the figure of Chaereas participates in the Athenian discursive constitution of the novel, and that literary representations of the historical Alcibiades provided for Chariton a conceptual mode for depicting his male protagonist. My focus on Chaereas at the end of this book is not androcentrism. Chariton's novel is about the *Liebespaar*, but Callirhoe is the emotional and psychological center of the novel, and throughout the book she is the focus of many of my interpretations. I am especially interested in how Callirhoe continually defines her identity not only by connection to her father, but – crucially – by her father's victory over the Athenian war machine. But since the narrator draws a specific parallel between Chaereas and Alcibiades at the beginning of the novel, a reading of the text's appropriation and reconfiguration of Athenian discourses demands a special consideration of the novel's explicitly Alcibiadean hero.

Chariton is not, however, engaged in historical allegory. As I will argue, we are not to read Chaereas *as* Alcibiades; rather Chariton invites us to read his romantic hero as characterized by certain qualities evocative of Alcibiades, namely his superior status within the community, his powerful erotic attraction, his peculiar ambivalence between masculinity and femininity, and his complicated relationship with politics and philosophy. These Alcibiadean qualities problematize Chariton's hero and complicate idealizing interpreta-

[98] Balot 1998: 156.

tions of the novel. The reader acquainted with Greek historiography will be motivated to ask potentially disconcerting questions: is Chaereas the right man for Callirhoe? And – just as importantly – is he the right man for Syracuse? On one level, an Alcibiadean hero adds to the novel's historical, classical feel. On another level, though, the shadow of Alcibiades, the most troubling figure from Athens' classical past, contributes to the ambiguities and ironies that pervade the novel.

2 Culture and Empire in Representations of Athens

In order to provide a discursive background for the images of Athens in Chariton's text, the following chapter describes the various ways in which classical Athens is represented by authors roughly contemporary with Chariton. I have restricted the literary comparanda to thematically relevant works of Greek and Roman prose from the 1st century BC and the 1st century CE, namely Diodorus' *Bibliothēkē*, Cicero's *Pro Flacco*, Nepos' *Life of Alcibiades*, Velleius Paterculus' *Historia Romana*, Seneca's *De Tranquilitate Animi*, and Plutarch's oration *De Gloria Atheniensium*. This is not to suggest, of course, that poetry of the period did not participate in the same kinds of literary representations of the classical past, or that Chariton was not influenced by the poetic tradition. Particularly fertile ground for such analyses would be, say, the glimpses of Athens in Horace's *Satires* and *Epistulae*, the Athenian books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and certain of the *Heroides*. Also relevant would be Seneca's appropriation and reimagining of Athenian tragedy. But a comprehensive study of literary representations of Athens could well fill several volumes, and so some limitations must be applied.

I do not suggest that Chariton was necessarily familiar with the works of any of the contemporary writers under discussion here, though it is possible that Diodorus' account of the Sicilian Expedition in Book 13 of the *Bibliothēkē* may have had some conceptual influence on Chariton's novel. Nor by analyzing the works of Cicero, Nepos, Velleius Paterculus, and Seneca do I mean to imply that Chariton was familiar with Latin. Though he worked for a presumably prominent *rhētōr* in an affluent city of an eastern Roman province, there is no evidence to suggest that Chariton knew Latin. Rather, the analysis of Latin and Greek authors together will show that evocations of Athens in both languages share some common themes. Against such a background, it will be easier to detect Chariton's participation in certain literary trends and also how Chariton departs from his contemporaries in rewriting the classical world.

1 Cultural Capital & Military Golden Age

By far the most common *topos* in evoking Athens' classical past is to praise the city as the cultural beacon of antiquity. It is the birthplace of civilization and eloquence (Cic. *Flac.* 61). It is the most brilliant city (*splendidissima civitas*, Nep. *Alc.* 7.11.2), the world's intellectual center (Vell. Pat. 1.18.1), envisioned as parent and nurse not only of its autochthonous people (Cic. *Flac.* 61), but also of art and literature (Plut. *De Glor. Ath.* 345F). Classical Athens is imagined as a time and place crowded with intellect and artistic genius (Vell. Pat. 1.16.5). It has given to civilization law, agriculture, religion (Cic. *Flac.* 61); it is the center of cult worship for the Eleusinian mysteries; and it is the international seat of liberal education (Diodorus 26.3–27.2).

In the *prooimion* of the twelfth book of his universal history, Diodorus states that the glory of Athens grew from its unexpected victory over Xerxes and his Persian forces, for out of the surprise of this reversal (τὴν εἰς τοὐναντίον μεταβολήν, 12.1.3)[1] came the prosperity which allowed the literary, rhetorical, and plastic arts to flourish. It was during this time, says Diodorus, that the greatest artists (τεχνῖται, 1.4) lived, including the sculptor Pheidias. This period in Athenian history also gave birth to the great philosophers Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; and in the area of rhetoric and oratory the names of Pericles and Isocrates and his students stand out. But Athenian glory was not restricted to the liberal arts, for this period also produced the great generals Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Myronides and many others besides these, too numerous for Diodorus to write about at length in his brief introduction (καὶ ἕτεροι πλείονες, περὶ ὧν μακρὸν ἂν εἴη γράφειν, 1.5). Praise of Athenian generals and statesmen finds its ultimate expression in the catalogue of the biographies of Nepos and Plutarch.

Athens receives effusive praise from Cicero in the *Pro Flacco*, as the orator attempts to strengthen the testimony of Athenian witnesses for the defense by associating them with their glorious ancestors. Cicero marks the Athenian witnesses and their ancestors as distinct among the race of Greeks as a whole. Athens, he says, is the birthplace of culture itself, learning, religion, agriculture, justice, and law (*unde humanitas, doctrina, religio, fruges, iura, leges*, 61). And from this central location, civilization is said to have spread into all lands (*in omnis terras*). The beauty of the city (*pulchritudinem*) even provoked a dispute among the gods (*inter deos certamen*) over its possession. Though he does not name the gods, Cicero evokes the

[1] I follow Oldfather's Loeb text (1950). All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

mythic tradition about the origins of Athens' divine patronage. Though the historical exemplum can on one level be read merely as Cicero's demonstration of his own erudition, the audience is nevertheless implicitly reminded of the primordial struggle between Athena and Poseidon and the story of the olive tree and the salt pool. Herodotus relates the story as told by the Athenians that the tree and the pool were housed in the temple of Erechtheus Earth-born and that they were set up as evidence of the gods' powers during their dispute over the land (ἔστι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλι ταύτῃ Ἐρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι νηός, ἐν τῷ ἐλαίη τε καὶ θάλασσα ἔνι, τὰ λόγος παρὰ Ἀθηναίων Ποσειδέωνά τε καὶ Ἀθηναίην ἐρίσαντας περὶ τῆς χώρης μαρτύρια θέσθαι, 8.55). If Cicero's allusion to the divine contest evoked this version of the story in the minds of his listeners, then they might have been led to remember particularly the legal language with which Herodotus invests the story – he describes the olive tree and the salt pool as the gods' *witnesses* (μαρτύρια). It is doubtful, though, that the jury would have had a copy of Herodotus at hand, tucked into the folds of their togas, and ready to be referred to when the moment came. Nevertheless the story itself is a reminder of the love of jurisprudence with which Athens had been invested from its origin. By recalling the tale of Athens' earliest legal dispute, Cicero reinforces the Athenian juridical tradition and lends a necessary *gravitas* to the Athenian witnesses in Flaccus's favor. It is also significant that the story brings to mind the image of the acropolis as the focus of Athenian glory. It is from this marbled, monumental source that civilization is imagined to have spread into all lands (*in omnis terras*). Praise of Athenian jurisprudence elsewhere in contemporary literature is focused on the Areopagos (cf. Sen. *Tranq*. 5.1 and Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 348B).

Cicero further strengthens the character of his Athenian witnesses in the *Pro Flacco* by a reminder of the antiquity of the Athenian people. The place itself is so old that it is thought to have given birth to its own citizens (*quae vetustate ea est ut ipsa ex sese suos civis genuisse ducatur*, 62). The very soil of Athens is personified by Cicero to become parent, nurse, and homeland (*parens, altrix, patria*). It is as if the Athenian people, their *polis*, and their land constitute a closed symbiotic system and exhibit a mutual interdependence which is integral to its *auctoritas*. It is the ancient and self-contained *auctoritas* of Athens alone which continues to support the name of Greece, now nearly broken and debilitated (*auctoritate autem tanta est ut iam fractum prope ac debilitatum Graeciae nomen huius urbis laude nitatur*). It is only through Athens, in other words, that Hellenic civilization is redeemed.

At the end of the first book of his Romano-centric history of the world, having concluded his account of the Punic Wars, Velleius Paterculus slows the pace of his brisk history (*in hac tam praecipiti festinatione*, 1.16.1)[2] to dwell upon a subject that he has often thought about (*rem saepe agitatam in animo meo*): the perception that the most eminent talents of every art come together in the development of the same genre and live together within a short space of time (*eminentissima cuiusque professionis ingenia in eandem formam et in idem artati temporis congruere spatium*, 1.16.2). For an analogy he draws upon the world of natural science: in the same way that animals of different species (*diversi generis animalia*), when they are shut up in a pen or other enclosure, nonetheless congregate into one group (*in unum quodque corpus congregantur*), so likewise the talents capable of each renowned art separate themselves from the rest, sharing as they do a single historical period and a similar artistic undertaking (*in similitudine et temporum et profectuum*). In his trans-historical perspective, Velleius imagines these ingenious talents congregating not just in space, but in time as well. He thus imagines that in the history of the world there are cultural high-periods and high-places, spatio-temporal realms distinguished by the many great minds crowded within their narrow limits.[3] Velleius' first example of such a genius space-time is 5th century Athens.

Velleius explains that one brief period alone (*una neque multorum annorum spatio divisa aetas*) brought to light the genius of tragedy through the agency of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, men of a divine spirit (*divini spiritus viros*, 1.16.3). In that same brief period Old Comedy (*veterem ... comoediam*) flourished with Cratinus, Aristophanes, and Eupolis. Likewise Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus all excelled in the genre of New Comedy (*novam comicam*), not to be imitated (*neque imitandam*) by their likes again. Velleius mentions that earlier in his history he had discussed the great philosophers of 5th century Athens, but that discussion is unfortunately now lost, part of the considerable lacuna that covered the period from the rape of the Sabine women to 171 BC. He nevertheless deems the Athenian philosophers of such great cultural significance that he does not hesitate to mention them again in his explication of 5th century Athenian genius. How much longer after the death of Plato and Aristotle, Velleius asks, did the genius last which flowed originally from the mouth of Socrates (*ingenia Socratico ore defluentia*, 1.16.4)? And in the area of rhetoric, what brilliance was there in orators before Isocrates, or after his pupils, or at most after their pupils? Velleius

[2] I follow Shipley's Loeb text (1924, revised 1979).
[3] Cf. Momigliano's idea of the *Achsenzeit* (1975: 8–9).

leaves us with the image of an Athens so crowded by the brevity of the period (*adeo quidem artatum angustiis temporum*, 1.16.5) that every man worthy of memory was able to see in his own city and in his own time every other man who was worthy of memory (*nemo memoria dignus alter ab altero videri nequiverint*). One receives the erroneous impression that Euripides stood shoulder-to-shoulder with Menander.

But the glory of the Athenian past and its cultural institutions was not always incontestable. By the end of the 1st century CE it was also possible to break from the eulogistic tradition and present a reactionary critique of Athenian culture. In Velleius Paterculus, the critique is subtle and indirect. Velleius concludes the first book of his universal history with the image of a nation whose citizens (but for one city alone) are walking shells of human beings. One Attic city, writes Velleius, flowered in more works of every kind of eloquence than all of Greece combined, and so much so that you would think that the bodies of that people were separated into other states, but that their minds were enclosed only by the walls of the Athenians (*Una urbs Attica pluribus omnis eloquentiae quam universa Graecia operibus usque floruit adeo ut corpora gentis illius separata sint in alias civitates, ingenia vero solis Atheniensium muris clausa existimes*, 1.18.1). There is no greater figurative separation of the mind from the body than this: Velleius effectively dismisses the corporeal and historical *reality* of Athens, concentrating Athens' cultural worth instead within an ideal city of the mind. The privilege which Athens receives as the locus of the collective Greek intellect implies conversely a neglect of the body. As further comparison of these Greek and Latin texts will show, there is a pattern[4] of contrasting Athens' cultural supremacy with its failed political and military efforts, and Velleius' silence on Athenian military and political power here draws attention to those deficiencies. True, Velleius' discussion at the end of Book 1 is about cultural and literary classicism, and so a critique of Athenian military and political power might seem forced and out of place in this context. It is also possible that Velleius might have included such a critique in the section of the *Historia Romana* now lost. Nevertheless, the image with which Velleius concludes Book 1, the image of an Athens that is all mind and contained within its own walls, indirectly impugns Athens' physical strength, and by implication identifies Athens as a political and military power past its prime.

[4] Plutarch is the exception which proves the rule.

The notion of Athens' glorious past is the subject of the entirety of Plutarch's oration *De Gloria Atheniensium*.[5] But the subject receives a special twist here, for the valorization of Athens' famous men of action necessarily demands of the orator a trivialization of Athens' cultural contribution, the σοφία manifested by Athenian historiography, painting, tragedy, and oratory. As for epic and lyric poetry – well, Athens never possessed the glory of either epic or melic poetry (Ἐπικῆς μὲν οὖν ποιήσεως ἡ πόλις οὐκ ἔσχηκεν ἔνδοξον δημιουργὸν οὐδὲ μελικῆς, 348B). The speaker criticizes Athenian historiography because it does not possess its own glory, but is instead dependent on the glorious deeds of others. If there were never to have been a Pericles, a Phormio, a Nicias, a Demosthenes, a Cleon, a Tolmides, or a Myronides, then Thucydides would disappear (345D). Some small praise is reserved for Xenophon, who himself became his own history (Ξενοφῶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γέγονεν ἱστορία, 345E). For the most part, however, writers of history are able to attain the appearance of glory because, just as light is reflected in a mirror (ὡς ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ, 345F), the glory of someone else is reflected upon themselves.

Plutarch writes that Athens has been the mother and nurse (μήτηρ καὶ τροφὸς εὐμενής) of many other arts also besides historiography, metaphorical language similarly used by Cicero in his defense of Flaccus (*parens, altrix, patria*, 62). In his assessment of Athenian painters, Plutarch briefly praises Apollodorus for discovering gradation of colors and chiaroscuro. He also goes on at length about Euphranor's painting of the cavalry battle against Epaminondas at Mantinea (362), ironically seizing upon the opportunity to become something of the historian himself, or a painter in words, as he describes the valor of the Athenians in their victory over the Theban general. Ignoring the mimetic quality of his own ekphrastic digression, Plutarch expresses doubt that anyone would prefer the representation of the act (τὸ μίμημα) to the act itself (τῆς ἀληθείας, 346F). We are clearly in Platonic

[5] I follow Thiolier's text (1985). Lamprias gives a different title: Κατὰ τί ἔνδοξοι Ἀθῆναι. The oration is generally referred to by its Latin title: *De Gloria Atheniensium*. Babbitt has argued that "the essay is a *tour de force*, like other rhetorical discussions which were popular in Plutarch's day; it does not necessarily represent his own belief" (Babbitt 1993: 490–491). For Thiolier this oration is evidence for the young writer's rebelliousness against an entire philosophical and literary tradition (1985: 22). Jones and Swain, on the other hand, argue for the sincerity of Plutarch's position and claim that this oration demonstrates an interest in ethical concerns which runs through Plutarch's writings (Jones 1971: 105; Swain 1996: 168 and1997: 175). I am hesitant, however, to equate the voice speaking in the text with Plutarch the man, and my reading suggests there is considerable irony in Plutarch's presentation of the speaker.

territory here,[6] and Plutarch seems to be well aware of the irony of his argument, evidence that his own critical approach is an extension of an Athenian philosophical discourse. Furthermore, the playful inconcinnity between the valorization of *praxis* over *mimēsis* and Plutarch's own indulgence in mimetic digression should raise an eyebrow. The critical reader might well ask: what has the clever Greek writer *done* that is praiseworthy? The content of Plutarch's essay takes for granted the incontestability of Athens' glorious past; on a metatextual level, though, Plutarch's essay begs a comparison between the glorious Athenian past and the questionable Greek present still being defined.

Just as he was able to criticize historiography, Plutarch also targets – of all things – Athenian drama. Historiography was criticized as a mere representation of glorious deeds, but poetry fares even worse in Plutarch's essay, for poetry is the representation of falsehoods. Plutarch disregards Athenian dithyramb, stating that its most famous practitioner, Cinesias, was not deemed worthy of praise by his fellow citizens even when he was alive. Comedy too gets quick treatment: the Athenians themselves thought it so irreverent and vulgar that there was a law proscribing the comic mockery of any member of the Areopagus (τὴν μὲν κωμῳδιοποιίαν οὕτως ἄσεμνον ἡγοῦντο καὶ φορτικόν, ὥστε νόμος ἦν μηδένα ποιεῖν κωμῳδίας Ἀρεοπαγίτην, 348B). Tragedy was something wonderful to see and hear for the men of that time (θαυμαστὸν ἀκρόαμα καὶ θέαμα τῶν τότ' ἀνθρώπων, 348C), but it is unfortunate, according to the speaker, that the content of tragic performances was not truth but a *muthos* owing its success to the power of deception (ἀπάτη).

The procession of tragedians[7] which follows in the text (348D–349E) lampoons the solemnity with which the poets are traditionally regarded. Plutarch depicts the tragedians speaking and singing as they parade to the accompaniment of flutes and lyres, and they bring along with them the tools of their trade: the masks, the altars, the revolving stage machinery, and their victory tripods. They are accompanied by a band of tragic actors who are imagined as bearing along the personified Tragedy upon a litter as if she were a wealthy woman (ὥσπερ γυναικὸς πολυτελοῦς τῆς τραγῳδίας κομμωταὶ καὶ διφροφόροι, 348E). The procession becomes even more outra-

[6] Though not completely, according to Thiolier: "si cette conception est largement déterminée par la principe de l'imitation, elle n'est pas totalement platonicienne et reste encore tributaire, en fait, du réalisme populaire le plus courant" (1985: 19).

[7] "Plutarque fait défiler successivement sous les yeux du lecteur deux cortèges différants (348D–349E), le premier (qui ne recueillera évidemment aucun applaudissement) est celui des poètes, le second celui des généraux" (Thiolier 1985: 7).

geous with the addition of purple robes, choreographers, more masks, spear-wielding guards, etc. Plutarch even cites the old Spartan criticism that the Athenians made a great mistake (ἁμαρτάνουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι μεγάλα, 348F) by spending more on dramatic festivals than they did on their fleet and their army. He faults the liberality and indulgence of the χορηγοί who lavished their actors and choristers with gourmet delicacies, while men in the field were forced to eat uncooked food (349A). The procession of tragedians culminates in a re-evaluation of the tripod, the famous symbol of victory at the Athenian dramatic festivals: the tripod was not really a token of victory, but instead the final libation of a livelihood spilled out and the cenotaph of a lost estate (ἐπίσπεισμα τῶν ἐκκεχυμένων βίων καὶ τῶν ἐκλελοιπότων κενοτάφιον οἴκων, 349B). For the purposes of his argument, the glory of Athenian tragedy is reduced to vanity: it is envisioned here not as the apex of Athenian culture (cf. Velleius Paterculus), but merely as an over-stuffed pomp, a drain on civic resources, and a weakness which resulted in Spartan victory at the end of the 5th century.

The speaker's primary strategy in lampooning Greek tragedy is of course the feminization of tragedy's male participants. The speaker's perspective is by no means that of the objective cultural anthropologist; on the contrary, Plutarch's speaker fulfills his agenda by charging the practitioners of tragedy with effeminacy, consequently calling into question the genre's moral value. The actors themselves are reduced to διφροφόροι, ἐγκαυσταί, χρυσωταί, and βαφεῖς in the service of the personified Tragedy, a domineering female figure whether imagined as a wealthy woman or as an idol worshipped and adorned by effeminate acolytes. Amongst their paraphernalia is to be found the ξυστὶς ἁλουργής (348F), a purple garment which the LSJ defines as a "robe of rich and soft material reaching to the feet." This is the appropriate garment for tragic heroes and even of statesmen (Pl. *Resp.* 420E). But the ξυστίς is also the finery of feminine wealth[8] and is even used by Aristophanes as a double-entendre for female genitalia (fragment 320.7).[9] The men of the choruses are furthermore transformed into τρυφῶντας by their doting χορηγοί.

Athenian dramatic festivals were civic institutions organized and enjoyed by among others the leading men of the *polis*, and so the Athenians themselves did not assign to tragedy a morally questionable and corrupting effeminacy. And yet this retrospective projection of morals onto the past is a viable rhetorical strategy in Plutarch's oration because effeminacy has been a constant threat to masculinity throughout Greek history: the speaker im-

[8] Henderson 1987: 207.
[9] Henderson 1991: 142.

putes to tragedy an unmanliness which would have been censured not only by the Athenians of the 5th century,[10] but likewise by Greeks and Romans of the 1st century CE.[11] Gendering Athenian tragedy in this manner, the speaker questions its ethical value in the formation of a Greek ἀνήρ or Roman *vir*.

By contrast, the procession of Athenian generals that follows in the oration is the embodiment of manliness. The generals are distinguished as men of action and are thereby immune to the criticisms of men who play no part in public affairs or who lack military experience (τοὺς ἀπράκτους καὶ ἀπολιτεύτους καὶ ἀστρατεύτους, 349B). Plutarch singles out for praise such men as Miltiades and Themistocles, who are not garlanded and wine-soaked like the tragedians, but who carry as their trophies whole cities, nations, continents, temples, and colonies. Their *skeuai* are not masks and purple robes, but structures like the Parthenon, the long walls of the city, the naval yards, the *propylaia*, the whole of the Chersonese, and Amphipolis. The glory of the generals is further bolstered by the fact that Athenians made state holidays and festivals out of the anniversaries of military victories. They did not, however, declare annual celebrations for the tragic victories of Carcinus' *Aërope* or Astydamas' *Hector* (349E). Military glory, finally, is not a vain achievement, but a means to a greater end. Athens' military glory stands as a symbol of freedom (ἐλευθερία) for all men, and Plutarch suggests that it is only through such freedom that the tragic *muthoi* of Thespis and Phrynichus can exist at all. Plutarch is succinct in his final assessment of Athenian poetry, which, he says, is the stuff of children (Ἀλλὰ νὴ Δία παιδιὰ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν, 350B). Ironically, however, despite his critiques of Athenian historiography, painting, poetry, and oratory, Plutarch's oration is itself a testament to their powers of representation.

Athens was therefore more often than not the subject of eulogy during this period, praised for both its cultural contributions and its military superiority. But as Velleius Paterculus and Plutarch demonstrate, the memory of Athens was not immune to historical revisionism, and even its most hallowed cultural institutions could in this period become targets of philosophical and ethical critique. When fault is found, it is the perception that Athenian manliness and physical integrity have been compromised by its feminine obsession with art and literature. One might even say that by the 1st century CE, its glorious past a distant memory, Athens itself had become

[10] Dover 1978: 73–81; Henderson 1991: 219.
[11] Williams 1999: 126.

vulnerable to the charge of a figurative εὐρυπρωκτία,[12] the butt of an Aristophanic joke.

2 *Democracy and Tyranny*

As is well known, attacks on Athenian democracy began as early as the 5th century BC,[13] and it is therefore not surprising that the critical attitude of the anti-democratic theorizers of the classical period survives in 1st century BC and CE writing about Athens. The greed, moral decay, and political factiousness that anti-democratic critiques find in the Athenian past lead to a deconstruction of Athens' own ideological antithesis between democracy and tyranny. This phenomenon is most prominent in Diodorus, Nepos, and Seneca.

Diodorus' account of the Sicilian Expedition in Book 13 of the *Bibliothēkē* demands special attention because of its many similarities with Athens' ambiguous representation in Chariton. It is worth remarking that in the *prooimion* to Book 13 Diodorus claims that he is prevented by the limitations of narrating a universal history from discoursing about his present subject. He is "bound," he says, "to omit the long discussion of the *prooimia* and to come to the events themselves" (ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὸν πολὺν λόγον τῶν προοιμίων παραπέμψαντας ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἔρχεσθαι τὰς πράξεις, 13.1.2). The remainder of the introduction to Book 13 recapitulates the preceding books and briefly summarizes what is to come, namely the military expedition against Syracuse. We are apparently left to our own hermeneutic devices in our reading of the events themselves, since the historian has here foregone the tradition of providing a moral frame within which to view these events. In this regard he departs from the pattern laid out by his model, Ephorus, and such a gesture is itself noteworthy.[14] The demands of his work compel Diodorus to narrate his already lengthy history at a relatively brisk pace, but it is interesting that Diodorus has chosen precisely this point to omit a proper introduction. Perhaps there is something so clear in the events themselves, perhaps the Sicilian expedition is so inherently didactic, that it requires no historian's moralizing voice to explicate its message. But such assumptions should heighten the reader's sensitivity to the rhetoric with which the writer colors his depiction.

---

[12] Cf. Ar. *Ach*. 843, *V*. 1070.

[13] See the discussion by Roberts 1994: 33–92.

[14] See Sacks 1990: 19.

Immediately noteworthy in this regard is the greed with which the Athenians are characterized at the beginning of Book 13. Enthusiasm for the invasion of Sicily has spread to such a degree that not only Athenian citizens, but foreigners and also members of allied states living in Athens are all eager to enroll themselves in the army (πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν δημοτικῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ξένων, ἔτι δὲ συμμάχων, 2.2). It is as if an imperial fever has spread even to the extremities of the body politic. The people are excited not by the abstract notion of patriotism, but rather by the expectation of gain, for they all looked forward to slicing up the Sicilian pie (κατακληρουχεῖν … τὴν Σικελίαν). Diodorus strikes a further dissonant chord when he notes that prior to the departure for Sicily, the generals, in secret assembly with the council (μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ συνεδρεύοντες, 2.6), decided how to take control of the cities in Sicily should they conquer the island (ἐὰν τῆς νήσου κρατήσωσιν). The subjunctive κρατήσωσιν is a grim reminder that Athenian victory is only a potentiality, and the reader, given the superior position through his/her knowledge of history, knows better. We are invited to see the secretive scheming and maneuvering of the generals as an indication of a moral flaw. Before they have even put to sea, and without the knowledge of the assembly, the generals and the council decide that the Selinuntians and Syracusans would become slaves, and that the other peoples in Sicily would pay an annual tribute to Athens. The ideal upon which Athenian democracy was founded, that the *dēmos* will decide public policy, is thus perverted by secretive machinations and a military hunger for gain and imperialist expansion.

In the account of the Syracusans' victory over the Athenian triremes, the Syracusan civilians stationed atop the city walls are said to have raised the paian (ἐπαιάνιζον) upon seeing their own men victorious. But these same spectators witness also the deaths of many Syracusans as well: "When they saw their own men being defeated, they moaned in grief and with tears in their eyes they prayed to the gods" (16.7). Naval warfare becomes a theatrical spectacle for the people of Syracuse, but their delight in the spectacle is shattered when they realize the personal and civic devastation of the events unfolding before them. Unwittingly they become the actors in their own tragedy. Diodorus writes that,

> ἐνίοτε γάρ, εἰ τύχοι, τῶν Συρακοσίων τριήρων παρὰ τὰ τείχη διαφθείρεσθαί τινας συνέβαινε, καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τῶν συγγενῶν ἀναιρεῖσθαι, καὶ θεωρεῖν γονεῖς μὲν τέκνων ἀπώλειαν, ἀδελφὰς δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἀδελφῶν οἰκτρὰν καταστροφήν.

> Sometimes it chanced to happen that certain of the Syracusan triremes were destroyed against the walls and the men in the boats were killed before the eyes of relatives: parents watched the death of their children, and sisters and wives the pitiable destruction of husbands and brothers. (16.7)

The artful structure of Diodorus' sentence is effective in bringing to life the Syracusans' grief. The atmosphere of death is achieved by a number of different words depicting the slaughter of the men (διαφθείρεσθαι, ἀναιρεῖσθαι, ἀπώλειαν, καταστροφήν), and the chiastic order of the final clause illustrates the interconnectedness of those dying and those witnessing the death. In this powerful sentence Diodorus captures the image of a social entity mourning the loss of a part of itself. Even though the Syracusans are victorious in this naval battle, the emphasis on Syracusan suffering implicitly reminds the reader of Athenian aggression.

After the slaughter of the 18,000 Athenian soldiers, Diodorus' narrative slows to focus on the assembly at Syracuse and the debate about what to do with the Athenian captives, including the generals. Diocles, a man described as the most distinguished leader of the people (τῶν δημαγωγῶν ἐνδοξότατος, 19.4), proposes that the generals be tortured and killed, and that the other prisoners should be put to work in the quarries. But Hermocrates, who, interestingly, is not distinguished by the narrator for his reputation as is Diocles, suggests that the Syracusans act humanely (ἀνθρωπίνως, 19.5) in their victory. Then for the first time in his account of the Sicilian expedition, Diodorus presents the extended speech of an individual in direct discourse; until this point, all dialogue or exhortations by the generals were reported in indirect speech. Nowhere else does the *Bibliothēkē* accommodate such oratorical exposition.[15] Diodorus thereby invites his reader to question why the fate of the captured Athenians is of such thematic concern for his universal history.[16]

---

[15] Sacks 1990: 101–102.

[16] Diodorus' departure from Thucydides' account is significant, as is the lack of scholarly consensus about whether Didorus' model was Timaeus or Ephorus (Sacks 1990: 102). Rather than assign the episode to the authority of any one literary model, Sacks argues convincingly that the episode is the invention of Diodorus himself, concluding that, "when extensive oratory is to be included or when speeches are to contain moral *sententiae*, Diodorus, consistent with his statement that the historian should occasionally display his rhetorical powers (xx 1.2, 2), often infuses them with his own message concerning moderate behavior" (1990: 107–108). *Contra* Sacks, see Stylianou (2002): "The peculiarities of the *Bibliothēkē* are best explained as the result of the fitful methods of a

Surprisingly it is not Diocles or Hermocrates who stands in the assembly to deliver a speech but rather Nikolaos, an old man who lost two sons in the recent military engagements. He mounts the *bēma* supported by two slaves, and begins by recounting his grief at the loss of his sons. But he states that, despite his grief, the Syracusans' actions toward the Athenian prisoners affect not only the prisoners themselves but also their own common advantage and the international reputation of the people of Syracuse (τό τε κοινῇ συμφέρον καὶ ἡ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Συρακοσίων ἐξενεχθησομένη δόξα, 20.5). Nikolaos' speech has much to say about the character of the Syracusans and about how the cultural identity of his people is informed by their relationship with and reaction to Athenian hegemony.

Though he claims that the destruction of the Athenian armada is the result of divine retribution for human arrogance (he calls the Athenians τοὺς ὑπερηφανοῦντας, 21.4), Nikolaos pleads with the Syracusans that they not act beyond their own powers. True leadership, says Nikolaos, lies not in arms but in character (21.8). Victory over the Athenians will be complete when the Syracusans surpass them not just in arms but also in humanity (τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ). The divine power of Clemency (Ἔλεος, 22.7), though his altar was established in Athens,[17] shall be found in Syracuse as well. Nikolaos' religious imagery here is shrewd, a stirring call for Syracuse to appropriate in addition to military also moral hegemony from Athens.

Athenian glory demands Sicilian respect, and Nikolaos eulogizes Athenian contributions to Hellenic culture with the familiar catalogue (26–7). Recounting the glory of Athenian culture in the face of the devastating effects of Athenian expansionism, Nikolaos struggles to come to terms with the paradox that continues to shape our understanding of the Athenian past. Rather than condemn Athens completely for its aggression, he acknowledges Athens' profound value to civilization as a whole: "Brief the hatred for the wrong they have done, but great and many the accomplishments that inspire goodwill" (βραχὺ τὸ διὰ τὴν ἁρματίαν μῖσος, μεγάλα δὲ καὶ πολλὰ τὰ πρὸς εὔνοιαν αὐτοῖς εἰργασμένα, 27.1–2). The surviving Athenians are not a

careless epitomizer with a moralizing bent, who produced, working in considerable haste, a historical compilation. Study of the ways of D. is of value only because it helps to establish the nature and worth of the sources which underlie the *Bibliothēkē*. Had these survived (the narrative histories and the chronographers) who would pay the slightest attention to D.?" But Stylianou's view of Diodorus is reductive and refuses to acknowledge Diodorus as a deliberate writer, constantly making choices in the creation of his narrative.

[17] Cf. Scholion at Soph. *OC*. 260.

bunch of barbarous foreigners, but men who, Nikolaos says, belong to Syracusans' own *ethnos* (ὁμοεθνεῖς ἀνθρώπους, 27.6).

Gylippus' response reminds the Syracusans of the slaughter and grief inflicted by the Athenians (28.6), and Gylippus demands as payment for such suffering the death of the Athenian captives. Whereas Nikolaos had imagined Athens as the victim of a reversal of fortune, the plaything of Chance, Gylippus asserts that the Athenians themselves are responsible for their aggressive public policy and consequently for their own defeat (29.3–7). The misfortune of the Athenians was brought about by their own greed (πλεονεξία, 30.1), and Gylippus provides as evidence the fact that the Athenians were already dividing up Syracuse as booty even before they had set sail for Sicily, citing their plan to enslave the citizens of Syracuse and Selinus and to force tribute upon the rest of Sicily (30.3).[18] Gylippus anticipates the counterargument that Alcibiades alone is to blame for the Athenian attack and he refutes the argument with some clever, sophistic political theorizing. The orator, he claims, is not in charge of the mob, but rather the mob, determining what is to its advantage, trains the orator to say what is best (οὐ γὰρ ὁ λέγων κύριος τοῦ πλήθους, ἀλλ' ὁ δῆμος ἐθίζει τὸν ῥήτορα τὰ βέλτιστα λέγειν χρήστα βουλευόμενος, 31.2). In other words, the mob rules in Athens. Gylippus concludes his portrait of Athens by noting the slipperiness of the Athenian character, shifting allies and enemies so long as it serves their own purposes (32.5). Gylippus therefore draws the image of Athens as an infidel polis: untrustworthy and in no way bound to the φιλανθρωπία articulated by Nikolaos.

As history demands, the Syracusans are persuaded more by Gylippus than by Nikolaos and so they vote for the proposal of Diocles, putting to death the Athenian generals and their allies while the rest of the Athenians are sent to work in the quarries (33.1). But the conclusion of the Sicilian war brings about no clear-cut picture of democratic Athens at the end of the 5th century. In fact by expanding his narrative to include a lengthy oratorical episode in which both the vices and virtues of the Athenians are debated, Diodorus has ensured that his text presents a deeply conflicted representation of the Athenian past. Diodorus depicts a greedy populace, eager to slice up and apportion the rich Sicilian pie. Democracy, rule of the people, is corrupted at Athens by intrigue, factiousness, and the willingness to allow personal desire to take precedence over public advantage. And by aligning the

[18] The reader was informed of this fact earlier in the narrative, where Diodorus notes that the Athenian invasion was planned not in open assemby but in a secret meeting between the generals and the *boulē* (13.2.6).

reader with the sympathies of the Syracusans, Diodorus associates Athenian imperialist expansion with murder and bloodshed. Nevertheless, it takes only a rhetorical flourish to remind the reader of the benefits of Athenian culture, that we owe agriculture, laws, and the arts all to Athens. This explains the absence of an elaborate *prooimion* at the beginning of Book 13: no easy moralizing can accurately frame the complex, paradoxical image of Athens at the end of the 5th century. The Athens depicted in Book 13 of the *Bibliothēkē* is an Athens past its prime, defeated militarily, yet culturally dominant, as viewed from the Sicilian perspective, and this image of Athens will have much in common with the Athens depicted by Chariton.

Emblematic of Athens' paradoxical nature is the figure of Alcibiades. A full consideration of the representations of Alcibiades in the literary tradition will be the focus of the final chapter of this book. For now, though, it suffices to consider how Alcibiades participates in the representation of Athens in Diodorus and Nepos. Diodorus draws a clear line of causality from Athens' destructively factious political atmosphere, to Alcibiades' desertion from Athens, to the eventual outbreak of the Deceleian phase of the Peloponnesian War. In 415, when Alcibiades is suddenly summoned back to Athens to defend himself against accusations of conspiracy, Diodorus explains that the accusations were made by "those in Athens who hated Alcibiades with a personal enmity" (οἱ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἔχθραν μισοῦντες τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐν Ἀθήναις, 5.1).[19] The personal enmity that is allowed to guide public business[20] sets off a destructive chain of events: Alcibiades defects to Sparta, urges an attack on the Athenians (5.4), suggests sending military aid (led by Gylippus) to the Syracusans (7.1), and spurs the Lacedaemonians to break their truce with Athens, thus beginning the Deceleian war (8.8–9.2). In Diodorus' account, therefore, Athenian political factiousness leads not just to the loss of a great statesman and a great general, but also to the stationing of a Spartan garrison in Attica for twelve long years (cf. Th. 7.19, 27–28).[21]

---

[19] Thucydides attributes Alcibiades' summons to juridical laxity born out of an atmosphere of suspicion in the matter of the defamation of the herms and the mysteries. Failing to test the validity of witnesses, the Athenians instead fall prey to πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι (Thuc. 6.53) who steer the investigative procedure to suit their own purposes.

[20] Cf. Nep. *Alc*. 7.3.3.

[21] Cf. also the appeal of Nicias to his demoralized soldiers that they should not return to Athens, but rather that they should remain in Sicily and continue with the expedition that they had begun. It would, he says, be disgraceful to abandon their siege of Syracuse while they were yet provided with triremes, soldiers, and money. But in addition to this, Nicias also tells his soldiers that if they were to make a settlement with Syracuse without the knowledge of the *dēmos*, then they would be endangered at Athens by those whose

In Cornelius Nepos' *Life of Alcibiades*, Athens is associated with jealousy, political factiousness, lack of restraint, cruelty toward nobles, and its overwhelming fear of tyranny. Nepos writes that Alcibiades had become an object of enmity because he was so frequently before the eyes of the people (*fiebat ut omnium oculos, quotienscumque in publicam prodisset, ad se converteret, neque ei par quisquam in civitate poneretur*, 7.3.5). Suspicion against Alcibiades' political ambitions leads the Athenians to believe that the mutilation of the herms and the profanation of the Eleusinian mysteries were not just religious blasphemy, but were part of a conspiratorial plot (*coniurationem*, 7.3.6). When the Athenians send for Alcibiades in Sicily to return to Athens to face trial, Alcibiades flees to Elis and Thebes because of his growing wariness of his own citizens' immoderate lack of restraint and their cruelty toward their best citizens (*de immoderata civium suorum licentia crudelitateque erga nobiles*, 7.4.4). The similarity to Ciceronian vocabulary here is remarkable (cf. *libertate immoderata ac licentia contionum*, *Pro Flacco* 16).

In his absence, the Athenians sentence Alcibiades to death, the Eumolpidae priests are compelled by the people to curse him, and a copy of the curse carved onto a stone pillar is placed in public view. According to Nepos, it was only after he had heard of these actions against him in Athens that Alcibiades fled to Sparta, where he addresses the people who were once his enemies. Alcibiades himself says to the Spartans that his political opponents in Athens exiled him from the city precisely because they realized that he was capable of being the most beneficial to the state (*nam cum intellegerent se plurimum prodesse posse rei publicae, ex ea eiecisse*, 7.4.6). His political opponents had therefore yielded more to their own anger than to the common good (*plusque irae suae quam utilitati communi paruisse*).

The centerpiece of Nepos' biography, however, is the description of Alcibiades' return to Athens in 407 after falling back into Athenian favor and conducting a victorious campaign in the Hellespont on their behalf. Remarkable in Nepos' treatment of the scene is the emphasis on the changeability of Athenian popular opinion. So great was Athens' expectation of seeing Alcibiades that, when the city as a whole (*universa civitas*) went down to the Piraeus, the crowd flocked together (*vulgus conflueret*) to his trireme, just as if he alone had arrived. Nepos explains that the people were convinced (*populo erat persuasum*, 7.6.2) that the earlier troubles and the present favorable turn of events were both attributable to Alcibiades: they blamed themselves (*culpae suae tribuebant*) both for the loss at Sicily and

---

custom it is to make false accusations against generals (ἀπὸ τῶν εἰωθότων τοὺς στρατηγοὺς συκοφαντεῖν, 13.12.2).

for the Spartan victories, because they had expelled such a good man from their state (*quod talem virum e civitate expulissent*). Alcibiades is grateful for the welcome with which he is received, but he does not forget their earlier bitterness (*acerbitatem*). During his speech in the assembly, the people are so overcome by Alcibiades' words that they lament his ruin and show themselves now as enemies of his political opponents (*inimicumque iis se ostenderit, quorum opera patria pulsus fuerat*, 7.6.4). It is as if some other people had condemned him of sacrilege, and not they themselves who at that moment were weeping (*proinde ac si alius populus, non ille ipse qui tum flebat, eum sacreligii damnasset*). His property is restored to him at public expense, and the Eumolpidae priests who had previously been compelled to curse him, are compelled once again to free him from the curse (*rursus resacrare sunt coacti*, 7.6.5). And the pillars upon which the curse had been written are thrown headfirst into the sea (*in mare praecipitatae*).[22]

But the envy (*invidia*, 7.7.1) of the Athenians reappears soon after their show of kindness and gratitude, and Alcibiades once again falls out of favor. Here the biographer asserts his own perspective (*maxime putamus*, 7.7.3) that the opinion of Alcibiades' talent and virtue was excessive (*fuisse nimiam opinionem ingenii atque virtutis*), for there was always the fear that, lifted up by favorable fortune and great wealth, he would lust after tyrrany (*tyrranidem*). Nepos' moral judgment of Alcibiades' character depends not upon Alcibiades' actions, but rather upon the expectations and political anxieties of the Athenians of the 5th century. To suggest that the Athenians feared *tyrannis*, or the supremacy of a tyrant, implies Athenian concern about their own identity as a non-tyrannical social body. To fear tyranny, in

[22] The scene is modeled on accounts of the same scene in Xenophon, Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus. Xenophon's account survives in the *Hellenica*, and we know from Plutarch that the scene was narrated also by Ephorus and Theopompus (*Alc.* 32.3). Nepos himself mentions only Thucydides, Theopompus, and Timaeus as sources (7.11.1). Xenophon might reasonably be considered the model for the description of Alcibiades' arrival and the greeting by the crowd: καταπλέοντος δ' αὐτοῦ ὅ τε ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιῶς καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως ὄχλος ἠθροίσθη πρὸς τὰς ναῦς, θαυμάζοντες καὶ ἰδεῖν βουλόμενοι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην (*Hel.* 1.4.13). Nepos renders ὄχλος ἠθροίσθη with the Latin *vulgus confluueret* and he translates ἰδεῖν βουλόμενοι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην with *exspectatio visendi Alcibiadis*. But if Xenophon is the model for the beginning of this passage, Nepos nevertheless opts for models other than Xenophon for the unified reaction of the *vulgus*. Xenophon's ὄχλος is split in its opinion about Alcibiades (οἱ μὲν ὡς κράτιστος εἴη τῶν πολιτῶν ... οἱ δὲ, ὅτι τῶν παροιχομένων αὐτοῖς κακῶν μόνος αἴτιος εἴη, 1.4.13–17), but Nepos' *vulgus* is of one mind in its changed attitude, so much so in fact that Nepos imagines that the previous enmity towards Alcibiades belonged to some other people entirely (*alius populus*) and not the Athenians themselves.

other words, is simultaneously to be unsure of the certainty of *dēmokratia*. Thus by basing his judgment of Alcibiades on the Athenian fear of tyranny, Nepos reinforces the idea of Athenian *dēmokratia* as a thing constantly threatened, and thus constantly in need of vigilance.[23] As it operates by fear (*magnus multitudini timor est*, 7.3.3; Alcibiades *timebatur*, 7.7.3) *dēmokratia* is itself ironically a form of tyranny, and this paradox accounts for the strained, ambivalent relationship between Alcibiades and Athens.

After the establishment of the Thirty Tyrants, Alcibiades intends to liberate his country (*ad patriam liberandam*), but he knows that he can only do so with the help of the Persian king. In an effort to secure the king's favor, he intends to reveal to the king his brother's plot against him, and at this point Nepos' account begins to take on a romantic shape. In fact the Persian king is the same Artaxerxes who falls prey to the beauty of Callihroe in Chariton's novel; and the plotting brother is of course Cyrus, whose failed attempt at gaining the Persian throne is recounted by Xenophon in the *Anabasis*. The political intrigue deepens when Critias and the rest of the Athenian tyrants (*Critias ceterique tyranni*, 7.10.1) send ambassadors to Lysander in Asia to warn Lysander that if he does not kill Alcibiades, then Athenian oligarchy would remain insecure. Despite Alcibiades' exile from Athens, *tyrannis* (imposed by the Spartans and the oligarchs at Athens) overcame Athenian *dēmokratia* anyway. Ironically, then, Alcibiades, formerly accused of being the enemy of *dēmokratia*, is transformed to become now the champion of liberty and a dangerous threat to Athenian *tyrannis*. The interrelatedness of *dēmokratia* and *tyrannis* and Alcibiades' ambivalent relationship with both is thus retained by Nepos in the biography right up until Alcibiades' death.[24]

The paradoxical tyranny of Athenian democracy is also the theme of Socrates' trial and execution in Seneca's *De Tranquilitate Animi*. Throughout Seneca's discussion of man's duty to affairs of state, there loom in the background the conditions that make life for the well-intentioned politician nearly impossible.[25] To provide an example of such conditions, Seneca asks, "Can you find a city more wretched than was that of the Athenians when the thirty tyrants were tearing it asunder?" (*Numquid potes invenire urbem miseriorem quam Atheniensium fuit, cum illam triginta tyranni divellerent?*, 5.1). The Athens of the Thirty Tyrants was, Seneca tells us, its very worst period,

[23] Cf. the "strange and compelling symbiosis between the democratic body politic and the body of antidemocratic theorizing" (Roberts 1994: 3).

[24] Roberts notes that "The biographies of Nepos, then, include many references to the existence of the anti-Athenian tradition, but these references are absorbed in a larger picture in which the Athenian demos appears in a less harsh light" (1994: 105).

[25] Griffin 1976: 325.

for they killed 1300 of the best citizens, and no end of their savagery was in sight, since cruelty itself was spurring them on (*irritabat se ipsa saevitia*).

Seneca contrasts his image of Athens under the Thirty Tyrants with an image of Athens at its height, when the institutions of *dēmokratia* still functioned. This was the city of the Areopagos, the site of the most conscientious legal procedure (*Areos pagos, religiosissimum iudicium*, 5.1). This was the city in which there existed a senate and a people that was itself like a senate (*senatus populusque senatu similis*). The language is idealizing, and thus Seneca evokes the image of Athens as a paradigmatic political entity. But this idealistic image of 5th century Athens serves the more immediate purpose of highlighting the gross perversion of justice by the Thirty Tyrants. The wickedness of the tyrants was so great, in fact, that the Athenians despaired of ever recovering their former freedom (*Ne spes quidem ulla recipiendae libertatis animis poterat offerri*). Seneca reminds the reader of Athens' history of tyrannicide but implies that there no longer existed enough Harmodiuses to kill all the tyrants (*Unde enim miserae civitati tot Harmodios?*). For a man who wants to serve his state to the best of his abilities, these are as bad as political conditions can possibly be.

Onto such a stage Seneca then introduces the figure of Socrates, who, despite political conditions, manages to provide himself as an example of moral rectitude. Just as Seneca presents himself as the *medicus* who can cure the ills of an intemperate mind (1.2), he likewise presents Socrates as a kind of physician who makes his rounds throughout the polis and attempts to cure Athens of her mental anguish (5.2). And just as Seneca had constructed a stark contrast between the Athens of the Thirty Tyrants and the Athens ruled by *dēmokratia*, so here he reinforces that contrast by describing the political ills that Socrates strives to cure. He consoles the Athenian elders who are in mourning (*lugentis*) over what they have lost and who are no longer free to govern their own city. Others in the city have lost hope in the government (*desperantis de re publica*) and this corroborates Seneca's earlier assertion that there was no longer any hope of recovering their freedom (*Ne spes quidem ulla recipiendae libertatis animis poterat offeri*, 5.1).

Most interesting is Socrates' treatment of the wealthy, who fear their own wealth under the oligarchs (*divitibus opes suas metuentibus*, 5.2), an irony that sharply illustrates the political reversal that has taken place in Athens. When Seneca says that Socrates criticized the "too late repentance of their dangerous greed" (*seram periculosae avaritiae paenitentiam*) he implies that the vice of *avaritia* is in some way to blame for the current political situation. Only now that wealth is dangerous under the reign of the

tyrants do they regret their greed, but Socrates' criticism suggests that had their greed been tempered earlier, then Athens' political circumstances might be altogether different and they might not all be under the yoke of foreign masters. Though the reference is not explicit in Seneca's text, one cannot help but remember the cautionary speech of Nicias in the Athenian assembly prior to the Sicilian expedition, advising the elders to check the younger men's mad lust for what does not belong to them (Thuc. 6.13.1). Greed as a motivating characteristic of the Athenians is also familiar from the history of Diodorus. Seneca thus incorporates the commonplace of Athenian *avaritia* into his own discourse as both a political and philosophical warning, an impediment to *tranquillitas* within one's own *animus* and within the state as a whole.

But the Thirty Tyrants cannot abide the kind of freedom that Socrates symbolizes, and Seneca proposes that the very notion of freedom could not endure the freedom of one who had in safety insulted an army of tyrants (*et qui tuto insultaverat agmini tyrannorum, eius libertatem libertas non tulit*, 5.3). The paradox is typically Senecan:[26] Athens was the great city which once championed the *libertas* of all its citizens, but under the Thirty Tyrants the very symbol of *libertas* (Socrates) is transformed into that which is now anathema to the new Athens. If by his very presence in the city Socrates demonstrates *libertas*, then Socrates himself must be removed from the city. And the fact that he faces his execution with dignity fosters the sense of dignity that his freedom represents.

The Socratic example demonstrates that the wise man may make himself known amid tyrannical conditions, but even in a flourishing and fortunate state, capriciousness, envy, and a thousand other useless vices reign (*Licet scias et in adflicta re publica esse occasionem sapienti viro ad se proferendum et in florenti ac beata petulantiam, invidiam, mille alia inertia vitia regnare*, 5.3). If the Athens of the Thirty Tyrants is the *adflicta res publica*, then the prior Athens – the Athens of Pericles and the tragedians, the Athens

[26] In letter 86, Seneca imagines Scipio Africanus' farewell speech to Rome: "Was Scipio to stay in Rome? Or was Rome to stay a free democracy? That was then the choice. What did Scipio say? 'I have no wish,' he said, 'to have the effect of weakening in the least degree our laws or institutions. All Roman citizens must be equal before the law. I ask my country, then, to make the most of what I have done for her, but without me. If she owes it to me that today she is a free country, let me also prove that she is free. If my stature has grown too great for her best interests, then out I go'" (Campbell's translation, 1969: 145). While Scipio's exile demonstrates Rome's commitment to *libertas*, Socrates' death demonstrates that the state which once heralded *libertas* can itself no longer endure *libertas*. I am indebted to James Ker for directing me to this passage.

which sent its fleet to Sicily – though flourishing and prosperous, was nevertheless a city characterized by *petulantia*, *invidia*, and countless other vices. One would expect the easy, straightforward contrast that Seneca had previously constructed: the ideally prosperous Athens of an earlier time versus the wretched cruelty of Athens under the Thirty Tyrants. But according to Seneca's more practical formulation, even during its prosperous period, Athens was still crippled by moral corruption.

Like Cicero and Diodorus, Seneca exposes the ease with which the idea of 5th century Athens can be summoned either as symbol of cultural prosperity or equally as an example of a corrupt state like any other. Seneca idealizes 5th century Athens to emphasize the cruelty of the Thirty Tyrants, but he also manages to remind the reader that even at its height Athens was plagued by vices. Athens produced Socrates as a living example of philosophy, and Seneca presents Socrates as a foil for himself as *medicus*. And yet Seneca simultaneously points out the flaw in Socrates' overly rigid sense of freedom (*eius libertatem libertas non tulit*, 5.3), thereby claiming for himself an authority superior even to that of the great exemplar (*magnum exemplar*, 5.2). It is in the nature of a polyvalent symbol to defy simple one-to-one correspondences, and when Seneca evokes the Athenian past, he demonstrates his skill and complexity as a writer by manipulating that image to suit his several rhetorical purposes.

3 A Figure for Rome

As discussed in Chapter 1, several scholars (most notably Laplace, Alvares, Connors, and Schwartz) have attempted to read analogies for Rome in Chariton's novel, with varying degrees of success. Contemporary literature of the 1st century BC and CE however is more explicit about the relationship between Athens and Rome. The representation of Athens as analogous to Rome is clearly articulated in the texts of Nepos, Velleius Paterculus, and Seneca, but the relationship between Athens and Rome is drawn with more complexity in Cicero, Diodorus, and Plutarch.

While Nepos' *Life of Alcibiades* may be read as a discrete work of literature, it is also part of a larger work, the *De viris illustribus*; consequently Nepos' depictions of Alcibiades and Athens serve a much larger rhetorical function. According to Joseph Geiger, Nepos' *Lives* of the Greek generals was the companion to a book (now lost) on the *Lives* of Roman generals, and

both halves formed a σύγκρισις.[27] The *magnum opus* hypothesized by Geiger therefore suggests a favorable rhetorical equation between classical Athens and Rome. The preface to the *De viris illustribus* provides further evidence for the cultural comparison between the Greek past and Rome that frames the work (1–10). In Velleius Paterculus, the relationship between Athens and Rome is yet more explicit, as the eulogy of Athenian literary genius finds its historical parallel in Velleius' Rome (1.17). Velleius focuses specifically on Roman achievements in drama (Accius, Caecilius, Terence, and Afranius),[28] historiography (culminating with Livy), and oratory (Cicero). Even Roman grammarians, sculptors, and painters receive the historian's praise. Velleius' excursus on the genius of 5th century Athens thus strongly suggests an historical precedent for the Roman cultural efflorescence.[29] Seneca likewise uses a reminiscence of the dangerous social and political landscape of Athens under the Thirty Tyrants as a way of suggesting the adverse social and political conditions of Rome in the 1st century CE.

According to Cicero's formulation in the *Pro Flacco*, in which the speaker must distinguish between Greek witnesses testifying for and against his defendant, the Greek *ethnos* consists of only three groups (*quin tria Graecorum genera sint vere*, 64): Athenians/Ionians, Aeolians, and Dorians. Only as a member of this tripartite whole may a Greek-speaking state claim *fama*, *gloria*, *doctrina*, *plurimae artes*, *imperium*, and *bellica laus*. The real Greece as defined by Cicero holds and has always held only a small portion of Europe (*parvum quondam locum ... Europae*). Having drawn his figurative map of the world in this way, Cicero turns to the witnesses against Flaccus, witnesses from Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, and Lydia, witnesses who are not *truly* Greek, and he instructs them to consider themselves not Greeks but Asians (*quaeso a vobis, Asiatici testes, ut ... vosmet ipsi describatis Asiam*, 65). Asia itself is thus imagined to be sitting in court. The Greek language which the Asian witnesses speak is not a convincing enough mask to conceal

---

[27] Geiger 1985: 94.

[28] Shipley suggests that Plautus' absence from this list is due either to textual corruption or to the possibility that Velleius follows Horace's valuation of Roman comedy from the *Ars Poetica* (1979: 43).

[29] See also Livy's account of a Roman embassy sent to Athens in 454 BC to transcribe the famous laws of Solon (*inclitas leges Solonis describere*, 3.31.8) as part of the formation of a new legal code at Rome. Ogilvie has persuasively argued against the historicity of this episode: "True, Rome was emergent and ambitious, but there were sources of Greek law much nearer to hand than Athens" (1965: 450). But the fact that Livy includes the (fictitious) episode in his history suggests a desire to envision ancient Athens as a kind of cultural and political forebear of the Roman republic.

their true eastern characters, for Cicero tells the prosecutorial witnesses to consider what they themselves say about their own kind, and proceeds to list a number of slanderous Greek proverbs about Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, and Lydia (*quid vosmet ipsi de genere vestro statuatis, memineritis*). Rather than apply a very fine scalpel to distinguish between "good" Greeks and "bad" Greeks, Cicero wants the jury to believe that he has instead applied the blunt but time-honored hammer to distinguish between Greeks and non-Greeks, *Hellēnikoi* and *barbaroi*.[30]

Cicero wants his jury to believe that there are barbarians at the figurative gates. Should the integrity and character of an upstanding Roman be questioned by foreigners appointed as representatives by an uproarious mob? The decision about Flaccus, Cicero claims, is not about Flaccus alone but about Rome herself, a bastion of learning, law, and order threatened from without by eastern effeminacy and infidelity. Cicero has transformed Flaccus' case into a story that is as old as the Greek literary tradition. We must understand the nostalgic reminiscence of Athens in this context, therefore, not as an historical fact to be taken for granted, but rather as a cultural construct evoked by Cicero to reinforce long-held stereotypes against Asians. In this scheme, Athens is a fundamental axis in a complex triangular relationship between Rome, the Greek world, and the East. Athens allows the orator to connect Rome with a distinguished classical past and at the same time to figure Rome positively within a pre-existing discourse defining East and West.

The rhetorical gesture is not without risk, though, for by reminding his audience of the old topos distinguishing Greek from non-Greek, Cicero implicitly reminds his listeners of Rome's status as non-Greek and hence potentially barbaric. But the emphasis on Athenian eulogy here, combined with Rome's and Cicero's own philo-Athenian attitude, secures for Rome in this context an honorary Greekness, defending her (and Flaccus) from the cor-

[30] Vasaly writes that "Cicero has resuscitated the ancient Greek point of view, focusing on the ethical contrasts between Europe (which included Greece) and Asia. It is to be remembered as well that the topos as it appears in ancient Greek literature (including the proverbs quoted by Cicero) generally depended on a contrast between the non-Greek and the Greek, while Cicero has used the same topos to posit an ethical distinction between Greek and Greek" (1993: 204). It is to be conceded that Cicero distinguishes between Greek and Greek insofar as Athenians, Spartans, Phrygians, and Mysians all speak the same language. But in illustrating the merit of Athens and Sparta and other states providing witnesses for Flaccus, Cicero clearly defines these cities and regions as the true and authentic Greece (*ex vera atque integra Graecia*, 61). By implication therefore he defines the witnesses against Flaccus as false and inauthentic Greeks, non-Greeks in other words. The old topos of Greek vs. *barbaros* is not so much revised as it is merely re-presented.

rupting influences of the East. Context, however, is key. Though he brings his speech to a climax with the evocation of Athens' golden past, it is important also to remember that earlier in the speech Cicero had just as easily evoked Athens as a paradigm of mob rule (17). In the very same speech, Cicero is therefore able to fashion quite different conceptions of classical Athens, and he does so with only a very slight shift of focus. The malleable images of Athens are summoned in the *Pro Flacco* to serve the rhetorical purposes of the orator.[31]

Originally from Sicily, Diodorus probably wrote his *Bibliothēkē* while living in Rome; it is inevitable therefore that his universal history reflects in some ways the complex attitudes of a Greek living under Roman power, a situation not unlike that of Chariton himself, though there is no evidence that Chariton ever even visited Rome. But given the impossibility of reconstructing the attitudes of Diodorus from his text, we are left with the frustrating fact that in the account of the Sicilian expedition – a clear indictment of imperialist aggression – there is no explicit comparison with Rome. Despite this silence in the account of the Sicilian expedition, the *Bibliothēkē* nevertheless recounts events up to the year 60 BC, and so the text's presentation of history is inevitably filtered through an understanding of the Roman present. Sacks writes that, "Diodorus is a realist: the Roman Empire would not dissolve in his lifetime, and to some extent he admires its success and the stability it brought. His argument, that hegemons who cease ruling with moderation (ἐπιείκεια) and instead employ terror are destined to lose their power, may be intended as a warning to Rome."[32] If we cannot read Rome specifically in the representation of Athens in Book 13 of the *Bibliothēkē*, the text's chronological *telos* at least invites Athens to be interpreted as a cautionary sign for the elite Roman audience of Diodorus' time.

Overt references to Rome are not to be found in Plutarch's oration, either. But the *De Gloria Atheniensium* is an early work,[33] and in Plutarch's later career the relationship between Greece (particularly Athens) and Rome would be the primary force shaping his best known works: the *Parallel Lives*. Plutarch's Athenocentrism should not therefore be read as an indica-

---

[31] Roberts writes that "Cicero's use of Athenian examples throughout his works demonstrates a complex, then, of three interrelated topoi: the topos of Athens as the cradle of the verbal arts; the topos of the ingratitude of the Athenians toward their leading politicians; and the topos of the unruliness of democratic government" (1994: 104).

[32] Sacks 1990: 158.

[33] It is believed to have been delivered in Rome between 60 and 65 CE (Jones 1971: 67, 135). Thiolier places the text somewhat later, in the last quarter of the first century (1985: 10–11).

tion of unresponsiveness to Roman authority or even as a reaction against such authority. Rather, as Jones writes, "Plutarch's attitude to Rome is in a sense both Greek and Roman: Greek, in that he saw himself as a Greek by birth and language, Roman, in that his interests and sympathies are bound up with the empire."[34] Despite the thoroughgoing Greek perspective of his writings, the evidence of an inscription attesting to Plutarch's Roman identity ("Lucius Mestrius Plutarchus")[35] confirms that Hellenism was not the only sphere in which the writer might define himself. Furthermore, one form of expression need not take priority over another form, as both the Greek and Roman aspects of identity must be continually reinforced, whether through writing or social and political interaction.[36]

But even in Plutarch's youthful literary projection of mastery over Greek history, there is an awareness of the self-negating potential implicit in cultural authority that is based solely on the fantasy of the classical past. Plutarch's criticism of oratory in the *De Gloria Atheniensium* is particularly significant in this regard. Once again in this rhetorical *tour de force*, words mean very little when compared with real action. The speaker criticizes Isocrates' hypocrisy for praising the valorous men who risked their lives at Marathon: Isocrates himself grew old not by sharpening his sword, polishing his helmet, or marching in the field, but by joining together antitheses, clauses, and rhetorical figures. "How," Plutarch aks, "could a man not fear the clash of armor and the crash of phalanxes when he fears that a vowel might collide with a vowel or that he might produce an isocolon spoiled only by the lack of a syllable?" (Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἄνθρωπος ψόφον ὅπλων φοβεῖσθαι καὶ σύρρηγμα φάλαγγος ὁ φοβούμενος φωνῆεν φωνήεντι συγκροῦσαι καὶ συλλαβῇ τὸ ἰσόκωλον ἐνδεὲς ἐξενεγκεῖν; 350E). The pedantic concerns of the orator are trivial obsessions when compared to the concerns of the real world. It took Isocrates almost twelve years to compose his *Panegyric*, but it took Pericles just as long to erect the *propylaia* and his hundred-foot-long temples (351A). The orator's words thus pale in comparison to the statesman's marble structures – iconic edifices which are the very symbols of Athenian glory in the minds of his listeners and to which the speaker could have pointed with outstretched arm if the speech were ever delivered in Athens. The achievements of the great statesman can be seen by the audience in the very stones of the acropolis.

---

[34] Jones 1971: 125. See also Swain 1996: 185–186.
[35] *SIG* 829a.
[36] Whitmarsh 2001: 22.

By arguing that the value of an orator is significantly diminished when he is compared with a statesman, Plutarch's speaker undermines his own authority as an orator and calls into question the ethical value of his speech. Not only is the orator's persona at risk, but so too is the perceived incontestability of Athenian glory, for when the orator indicates the acropolis as evidence for the achievements of statesmen, his audience would see before them at least two different realities. The first of course is the historical reality of Athenian power memorialized in the remains of Pericles' 5th century building program. The second reality, however, was the restoration of Athens and her acropolis by the Roman emperors, beginning with Augustus.[37] Caligula and Nero were rapacious in their treatment of Athens,[38] and despite his love of the Greek arts, Nero's attitude towards Athens was apparently colored by a superstitious fear of the Furies (Cass. Dio 63.14). Claudius, however, Nero's immediate predecessor, followed the Augustan example in his relationship with Athens, marked by the construction of a monumental flight of stairs leading to the *propylaia* on the acropolis. Further renovations during this period consisted of the repaving of sections of the Panathenaic Way, a new stairway leading from the agora to the Temple of Hephaestus, additions to the Theatre of Dionysus, the Agoranomeion dedicated to the deified Augusti in the Roman agora, and a public restroom by the Tower of the Winds.[39] The simultaneous presence of the monumental remains of Athens' glorious past side-by-side and underneath the Roman edifices would have produced a kind of double-vision, not only for the Athenians themselves, but also for their Roman occupiers. If the Athenians and other Greeks wanted to believe in their own cultural authority, then emperors like Augustus and Claudius (and eventually Hadrian) facilitated this belief by restoring and recreating the experience of Athenian glory. Greeks like Plutarch were complicit with if not active participants in this pervasive classicizing project. When considered from this perspective, Plutarch's oration turns out to be a not-so-subtle reminder of who the current monument builders are, and who the speech writers are.

Plutarch's oration does not solve this inherent ambiguity. True, our text of the oration is incomplete, and in the missing conclusion the speaker might very well have addressed this central paradox. And yet paradoxes abound in

---

[37] Geagan 1979: 379–381.

[38] Geagan 1979: 384.

[39] See Graindor 1931; Travlos 1993: 96–108; Stevens 1946: 92–93; Thompson and Wycherly 1972: 149; Oliver 1950: 82–83; Robinson 1943: 303–305; and Geagan 1979: 383–385.

the oration: for as forcefully as the speaker asserts the superiority of Athens' men of action over her men of letters, there is an alternate voice in the text which seems to suggest the opposite and to reinforce the authority of the literary tradition.[40] This alternate voice which subverts the argument of the speaker is strengthened not by the presence of the marble *propylaia* and the continuity of festival days at Athens, but by the rich literary tradition and the institutions of *paideia* which propagate the idea of classical Athens to begin with. Plutarch's early oration provides powerful evidence for the difficulty of representing a unified image of Athens' classical past, a difficulty which Chariton's novel actively embraces. Evoking classical Athens was a complex cultural process bound ultimately to contradict itself and resist easy definition. And how one recreated the Athenian past was highly relevant to how one articulated a Greek and Roman identity in the imperial context of the Common Era.

[40] "Le principal paradoxe est constitué par le fait même que Plutarque, homme de plume qui à l'époque du *De Gloria Atheniensium* ne doit connaître de la vie que les écoles de rhétorique ou de philosophie, s'applique à démontrer la supériorité de l'épée sur la plume. Ce paradoxe de base est accompagné et servi par une série de définitions ou d'anecdotes paradoxales pour la confection desquelles la vérité ou la réalité historique a été quelquefois un peu forcée" (Thiolier 1985: 14–15).

3 Chariton's Athens: Making Men, Women, and States

An overview of Chariton's text reveals roughly 22 explicit or implied references to Athens or Attica,[1] the significance of which depends on the reader's point of view. That number may seem small considering that the narrative depicts a vast international landscape and that one of the points of Chariton's romance is to represent an historically believable world. In such a scheme, it seems only natural that Athens should be a part of the novel's composition. But of course everything in Chariton's novel reflects a literary choice – nothing in the novel is "natural." Furthermore, the Athenian presence in the novel – even its relatively meager explicit presence – is remarkable considering that none of the characters are Athenian and that Athens is never a dramatic setting in the narrative. It's interesting that the explicit and implied references in the novel are clustered toward the beginning and end of the narrative, specifically in the Syracusan episodes. This is consistent with the idea that, as will become clear in this chapter, Syracuse and its most prominent citizens define themselves by opposition and allusion to Athens. But it will also become apparent that Athens has relevance beyond the representation of Syracuse and that the Athenian presence in the novel transcends explicit or implied references. In fact the Athenian literary and cultural tradition is an integral part of the novel's fabric and it shapes the world-view of the characters and the narrator in ways more subtle and profound than can be accounted for by simple lexical tabulation.

The Greek novels are obsessed with the notion of identity. The novels test the constitution of their protagonists' characters, from the moment when they first see each other and experience a mutual erotic desire, to the ways in which they endure separation and suffering. Even the theoretically infinite

[1] These are Book 1: 1.1, 1.3, 1.13, 6.2–3, 11.2–3, 11.4, 11.5–7; Book 2: 6.3; Book 3: 4.16, 4.18, 5.3, 10.8; Book 5: 4.4, 8.8; Book 6: 7.10; Book 7: 2.3–4, 5.8; and Book 8: 2.12, 6.2, 6.10, 6.12, 7.2. All of these, and more subtle evocations of Athens, will be discussed in this chapter.

expansion of episodes of which the Greek novels are composed is a medium for projecting and testing identity.[2] The novels are therefore an important expression of what Michel Foucault termed the "cultivation of the self" which was the intense focus of much of the literary production during the early imperial period. Slowly evolving from its origin in 5th and 4th century Athenian philosophy (most notably in Plato's *Alcibiades*, which I will discuss further in Chapter 5), the cultivation of the self eventually "took the form of an attitude, a mode of behavior; it became instilled in ways of living; it evolved into procedures, practices, and formulas that people reflected on, developed, perfected, and taught. It thus came to constitute a social practice, giving rise to relationships between individuals, to exchanges and communications, and at times even to institutions."[3] Ryan Balot has shown in particular how Chariton's novel stages the construction of masculinity.[4] But to focus on the symbolic function of Athens reveals how the cultivation of identity in Chariton's novel also contributes to the text's complex relationship with the classical past. In a sense, the representation of characters who talk about Athens to articulate a sense of identity is mimetic of the text itself as an expression of Greek identity. To chart the complexity of this articulation demands first a narratological examination of how characters like Callirhoe, Chaereas, Hermocrates, Dionysius, and Theron talk about Athens and themselves and how also attitudes towards Athens reflect larger social and political attitudes. Related to the construction of individual identities is the way talking about Athens becomes in the novel a social practice and a means of defining the character of the state.

1 Syracuse

The role of Athens in Syracuse's political self-expression is first seen in the public assembly convened to deal with the problem of Chaereas' erotic suffering. Chaereas' father Ariston has insisted that Hermocrates would never allow his marriage to Callirhoe when wealthy suitors and princes are vying for her hand. Dejected, Chaereas stops taking part in the activities of a young man; his friends never see him any more and the gymnasium seems empty

---

[2] See Bakhtin 1981: 84–100; Konstan 1994: 45–47; Branham 2002b: 173–174; Connors 2002: 12–13; Smith 2005: 167–183.

[3] Foucault 1986: 45. Goldhill's 1995 evaluation and refinement of Foucault's work on the novel is crucial.

[4] Balot 1998.

without him. When the assembly is convened, therefore, civic discussion is transformed into a plea for Hermocrates to save their beloved Chaereas.[5] Using civic and military rhetoric, the crowd claims that saving Chaereas and allowing a marriage to Callirhoe will be Hermocrates' greatest trophy (τοῦτο πρῶτον τῶν τροπαίων, 1.1.11), an implicit reminder that Hermocrates' present glory rests on his victory over the Athenians. The narrator then draws attention to himself by posing a rhetorical question to the reader: "Who could interpret that assembly over which Love presided as the popular leader?" (τίς ἂν ἑρμηνεύσειε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκείνην, ἧς ὁ Ἔρως ἦν δημαγωγός; 1.1.12). The agent leading the crowd, we learn, is no mortal politician, but Eros himself. Being a patriot (φιλόπατρις), Hermocrates is unable to resist the will of the people, and so he assents to the marriage. The crowd dashes off to rescue Chaereas from his misery, and the women attend Callirhoe; the city is decked out with garlands and bridal torches; doorways are filled with the scents of wine and perfume. Thus in Chariton's fictional world, erotic concerns are privileged over political and military concerns: an unexpected marriage becomes worthy of a trophy, Eros is the most powerful demagogue in the city, and patriotism is best expressed by yielding to a romantic engagement. This reading is corroborated when the narrator brings his description of the celebration to a climax: "The Syracusans considered this day sweeter than the day of their victory celebrations" (ἥδιον ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ἤγαγον οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων, 1.1.13). While it is not mentioned specifically, the prior "victory celebrations" are none other than the celebrations in Syracuse after the defeat of the invading Athenian army.

---

[5] Alvares has noted how this scene is part of a larger movement throughout the novel by which traditional political and historical forces are re-shaped to conform to the romantic plots of Aphrodite and Eros (1997: 616). Similarly, Peter Toohey has cleverly argued that Callirhoe's and Chaereas' erotic wasting, paradoxically emphasizing their fidelity and innocence, can only be cured by "the public proclamation of their ethical worth": the degenerative symptoms of their lovesickness "elicit a sympathy and approval that can remedy the dangerous decline into death … The externality of erotic infatuation to the subject, when it leads to a passive reaction such as wasting, death, or suicide, is to be associated with currently admired modes of behavior such as fidelity, reciprocity, and purity. The externality of erotic infatuation to the subject, when it leads to active reactions such as violence [cf. Archilochus] or promiscuity [cf. Sappho], leads to modes of behavior that are not admired, at least, by Stoics, Christians, or by our contemporary society" (1999: 268–269). The erotic reactions of Chaereas and Callirhoe are to be compared with the erotic reaction of Artaxerxes. Though he himself professes to be the victim of the god who can even overpower Zeus (6.3.1–3), the narrator informs us that in reality Artaxerxes' love-sickness is the result of a "passion nourished by idleness" (ἐπιθυμίαν ὑπὸ ἀργίας τρεφομένην, 6.9.4). Artaxerxes' love-sickness, then, is the negative result of an ethically questionable lifestyle.

With the images of garlands, torches, wine, and perfume, the reader is seduced into the world of romance: we are granted the perspective of the festive crowd as they prepare for the marriage of Syracuse's most beautiful young man and woman. But mentions of the τροπαῖα and ἐπινίκια are jarring reminders to the reader of the novel's historical framework, a decidedly unromantic gesture which brings to mind the bloody devastation of 413. Alvares has argued that the evocation of the victory celebrations simultaneously establishes Aphrodite's influence in Syracuse (erotic forces are privileged over military forces) and dissolves "a dangerous political rivalry. This will be the first of many benefits arising from devotion to the values of Aphrodite."[6] On one level I agree with Alvares: Hermocrates' assent to the marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe does establish Aphrodite's influence in Syracuse – traditional political and military values are overturned in the service of Eros. But while Aphrodite may have resolved the rivalry between Hermocrates and Ariston, the primacy of Aphrodite does not dissolve the political rivalry with Athens. We are made to understand that the Syracusans *believed* (ἤγαγον) that this day was more pleasing than the day of their victory over Athens, but there is no indication in the text at this point that the political rivalry with Athens has been dissolved in the minds of the Syracusans. The civic benefit of the marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe is merely a perception focalized through the citizens themselves; it is not a fact asserted as true in the fictional world by the external omniscient narrator.[7] On the contrary, Athens and her imperialist aggression continue to haunt the minds of the characters, and at the end of the novel, as we shall see, Athens is even imagined (however briefly) to have launched a second attack on Syracuse. Ultimately the remark by the narrator at 1.1.13 serves at least three purposes: (1) to reinforce further the novel's historical milieu, (2) as Alvares has argued, to demonstrate how the Syracusans have prioritized Eros and the works of Aphrodite over more traditional political concerns, and (3) paradoxically to reassert the cultural and political authority with which Athens continues to be invested by Syracuse. The day of Callirhoe's engagement to Chaereas might have been perceived to be sweeter than the day of victory over Athens, but the sustained memory of that earlier day, as much as it em-

[6] Alvares 1997: 616.
[7] See Bal 1997: 27.

phasizes Syracuse's military superiority, simultaneously also perpetuates the image of Athens as an imperialist threat to be feared.[8]

Despite Hermocrates' public intervention, the marriage of Callirhoe and Chaereas is plagued by (an apparently) fatal jealousy. The description of Callirhoe's funeral procession provides on the one hand an opportunity for novelistic ekphrasis,[9] but it also provides the best demonstration in the novel of Syracuse's dependency on Athens for the articulation of identity. Once again the narrator makes himself perceptible to the reader and poses his rhetorical question: "Who could accurately describe that funeral procession?" (Τίς ἂν οὖν ἀπαγγεῖλαι δύναιτο κατ' ἀξίαν τὴν ἐκκομιδὴν ἐκείνην; 1.6.2). Who indeed but our humble narrator? By briefly stepping outside of the story, the narrator heightens the descriptive moment and focuses the reader's attention on his own mimetic power. So swept up in the drama of the romantic intrigues and the sudden, tragic collapse of the heroine, the reader might easily lose sight of the narrative voice. But by making himself perceptible once again, the narrator subtly reminds the reader that this πάθος ἐρωτικόν is the subject of a narrative art. The perceptibility of the narrator reveals the beautiful lie, the artificiality of the ekphrastic moment. The description of Callirhoe's funeral deserves to be quoted in full:

> κατέκειτο μὲν Καλλιρόη νυμφικὴν ἐσθῆτα περικειμένη καὶ ἐπὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης μείζων τε καὶ κρείττων, ὥστε πάντες εἴκαζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδνῃ καθευδούσῃ. προῄεσαν δὲ τῆς κλίνης πρῶτοι μὲν οἱ Συρακοσίων ἱππεῖς αὐτοῖς ἵπποις κεκοσμημένοι· μετὰ τούτους ὁπλῖται φέροντες σημεῖα τῶν Ἑρμοκράτους τροπαίων· εἶτα ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ πά<ντες οἱ ἄρχο>ντες Ἑρμοκράτην δορυφοροῦντες. ἐφέρετο δὲ καὶ Ἀρίστων ἔτι νοσῶν, θυγατέρα καὶ κυρίαν Καλλιρόην ἀποκαλῶν. ἐπὶ τούτοις αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν πολιτῶν μελανείμονες· εἶτα πλοῦτος ἐνταφίων βασιλικός· πρῶτος μὲν ὁ τῆς φερνῆς χρυσός τε καὶ ἄργυρος· ἐσθήτων κάλλος καὶ κόσμος (συνέπεμψε δὲ Ἑρμοκράτης πολλὰ ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων)· συγγενῶν τε δωρεαὶ καὶ φίλων. τελευταῖος ἐπηκολούθησεν ὁ Χαι-

[8] See also Oudot, who writes that, "la référence aux Athéniens défaits par le stratège de Syracuse constitue un hommage implicite aux vaincus: on ne se vante si fort de sa victoire que lorsque le vaincu est prestigieux" (1992: 103).

[9] As far as ekphraseis go, the description of Callirhoe's funeral is neither extensive nor very detailed; it is precisely the kind of descriptive moment suitable for the expansive prose and sophistic art of later novelists like Achilles Tatius and Longus. And though Chariton does not take off on a flight of literary fancy, his description of the funeral is appropriately sentimental in its pageantry, and perhaps more importantly it is thematically significant.

> ρέου πλοῦτος· ἐπεθύμει γάρ, εἰ δυνατὸν ἦν, πᾶσαν τὴν οὐσίαν συγκαταφλέξαι τῇ γυναικί. ἔφερον δὲ τὴν κλίνην οἱ Συρακοσίων ἔφηβοι, καὶ ἐπηκολούθει τὸ πλῆθος. τούτων δὲ θρηνούντων μάλιστα Χαιρέας ἠκούετο. ἦν δὲ τάφος μεγαλοπρεπὴς Ἑρμοκράτους πλησίον τῆς θαλάσσης, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς πόρρωθεν πλέουσι περίβλεπτος εἶναι· τοῦτον ὥσπερ θησαυρὸν ἐπλήρωσεν ἡ τῶν ἐνταφίων πολυτέλεια. τὸ δὲ δοκοῦν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς νεκρᾶς γεγονέναι μειζόνων πραγμάτων ἐκίνησεν ἀρχήν.
>
> Callirhoe lay dressed in a bridal gown, and upon a bier of beaten gold she was both greater and more powerful, so that everyone likened her to a sleeping Ariadne. The Syracusan cavalry in orderly formation with their horses marched first before the bier. After these were the hoplites bearing the symbols of Hermocrates' trophies. Then the council, and in the midst of the people were all the archons flanking Hermocrates as guards. Ariston, who was still ill, was also carried along, calling out to Callirhoe as his daughter and lady. Behind these were the citizens' wives dressed in black, then the royal wealth of the burial offerings: first the gold and silver of the dowry, then the beauty and adornment of gowns (and Hermocrates sent in addition much from the spoils of war). And then there were the gifts of both relatives and friends. And last of all followed the wealth of Chaereas, for he wanted, if it were possible, to burn everything he owned along with his wife. The Syracusan ephebes carried the bier, and the multitude followed. Of those who were wailing, Chaereas was heard most of all. Hermocrates' magnificent tomb was beside the sea, so that it was admired even by those sailing from afar. The great expense of the burial offerings filled up this tomb as if it were a treasure house. But that which was intended for the honor of the dead girl set in motion the beginning of greater events. (1.6.2–5)

Zimmermann has suggested that this description reflects traditional local custom with which Chariton was familiar,[10] but I am more concerned with the narrative function of such a description. Hägg has called this descriptive passage a "*tableau*, that is, a detailed, vivid picture of a piece of action."[11] The most basic function of the *tableau* is to provide enjoyment; the reader takes pleasure in the rhetorical power of the descriptive passage. And yet the *tableau* is not composed entirely outside of the narrative progress of the text; though the tempo slows to accommodate the ekphrasis, the characters are nevertheless depicted as acting out their respective roles within the fictional

[10] Zimmermann 1961: 339.
[11] Hägg 1971: 93.

time of the narrative.[12] The *tableau* is also a "means of characterization" – we learn more about Hermocrates as father and statesman; we learn more about Ariston's sentimentality, about Chariton's devotion as husband, and about the romantic and political affiliations of the Syracusan people as a whole. In these ways, the ekphrasis on the one hand is realized as a heightened moment within the narrative and on the other hand is integrated into the story. Plepelits has little to say about the funeral procession beyond some remarks about the tradition of burial offerings for the dead,[13] and Bompaire has noted the passage's significance as a means of characterizing the people of Syracuse as a collective body. Their participation in the funeral procession "affirms their identity" and the "social categories" into which the people are divided reflect their civic concerns: "one notes, among others, the presence of the Syracusan cavalry and the hoplites as the standard-bearers of Hermocrates' trophies."[14] Kaimio likewise has called this ekphrasis the novel's "most elaborate expression of the social hierarchy in Syracuse."[15] I find it striking, however, that the Athenian element and the evocations of the Sicilian victory are so prominent in what might have been a private, family affair: the burial of daughter and wife. But this is no ordinary girl; this is the daughter of Hermocrates, and so Callirhoe's burial procession becomes a public event, a state funeral.[16]

---

[12] Bal explains that at moments of slow-down within a narrative, "An entire drama of vision inserts itself between fabula and story. For the magnifying glass does not improve close-up vision; it modifies it" (Bal 1997:108). The point is that Chariton does not need to slow down the action of the story and account for the order of the funeral procession and the attitudes and behavior of its participants. He could have written simply: And then the people of Syracuse escorted Callirhoe's body to the tomb. And yet the ekphrasis does more than just delay the action. The descriptive voice of the narrator modifies the reader's perceptions: it brings some elements into focus and blurs others. As I will explain below, one of the functions of this ekphrasis is to draw the reader's attention to thematic concerns and to historiographical elements which surround the story, *inter alia* the Sicilian expedition.

[13] From the very earliest period, Plepelits writes, the practice of providing offerings for the dead was widespread and the offering itself consisted of all of the dead person's property. In the classical period, moderation prevailed ("in klassischer Zeit war die Tendenz zur Mäßigung vorherrschend." And then in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, burial offerings were uncommon (1976: 166).

[14] Bompaire 1977: 60. The thematic importance of civic participation in this scene has also been noted by Alvares (1997: 618).

[15] Kaimio 1995: 122.

[16] Readers of the 1st century CE would have understood a state funeral as an honor designated for civic benefactors, and Alvares notes that Callirhoe would have been an unusual "major public benefactrix" (1993: 213). He goes on, though, to say that Syracuse has

The naval battle of 413 and the Syracusans' subsequent inland pursuit of the Athenians are events of the past, and the trophies that were erected at that time by the victorious general are by the time of the funeral merely memories. But these memories are historically potent and they continue to haunt the characters in the present. And so the people of Syracuse preserve their victory over the Athenians by outward signs, tokens that hearken back to the not-so-distant past and reify Syracusan military superiority. Victory over Athenian aggression will be an important means of self-definition for all of the most important Syracusan characters throughout Chariton's novel: just as the σημεῖα carried by the hoplites express Syracusan identity, so this ekphrastic passage is itself a σημεῖον of the way in which a polis constitutes for itself a civic *ēthos*.

But how can it be that the people of Syracuse are collectively "speaking" in the ekphrasis? I have already shown that the ekphrasis is the rhetorical performance of the narrator (Τίς ἂν οὖν ἀπαγγεῖλαι δύναιτο κατ' ἄξιαν τὴν ἐκκομιδὴν ἐκείνην; 1.6.2). And yet, though the characters in the ekphrasis are not speaking *per se* (except for Ariston), within the narrator's voice may be read an extended *oratio obliqua*. The entire description is a kind of indirect statement made by the people of Syracuse, not in this case through language but through spatial organization and performance (i.e. who is placed where in the ordering of the procession). Narratologically speaking, there is in the ekphrasis of the funeral procession "an interference of narrator's text and actor's text."[17] Both the narrator therefore and the objects of his descriptive powers convey meaning simultaneously. Tracing within the ekphrasis the intermingled voices of δημαγωγός and δῆμος, leader and people, we find that the funeral procession too becomes a technology of the self.

If we first imagine that the procession is organized by Hermocrates, then the procession is on the one hand Hermocrates' projection of the polis as a whole and of his place within that polis. Identified as a military man from the beginning, he privileges the military even at the funeral of his daughter: the cavalry leads the way and is followed closely by the hoplites, who bear the symbols of Hermocrates' trophies (ὁπλῖται φέροντες σημεῖα τῶν Ἑρμοκράτους τροπαίων). The presence of these military symbols in the funeral procession suggests on the part of Hermocrates a kind of semiotic response to the Syracusan crowd who only days before had so favored the marriage

---

benefited both socially and politically from Callirhoe's "new devotion to Aphrodite and to sentimental values."

[17] Bal 1997: 52. In other words, "When there is text interference, narrator's text and actor's text are so closely related that a distinction into narrative levels can no longer be made."

between Chaereas and Callirhoe. At 1.1.11, the crowd had said that Hermocrates' assent to a marriage between his daughter and the son of a political rival would be "the very first of his trophies" (πρῶτον τροπαίων), simultaneously satisfying Syracuse's romantic appetites and healing the wounds of civic discord. And yet the marriage ends in tragedy: the ill-will and political jealousy which divided the στρατηγός and the second man in Syracuse (πατρὸς Ἀρίστωνος τὰ δεύτερα ἐν Συρακούσαις μετὰ Ἑρμοκράτην φερομένου, 1.1.3) at the beginning of the novel seems to have been transformed into an erotic jealousy (Ζηλοτυπίαν, 1.2.5) and poisoned also the union of the two young people. And so despite the fact that Hermocrates forgives Chaereas for the unintentional murder of his daughter, the presence of the σημεῖα τῶν Ἑρμοκράτους τροπαίων in the funeral procession may be a visual rebuke both to Chaereas and the people of Syracuse generally. By marshalling the hoplites in his daughter's funeral procession and by bidding them to carry the symbols of his victory over Athens, Hermocrates reaffirms his superior position as στρατηγός and attempts to muster once again the city's traditional political and military concerns in the face of newer, more popular erotic concerns. In fact the organization of the funeral procession might on a grand scale be understood as a way of emphasizing the traditional concerns of the polis while warding off the potentially dangerous lures of Aphrodite. Hermocrates' political posturing is, however, ultimately in vain, for this is not his story, but the story of Aphrodite and her corporeal double, Callirhoe. Nevertheless, as an evocation of 5th century Athens, the σημεῖα τῶν Ἑρμοκράτους τροπαίων and the ekphrasis of the funeral procession as a whole must be accounted for as one of the means by which the novel constructs the classical past.

Giving the cavalry and infantry the first and second places respectively, Hermocrates reminds his people that if it were not for him, then they all by now might be living under the authority of an Athenian garrison. And where does Hermocrates envision himself in the big picture? Shrewdly he places himself in the midst of the people, of course, but not without the armed protection of the archons (ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ πά<ντες οἱ ἄρχο>ντες Ἑρμοκράτην δορυφοροῦντες).[18] In fact, the very extravagance of the procession is also a testament to Hermocrates' military prowess and importance in the state, for

[18] The Codex Florentinus (F) reads ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ πάντες Ἑρμοκράτην δορυφοροῦντες. Blake (1938) emended the passage to read ὁ δῆμος. Lucke (1985) substitutes οἱ ἄρχοντες for πάντες, but this would allow for hiatus with the preceding τῷ δήμῳ. Reardon's reading follows Goold (1995), who suggests ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ πά<ντες οἱ ἄρχο>ντες Ἑρμοκράτην δορυφοροῦντες.

we learn that the expenses have been paid in part by Athenian spoils (συνέπεμψε δὲ Ἑρμοκράτης πολλὰ ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων). The procession climaxes not at a newly-constructed tomb dedicated to Callirhoe, but to the magnificent tomb of her father Hermocrates, eye-catching and awe-inspiring even from far out at sea (ἦν δὲ τάφος μεγαλοπρεπὴς Ἑρμοκράτους πλησίον τῆς θαλάσσης, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς πόρρωθεν πλέουσι περίβλεπτος εἶναι). From this perspective, Callirhoe is truly her father's daughter. The tomb's proximity to the sea and the fact that it can be seen by ships at a great distance are both significant. Hermocrates is, after all, a man whose reputation stems from his great naval victory over the Athenians, and the tomb's seaside location reminds both his people and the reader of that victory, thereby reinforcing Hermocrates' political stature. Should the Athenians attempt a second invasion of Syracuse, the great tomb (μεγαλοπρεπὴς, περίβλεπτος) would be seen by the approaching ships as an apotropaic talisman, reminding the Athenians of the earlier wounds inflicted upon them by the great general.

And yet this is only a one-sided reading of the funeral procession, for if we consider that the procession is a grand expression and outward constitution of the self by the great general, then the procession equally becomes a symbol for the state's construction of its own identity. The civic body, by its very participation in the procession, whether it was organized by Hermocrates alone or by the βουλή, constitutes the collective character of the polis, as Bompaire and Alvares have remarked. The people have decked themselves out in all the finery and regalia which denote their civic station. They stratify themselves into martial and political classes (ἱππεῖς, ὁπλῖται, βουλή, ἄρχοντες, ἔφηβοι), they segregate themselves along gender lines, and they even distinguish between πολῖται and the πλῆθος at large.[19] And most importantly for the present concerns, they proclaim the victory over Athens as an integral part of their own civic identity. In other words, Athens has become a cultural symbol, one element in the larger semiotic vocabulary by which both individuals and civic groups engage in the process of self-definition.

I also find it significant that the bier upon which Callirhoe's body has been laid is carried in the procession by the Syracusan ephebes (ἔφερον δὲ τὴν κλίνην οἱ Συρακοσίων ἔφηβοι). No doubt Syracuse had its own particular traditions of ephebic training and responsibilities.[20] And yet Chariton's

[19] For the organization of Chariton's Syracuse, see the analyses by Alvares (1993: 154–160 and 2001–2002: 132–136).

[20] "Ich halte es für durchaus möglich, daß sich unser Verfasser auch in diesem Punkte einer Lokaltradition von Syrakus angeschlossen hat" (Zimmermann 1961: 339).

understanding of the ephebic class would have been drawn not from an extensive Syracusan literature, but from the Athenian tradition. We learn from Thucydides that the job of defending against invasions belonged to the oldest and youngest citizens (Thuc. 2.13.7), and these youngest citizen-soldiers would have been the Athenian ephebes. And the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* tells us that the ephebes in Athens kept watch in the Piraeus at Mounichia and Akte (*Ath. Pol.* 52.3).[21] But Chariton would have been most familiar (as he demonstrates elsewhere) with the *Cyropaedia*, in which Xenophon sets out the system of education in his curiously Hellenized Persia. Xenophon seems primarily concerned with the ephebes' participation in the hunt, and the positive, didactic function of the hunt as preparation for war. But he remarks that the more immediate concerns of the ephebes are defense and protection of the state and, equally important, the cultivation of self-control (σωφροσύνη, 1.2.9). "This time of life," Xenophon writes, "seems to be especially in need of watchful care" (δοκεῖ γὰρ αὕτη ἡ ἡλικία μάλιστα ἐπιμελείας δεῖσθαι). Xenophon concludes his assessment of the ephebic class by saying that the archons have authority to utilize them for whatever necessity demands, "whether for garrison duty or for arresting criminals or for hunting down robbers"[22] (ἤν τι ἢ φρουρῆσαι δείσῃ ἢ κακούργους ἐρευνῆσαι ἢ λῃστὰς ὑποδραμεῖν, 1.2.12). The ephebes therefore represent the preservation of the state, in that (a) they are the youngest of the citizen-soldiers and (b) protection and defense are their primary duties. Xenophon provides the ethical dimension to the ephebic class by expressing their anxiety about and problematization of σωφροσύνη. The ephebes should be the first bulwark of the state, a class of youths, moderate in character, whose watchful care of the polis should equal that of their own selves.

If, therefore, the Athenian element is a prominent feature of Chariton's description of the funeral procession, then I see no reason to doubt the possibility that the mention of the Syracusan ephebes is itself an allusion to the Sicilian expedition and the defeat of Athens. These ephebes carrying Callirhoe's body might, after all, have been the same ephebes who during their garrison duty saw the first of the Athenian sails on the horizon during the invasion of 415. Since the novel takes place in the period very shortly after the end of the Sicilian War (413), then this is not inconceivable. And yet these need not be the selfsame ephebes of 415 for their participation in Callirhoe's funeral to have poignant meaning. For though Athens has been defeated once by Syracuse, Athens nevertheless remains an imperialist threat,

[21] Moore 1986: 274–276.
[22] Miller's translation (1983: 21).

and Syracuse's continued military vigilance is of the utmost importance for the preservation of its polis. As we shall see, this anxiety is manifested at the end of the novel as Chaereas' sails are seen on the horizon by a Syracusan watchman. If the σημεῖα of Hermocrates' trophies represent the recent ascendancy of Syracuse as a military power, then the ephebes, charged with the most important duty in the funeral procession, represent the *future* of Syracuse as a military power.

A further parallel between Athens and Syracuse in the novel may be found on the level of cultural stereotype. Though Athens is distinguished by the pirates who steal Callirhoe as a wealthy capital of international commerce, it becomes apparent that Athens and Syracuse have much in common in terms of the character of their people. As the pirates make plans for selling their cargo, an unnamed member of the group speaks up first in one of the only overtly pro-Athenian passages in the entire novel:

> "Ἀθῆναι πλησίον, μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων πόλις. ἐκεῖ πλῆθος μὲν ἐμπόρων εὑρήσομεν, πλῆθος δὲ πλουσίων. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἀγορᾷ τοὺς ἄνδρας οὕτως ἐν Ἀθήναις τὰς πόλεις ἔστιν ἰδεῖν."
> "Athens is nearby, a great and prosperous city. There we will find a crowd of dealers and a crowd of wealthy men. For in Athens you can see as many cities as there are men in the agora." (1.11.5)

That these remarks are focalized through the point-of-view of an anonymous pirate underscores the insignificance of the explicitly pro-Athenian perspective. Oudot senses in this representation of a wealthy, multicultural Athens a refracted image of cosmopolitan Rome. For Oudot, Chariton's representation of Athens here is "anachronic"; it is a place of "undifferentiated peoples where anonymity is preserved."[23] Such a representation of Athens makes sense contextually, for a rich, globally commercial cosmopolitan center seems ideally suited for unloading illegal goods, and all of the pirates agree – all except Theron, whose image of Athens is far less optimistic than that of his colleagues.

---

[23] Citing similar passages in Aelius Aristides' *Roman Oration* (36, 61), Oudot writes that, "Si Rome, dans le discours d'Aristide, régit un univers structuré comme une seule cité, à l'inverse, l'Athènes de Chariton est un creuset où se mélangent les peuples. Le romancier déplace la métaphore politique pour présenter une Athènes qui devient alors anachronique, et en faire le lieu de peuples indifférenciés où l'anonymat est préservé" (1992: 102).

> "μόνοι γὰρ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν Ἀθηναίων; δῆμός ἐστι λάλος καὶ φιλόδικος, ἐν δὲ τῷ λιμένι μυρίοι συκοφάνται πεύσονται τίνες ἐσμὲν καὶ πόθεν ταῦτα φέρομεν τὰ φορτία. ὑποψία καταλήψεται πονηρὰ τοὺς κακοήθεις. Ἄρειος πάγος εὐθὺς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄρχοντες τυράννων βαρύτεροι. μᾶλλον Συρακουσίων Ἀθηναίους φοβηθῶμεν."
>
> "Are you the only ones who have not heard about the busybodiness of the Athenians? The people are chatterboxes and a litigious bunch, and in the harbor countless informers will ask who we are and from where we bring this freight. Wicked suspicion will lay hold of those malicious men. The Areopagus is right there, and its officials are more severe than tyrants. We ought to fear the Athenians more than the Syracusans." (1.11.6–7)

These attitudes toward Athens are familiar from many Greek and Roman writers. The Athenian people are stereotypically talkative (λάλος) and litigious (φιλόδικος); there are many sycophants (συκοφάνται) among them; they are motivated by suspicion (ὑποψία), and they are generally a wicked bunch (τοὺς κακοήθεις). Not surprisingly, the Areopagus stands as the symbol of Athenian juridical process. For Seneca, the Areopagus was the *religiosissimum iudicium* (*Tranq.* 5.1), and a similar reverence for the Areopagus is articulated by Plutarch (*De glor. Ath.* 348B). From Theron's perspective, however, the democratic authorities of the Areopagus are "more severe than tyrants" and are therefore to be avoided at all costs (Ἄρειος πάγος εὐθὺς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄρχοντες τυράννων βαρύτεροι). And so like other contemporary authors (cf. the sections on Nepos and Seneca in Chapter 2), Chariton complicates the binary opposition between Athenian democracy and tyranny.[24]

Theron's charge of Athenian "busybodiness," however, stands out. The noun πολυπραγμοσύνη was a term common among the poets of Old Comedy for describing the talkative, gossipy, and frankly curious *ēthos* of Athens and her people (see, in addition to Aristophanes, the comic fragments of Timocles, Diphilus, and Heniochus). In Thucydides, the word also becomes a criticism of Athens' imperialism: the busybodiness of Athens' private citizens characterizes also her intervention in the larger world of the Greek city-states (Thuc. 1.70; 2.40.2). The word became a stereotypical quality of Athenians throughout antiquity,[25] and so it should come as no surprise to see it here in a speech that is critical of the city.

---

[24] Cf. Kasprzyk 2001: 154n40.

[25] See Ehrenberg 1964 and Oudot 1992: 102.

Yet this is not the first appearance of πολυπραγμοσύνη in Chariton's text. Earlier in the novel, after Chaereas becomes lovesick, his young companions wonder why he no longer spends so much time in their company. At that point the narrator states that, "The gymnasium wanted Chaereas back: it was practically deserted, for the young men loved him. Getting involved, they learned the cause of his sickness" (ἐπόθει δὲ τὸ γυμνάσιον Χαιρέαν καὶ ὥσπερ ἔρημον ἦν. ἐφίλει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ νεολαία. πολυπραγμονοῦντες δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔμαθον τῆς νόσου, 1.1.10). Somewhat later, when Chaereas has been lured away from his home on false pretenses, the scheming rival suitors adorn his doorway with garlands and burnt torches to make it seem as if Callirhoe has played host to the rival erotic suitors (1.3.2). When dawn breaks upon the scene of false nocturnal reveling, the narrator recounts that "Everyone who passed by stood in a common feeling of nosy curiosity" (πᾶς ὁ παριὼν εἱστήκει κοινῷ τινι πολυπραγμοσύνης πάθει, 1.3.3). And again later, when the suitors for the second time attempt to rouse the jealousy of Chaereas, the narrator states that "with such words that foul man roused the young man's spirit and made him full of hope and fear and dangerous curiosity" (Τοιούτοις ῥήμασιν ὁ μιαρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἄνθρωπος τοῦ μειρακίου τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνακουφίσας καὶ μεστὸν ποιήσας ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου καὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης, 1.4.4). This "dangerous curiosity" ultimately compels Chaereas to kick his wife unconscious. And so this word πολυπραγμοσύνη, which is the marked term in Greek literature for denoting the meddlesome character of Athens, is in the early pages of Chariton's novel twice applied by the narrator to the people of Syracuse, and once even to Chaereas himself.

Both Hunter and Alvares have argued that Syracuse is politically idealized in Chariton's novel as a "guided democracy,"[26] and as Alvares' detailed account makes clear, the machinery of government in Syracuse seems to work to the state's advantage. Most notably, for example, Hermocrates as στρατηγός prevents the people from being unduly swayed by the Italian "demagogues" during Chaereas' trial (1.6.1).[27] The narrator's text, however, opens up the possibility that Syracuse's political identity is more problematic. This polis that defines itself in part by its opposition to Athens turns out to be characterized by the very same πολυπραγμοσύνη that characterizes the Athenian people. And the characterization of Athens is, interestingly, focalized not through the narrator, but through Theron, the pirate, the outsider, the marginalized figure. There is, therefore, some overlap between the language

[26] Hunter 1994: 1077.
[27] Alvares 2001–2002: 133.

that the narrator uses to describe Syracuse and the language that Theron uses to describe Athens.

Alvares has been careful to note that Theron's remarks about Athens should not be confused with the political sentiments of Chariton the author; we cannot point to this passage as easy evidence for a consistently anti-Athenian strain in the novel.[28] But we must be equally careful not to over-simplify the depiction of Syracuse in the novel: if on one level Syracuse is idealized, then, I would argue, there is an alternate trend in the narrative which subtly critiques and undermines that ideal picture.[29] If Syracuse continually holds up the image of a defeated Athens as a means of defining its own superiority, then the narrator's text reveals that Syracuse, through a seemingly innocent πολυπραγμοσύνη, at least has the potential to embody those qualities that distinguish its fearful political opponent. Syracuse, it seems, is more like Athens than it would probably care to admit.[30]

2 Callirhoe

Callirhoe first elaborates upon her own relationship with Athens after she has been abducted by Theron and his fellow tomb robbers. Theron lies to her about his intentions, but Callirhoe is no fool: though she sees through the lies, she plays dumb, fearing that they would kill her if she were to become angry with them. She covers her head and laments:

---

[28] Alvares 1993: 170.

[29] Alvares too has recognized the subtle counter-idealization, though from a different perspective. The idealizing tone of the novel takes on a different flavor when the narrator begins to focalize the story through the pirate Theron, and when he seeks out his crew among the taverns and brothels, the reader begins "to rethink what has been read and the terms of Syracuse's earlier representations. The initial description reveals Syracuse's ideal status, but these later elements suggest that this earlier representation was incomplete. The reader then at some level must decide to what extent Syracuse is actually 'ideal,' an activity that increases the reader's intellectual engagement with the text" (1993: 90).

[30] The verbal form πολυπραγμονεῖν is, according to the *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, used a total of six times in Chariton's novel: 1.1.10, 2.4.9, 2.5.7, 2.7.2, 3.9.4, 3.9.12. In Book 1 it is applied to Chaereas' young male friends (see above). But throughout the rest of the novel, whether it denotes a meddlesome quality or simple curiosity, the verb is either applied to or spoken by Dionysius. On one level this is an indication of the jealousy and suspicion that Callirhoe generates in her lovers. On another level, it humorously confirms Callirhoe's initial fear of being sold to an Athenian master, for though Dionysius is Ionian and not Athenian, he is certainly characterized by this most Athenian of qualities.

> "σὺ μὲν" ἔφη, "πάτερ, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θαλάσσῃ τριακοσίας ναῦς Ἀθηναίων κατεναυμάχησας, ἥρπασε δέ σου τὴν θυγατέρα κέλης μικρὸς καὶ οὐδέν μοι βοηθεῖς. ἐπὶ ξένην ἄγομαι γῆν καὶ δουλεύειν με δεῖ τὴν εὐγενῆ· τάχα δὲ ἀγοράσει τις τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα δεσπότης Ἀθηναῖος. πόσῳ μοι κρεῖττον ἦν ἐν τάφῳ κεῖσθαι νεκράν· πάντως ἂν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ Χαιρέας ἐκηδεύθη· νῦν δὲ καὶ ζῶντες καὶ ἀποθανόντες διεζεύχθημεν."
> "You yourself, father," she said, "on this very sea conquered three-hundred Athenian ships in a naval battle, but now a small boat has snatched away your daughter and you are of no help to me. I am driven to a foreign land and I, born from a noble family, must become a slave. Soon some Athenian master will buy the daughter of Hermocrates. How much better was it for me to lie as a corpse in a tomb! Certainly then Chaereas would have been buried with me. But now both living and dead we have been separated." (1.11.2–3)

It is important that Callirhoe's first major lament after leaving the shores of Syracuse is addressed to her father, Hermocrates. Helen Elsom has argued that Chariton's novel as a whole reinforces a cultural "discourse of kinship and offspring"[31] by presenting Callirhoe simultaneously as an object of transgressive desire and of erotic chastity which preserves the mores of patriarchal society. She is on the one hand a "work of art," constructed for the quasi-visual enjoyment of the reader; but on the other hand she is defined as the daughter of Hermocrates, "who initially controls her appearance in public in accordance with his status in the world." Callirhoe's appeal to her absent father aboard the pirate ship is yet another example of the way in which patriarchal ideology is deployed in the novel. Laplace has focused not only on the fact that Callirhoe addresses her father in this soliloquy, but that she addresses him significantly as victor over the Athenians. Hermocrates, in other words, is not just "father" in Callirhoe's mind, but also the dominant historical, social, and political figure in her life. Laplace writes that the victory over the Athenians is a "point of reference for the appreciation of all the important events [in the novel],"[32] both public and private.

On one level, Callirhoe's soliloquy illustrates Chariton's mastery of the ironic. The daughter of a famous naval general has, by a twist of fate, be-

---

[31] Elsom 1992: 221. See also Egger 1994.

[32] "Et ce bonheur sert ensuite de référence pour l'appréciation de tous les événements importants, non seulement publics – les actions militaries de Chairéas (VI 7, 10; VII 1, 3 – 4; 5, 8) –, mais même privés – les relations amoureuses et conjugales de Chairéas et Callirhoé (I 1,11; I 11, 2 – 3; III 4, 8; VIII 7, 2)" (Laplace 1997: 57).

come the prisoner at sea – and for that matter not the prisoner of a worthy naval opponent like Athens, but of a lowly tomb robber. On another level, though, Callirhoe's soliloquy tells the reader precisely how Callirhoe envisions herself and her position in the world. By articulating the reversals that she has suffered at the hands of Tyche and Eros, the heroine simultaneously articulates how she desires herself to be read in the narrative of her life. Despite the fact that she is now chattel aboard a pirate ship, Callirhoe addresses her absent father as a means of reaffirming what she believes to be her true identity. She is first and foremost the daughter of Hermocrates. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator informed the reader that this was the same Hermocrates who conquered the Athenians (οὗτος ὁ νικήσας Ἀθηναίους, 1.1.1). But now Callirhoe gives us a few more details about that victory: the glory of Syracuse, she tells us, arose from Hermocrates' naval defeat of three hundred Athenian triremes (τριακοσίας ναῦς Ἀθηναίων κατεναυμάχησας). The postpositive δέ which introduces her next clause contrasts sharply with the μέν that introduced the address to her father (σὺ μὲν … πάτερ), bringing into sharp relief her present misfortune. Born from so glorious and victorious a father, she now sits captive on board a pirate ship and in the very sea (ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θαλάσσῃ) where her father and Syracuse were victorious. This is not the lamentation of a mere girl afraid for her own wellbeing; rather, Callirhoe conflates her own private tragedy to become also a public tragedy.[33] She is not afraid merely of the prospect of being sold as a slave; rather her fear takes on a political dimension. Callirhoe's own worst nightmare, to become the possession of an *Athenian* master (τάχα δὲ ἀγοράσει τις τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα δεσπότης Ἀθηναῖος), mirrors the political nightmare of all of Syracuse. Just as the σημεῖα of Hermocrates' trophies function as an emblem of Syracusan identity, so too does Callirhoe's fixation on her father's victory. Callirhoe employs the same strategy of self-definition as do her father and the people of Syracuse.

When the pirate ship finally arrives in the Saronic gulf,[34] the narrator gives the reader a scenic description, rare in Chariton's novel:

---

[33] For a similar reading cf. Hunter 1994: 1078.

[34] Plepelits notes that Theron and his crew would have crossed the isthmus of Corinth via the Diolkos, the road joining the Corinthian Gulf and the Saronic Gulf. The author himself, says Plepelits, need not have experienced the journey to relate it in narrative, for he could have extracted it from literature (1976:166–167). And yet there is no indication in the text that this is the route which Theron and his crew took. It seems to me that Theron would want to attract as little attention as possible, and dragging their ship across the isthmus via the Diolkos would perhaps attract too much attention. They would be safer taking the longer passage around the Peloponnese. And besides, the narrator makes it

> οἱ δὲ λῃσταὶ νήσους μικρὰς καὶ πόλεις παρέπλεον· οὐ γὰρ ἦν τὰ φορτία πενήτων, ἐζήτουν δὲ πλουσίους ἄνδρας. ὡρμίσαντο δὴ καταντικρὺ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὑπό τινα χηλήν· πηγὴ δὲ ἦν αὐτόθι πολλοῦ καὶ καθαροῦ νάματος καὶ λειμὼν εὐφυής. ἔνθα τὴν Καλλιρόην προαγαγόντες φαιδρύνασθαι καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι κατὰ μικρὸν ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης ἠξίωσαν, διασώζειν θέλοντες αὐτῆς τὸ κάλλος …
>
> The pirates sailed past small islands and towns, for their cargo was not the sort for the poor. Rather, they were seeking wealthy men. They finally anchored directly across from Attica under a certain headland. There was a spring of abundant pure water there and a well-grown meadow. Leading Callirhoe to this place, they thought it best that she wash herself and take a rest for a short time from the sea, since they wanted her to preserve her beauty … (1.11.4)

Hägg identifies the setting as a *locus amoenus*,[35] and it indeed seems a pleasant spot for relaxation and discussion. But this will not be a pastoral scene. Rather Chariton's choice of idyllic setting becomes ironically a place for urban critique and a brief debate about the merits and disadvantages of Athens. The narrative actors are, after all, not bucolic shepherds, but city-dwelling rogues. Situated across the shore from Attica, the pure spring and fertile meadow are a perfect vantage point for the pirates from which their destination can be viewed at a distance and considered as a suitable place to sell their goods.

But for a reader familiar with the Athenian literary tradition upon which Chariton draws for inspiration, the narrator's mention of a freshwater spring in this particular context might have special resonance. The name Callirhoe is first attested in Greek literature in Hesiod's *Theogony*: this Callirhoe is the daughter of Oceanus and the mother of the three-headed monster Geryon by Chrysaor (287–288). The next most important Callirhoe from myth is the daughter of the river god Achelous and wife of Alcmaeon, one of the Epigonoi, or sons of the Seven Against Thebes (the story is recounted by Thucydides [2.102], though he does not provide the name Callirhoe). Callirhoe was also the name of a maiden who was adored by a priest of Dionysus named Coresus (Pausanias 7.21.1–5). But the most familiar Callirhoe in

---

quite clear that "they were not fighting against wave and wind, since no particular course was laid before them; rather, every wind seemed to favor them and stand at the stern" (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐβιάζοντο πρὸς κῦμα καὶ πνεῦμα τῷ μὴ προκεῖσθαί τινα πλοῦν ἴδιον αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἅπας ἄνεμος οὔριος αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει καὶ κατὰ πρύμναν εἱστήκει, 1.11.1). Under such conditions, the long route around the Peloponnese would not have been difficult.

[35] Hägg 1971: 93.

antiquity was not from myth at all, for within the city of Athens itself there was a spring called Callirhoe, later named Enneakrounos for the nine-headed fountain constructed on the spot by the tyrants. This was by all accounts the most famous spring in Athens. Thucydides states that because of its proximity the Athenians used the water of Callirhoe "for the most important purposes" (τὰ πλείστου ἄξια, 2.15.5). Pausanias reports that, "There are wells throughout the whole city, but this is the only spring"[36] (φρέατα μὲν γὰρ καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς πόλεώς ἐστι, πηγὴ δὲ αὕτη μόνη, 1.14.1). Callirhoe's primary sacral function among the Athenians was for ritual bathing before marriage.[37] Thucydides writes that "even now from long tradition it is the custom to use [Callirhoe's] water for marriage and other kinds of rituals" (καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρό τε γαμικῶν καὶ ἐς ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν νομίζεται τῷ ὕδατι χρῆσθαι, 2.15.5). And as late as the 2nd century CE the rhetorician Pollux calls the water of Callirhoe νυμφικὰ λουτρά (3.43).

I do not suggest that the πηγή by which Theron and his gang have docked is this same Callirhoe/Enneakrounos spring. The narrator clearly states that the ship has docked beneath a headland across from Attica (καταντικρὺ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, 1.11.4), whereas the Callirhoe/Enneakrounos fountain is located in Attica itself, most likely to the southeast of the Athenian agora.[38] And yet we find in this brief passage describing a spring of abundant pure water (πηγὴ δὲ ἦν αὐτόθι πολλοῦ καὶ καθαροῦ νάματος) a curious confluence of all of the motifs surrounding Callirhoe/Enneakrounos. The name of the heroine, Callirhoe, speaks for itself. Furthermore, the scene's proximity to Attica calls to mind the nearby Athenian polis, and the image of this recently wedded young woman bathing in the spring to preserve her beauty evokes the ritual bathing of the Athenian wedding. What I suggest, therefore, is that there is a constellation of four highly allusive elements, coordinated at this particular point in the narrative, which motivate the reader once again to think outside of the events of the primary fabula and to consider larger ritual and historiographical themes: (1) the spring, (2) the scene's proximity to

---

[36] Wycherley's translation (1957: 139). Wycherley also notes that "It is strange that Pausanias calls Enneakrounos the only πηγή, i.e. natural spring or source, in Athens, when there were others of which he himself mentions two, the spring in the Asklepieion (21, 4; though Pausanias actually calls this κρήνη) and Klepsydra (28, 4). Perhaps he means that Enneakrounos was the only πηγή which was a regular source of daily water supply" (140).

[37] For all of the testimonia see Wycherley 1957: 137–142. For the significance of ritual bathing before marriage, see Oakley and Sinos 1993: 15.

[38] The precise location of Callirhoe/Enneakrounos is notoriously problematic. For a clear account, see Wycherley 1957: 140, 142.

Attica, (3) the name Callirhoe, and (4) the heroine's status as both a recent bride and a bride-to-be. All of these elements taken together bring to mind the Callirhoe/Enneakrounos spring in Athens.

Oakley and Sinos write that "Washing is one way to establish divisions, between different activities or from the rest of the world," and brides who bathed ritually in river water "were symbolically cleansed of their womanhood."[39] A ritual interpretation of 1.11.4 would therefore see in Callirhoe's bathing a symbolic *limen*, a threshold between identities. Subsequent events in the novel corroborate such an interpretation. In Book 1 Callirhoe is the wife of Chaereas and in Book 3 she becomes the wife of Dionysius; the passage from Syracuse to Miletus is a passage of transformation. The erotic and ritual significance of bathing, established at 1.11.4, is further developed at 2.2.1–4. Brigitte Egger notes that, "This bath scene [2.2.2] – a clear sexual marker – cleverly foreshadows [Callirhoe's] relationship with her second husband, Dionysius, and her more than merely passive role in it. The servants compare her to Dionysius' dead wife and to the image of Aphrodite in the local temple. In setting the atmosphere for a new sexual encounter, this bath also prepares Callirhoe for her meeting with her new master in this very temple, and for a new wedding."[40] But a ritual interpretation alone does not account for the prominence of the Athenian element at 1.11.4. There is really no good reason why Theron and his gang should stop off at Attica, and this is made abundantly clear by the fact that Attica remains always only on the horizon, in the distance.[41] In fact the entirety of 1.11.4–8 is something of a parenthesis to the story, as if the narrator nudges the reader to say "(by the way, they almost went to Athens)," while hinting at the portentiousness of such a possibility. Athens never actually becomes a *real* setting for events in the novel, and yet the narrator continually draws attention to it.

The allusive quality of the text here is playfully nebulous and perhaps slightly disconcerting to a reader who is not sure exactly which hermeneutic paths to pursue. But if we consider how Athens has been imagined and evoked in the novel up to this point, then its appearance and narrative purpose here will seem less elusive. The novel has already provided the reader with models to help decode Athens' mysterious appearance on the narrative's event horizon. The primary function of a reference to Athens in the text (beyond reinforcing the historiographical flavor of the narrative) is as a means of cultural self-definition for the people of Syracuse. In other words,

---

[39] Oakley and Sinos 1993: 15.

[40] Egger 1994: 38.

[41] Hägg (1971: 249) notes that this episode has nothing to do with the plot.

Callirhoe and her people define themselves in part by their relationship to that which they are not: Hermocrates is the general who conquered the Athenians (1.1.1); the Syracusans think that the wedding of Chaereas and Callirhoe is more joyful than the victory celebrations after Athens' defeat (1.1.13); and Callirhoe traces her own glory back to her father's military victory over Athens (1.11.2). When the pirates first set sail with no particular destination in mind (1.11.1), Callirhoe expressed her fear that she would become a slave to an Athenian master (τάχα δὲ ἀγοράσει τις τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα δεσπότης Ἀθηναῖος, 1.11.3). And then suddenly (a mere six lines of text later!), there she is with Attica in plain sight. It is as if the narrator responds to Callirhoe's tragic lament and anxiety with comic immediacy.[42] With Athens now only miles away, the possibility of being sold to an Athenian becomes that much greater. Are Callirhoe's fears going to be realized? By marrying her off to an Athenian master, does the narrator intend to dissolve utterly the way in which Callirhoe defines herself and conceptualizes the socio-political world? No. Fortune and Aphrodite (and, for that matter, the controlling narrator) have something else in store for Callirhoe, a girl destined to ensnare the heart of the most powerful man in the world, namely the King of Persia, and not just some Athenian πολίτης. That Athens should appear so suddenly on the landscape and for no practical purpose suggests that its function is purely thematic. On the one hand the image of Athens looming on the horizon compounds Callirhoe's fear of serving an Athenian master. And on the other hand, since Attica is the site merely of a brief stopover on a much longer journey to Miletus and then ultimately to Babylon, a reader might accurately conclude that in Chariton's imagined history, Athens has been displaced by the East.[43]

And yet there is an alternate trend in the narrative which paradoxically continues to reinforce Athens' cultural, military, and political significance. By subtly reminding the reader of the Callirhoe/Enneakrounos spring, the

[42] Hägg notes the brevity of the transition from Callirhoe's soliloquy to the scene following (1971: 32). In narratological terms this would qualify as ellipsis, in which "nothing is indicated in the story about the amount of fabula-time involved" (Bal 1997: 103).

[43] Following Calderini (1913: 118–124), Kasprzyk writes that, "c'est en Asie que se situe l'action de tous les romans grecs – y compris celui de Longus, puisque Lesbos se situe près des côtes d'Asie Mineure – alors qu'Athènes en est quasiment absente. Chariton, par la bouche du pirate, suit un tradition – crée une tradition?" (2001: 153–154). He goes on to suggest that Theron's desire to depart from Athens and head for Miletus is something of a meta-narrative sign which marks the work as romance and not history. In this way Kasprzyk defines Theron as the "maître de la narration en ce début de roman" (155). Theron is indeed a powerful character with a significant role; ultimately though his role is subsumed beneath that of the narrator, even when the narrator is nearly imperceptible.

distinctly Athenian symbol of marriage and purification, the narrator invests Athens with symbolic significance. On the secondary level of narration,[44] if we are to believe the characters in the novel, Athens is a diminished political entity; nevertheless, the characters continually feel the need to *talk about* Athens and *refer* to it. There is a similar tension on the primary level of narration (i.e. the text of the narrator): the brevity of the stop-over near Attica indicates Athens' diminished role in the fictional world (it is only ever a *potential* setting of the fabula); oddly, though, Athens continues to be a powerful referent, as the allusion to the Callirhoe/Enneakrounos spring suggests. Such ambivalence is part of Chariton's literary game. The author has from the very beginning introduced tensions and oppositions, as can be seen in the disjunction between the novel's historical framework and its erotic subject matter. Are we reading history or romance? Or both? It is up to the reader either to become annoyed in the attempt to solidify meaning or to delight, like Eros himself, in paradoxical triumphs (1.1.4). The paradox of Athens' semiotic function, I maintain, echoes the many paradoxes unfolding in the novel as a whole.

During her lament for Chaereas later in the novel, Callirhoe once again mentions Athens' defeat in the Sicilian expedition, and the reader is furthermore invited to interpret the events in Chariton's novel as a playful reversal of traditional historiography. Finally believing Chaereas to be well and truly dead, Callirhoe appeals to Aphrodite: "I know that we have been born the most unfortunate people in the world – but what wrong did the trireme commit when the barbarians burnt it down, that trireme which not even the Athenians defeated?" (τίθημι ὅτι ἐγεννήθημεν ἡμεῖς ἀτυχέστατοι πάντων· τί δὲ καὶ ἡ τριήρης ἠδίκησεν, καὶ βάρβαροι κατέκαυσαν αὐτήν, ἣς οὐκ ἐκράτησαν οὐδὲ Ἀθηναῖοι; 3.10.8).[45] During the Sicilian expedition, the Syracu-

[44] On primary and secondary levels of narration see Bal 1997: 43–74.

[45] A somewhat problematic passage. F reads καὶ βάρβαροι, where the interrogative τί must be implied from the preceding clause. In his edition of 1783, Beck removed καὶ and supplied ὥστε, preferring a dependent result clause to F's independent clause. An anonymous 18th century Dutch scholar retained F's καὶ, but supposed that a subsequent interrogative τί had fallen out of the MS: καὶ <τί> βάρβαροι. Subsequent scholars went Beck's route: Cobet supplied ἵνα, and Hercher supplied ὡς. Though Blake and Reardon retain F's reading, Goold opts for Cobet's ἵνα. The conjectures (except for the anonymous Dutchman's) subordinate βάρβαροι κατέκαυσαν, attempting to impose hypotaxis where parataxis does not sufficiently articulate the logical relationship between the two clauses. But this is late Greek and Chariton does not always compose the kind of periodic sentences typical of classical Attic. Besides, we are in the midst of the heroine's impassioned speech, and the parataxis suggests a frenzied emotional state. I agree with Reardon that the reading in F is correct.

sans had been completely victorious over the foreign invaders. But now by a twist of fate, that same ship which bore the symbols of Syracusan victory has been vanquished upon a foreign shore. If Syracuse's primacy has been consistently defined by its victory over an enemey as great as Athens, then what does it mean to Callirhoe that her father's flagship has suddenly been destroyed by a gang of brigands who are not even Greeks? Not only has her own identity as daughter of Hermocrates and bride of Chaereas been overturned, but so too has her conception of Syracuse's military superiority. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator remarked that "Eros rejoices in unexpected triumphs" (χαίρει τοῖς κατορθώμασιν, 1.1.4). And what triumph is more unexpected than this? When she hears that βάρβαροι have destroyed her father's flagship, which not even the Athenians managed to conquer, Callirhoe's entire world-view is challenged.

Athens once again plays counterpoint to Syracuse in this scene, but it also serves as a point of reference for Callirhoe, indicating to her how far exactly she has fallen. Living in Miletus, in the distant and alien East, Callirhoe is now in the hands of a people whom she deems to be opponents unworthy of Syracuse. Earlier her greatest fear was to be sold to an Athenian master, but is it any better to be trapped in a land where βάρβαροι can in the middle of the night set fire to a warship bearing the standards of Syracuse's victory? At the end of her soliloquy she addresses the "hateful sea"[46] as the source of her misery (θάλασσα μιαρά, σὺ καὶ Χαιρέαν εἰς Μίλητον ἤγαγες φονευθῆναι καὶ ἐμὲ πραθῆναι, 3.10.8); the very symbol of Syracuse's glory (and by extension her own glory) is therefore transformed into an object of scorn. If Eros revels in paradoxes and ironies, then he must reckon our narrator's story as the greatest ever told.

And yet the ironies and paradoxes signified in part by the thematic recurrence of Athens in the narrative are not merely rhetorical indulgences. Callirhoe's survival at the end of the novel after so many reversals attests to the

[46] Doulamis writes that the adjective μιαρά here "does not mean 'impure, sacrilegous', a meaning not uncommon in Homer [*Il*. 24.420], Herodotus [2.47], and Euripides [*Bacch*. 1384], but rather 'hateful, odious'. This meaning occurs in tragedy [Soph. *Ant*. 746; *Trach*. 987] but also in comedy; in fact it is used by Aristophanes as a term of reproach [Ar. *Ach*. 182, 285; *Eq*. 218, 831]. In the *Phaedrus* the word occurs in the playful conversation between Socrates and Phaedrus before the former delivers his first speech. To Phaedrus' serious threat never to read or tell Socrates of another discourse, the latter replies: Βαβαί, ὦ μιαρέ, ὡς εὖ ἀνηῦρες τὴν ἀνάγκην ἀνδρὶ φιλολόγῳ ποιεῖν ὃ ἂν κελεύῃς [Pl. *Phdr*. 236E]. It would seem that this strong term, with colorful connotations already from the classical period, employed here to qualify *thalassa* being blamed for a couple's misfortunes, is being used in a somewhat ironic way" (2001: 66–67).

strength and continuity of her character.[47] Placed in a foreign land, transformed from a daughter of privilege into a slave, and forced to raise Chaereas' son in another man's house, Callirhoe, as we shall see, nevertheless actively maintains her identity beneath her veils of subterfuge. Though she becomes complicit in her new marriage and assumes a passive role as the bride of Dionysius,[48] her continuous love for Chaereas represents a form of resistence. Her own subtle and strategic maneuvering will remind the reader that, despite the reversals which she suffers, Callirhoe never completely ceases to be the daughter of a great general.[49]

3 Theron

Reference to Athens in the articulation of identity is not a strategy only of the Syracusan characters in the novel. The tomb robber and pirate Theron may technically be a Syracusan, but his character is defined in sharp contrast and opposition to Syracuse. Theron's execution at the hands of the Syracusans is vividly described by the narrator:

---

[47] Cf. Konstan, who writes that, "This persisting love, *eros* augmented by fidelity, registers a change in the desire of the primary couple and differentiates their passion from that of rivals. In this respect, and contrary to the thesis advanced by Bakhtin, time is of the very essence in the Greek novels. It is precisely the element of duration that engenders the love specific to the hero and heroine. The function of the plot, with its multifarious vicissitudes, is to set in relief the mutual loyalty of the protagonists" (1994: 46–47). For a Bakhtinian response, see Branham 2002b: 173–174.

[48] Kaimio agrees with Egger (1994) that Callirhoe "takes more or less active steps to encourage Dionysius' passion [3.2.3, 3.2.16]," and yet he also argues "that the readers would recognize in her submission to her second marriage resignation to the inevitable and acceptance of her new life, however painful. This new and painful reality is typical for many Greek wives in Greek literature, who, as victims of war, live as concubines of the victorious chieftains – like Briseis (cf. Il. 19.290ff.) or Tecmessa (Soph. Ai. 485ff.) or Andromache (Eur. Andr. 208ff.)" (1995: 131).

[49] Egger argues that, though the ambivalence surrounding Callirhoe's character would appeal to a female readership, that appeal is limited ultimately to the realm of the erotic. There is in the text "a powerful double message, which on one hand triggers female fantasies of erotic omnipotence … but at the same time evokes traditional restrictions on femininity. A more assertive aspect of Callirhoe's sexual identity, which emerges through textual indeterminacy, permits some release, but the focus on the seductive illusion of women's enhanced visual and sexual power channels reader interest to the ambivalent sphere of the erotic and contains female subjectivity there" (1994: 42–43). But it should also be noted that, as Balot has shown (1998: 139–161), male subjectivity in the novel is also contained primarily in the erotic sphere.

> ἀπαγομένῳ δὲ Θήρωνι μέγα μέρος τοῦ πλήθους ἐπηκολούθησεν. ἀνεσκολοπίσθη δὲ πρὸ τοῦ Καλλιρόης τάφου καὶ ἔβλεπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκείνην, δι᾽ ἧς αἰχμάλωτον ἔφερε τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα, ἣν οὐκ ἔλαβον οὐδὲ Ἀθηναῖοι.
>
> A great part of the crowd followed closely upon Theron as he was being led out. Then he was impaled before the tomb of Callirhoe and from his cross he looked upon that very sea over which he had carried as a captive Hermocrates' daughter, whom not even the Athenians captured. (3.4.18)

What interests me is not so much the graphic nature of Theron's execution[50] as the fact that the narrator deems it necessary to provide a comparison between the pirate and the Athenians. It is first of all significant that Theron is crucified before Callirhoe's tomb. A careful reader will remember, though, that while Callirhoe was buried in that tomb, it did not belong to her exclusively. In fact, during the description of her funeral procession, the tomb is said by the narrator to belong to Hermocrates (ἦν δὲ τάφος μεγαλοπρεπὴς Ἑρμοκράτους, 1.6.5). Just as in the funeral procession Hermocrates had marshaled the cavalry, hoplites, and ephebes to reinforce his supremacy among the Syracusans, so here he takes the execution of his daughter's abductor as an opportunity to enhance further his own standing. The image of the villain impaled before the family tomb serves as a sign of warning: all enemies of Hermocrates beware, *sic semper hostibus*. It should begin to become clear to the reader that Hermocrates' hold on power in Syracuse is not accidental, for in addition to being a brilliant military tactician, he is also a brilliant semiotician: he continually uses the power of signs and images to reaffirm his position within the state.

And yet the scene does not end simply with the image of crucifixion, for the narrator interrupts Hermocrates' semiotic threat by suddenly shifting from the perspective of the Syracusans to that of Theron himself. The narrator says that "from his cross Theron looked out upon that sea through which he had transported Callirhoe, whom not even the Athenians captured" (ἔβλεπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκείνην, δι᾽ ἧς αἰχμάλωτον ἔφερε τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα, ἣν οὐκ ἔλαβον οὐδὲ Ἀθηναῖοι).[51] In her lamentation aboard the pirate ship, Callirhoe had made special emphasis of the fact

---

[50] Schmeling has noted that, "The punishment of Theron is particularly gruesome and unparalleled in the remainder of the book. The Greek word here for 'to impale' is marvelously graphic, *anaskolopizein*. The image behind the word is 'to skewer,' 'to fix on a pole'" (1974: 106).

[51] This is the reading in F. Schmidt (1882) removes ἣν … Ἀθηναῖοι, but subsequent editors have not adopted his emendation.

that her own tragedy was ironically transpiring on that very sea in which her father had defeated the Athenian navy (ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θαλάσσῃ τριακοσίας ναῦς Ἀθηναίων κατεναυμάχησας, 1.11.2). The historical importance of that sea is here signaled by Theron once again, but as focalized through him it takes on a different meaning. For the Syracusans, the Athenian defeat serves as a means of bolstering their own sense of superiority: Athenian military excellence is acknowledged by the Syracusans, and their own victory over Athens consequently transfers that military excellence to themselves. But despite the fact that he has been tortured and is dying, when he looks out upon the sea Theron is not conquered by shame and guilt, but rather he is satisfied by the pride of his achievement, for he was able to accomplish what not even the Athenians were able to accomplish.

Allowing Theron to become a focalizer in his final moments within the narrative seems to suggest a kind of sympathy with the villain on the part of the narrator. The narrator could, after all, have painted Theron as wholly evil and prevented the reader from sympathizing with the character by privileging only the perspective of the Syracusans, and indeed the narrator does provide the moral commentary, with a sophisticated play on the words εὐσέβεια and ἀσέβεια, that "it would have been the greatest of all outrages if the Syracusans were persuaded that he alone was saved through piety who alone was saved through impiety" (ἔμελλε γὰρ τὸ σχετλιώτατον ἔσεσθαι πάντων πραγμάτων, πεῖσθηναι Συρακοσίους ὅτι μόνος ἐσώθη διὰ εὐσέβειαν ὁ μόνος σωθεὶς δι' ἀσέβειαν, 3.4.10). But the fact that Theron's perspective is focalized at the end of the scene (and for that matter through the narrator's own text and not through direct discourse) suggests the narrator's morally ambiguous attitude regarding Theron. Schmeling too senses the ambivalence surrounding Theron's purported villainy: "Theron had never been painted as a real villain. He robbed Callirhoe's tomb, but in so doing, probably saved her from certain death by starvation. Rather than kill her, he sold her in Miletus. As his fellow pirates lay dying of thirst, he did steal extra portions of water. This was hardly a villainous act. In view of this, the punishment does not fit the crime."[52] Kasprzyk goes so far as to suggest that Theron acts as a foil for the narrator himself within the story, symbolizing the game of narrative possibilities.[53]

---

[52] Schmeling 1974: 106–107.

[53] Kasprzyk goes on to suggest that the figure of Theron "offre un miroir du roman que nous lisons, et c'est un miroir déformant. Théron occupe donc une place essentielle dans l'économie du roman, et il me paraît assez piquant que Chariton ait délégué son pouvoir à un personnage tel que lui – un pirate, un imposteur, un menteur, qui profite de son interrogatoire pour reprendre de façon irrévérencieuse les données littéraires les plus vé-

The narrator prevents the reader from aligning him- or herself entirely with the Syracusans or with Theron, an ambivalent strategy suggested by the text's seemingly contradictory attitudes: one moment the Syracusans' swift and gruesome carriage of justice is applauded, and the next moment it is undermined as a result of the shifting point-of-view. The voice of the narrator, controlling whose perspective is privileged at any given moment, hints at the relativity of ideological righteousness, whether moral or political. From the Syracusan perspective, evocations of the Athenian defeat have been a strategy of maintaining Syracuse's glorious military reputation, and ever since 413 the sea has been a symbol of Hermocrates' and Syracuse's naval prowess. From Theron's perspective, however, Athens and the sea become symbols of his own strategic victory in capturing the daughter of the great Hermocrates. The narrator allows the reader to see that, even in the face of his swiftly approaching death upon the cross, Theron retains for himself some measure of dignity and pride. Items within the cultural vocabulary, therefore, presumed to have some consistency of meaning and function, are revealed for their ambiguities and inconsistencies. A change of perspective is all that is needed to expose the easy fluidity between history and fiction.[54]

4 Dionysius

Focalized through the character of the Milesian Dionysius, the figure of Athens participates not only as a strategy for defining the self, but also as a point of reference between east and west and the political extremes of tyranny and democracy. After Dionysius learns that his new slave is in fact the daughter of Hermocrates, his steward Leonas attempts to encourage his master, re-

---

nérables. C'est peut-être une manière, pour Chariton, de comparer la pénétration de Théron dans le tombeau de Callirhoé avec son entrée, comme par effraction, dans un monde littéraire qui n'a jamais consacré le genre romanesque" (2001: 162).

[54] Helms' account of Theron is insufficient. He writes that, "As a pirate, Theron towers far above all the other pirates in the Greek romances. He possesses a definite personality with distinct characteristics, while the other pirates are cruel, bloodthirsty, and have no distinctive features" (1966: 88). After such a promising beginning, though, Helms' conclusion is unsatisfactory. If Theron's character is so skillfully drawn, then one expects Helms at least to explain why Chariton might have invested so much dynamism into this relatively minor character. Providing the reader with a lengthy list of citations, Helms claims only that Theron is (1) a rascal, (2) shrewd, (3) an intelligent businessman, and (4) a liar. My own reading, I hope, demonstrates that Theron is a more finely drawn character. For the question of Theron's non-erotic involvement with Callirhoe, see Guez 2001: 101–110.

minding him of his power to do with the girl as he wishes, "For you," he says, "are her master" (κύριος γὰρ εἶ, 2.6.2). But Dionysius becomes enraged at such an idea:

> "ἐπρίω σύ, τρισάθλιε, τὴν εὐγενῆ; οὐκ ἀκούεις Ἑρμοκράτην τὸν στρατηγὸν τῆς ὅλης Σικελίας ἐγκεχαραγμένον μεγάλως, ὃν βασιλεὺς ὁ Περσῶν θαυμάζει καὶ φιλεῖ, πέμπει δὲ αὐτῷ κατ' ἔτος δωρεάς, ὅτι Ἀθηναίους κατεναυμάχησε τοὺς Περσῶν πολεμίους; ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλευθέρου, καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ περιβόητος ἄκουσαν ὑβρίσω, ἣν οὐκ ἂν ὕβρισεν οὐδὲ Θήρων ὁ λῃστής;"
> "You yourself, you triple abomination, purchased a noble-born girl? Haven't you heard of Hermocrates, the general of all Sicily, with his great record, whom the king of the Persians reveres and loves? Haven't you heard that the king sends him gifts each year, because he defeated the Athenians at sea, the enemies of the Persians? Shall I myself become tyrant over a free body, and shall I, Dionysius, who am famed for my self-control, shall I violate a girl who is unwilling, whom not even the pirate Theron would violate?" (2.6.3)

So far I have talked about the symbol of Athens primarily as a means of self-definition, i.e. as a way for Syracusans to express what they think about themselves and their place in the world. But in this passage it becomes clear that Athens serves a similar function even for people who are not citizens of Syracuse. In other words, the victory over Athens was so significant an event that it becomes a defining quality of Syracuse even in the minds of a wealthy Ionian gentleman and the Great Persian King. For the first time in the novel, the reader learns about Syracuse's newly won prestige from the perspective of a character who is *not* from Syracuse. Up to this point, remarks about Athens' defeat have served to glorify Syracuse according to the Syracusans themselves. But here we learn that Syracuse's influence is truly global, for by his victory over Athens, the common enemy of both Syracuse and Persia, Hermocrates has gained the favor and esteem of the Persian king.

Athens also serves a second function in bringing out the passage's tight thematic opposition between notions of freedom and tyranny, mastery and slavery. Mention of the Persian King in relation to both Syracuse and Athens suggests a comparison between Persian royal autocracy and the more democratic tendencies of the western Greek state. Such oppositions between mastery and servitude, victory and defeat, freedom and tyranny in the political realm are mirrored in Dionysius' ethical concern for himself. As a man

famed for his own self-mastery (σωφροσύνη), Dionysius has ironically fallen prey to Eros and contemplates playing tyrant over the body of a free-born girl (ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλεύθερου;). But such an act, he knows, would transform him into a creature more base than the pirate Theron, who never laid a hand on Callirhoe. Amid such tightly woven rhetorical oppositions, the evocation of Athens' defeat in the Sicilian expedition is thematically appropriate. As I have shown in Chapter 2, Athens can become a symbol of the ambivalent vacillation between democratic and tyrannical tendencies. Such ambivalence is best exemplified in Cornelius Nepos' biography of Alcibiades, the greatest proponent of Athens' invasion of Syracuse. The Sicilian expedition is generally considered to be the greatest ethical failure of Athens' democracy, the inability of a self-governing people to govern even their own transgressive lust for wealth and expansion (cf. *inter alios* Thucydides and Diodorus Siculus). Thus Athens' disaster, a mere footnote in the conversation between Dionysius and Leonas, servant and master, serves as a minor, but potent warning for Dionysius in his moral dilemma.

It is not insignificant that in Dionysius' speech Syracuse's glory is synonymous with the glory of Hermocrates alone. In the interplay in this passage between freedom and tyranny, mastery and slavery, are we to read also a subtle interpretation of Hermocrates' political position from the Ionian perspective? Despite Hunter's and Alvares' label for Syracuse as a "guided democracy," Syracuse is never expressly called a democracy in the novel, and one wonders how Syracuse's political organization would have been perceived by outsiders. Dionysius identifies Hermocrates not just as the first man in Syracuse, but as the general of all of Sicily (τὸν στρατηγὸν τῆς ὅλης Σικελίας). At the beginning of the novel, Callirhoe is said by the narrator to be "the idol of all of Sicily" (ἄγαλμα τῆς ὅλης Σικελίας, 1.1.1), and her suitors are said to have come "not only from Sicily, but even from Italy, from the Greek mainland, and from the peoples of the mainland" (οὐκ ἐκ Σικελίας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ Ἰταλίας καὶ ἠπείρου καὶ ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐν ἠπείρῳ, 1.1.2). And so while Callirhoe's influence is acknowledged as vast from the beginning, this is the first time we have heard that Hermocrates' political influence and authority extend beyond Syracuse to the whole of Sicily. And because Hermocrates has conquered the enemy of the Persians, the Persian King gives Hermocrates annual gifts. Though this is not affirmed by Dionysius, one assumes that Hermocrates accepts and receives the Persian gifts with honor, and so Dionysius' remarks imply that at least as far as he is concerned, Hermocrates has entered into a kind of political relationship with the Great King. About the depth of the relationship it is impossible to speak,

except to say that Dionysius is sufficiently worried about indirectly offending the Great King through an offense to Hermocrates.

Dionysius acknowledges Callirhoe as a "free body" (σώματος ἐλευθέρου), and by that very definition he places her and her people outside of the royal authority of the Great King (cf. also 7.1.1). And yet the implied relationship between the King and Hermocrates suggests that there is some measure of respect paid to the King by Hermocrates. Whereas in the novel's early Syracusan scenes Hermocrates is drawn as a patriotic leader (φιλόπατρις, 1.1.12) who trusts in democratic procedures, the Persian King Artaxerxes by contrast will in the Babylonian scenes be drawn as the embodiment of tyranny: in Persia "The official sphere lacks any trace of democracy; the Great King is supreme lawgiver, army commander, judge and religious official, and his authority over individuals is summed up at 6.7.3: οὐδενὶ γὰρ ἔξεστιν ἀντειπεῖν βασιλέως κελεύοντος."[55] Democracy had the traditional reputation of being a destructive form of government: in anti-democratic literature, Athens is the seat of mob rule, ejecting from the city its most prudent leaders. But in Syracuse, rule of the people through *ekklēsia* and *boulē* seems to work. And yet paradoxically Syracusan freedom and democracy function not by autonomy, but by deference to the influence and authority of a στρατηγός. Dionysius' assessment of Hermocrates' new political prestige and international clout, therefore, brings into focus the delicate balance struck in Syracuse between democracy and tyranny. The reader suddenly envisions Hermocrates not as the first among citizen-statesmen, but as στρατηγός with authority throughout Sicily and as a nobleman favored by the Persian court. Dionysius' perspective offers the reader an alternative interpretation of Hermocrates' political position, and so the reader must continually question whose perspective is favored at any given time and how political ideologies change when perspectives shift. Now Hermocrates is the beneficent leader of a democratic body, now he is a military figure with supreme regional authority, now he is another nobleman like Dionysius seeking to maintain the favor of the Persian King. In Chariton's novel, the characters always seem to be fluctuating, ambiguously moving along the spectrum between democracy and tyranny, and as a result the reader must constantly revise his or her notions of the novel's political affiliations. And ever-present, behind the alternatives of Syracusan democracy and Persian empire, is Athens, de-fanged and de-clawed, but a potent political symbol nonetheless, always complicating the relationship between democracy and tyranny.

---

[55] Alvares 2001–2002: 123.

5 East & West, Tyranny & Democracy

The people of Babylon are captivated by Callirhoe's beauty, the fame of which had long ago penetrated into the heart of Persia (4.1.8). The king's postponement of the trial for religious reasons makes an anxious crowd all the more excited about the impending debate over the most beautiful woman in the world. The narrator explains that the people's sympathy is split: those well-connected to the Persian satrapies side with Mithridates, while Dionysius gains the favor of the common people (5.4.1). Some people are jealous of Callirhoe's beauty, while others, spiteful of the pride of the local beauties, hope for Callirhoe's popular approval. The narrator states:

> ταῖς δὲ τριάκοντα ἡμέραις Πέρσαι καὶ Περσίδες οὐδὲν ἕτερον διελάλουν ἢ τὴν δίκην ταύτην, ὥστε, εἰ χρὴ τἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, ὅλη [ἡ] Βαβυλὼν δικαστήριον ἦν. ἐδόκει δὲ πᾶσιν ἡ προθεσμία μακρὰ καὶ οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ βασιλεῖ. ποῖος ἀγὼν Ὀλυμπικὸς ἢ νύκτες Ἐλευσίνιαι προσδοκίαν τοσαύτης ἔσχον σπουδῆς;
> During the thirty days, Persian men and Persian women talked about nothing other than this trial, and so, if one must speak the truth, all of Babylon was a courthouse. And to everyone the adjournment seemed long, and not only to everyone else, but even to the king himself. What sort of Olympic contest or Eleusinian nights held an expectation of such excitement? (5.4.4)

By the time Chariton was writing in the 1st century CE, the Eleusinian mysteries and the September festival of Eleusis had, like the Olympic games, gained international renown: no longer local Greek traditions, they had become popular symbols of a pan-Hellenic culture. But at the novel's dramatic date (the end of the 5th century BC), Eleusis would not have had the same kind of international renown. Given the curious significance with which Athens has been invested in Chariton's novel, this seemingly offhand reference to the most prominent site of Attic cult worship cannot be disregarded. If we consider the novel's historical setting and the special prominence of the Sicilian expedition in that historical setting, then the narrator's reference to Eleusis draws attention back to events in Athens leading up to the invasion of Syracuse. We are reminded of the mutilation of the Herms in Athens and the allegations that influential young men were at the time profaning the Eleusinian mysteries during private dinner-parties. It is necessary to quote Thucydides' account in full:

> καὶ αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι ἐμποδὼν ὄντι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι, καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγάλυνον καὶ ἐβόων ὡς ἐπὶ δήμου καταλύσει τά τε μυστικὰ καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἑρμῶν περικοπὴ γένοιτο καὶ οὐδὲν εἴη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν.
>
> The people who hated Alcibiades the most (because he stood in their way of being securely in charge of the people), took up these accusations, thinking that, should they get rid of him, then they themselves would be in charge. They repeatedly magnified the accusations and shouted that both the mysteries and the mutilation of the Herms meant the destruction of the people and that none of those crimes were committed without Alcibiades, claiming as proof the generally undemocratic indecency of his lifestyle. (6.28)

Thucydides' point here is not that Alcibiades colluded with some of his aristocratic friends to overthrow the democracy, but that such a portrait of Alcibiades is the exaggerated propaganda of a political faction (ἐμεγάλυνον καὶ ἐβόων). A reader must be careful to remember here that Thucydides is not just narrating history, but that he is also theorizing about the nature of Athenian politics. As I showed in Chapter 2, Diodorus Siculus in his own account of the scandal (13.5.1) makes special note of the enmity which Alcibiades inspired in his political opponents. Cornelius Nepos also calls attention to the factiousness caused by Alcibiades' popularity; Nepos writes that Alcibiades' political enemies took advantage of the accusations against him and claimed that he was an anti-democratic conspirator (7.3.5–6). And so from this intriguing historical episode, literary tradition, following the Thucydidean model, has focused primarily on the theme of political factiousness and the conflict between democratic and anti-democratic tendencies at Athens. It has by now become clear that these are also important themes in Chariton's novel. But why might the narrator, by alluding to Eleusis at the end of the 5th century, call attention to Athens' problematic democracy at precisely this moment in the story?

In Book 1, references to Athens provided an ideological background against which to read the complex relationship between Hermocrates and the people of Syracuse. In this instance, I maintain, a reference to Athens and the important cult site of Eleusis reactivates that ideological background: though still in the romantic mode, the narrative simultaneously invites the reader to approach the text from an historiographic perspective. It is not by

coincidence that the reference to Eleusis comes in the form of a rhetorical question (ποῖος ἀγὼν Ὀλυμπικὸς ἢ νύκτες Ἐλευσίνιαι προσδοκίαν τοσαύτης ἔσχον σπουδῆς; 5.4.4). The narrator makes himself perceptible to the reader, heightening the narrative moment and demanding the reader's engagement with the text. Reminded of the profanation of the mysteries and the ensuing interplay between demagogues and the *dēmos* at Athens, a reader is indirectly reminded of the other complicated democracy in the novel, that of Syracuse. But the setting at this point in the novel has shifted from Syracuse to Babylon, and the leading man is now not Hermocrates, but Artaxerxes, the Persian King; the narrator thus invites a comparison between the governing practices of western Greeks and eastern βάρβαροι. And if an allusion to Athens via Eleusis were not enough to motivate a comparative interpretation of Artaxerxes as leader, then the narrator proceeds immediately to describe the hierarchical organization of Artaxerxes' court.

> ἔστι δὲ οἶκος ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐξαίρετος, ἀποδεδειγμένος εἰς δικαστήριον, μεγέθει και κάλλει διαφέρων· ἔνθα μέσος μὲν ὁ θρόνος κεῖται βασιλεῖ, παρ' ἑκάτερα δὲ τοῖς φίλοις καὶ ⟨ὅσοι⟩ τοῖς ἀξιώμασι καὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἡγεμόνες ἡγεμόνων. περιεστᾶσι δὲ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου λοχαγοὶ καὶ ταξίαρχοι καὶ τῶν βασιλέως ἐξελευθέρων τὸ ἐντιμότατον, ὥστε ἐπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ συνεδρίου καλῶς ἂν εἴποι τις "οἱ δὲ θεοὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἠγορόωντο."
>
> There is a special chamber in the palace designated as a courtroom, differing from other rooms by its magnitude and it beauty. A throne for the king sits in the middle of that chamber, and there are thrones on either side for the king's friends and for those who by their rank and virtue are leaders of leaders. In a circle around the throne stand commanders and captains and the most esteemed of the king's freedmen. And so one might rightly say of that arrangement that, "the gods seated at the side of Zeus held their assembly."[56] (5.4.5–6)

In much the same way that Callirhoe's funeral procession reflected the political organization of Syracuse, here the description of the king's court reflects the pyramidal, monarchical structure of the Persian Empire.[57] In the

[56] A quotation of *Iliad* 4.1, when the gods debate about the fate of Troy.

[57] For the similarity of Artaxerxes' court to a Roman *conventus*, see Karabélias 1988: 393–394 and Alvares 2001–2002: 122. Chariton's novel is by no means allegory: Persia does not equal Rome. But the novel must certainly be considered as an artistic response to Roman imperialism. The overarching concern with politics and leadership, freedom and

description of Callirhoe's funeral procession Hermocrates is given a central place: he is preceded first by his cavalry, then by the hoplites who carry the symbols of his trophies, then by the council. He is said by the narrator to be "in the midst of the people" (ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δήμῳ, 1.6.3). Flanked by the archons, he is then followed by the citizens' wives, the abundant funeral offerings and gifts, and then finally by the ephebes who carry Callirhoe's bier. The analogous representation of Artaxerxes' central position in his court (μέσος μὲν ὁ θρόνος κεῖται βασιλεῖ, 5.4.5) suggests a parallel between the centralized use of power at Syracuse and Babylon. Though Syracuse functions with all the outward signs of a democracy, the parallelism of the depictions of Artaxerxes and Hermocrates in their respective hierarchies undermines Syracuse's seemingly democratic façade.

The description of the court at Babylon also motivates us to ask questions about Artaxerxes' own use of power and his administration of the empire. Callirhoe compels strong men to confront their mastery over themselves and consequently their mastery over the people whom they govern. Dionysius, for example, famed for his self-control (ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ περιβόητος, 2.6.3), is nevertheless tempted by Callirhoe's erotic lure and he consequently questions his own tyrannical tendencies. Callirhoe has a similar effect on Artaxerxes: when we are first introduced to him in Book 5, the narrator explains that Persians are "by nature mad about women" (φύσει δέ ἐστι τὸ βάρβαρον γυναιμανές, 5.2.6), and, influenced by rumor, Artaxerxes is anxious for Callirhoe's arrival in Babylon. Nevertheless, upon Dionysius' late arrival, the king exhibits a piety appropriate to his station in postponing the trial until after the conclusion of a holy festival (5.3.11). But during the trial it becomes clear that like Dionysius and Mithridates before him, Artaxerxes has fallen prey to Eros. His position as king and judge in the trial demands a distanced objectivity, but his lust for Callirhoe presents a dangerous conflict of interests: "who are you?" he asks himself, "Callirhoe's lover, or her judge?" (τίς εἶ; Καλλιρόης ἐραστὴς ἢ δικαστής; 6.1.10). Balot writes that, "Given the king's preeminence within the Empire and his control over thousands of subjects, his inability even to articulate the role he plays, much less to live up to socially-sanctioned ideals, will have significant civic consequences as the trial unfolds."[58] By revealing the ethical dilemmas of the characters as their integrity is challenged by Eros, the text mingles elements of romance with more traditional historiographical concerns. A πάθος ἐρωτι-

---

tyranny in the novel compel a reader to draw comparisons between the historical setting of the fictional world and the political realities of the 1st century CE.

[58] Balot 1998: 153.

κόν need not be simply about love, intrigue, and adventure; as Chariton's text makes clear, romance can show how love, intrigue, and adventure affect the power of both the individual and the state.

Within the east-west dynamic that pervades Chariton's novel, the figure of Athens, inasmuch as it represents victory over Persian tyranny, powerfully reinforces the notion of Greek identity in the face of barbarian influences. When Callirhoe later passes into the hands of the Persian King, she is confronted by Artaxates, the King's chief eunuch, who attempts to persuade her to yield to the King's passion. But after being rebuffed by the headstrong daughter of Hermocrates, Artaxates is at first unwilling to deliver the bad news to his master and he fabricates a "recantation" (τὴν παλινῳδίαν, 6.6.8).[59] He lies to the King that he was unable to meet with Callirhoe and that it might be better for the King to reconsider his designs on the girl: the Greek love of gossip would spread the news of his affair far and wide, and it would be better not to hurt his wife Stateira by his infidelity. But the King's desire for Callirhoe is unrelenting, and he bids the eunuch to intervene again on his behalf. Callirhoe is as strong-willed as ever, and she resists the royal seduction by affirming her undying devotion to Chaereas. Her choice is incomprehensible to the eunuch, and when he asks her, "Do you prefer the slave of Mithridates to the King?" (τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν Μιθριδάτου δοῦλον προτιμᾷς, 6.7.9), Callirhoe at last becomes infuriated:

> ἠγανάκτησε Καλλιρόη Χαιρέου λοιδορηθέντος καὶ "εὐφήμησον" εἶπεν, "ἄνθρωπε. Χαιρέας εὐγενής ἐστι, πόλεως πρῶτος ἣν οὐκ ἐνίκησαν οὐδὲ Ἀθηναῖοι οἱ ἐν Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι νικήσαντες τὸν μέγαν σου βασιλέα."
>
> Callirhoe became angry when Chaereas was insulted, and she said, "Keep quiet, sir! Chaereas is of noble birth, the foremost man of that city which not even the Athenians conquered – those same Athenians who at both Marathon and Salamis conquered your great King." (6.7.9–10)

[59] Chariton must surely be alluding here to Plato's *Phaedrus*, in which Socrates recalls the famous recantation of the poet Stesichorus. Just as Stesichorus cured his blindness by recanting his slander of Helen, so Socrates will avoid suffering by recanting his slanderous speech against the god Eros (πρὶν γάρ τι παθεῖν διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἔρωτος κακηγορίαν πειράσομαι αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν παλινῳδίαν, 243b). The allusion is characteristically playful and reveals an understanding of Platonic thought: Artaxates is cast in the Socratic mold, even though he is concerned more with the delicate arts of sophistry and persuasion than with true philosophy. Plato's dialogue is about the intertwining of rhetoric and Eros, and so too, in a sense, is Chariton's novel.

Once again, the figure of Athens is deployed in direct speech as a means of comparison. The adverb οὐδέ, as before at 3.4.18 and 3.10.8, indicates that Athens' military power must be taken for granted in order for the comparison to have any meaning. But although Callirhoe concedes power to Athens, Syracuse in her words is that much greater since the Athenians were unable to conquer it. Callirhoe then introduces a third element into the comparison when she further elevates the status of the Athenians as "those who defeated your great King at Marathon and Salamis" (οἱ ἐν Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι νικήσαντες τὸν μέγαν σου βασιλέα). Her implication is that if Syracuse is all the more superior for having defeated the Athenians, then it is even more superior than Persia, an enemy twice defeated by Athens.

The figure of Athens therefore serves as a common point of reference and comparison for individuals from two vastly different nations. The King had taken advantage of the fact that Athens was a common enemy of both Syracuse and Persia in order to create a bond between himself and Hermocrates (5.8.8). Callirhoe however can manipulate the same historical narrative not to emphasize the common bond between Syracuse and Persia, but to articulate *difference*, Syracuse's perceived superiority over Persia in the socio-political hierarchy of the fictional world. One's relationship with Athens, in other words, becomes a means of expressing both one's political alignment and one's political superiority.

In addition to widening the historical scope of the novel, Callirhoe's reference to the Athenian/Greek victories over the Persians (490 and 480) also reinforces the traditional Hellenic differentiation between Greek and barbarian. The *agōn* between Callirhoe and Artaxates is an ideal opportunity for the narrator to illustrate the ethical differences between a strong Greek woman and a base eunuch in the service of the Persian King. When confronted by this creature of sycophancy and guile, Callirhoe's first impulse is to scratch his eyes out. But the narrator states that Callirhoe manages to control herself in the manner becoming of an educated and rational woman (οἷα δὲ γυνὴ πεπαιδευμένη καὶ φρενήρης, 6.5.8). Rather than yield to anger, Callirhoe employs sound reason (λογισαμένη). If Callirhoe is depicted as the embodiment of self-control, then Artaxates is depicted merely as a body controlled by the King; the King is the source of all his power. "Just as one raised under oppressive tyranny," says the narrator, "Artaxates assumed that nothing was impossible, not only for the King, but even for himself" (οἷα γὰρ ἐν μεγάλῃ τυραννίδι τεθραμμένος οὐδὲν ἀδύνατον ὑπελάμβανεν, οὐ βασιλεῖ μόνον, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἑαυτῷ, 6.5.10). The subordinating conjunction οἷα introduces the narrator's commentary on the characters of both Callirhoe and

Artaxates, and frames an ethical comparison of the two individuals: Callirhoe is strong and morally upright, where Artaxates is weak and deluded.[60] Callirhoe's final reference to Athens as victor over the Persians at Marathon and Salamis (6.7.10) serves as an historical confirmation (validated by the narrator's own Hellenocentric perspective) of Greek superiority and Persian inferiority.[61]

Throughout the novel, Callirhoe has used her father's victory over the Athenians as a means of defining herself politically as a Syracusan and as the daughter of Hermocrates. Here, however, she is invoking the Athenian defeat not only as an indirect glorification of herself and her city, but for the more immediate purpose of elevating the status of Chaereas. From Artaxates' perspective Chaereas is nothing more than the slave of Mithridates (and hence also a slave of the King), but Callirhoe by contrast asserts that Chaereas is the first man of their city (πόλεως πρῶτος, 6.7.10). Technically, however, this is not true. As the narrator informed us at the beginning of the novel, the first man in Syracuse is quite clearly Hermocrates, and in second place after Hermocrates is Chaereas' father Ariston (1.1.3). Could Callirhoe's assertion of her husband as πόλεως πρῶτος be an indication of political ambition? Or is it a meta-narrative strategy preparing the reader for Chaereas' *aristeia* in books 7 and 8?[62] In any case, with the sudden outbreak of the Egyptian rebellion and the interruption of the impending trial, Chaereas undergoes a major transformation from passive erotic victim to active hero.[63] By defining his superior position in the political realm as first among a people whom not even the Athenians could conquer, Callirhoe prepares the way for Chaereas' ascendancy in the final books of the novel. As a Syracusan, Chaereas will more and more begin to be defined by others and to define himself with respect to the victory over Athens.

---

[60] See also the narrator's remark at 6.7.12: καταπεπλήγασι γὰρ πάντες οἱ βάρβαροι καὶ θεὸν φανερὸν νομίζουσι τὸν βασιλέα.

[61] See also Oudot 1992: 103.

[62] If we consider Callirhoe's retort to Artaxates as a kind of mini-fabula embedded within the secondary narrative ("Chaereas is not the man you think he is; he is in fact a hero"), then as the novel progresses the embedded fabula actually becomes the primary fabula. Chaereas does in fact cease to behave as a passive victim and becomes instead the hero of the novel. The embedded fabula, in other words, explains and determines the primary fabula. For a discussion of this phenomenon, see Bal 1997: 54–55.

[63] For an excellent mythic interpretation of Chaereas' transformation, see Schmeling 1974: 130–141.

6 Chaereas Among the Egyptians

As Book 7 opens, Chaereas is placed in a unique situation: everyone around him in Babylon is pressed into the King's service (such is the hierarchical structure of the Persian court), and he alone is marked by the narrator as "the only free man in Babylon" (ἀλλὰ τότε μόνος ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἐλεύθερος, 7.1.1). Given the recurring themes of tyranny and freedom in the novel, this narratorial remark is of no small significance. When Chaereas is duped into believing that Dionysius has finally won the hand of Callirhoe, he takes control of his own actions (with the help of his companion Polycharmus) and plunges headfirst into a suicidal mission to inflict vengeance upon the King for his treachery. Chaereas and Polycharmus proceed at once to the side of the Egyptian rebels and offer their services to the pharaoh:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤχθησαν, Χαιρέας εἶπεν "ἡμεῖς Ἕλληνές ἐσμεν Συρακόσιοι τῶν εὐπατριδῶν. οὗτος μὲν οὖν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα φίλος ἐμὸς ὢν ἦλθε δι' ἐμέ, ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ γυναῖκα, τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατέρα, εἴ τινα Ἑρμοκράτην ἀκούεις στρατηγὸν <τὸν> Ἀθηναίους καταναυμαχήσαντα." ἐπένευσεν ὁ Αἰγύπτιος, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔθνος ἄπυστον ἦν τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυστυχίας, ἣν ἐδυστύχησαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ Σικελικῷ. "τετυράννηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης," καὶ πάντα διηγήσατο.
> When they were led to him, Chaereas said, "We are Greeks – Syracusans of noble families. This man then, being my friend, came to Babylon for me, and I came for my wife, the daughter of Hermocrates, if you have heard of one Hermocrates, the general who conquered the Athenians at sea." The Egyptian nodded, for there was no people who had not heard of the misfortune with which the Athenians were cursed in the Sicilian war. "Artaxerxes has acted like a tyrant towards us," he said, and he told the whole story. (7.2.3–4)

When Chaereas spoke to non-Syracusans at other moments in the novel, he never before explained in such detail who he is and where he comes from. Owing to the delicacy of his mission to Ionia, he did not declare his identity when confronted by the attendant of Aphrodite's temple in Miletus (3.6.4–5). When he was sold as a slave to Mithridates, the narrator did not provide the reader access to Chaereas' perspective, and so the initial confrontation between master and servant was elided in the narrative (3.7.3). Polycharmus is the one who saves Chaereas from death by crucifixion, but even after he is brought down from the cross Chaereas still does not launch into a detailed

account of his glorious Syracusan identity (4.3.6–7). And when he is finally produced in court to the surprise of all those in attendance, he still does not take advantage of the opportunity for announcing his noble lineage and his relationship (via Callirhoe) to the great Hermocrates, victor over the Athenians. What should have been an impassioned declaration of his love for Callirhoe and an assertion of his manly virtue becomes instead a bickering match between Chaereas and Dionysius, in the style of a stichomythia after the *agōn* of the set courtroom speeches (5.8.5).

Only when he deserts to the side of the Egyptian pharaoh does Chaereas at last participate in the same rhetoric of self-representation adopted by other Syracusans in the story. To distinguish himself as a Greek and a Syracusan of noble birth is not sufficient, for he proceeds to mark himself further by his relationship to Callirhoe and the family of the first man of Syracuse. Evoking the memory of the Athenian defeat would no doubt elevate his military and political reputation in the pharaoh's eyes, and yet Chaereas does not merely *mention* the Syracusan victory. Rather, the very way in which he evokes the Syracusan victory suggests that Syracusan military superiority is by now so well known that anyone unfamiliar with Syracuse would have to be from a provincial backwater. Chaereas' use of the indefinite article to refer to his illustrious father-in-law (τινα Ἑρμοκράτην) is surely ironic, a gesture of false humility in an otherwise extended and elaborate self-introduction.

Also significant is the narratorial remark that, "there was no people who had not heard of the misfortune with which the Athenians were cursed in the Sicilian war" (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔθνος ἄπυστον ἦν τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυστυχίας, ἣν ἐδυστύχησαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ Σικελικῷ). Though the words are the narrator's, the explanatory γάρ introduces free indirect speech, creating a double focalization: the pharaoh's thought is expressed through the perspective and language of the narrator.[64] What then are we to make of the Syracusan victory from the perspective of the rebellious pharaoh? Interestingly, the narrator's text, focalizing the pharaoh's perspective, empathizes not with the Syracusans in this instance, but with the Athenians. By qualifying the Athenian disaster as a δυστυχία, the narrator marks it as the work of Tyche, in turn characterizing the Athenians as victims of a divine scheme. The poignancy of the abstract noun δυστυχία is compounded by its own verbal form in

[64] Schenkeveld has demonstrated that Chariton frequently introduces an embedded focalization by means of a γάρ-clause with accusative and infinitive. Finite verbs, however, indicate free indirect speech and a double focalization: an ambivalence between the point-of-view of the narrator and the focalizing character (1993: 20–22).

the following relative clause, forming a kind of tautological image sympathetic to Athenian failure: theirs was the misfortune which the Athenians themselves suffered (τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυστυχίας, ἣν ἐδυστύχησαν). Since the Egyptian rebellion was at first described by the narrator as the work of Tyche (Πᾶσαν δὲ σκέψιν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐρωτικὴν ὁμιλίαν ταχέως μετέβαλεν ἡ Τύχη, 6.8.1), then the Egyptian pharaoh's quick identification with Athenian misfortune (δυστυχία) is, I suggest, a proleptic indication to the reader that the pharaoh's faction will bear the misfortune of defeat at the hands of the Persian King.

The pharaoh's empathy with Athenian misfortune as a response to Chaereas' assertion of Syracusan superiority is also part of a larger, complex evocation of the Sicilian expedition within the immediate context of the Egyptian rebellion. Robert Luginbill has convincingly shown that the Persians' reactions to the sudden Egyptian aggression are similar to reactions described by Thucydides in his account of the Sicilian expedition. When Tyche brings about the unexpected, dramatic turn of events in Chariton's novel, the Persians react with a combination of confusion, shock, and despair (πρὸς δὲ τὴν φήμην ἐταράχθη μὲν ὁ βασιλεύς, κατεπλάγησαν δὲ Πέρσαι· κατήφεια δὲ πᾶσαν ἔσχε Βαβυλῶνα, 6.8.3). Luginbill writes that, "Along with its cognates, ταράσσομαι in Thucydides evokes the confusion and perplexity brought about by sudden fear originating from an uncertain event."[65] Similarly, "κατάπληξις is what grips the Syracusans and their allies when they learn of the arrival of Demosthenes and his fleet at the critical juncture of the Sicilian campaign (7.42.2)."[66] The κατήφεια of the Persians mirrors "the dejected state of mood of the Athenian expeditionary force during the retreat from Syracuse (*Hist*. 7.75.5)."[67] By casting his narrative in Thycididean terms, Chariton invites a comparison between the account of the Sicilian expedition and the Egyptian revolution.

But Chariton's text resists a straightforward allegorical interpretation: the Persians do not necessarily play the role of the Syracusans, and the Egyptians cannot be understood simply as stand-ins for the Athenians. On the contrary, the prominence of Tyche in this episode underscores how quickly and easily roles can be reversed in Chariton's world. Certainly, the Persians, like the Syracusans before them, are thrown into confusion by reports of the invading army and they are ultimately victorious. But unlike the Syracusans, the Persians in this context are the imperialist power, and in this

[65] Luginbill 2000: 6.
[66] Luginbill 2000: 7.
[67] Luginbill 2000: 7n29.

sense they are more like the Athenians. And yet in the novel, imperial power is characterized as tyranny, the traditional antithesis of Athenian democracy. Chaereas here declares that, "Artaxerxes has acted like a tyrant towards us" (τετυράννηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης, 7.2.4), but earlier in the novel Theron declared that the Athenian officials of the Areopagus were even worse than tyrants (Ἄρειος πάγος εὐθὺς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄρχοντες τυράννων βαρύτεροι, 1.11.7). The shape of tyranny changes, then, depending on the perspective of the oppressed.

The interplay in the novel between tyranny and democracy is further enhanced when we consider that the Egyptian revolution is depicted as a democratic rebellion against tyranny (6.8.2). Although Chariton's narrative invites us to compare the Egyptian rebellion to the Sicilian expedition, it quickly becomes clear that the motivations for aggression in each context are radically different. According to the historiographic tradition, democratic Athens, acting in a very undemocratic fashion (see Diodorus Siculus), set out to conquer Syracuse for reasons of expansion and sheer greed. In Chariton's novel, by contrast, Egypt rises up against an oppressive imperial tyranny. When confronted with the details, it is difficult for the reader to sustain an interpretation of the Egyptian rebellion as an allegory for the Sicilian expedition; the pieces of the puzzle look the same, but when put together they form an entirely different picture.

Alvares has argued that the Egyptian rebellion reflects Egypt's reputation for trouble-making during the Roman Imperial period. The reader is then able to compare the tyranny of Chariton's King Artaxerxes to the tyranny of Roman rule in the Greek world, and perhaps even read into the episode a resistance to Roman tyranny. Alvares writes that, "while accusations of royal tyranny are hardly rare in the literature of the Roman empire, of the extant Greek romances the denunciation made by Chariton's characters is the most explicit."[68] The resistance to tyranny by default valorizes the anti-tyrannical, democratic attitudes of the Egyptian rebels, a rarity in the Greek novels, where Egypt is a place not of democratic freedoms but of treachery and barbarism. In all the other Greek romances except for that of Longus, the mouth of the Nile is a haven for thieving and murderous "herdsmen" (ποίμενες, Xen. Eph. 3.12.2) or "cattlemen" (βουκόλοι, Ach. Tat. and Heliod.).[69] In her study of the depictions of rural society in the Greek novel Suzanne

[68] Alvares 2001: 18.

[69] Xenophon of Ephesus 3.12.2; Achilles Tatius 3.9.2–15.6, 4.11.1–18.1; Heliodorus 1.1–33.

Saïd writes that these Egyptian "Herdsmen look repulsive;[70] they all speak a barbarian language;[71] they are 'gullible'[72] and stupid;[73] their customs are primitive: they fight with clods of earth[74] and eat fish which has been dried in the sun;[75] their deeds are dictated by passion[76] and individual interest;[77] their habits are cruel: they practice human sacrifice and anthropophagy.[78]"[79] In Chariton's novel, by contrast, the Egyptians, though they are trouble-making rebels, seem to be a much more enlightened bunch than those depicted by Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus. This is an effect, I think, of Chariton's strategy for depicting the Persian King as an oppressive tyrant: whereas Artaxerxes is an hereditary despot, the Egyptian pharaoh is elected by his people (κεχειροτονηκέναι, Ch. 6.8.2) and convenes a council to discuss his leadership (βουλή, 7.3.1).[80] Chariton might in his depiction of the Egyptian rebels be suggesting Alexandrian discontent under Roman rule;[81] on the level of narrative, though, the Egyptians' anti-tyrannical attitude and their adoption of democratic principles are further developments of the tyranny/freedom leitmotif which runs throughout the novel. Chariton is concerned not with historical allegory but impressionistic evocation: rather than construct an overly rigid historical parallel, Chariton demonstrates how recurring themes continually shape historical events, even perhaps in the reader's own time. In Chariton's romantic vision, historical narrative operates under the conflicting forces of tyranny, democracy,

---

[70] Achilles Tatius 3.9.2; Heliodorus 2.20.5.
[71] Achilles Tatius 3.10.2–3.
[72] Heliodorus 2.18.1.
[73] Heliodorus 1.7.2.
[74] Achilles Tatius 3.13.2–3.
[75] Heliodorus 1.5.4.
[76] Heliodorus 2.12.5.
[77] Heliodorus 1.32.4.
[78] Achilles Tatius 3.15.1–5.
[79] Saïd 1999: 86.
[80] Alvares 2001–2002: 137.
[81] "Rome's refusal to allow the Alexandrians a *boule* was a sore point for many Greeks in Alexandria, who in Chariton's time would have expected to enjoy greater freedom and closer partnership with the Romans that, for example, Greeks in Asia Minor possessed, as well as other, lesser Greek cities of Egypt, such as Ptolemais, probably Naukratis and certainly Antinoopolis did later [N. Lewis, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule*, Oxford, 1986: 26–27, 198; A. K. Bowman, *Egypt After the Pharaohs: 332 BC–AD 642*, University of California Press, 1989: 211–212]. Thus this Egyptian desire for self-rule is recalled as Chariton's Egyptians are shown *electing* their King (κεχειροτονηκέναι VI 8, 2), and that this king makes a point of calling his *allies* not slaves, but *friends* (VII 3, 2)" (Alvares 2000: 18).

chance, and eros. History does not repeat itself, in other words; it merely plays out the same motifs.

The pharaoh soon befriends Chaereas, who bravely gathers together a band of his fellow Greeks to lay siege to and ultimately conquer Tyre for the benefit of the rebelling Egyptian army. The mercenary Greeks chosen for the mission are, interestingly, Spartans, Corinthians, some other Peloponnesians, and twenty Sicilians (ἐξελέξατο δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ Κορινθίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Πελοποννησίους· εὗρε δὲ καὶ ὡς εἴκοσι Σικελιώτας, 7.3.7). The lack of an Athenian presence is noticeable and has led Alvares to argue that "Chariton (perhaps motivated by the regional jealousies against Athens) has chosen to locate the true stream of Greek virtue among the Dorians."[82] But of course the text at this point reflects the prejudices and affiliations of Chaereas, not necessarily Chariton the author. As a Syracusan, Chariton quite naturally chooses soldiers from amongst people with whom Syracuse has friendly political relations. Given the potent historical memory of the Sicilian expedition and the trend among prominent Syracusans of rhetorical opposition to Athens, why would Chaereas align himself even with an Athenian mercenary? Within the world of the fabula, the absence of Athenians among Chaereas' chosen men is entirely plausible.

Chaereas' success in subduing Tyre convinces the pharaoh to enlist Chaereas' aid in the coming battle against the Persian forces. As a reward for his continued success, the pharaoh promises him the rule over Syria, and he then places before Chaereas the option of conducting the battle on land or the battle at sea:

> "ἐν ἀμφοτέροις γὰρ τοῖς στοιχείοις ὁ πόλεμος ἀκμάζει. σοὶ δὲ ἐπιτρέπω τὴν αἵρεσιν, εἴτε τῆς πεζῆς θέλεις στρατηγεῖν εἴτε τῆς ναυτικῆς δυνάμεως. οἶομαι δὲ οἰκειότερόν σοι εἶναι τὴν θάλασσαν· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οἱ Συρακόσιοι καὶ Ἀθηναίους κατεναυμαχήσατε. σήμερον δὲ ἀγών ἐστί σοι πρὸς Πέρσας τοὺς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων νενικημένους. ἔχεις τριήρεις Αἰγυπτίας, μείζονας καὶ πλείονας τῶν Σικελικῶν· μίμησαι τὸν κηδεστὴν Ἑρμοκράτην ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ."
>
> "On both elements the war is at its climax. I leave the choice to you, whether you choose to be general over the infantry or over the naval power. But I think the sea is more appropriate for you, for you Syracusans defeated even the Athenians in a sea battle. And today there is a contest against the Persians, who have been defeated by the Athenians.

[82] Alvares 2001–2002: 120.

> You have Egyptian warships which are larger and more numerous than those of the Sicilians. Imitate your father-in-law Hermocrates on the sea." (7.5.7–8)

As did Dionysius, Artaxerxes, and Callirhoe before him (2.6.3, 5.8.8, 6.7.10, respectively), the Egyptian pharaoh here constructs a triangular relationship between Syracuse, Persia, and Athens. His logic is syllogistic: Syracuse defeated Athens; Athens defeated Persia; therefore Syracuse will defeat Persia. Once again history plays an important part in identifying the *ēthos* of a whole people, and the *ēthos* of a whole people becomes in turn the reputation and consequently the very identity of one man. In his first encounter with the pharaoh (see above the discussion of 7.2.3–4), Chaereas deployed the same means of self-representation as both Hermocrates and Callirhoe, that is, evoking the Athenian defeat in order to reinforce the glory of Syracuse. If such is the glory that Chaereas projects, then such is the glory reflected back upon him now by the pharaoh. As a Syracusan, he has marked himself as one at home, as it were, upon the sea, more inclined by his ethical nature to lead his cause to naval victory. The pharaoh therefore takes advantage of Chaereas' presumed natural abilities and says that the sea is a rather more suitable environment for this Greek commander (οἰκειότερόν σοι εἶναι τὴν θάλασσαν).

In conquering Tyre, Chaereas exhibited a traditional martial *aristeia*. During the description of Chaereas' action in the battle (7.4.6), the narrator quotes an Homeric line: τύπτε δ' ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὤρνυτ' ἀεικής. The line appears twice in the *Odyssey* (22.308 and 24.184), both times describing Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors in his home. Given that the wider context of the novel concerns Chaereas' *agōn* with Dionysius over possession of Callirhoe, the reference here to Odysseus' bloody repossession of Penelope is thematically appropriate. But the line also appears at *Iliad* 10.483, describing Diomedes' battle amongst the Thracians, and in that context the line is followed immediately by a simile comparing the warrior to a lion.[83] Likewise in Chariton's text, immediately after quoting the Homeric line, the narrator describes Chaereas' men as if they were lions (ἄλλος δὲ ἄλλον ἐφόνευεν, ὥσπερ λέοντες εἰς ἀγέλην βοῶν ἐμπεσόντες ἀφύλακτον, 7.4.6). Though Diomedes' power is inspired by none other than Athena, Chaereas' *aristeia* is, by contrast, a purely mortal achievement. Even in the

[83] Reardon 1989: 105. This reference is neglected by Plepelits (1976: 185). Reardon does not note, however, the difference from the Iliadic text: Homer uses the verb κτείνε, where Chariton writes τύπτε.

mortal realm, however, Athena is absent from the events depicted, since there is no representative of Athena's city in Chaereas' mercenary army.

Nevertheless Chaereas is here momentarily cast in the role of Diomedes by the narrator. If Chaereas were to become a true Diomedes, then his military prowess would be superlative without question. But as a transgressive figure whose power was so great as to wound even Aphrodite in battle (*Il.* 5.334ff.), Diomedes is not an ideal model for Chaereas, a character whose problematic relationship with Aphrodite has been the source of all his wife's misfortunes (cf. 8.1.3). Furthermore, the people of Chariton's novel do not exist in the world of legendary Homeric heroes. Just as Chaereas' naval abilities are said by the Egyptian pharaoh to be οἰκειότερον, so also the model for Chaereas' behavior in the coming battle must be οἰκειότερον. It therefore seems the natural choice for Chaereas to imitate (μίμησαι, 7.5.8) his father-in-law Hermocrates, the historical figure whose legendary status in the present is continually perpetuated by the characters in the novel. And although in the ensuing land battle the pharaoh is defeated by Dionysius, who delivers the head of the rebellious Egyptian to the Persian King, without Artaxerxes' knowledge Chaereas defeats the Persian naval forces, true to his Sicilian origins.

7 The New Power Couple

When Chaereas finally regains Callirhoe on the island of Aradus, everyone in Chaereas' camp celebrates the luck of their most handsome leader (τὸν εὐμορφότατον ἄνδρα, 8.1.11) in regaining his lost bride. Even when the Syracusan heroes have come so far from Syracuse, however, Athens continues to play a part in the narrative representation of their identities. The narrator states that, "They threw flowers and garlands at them, and wine and myrrh was poured at their feet. The sweetest things of both war and peace were brought together: the triumph and the wedding" (ἄνθη καὶ στεφάνους <ἐπ>έβαλλον αὐτοῖς, καὶ οἶνος καὶ μύρα πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν ἐχεῖτο, καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης ἦν ὁμοῦ τὰ ἥδιστα, ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι, 8.1.12). The language and imagery in this passage clearly evoke the narrator's description of the marriage in Book 1: μεσταὶ δὲ αἱ ῥῦμαι στεφάνων, λαμπάδων· ἐρραίνετο τὰ πρόθυρα οἴνῳ καὶ μύροις. ἥδιον ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ἤγαγον οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων (1.1.13). But the reunion of Chaereas and Callirhoe in Book 8 is not just a repeat performance of their wedding night; the martial element of the victory celebration invests the couple with a new dynamic

that their marriage lacked at the beginning of the novel. In Book 1, victory over the Athenians belonged to Syracuse generally, but to Hermocrates first and foremost. The people of Syracuse *believed* that the marriage of Chaereas and Callirhoe was more pleasing than their celebrations of that victory, but the sudden death of Callirhoe ultimately proved the marriage disastrous. We were then given a dark vision of that earlier triumphal celebration as reflected through Callirhoe's grim funeral procession, which was paid for in part by Athenian booty and where the symbols of military victory were on full display (1.6.2–5). That funeral procession was as much about Hermocrates as it was about Callirhoe. But now after his lengthy odyssey, Chaereas is himself the victorious general and is for that reason all the more worthy of Callirhoe, herself the daughter of Syracuse's most glorious general. At last victory in marriage may be joined by victory in war. Thus begins a movement in the novel's final book whereby Chaereas and Callirhoe define themselves no longer solely in terms of the military achievements of the previous generation, but in terms of their own actions and their own story.[84] Chaereas' victory over the Persian fleet is so great as to be compared with his illustrious father-in-law's victory over the Athenians, and as a result of that comparison, Chaereas gains an honorable reputation and authority among the people of Syracuse.

Despite the teleological idealization which seems to have been an integral component of the form of Greek romance, the characterization of Chaereas and Callirhoe in the denouement of the novel takes on a sinister undercurrent when it is considered against the discursive background of Athenian politicking which was so formative on Chariton's narrative. Certainly there were non-Athenian models at hand for representing the kind of power couple that Callirhoe and Chaereas become in Book 8 of Chariton's novel, but Athenian history also provided ample models for the political manipulations of the *Liebespaar*, and the classical setting implies the Athenian precedents. When Chaereas learns that his ally, the Egyptian pharaoh, has been defeated by the Persian King and that the Persian is sailing to Aradus to regain his wife Stateira, Chaereras' first instinct is to jump to action. But Callirhoe intervenes with advice that is suggestive of the private power which she yields over her husband's political maneuverings: "Where are you running

[84] In his mythological interpretation of the novel, Schmeling draws a similar conclusion: "His final act of correction is his assuming the warlike character of the ancient hero and returning Callirhoe to Syracuse. Chaereas now deserves Callirhoe and his famous father-in-law; his adventures and trials have made him a worthy hero, to be admired by his parents, loved by his wife, and worshipped by the common people of Syracuse, desperately in need of a hero" (1974: 135).

off to before devising a plan about what has happened? If you make this public, you will set in motion a huge war that you yourself will have to deal with, since everyone will have by then learned what has happened and would think of you with contempt. And coming once more into the hands of the king, we will suffer worse than before" (ποῦ σπεύδεις … πρὶν βουλεύσασθαι περὶ τῶν ἐφεστηκότων; ἂν γὰρ τοῦτο δημοσιεύσῃς, μέγαν πόλεμον κινήσεις σεαυτῷ, πάντων ἐπισταμένων ἤδη καὶ καταφρονούντων· πάλιν δὲ ἐν ⟨βασιλέως⟩ χερσὶ γενόμενοι πεισόμεθα τῶν πρώτων βαρύτερα, 8.2.4).[85] Persuaded by his wife's shrewd advice, Chaereas reconsiders and finally leaves the nuptual bedroom only when a plan has been devised (τοῦ θαλάμου προῆλθε μετὰ τέχνης, 8.2.5): he will move his men to Paphos, one of the oldest cult sites of Aphrodite[86] and a setting powerfully evocative of the goddess' favor towards him and his wife, and there he will manipulate his men into thinking that it is their own idea to sail to Syracuse.

After an elaborate sacrifice in honor of the goddess, the priests of Paphos declare that the omens for Chaereas are (of course) favorable, and thus encouraged Chaereas asks his men if they consider it best to return to the King and beg for his mercy. As expected, they refuse such a surrender, but Chaereas continues to press them, demanding their opinion as to what land would be most hospitable to them when they are surrounded on all sides by their enemy.

> Σιωπῆς ἐπὶ τούτοις γενομένης Λακεδαιμόνιος ἀνήρ, Βρασίδου συγγενής, κατὰ μεγάλην ἀνάγκην τῆς Σπάρτης ἐκπεσών, πρῶτος ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν "τί δὲ ζητοῦμεν ποῦ φύγωμεν βασιλέα; ἔχομεν γὰρ θάλασσαν καὶ τριήρεις· ἀμφότερα δὲ ἡμᾶς εἰς Σικελίαν ἄγει καὶ Συρακούσας, ὅπου οὐ μόνον Πέρσας οὐκ ἂν δείσαμεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἀθηναίους."
> When silence came about at this time, a Lacedaemonian man, a relative of Brasidas, forced to become an exile from Sparta, was the first to dare to speak: "Why are we seeking a place to flee the king? We have the sea and triremes. Both lead us to Sicily and to Syracuse, where we would have no fear not only of the Persians, but even of the Athenians." (8.2.12)

The detailed description of this man by the narrator is an important reminder to the reader of the novel's historical setting. He is a Lacedaemonian, and more specifically a relative of Brasidas, the distinguished Spartan com-

[85] Haynes 2003: 51.
[86] Plepelits 1976: 187–188.

mander responsible for a string of victories over Athens who died in 422 at Amphipolis while defeating an army led by Cleon. We are thus reminded of the predominantly Doric character of Chaereas' Greek contingent (7.3.6–7), not one of his men being an Athenian. We are reminded, after the romantic couple's long night of passionate love-making, that the old political animosities still exist: the events of the Peloponnesian War are still very real for the characters in Chariton's novel. And yet this man's alignment with the Spartan state is not complete, for he has fallen out of favor with his country and his misfortunes have compelled him to lead a life as a mercenary soldier (κατὰ μεγάλην ἀνάγκην τῆς Σπάρτης ἐκπεσών). Generally speaking, they are all men without countries, adrift in an alien sea. When he says, "We have the sea and triremes" (ἔχομεν γὰρ θάλασσαν καὶ τριήρεις), the Spartan's words would have a potent double meaning for Chaereas and Callirhoe. On the one hand, their possession of the sea and a fleet of ships provides them with an expedient means of returning to Sicily. On the other hand, the sea and triremes are symbols evocative of Syracuse's recent military superiority in the Mediterranean (cf. Callirhoe's soliloquy at 1.6.2–3). These words from the mouth of the Spartan trigger an immediate reminder of Hermocrates's victory over the Athenians and the newfound glory of the Syracusan people.

But such an evocation is by no means coincidental; the Spartan man's entire speech to his fellow Greeks has been rhetorically engineered by Chaereas precisely as a means of generating a popular vote to sail for Syracuse. Chaereas first summoned his men to him because he was encouraged (θαρρήσας, 8.2.9) by the favorable omens after the elaborate sacrifice to Aphrodite on Paphos; he addressed his men as his "comrades of great successes" (κοινωνοὶ μεγάλων κατορθωμάτων, 8.2.10), similar to the "unexpected successes" (τοῖς παραδόξοις κατορθώμασιν, 1.1.4) favored by Eros. Convincing them that it was their sense of unity which allowed them to defeat the Persian navy, he told them that "We conquered the sea all of one mind" (ὁμονοοῦντες ἐκρατήσαμεν τῆς θαλάσσης, 8.2.10). His address revealed a keen sense of opportunity (καιρὸς δὲ ὀξύς), and it prompted exactly the right response from the bravely vocal relative of Brasidas. Primed by their leader to be all of one mind (ὁμονοοῦντες), the Greeks are, not surprisingly, won over by the Spartan's suggestion of sailing to Sicily. Any doubt that Chaereas was massaging such a response from his fellow comrades is dissolved when the narrator informs us that "Chaereas alone pretended not to agree, providing as an excuse the length of the voyage, but really proving whether it seemed to them the sure thing" (μόνος Χαιρέας προσεποιεῖτο μὴ συγκατατίθεσθαι, τὸ μῆκος τοῦ πλοῦ προφασιζόμενος, τὸ

δὲ ἀληθὲς ἀποπειρώμενος εἰ βεβαίως αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ, 8.2.13). If we are to take the narrator at his word, then we cannot doubt that Chaereas has the best interest of his men in mind. And yet, the fact cannot be ignored that to achieve his ends he employs deception and pretense without hesitation. Chaereas' behavior in this scene is certainly an echo of Agamemnon's manipulation of the army in the *Iliad* (2.73ff.),[87] but the historical milieu of the novel is not without significance here either. We are reminded that if this is the world of the Spartan Brasidas, then it is also the world of the Athenian Cleon, and an alert reader will recognize in Chaereas' behavior the same kind of political maneuvering typical of Athenian statesmen in Thucydides' history. Though he has not been characterized as a wicked or ambitious politician, Chaereas has become himself a kind of Cleon or Alcibiades, using subtle rhetorical persuasion as a means of demagoguery (cf. Thuc. 4.27–28; 6.15.4–19.1). As a result, a reader wonders whether Chaereas' subtle manipulation of his men is an indication of what his political career will be like upon his return home to Syracuse.

Earlier in the novel, both Dionysius and Artaxerxes indicated that a friendship existed between Syracuse and Persia based primarily on their shared opposition to Athens (2.6.3 and 5.8.8). Athens was in that context therefore represented as part of a triangular relationship between three political entities. But the political landscape has shifted as a result of the Egyptian rebellion, and Chaereas' army embodies yet a fourth political entity. Though Chaereas and Callirhoe hail from Syracuse, they are defined more at this point by Chaereas' assistance in the Egyptian pharaoh's failed revolt; Chaereas' army, as a band of mercenaries, in other words has no strict political alignment. But the Spartan's words offer a solution (obviously foreseen by Chaereas) and point them all in a safe political direction: sailing to Syracuse will first put distance between themselves and the vengeful Persian King, and will second place them out of the way of the Athenians, who apparently still present a naval threat (μὴ μόνον Πέρσας οὐκ ἂν δείσαιμεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἀθηναίους, 8.2.12). In the same manner that Hermocrates, Dionysius, and Artaxerxes all represented their political identities in terms of an oppositional relationship to Athens, so too does the Spartan soldier. Even as the novel moves towards its finale, Athens continues to be an important cultural symbol in the political vocabulary of self-definition and differentiation.

[87] Goold 1995: 375.

4 Athenian Myth and Drama

1 Theseus and Ariadne

The influence of myth and drama on Chariton's novel have long been noted, but the interest of this chapter will be the specific influence of myth and drama insofar as they convey trans-historical Athenian ideologies. Of particular concern for Chariton's novel is the way in which Athenian myth shapes the paradoxical concept of the democratic hero. A positivist reading of the novel might focus on the teleological return of the romantic couple to their home in Syracuse and on their reincorporation within the benevolent guided democracy – Callirhoe and Chaereas have come out of the proverbial woods of barbarian tyranny and are back home in the comforts of western democracy. But the analogical comparisons of the romantic pair to figures from Athenian myth and drama suggest that the incorporation of these heroic characters within a democratic political structure will not necessarily be easy.

A brief consideration of the mythical characterization of the *Liebespaar* at the beginning of the novel reveals what kind of obstacles the two young people will have to overcome to be reintegrated into their society upon their eventual return from the east. Callirhoe is said to have the divine beauty "not of a Nereid or of a nymph of the mountains, but of the maiden Aphrodite herself" (οὐδὲ Νηρηΐδος ἢ Νύμφης τῶν ὀρειῶν ἀλλ' αὐτῆς Ἀφροδίτης [παρθένου], 1.1.2).[1] There is a hierarchy even within the category of divine beauty. Even in this regard Callirhoe is superior, for she is likened not just to a Nereid or rustic nymph, but to the very queen of erotic beauty. Aphrodite is, as Douglas Edwards has named her, "the ultimate power broker"[2] in the novel. Her divine authority is consolidated when the beauty of her avatar subverts human political institutions, whether the monarchy of the Persian empire or even the democratic assembly in Syracuse.[3] Chaereas' physical

[1] Hercher suggested deleting παρθένου from the text at this point, as an intrusion from 1.1.1.

[2] Edwards 1998: 46.

[3] Smith 2005: 178.

appearance is likewise compared to mythical and legendary precedents: he was "the kind of Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades that sculptors and painters depict" (οἷον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἱππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς ⟨ἀπο⟩δεικνύουσι, 1.1.3). Only the figure of Nireus in that catalogue does not have problematic associations: Achilles, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades are all famous for their inability to exist on a plane equal with their fellow men. The political and philosophical implications of the comparison with the Athenian Alcibiades will be explored fully in the final chapter of this book. But the comparison with Hippolytus should also motivate questions about what kind of political creature Chaereas will turn out to be. Athenian drama had, after all, figured Hippolytus as a symbol of erotic jealousy and as the cause of Theseus' tyrannical subversion of judicial procedure, the foundation of democratic institutions (Eur. *Hipp*. 1320–1324). In other words, Chaereas is in a league with men whose relationship with democracy is difficult to say the least. The reader of Chariton's novel who has been steeped in the myth and dramatic texts of the Athenian past will have to ask: how can Callirhoe and Chaereas exist within Syracusan democracy when their very presence suggests a divinity and heroism that transcend democracy's inherent limitations?

The ambivalent tradition of the Theseus myth is evoked again at the end of the novel, when Chaereas, victorious over the Persian naval forces, has taken Aradus and is unaware of Callirhoe's presence on the island. Book 8 begins with an extended introduction by the narrator, who says that Tyche was on the verge of allowing Callirhoe to be abandoned by Chaereas on Aradus as he sailed away with other men's wives aboard his trireme. If he were to abandon Calllirhoe, says the narrator, she would "not be like the sleeping Ariadne, not even for Dionysus as husband, but she would be booty for Chaereas' own enemies" (οὐχ ὡς Ἀριάδνην καθεύδουσαν, οὐδὲ Διονύσῳ νυμφίῳ, λάφυρον δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολεμίοις, 8.1.2). From the beginning of the novel, Callirhoe has been compared to a number of beautiful figures from myth: Artemis (3.8.6),[4] Helen (5.2.8),[5] Medea (2.9.3),[6] and even Aphrodite herself (1.1.2, 2.2.6, 2.5.7, 3.2.14, 3.2.17).[7] More significant for this study, however, are Callirhoe's several comparisons to Ariadne, the abandoned bride of Theseus (1.6.2, 3.3.5, 4.1.8, 8.1.2). She is an appropriate ana-

[4] See Elsom 1992: 223–224; Haynes 2003: 48.

[5] See Laplace 1980.

[6] Elsom (1992: 222–223) and Goldhill (1995: 127–128) both neglect to comment on Callirhoe's reference to Medea in their discussion of this passage.

[7] See among others Elsom 1992: 221; Egger 1994: 37–38; Haynes 2003: 48.

logue for the heroine of the novel: both are separated from their first husbands, and both are wedded a second time to an eastern Dionys(i)us. Since Ariadne's husband was the legendary king of Athens, it is hard not to imagine that the repeated references to Ariadne are part of the novel's playful evocation of an Athenian background.

It was Ariadne who helped Theseus escape from her father's labyrinth after his slaughter of the Minotaur, and he took Ariadne with him in his flight from Crete. For some reason, though, Ariadne did not complete the journey with Theseus, and she was left on the island of Naxos. According to Homer, Ariadne was already betrothed to Dionysus on Crete, and Artemis slew her on Naxos as punishment for her escape with Theseus (*Od*. 11.321–325). This seems to work out well for Theseus: the legendary Athenian king ought not to be tied down to an unfaithful princess. In this version of events, the central theme is the infidelity of Ariadne, a theme that is deeply relevant to the plot of Chariton's novel. Callirhoe musters all her rhetorical skill to persuade herself that she is doing the right thing for Chaereas' son by choosing to marry Dionysius (2.9–11), but at the end of the novel Chariton's narrator emphasizes the heroine's strategic silence about sharing Dionysius' bed (8.1.15) and about secretly sending a farewell letter to her second husband (8.4.4–9).[8] Like Homer's Ariadne, Callirhoe too abandons a Dionysian figure with whom she shares a conjugal bond. Chariton's portrayal of Callirhoe as an ethically conflicted character and the novelistic problematization of her marital fidelity are an integral part of the narrative, and so reading Callirhoe as this kind of problematic Ariadne is not entirely inappropriate.

But the most popular accounts of the Theseus and Ariadne story relate that out of cruelty (*crudelis*, Ov. *Met*. 8.175) or sheer forgetfulness (*immemor*, Cat. 64.58) Theseus abandonded Ariadne on Naxos while she was still sleeping, and that Dionysus rescued her from her misery and solitude (see also Paus. 1.20.3; Ov. *Ars am.* 1.535–564, *Her.* 10; Hyg. *Fab.* 40). Plutarch even offers an account in which Ariadne is abandoned by Theseus because he was already in love with another woman, Aigle, the daughter of Panopeus (*Thes.* 20.1). As opposed to the Homeric version of the story, which finds Ariadne the culpable party, these more popular versions of the story offer Theseus as a problematic hero and consequently complicate an idealized Athenian etiology.[9] If we are invited to read Callirhoe as a blame-

[8] Goldhill 1995: 127–132.

[9] This ambiguity pervades representations of Theseus, whose wild character had to be tamed by the mythographic tradition, beginning with Pherecydes, before he could begin to be accepted as a democratic hero at Athens. See Walker 1995.

less Ariadne, then it falls to Chaereas to exculpate himself of the charge of husbandly neglect or, worse, spousal abuse.

The first reference to Ariadne in Chariton's novel occurs in the narrator's description of the funeral procession, where he says that, "Everyone present likened Callirhoe to the sleeping Ariadne" (πάντες εἴκαζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδνῃ καθευδούσῃ, 1.6.1). No mention is made of Theseus, and it is unclear from the reference which Ariadne tradition the narrator is following. But after discovering that Callirhoe's body is no longer in the tomb in Syracuse, Chaereas raises his hands and pleads with the gods: "Which of the gods, becoming my rival in love, has carried away Callirhoe and now holds her to himself – she who is unwilling, compelled by a stronger fate? … Thus even Dionysus stole Ariadne from Theseus" (τίς ἄρα θεῶν ἀντεραστής μου γενόμενος Καλλιρόην ἀπενήνοχε καὶ νῦν ἔχει μεθ' αὑτοῦ μὴ θέλουσαν, ἀλλὰ βιαζομένην ὑπὸ κρείττονος μοίρας; … οὕτω καὶ Θησέως Ἀριάδνην ἀφείλετο Διόνυσος, 3.3.4–5). This alternative version of the story is recounted by the epic poet Theolytus (Ath. 7.296a), by Pausanias (10.29.4),[10] by the mythographer Apollodorus (*Epit*. 1.9), and by Diodorus Siculus (4.61.5). If the Chaereas/Callirhoe story is analogous to the Theseus/Ariadne myth, as the narrator has suggested beginning at 1.6.2, then Chaereas, as the Theseus figure, is cast in a potentially suspicious light, possibly having abandoned his beautiful bride for dubious reasons. And we know that it is only because of Chaereas' jealous assault on his wife that Callirhoe fell to her seeming death to begin with – perhaps, then, the analogy to a cruel or forgetful Theseus is appropriate. But given the opportunity to retell the myth in his own terms, Chaereas follows a different narrative tradition that exonerates Theseus (and by analogy, himself) from any wrongdoing. In Chaereas' version of the story, Theseus is transformed (like Ariadne herself) into a passive victim of Dionysus.

Plutarch reminds us that "There are many stories still told both about [Theseus' adventures] and about Ariadne, and none of them are in agreement" (πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἔτι λέγονται καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀριάδνης, οὐδὲν ὁμολογούμενον ἔχοντες, *Thes*. 20.1).[11] Chariton was clearly aware of

[10] Plepelits 1976: 174.

[11] Edmund Cueva has argued that Chariton's story is in many ways similar to the story of Theseus and Ariadne as told by Paeon, whose account is preserved in Plutarch's life of *Theseus* (20.3–5). There is also in Chariton a parallel to the mid-4th century BC writer Cleidemus, whose account is also preserved in the same work of Plutarch (19.8). Cueva sees both of these parallels as evidence that Chariton must have used Plutarch's life of *Theseus* as a model for his own narrative. He concedes the possibility that perhaps Chariton was following Paeon, but confusingly insists that "Chariton would not have been able

the different, sometimes conflicting, versions of the myth, and he uses the ambiguities to great effect in his novel. The ambivalent relationship between Ariadne and Theseus raises questions of marital fidelity: did Theseus abandon Ariadne, or was she stolen from him? Did Ariadne grieve at the prospect of a second marriage to Dionysus, or did she welcome him with open arms? On one level this ambivalence reflects the complicated relationship between Callirhoe and Chaereas. Not only is Chaereas' jealous rage problematic (1.4.12), but so too is Callirhoe's secretive behavior at the end of the novel (8.4.4). On another level, though, Chariton's ambivalent references to Theseus, heroic founder of Athens (victimized one moment, potentially problematic the next) reinforce the fluctuating significance in the novel of Athens itself. For Hermocrates and Callirhoe a militarily defeated Athens is a symbol of Syracusan glory; for Theron Athens represents a litigious society and a judicial system more dangerous than tyranny; for Artaxerxes Athens is a haunting reminder of Persia's past weakness. Just as Theseus dons a sympathetic mask when his story is focalized through Chaereas, so too does Athens mean different things to different people in the novel.

And yet the narrator tells us that Aphrodite would not allow Tyche's plans to come to fruition: Callirhoe would not be abandoned by Chaereas on Aradus as Ariadne was abandoned by Theseus on Naxos. This would have been a deed "not only ironic, but grim even" (οὐ μόνον παράδοξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυθρωπόν, 8.1.2). The narrator then explains that for all his trials and for having struggled through so many misfortunes, Chaereas had paid a sufficient penalty to Aphrodite. She had previously been angered by his inappropriate jealousy (ἄκαιρον ζηλοτυπίαν, 8.1.3): she had granted to him Callirhoe, the most beautiful gift in the world (δῶρον … τὸ κάλλιστον), and in return for her favor he had offended her (ὕβρισεν εἰς τὴν χάριν). Now, however, Aphrodite was reconciled to the hero (αὐτῷ διηλλάττετο) and took pity on him (ἠλέησεν αὐτόν), intending finally to reunite the young husband and wife (πάλιν ἠθέλησεν ἀποδοῦναι).[12]

---

to parallel" Cleidemus also (1996: 482). This doesn't seem to make sense. I find it perfectly reasonable that Chariton would have had access to both Paeon and Cleidemus (and many other writers, for that matter), and it is therefore not necessary to insist that Plutarch is Chariton's model. Cueva goes further, though, and bases his dating of Chariton "in the third or fourth decade of the second century of our era" in part on the supposition that Plutarch was a model for Chariton's narrative (2000: 206). I find Cueva's argument for a 2nd century date unconvincing, and I agree with the consensus that Chariton was composing in the latter half of the 1st century CE.

[12] On the extended introduction to Book 8 by the narrator, see also A. Rijksbaron 1984 who argues for the interpretation in antiquity that Aristotelian *katharsis* was achieved by liter-

Despite the narrator's temporary diffusion of the tensions attendant upon comparisons with Theseus and Ariadne, those tensions continue to fester beneath the idealizing sheen of the novel's denouement. Likeness to Ariadne does not always connote victimization, and Callirhoe's deceptions at the end of the novel suggest that she may be read as an Ariadne in the Homeric mold, deceiving her Dionysian husband to run away with a Greek hero. If however we are to read Callirhoe as the blameless Ariadne of popular tradition, then it is left for Chaereas to contend with the charge of being a neglectful, abusive Theseus. The heroine, on the one hand, subverts what is considered to be the acceptable behavior of a wife, while the hero, on the other hand, is characterized by his tyrannical behavior and his disruptive, if not deadly, jealousy. At the beginning of this section I posed the question: how can Callirhoe and Chaereas exist within Syracusan democracy when their mythological counterparts transcend the boundaries inherent in a democratic society? In other words, will the crafty and politically shrewd Callirhoe ever accept her social position as wife? And how will Chaereas' domestic tyranny translate to the political arena in Syracuse? Callirhoe and Chaereas are hardly doomed by the negative connotations of the Ariadne and Theseus comparisons. Chariton's novel shows, on the contrary, that the mythic past is not a crystallized tradition to be accepted without question. Rather, at stake in the mythologizing of the present is not only the narrator's representation of his characters, but also the characters' own self-presentation. Crucial notions of culpability and blamelessness, fidelity and infidelity are shaped by which mythical traditions are appropriated and applied in any given context. This is the brilliant rhetorical ambiguity of myth. In this sense, Callirhoe and Chaereas will have learned much from Gorgias' defense of Helen. The young man and woman from Syracuse will be democrats in the sophistic style, ready and able to use their rhetorical training to fashion for themselves persuasive mythic personae, regardless of whatever anti-democratic intentions they may harbor.

2 Menander and the Influence of Athenian Drama

The dramatic quality of Chariton's novel has long been remarked upon by scholars. Hägg showed in his detailed narratological study that nearly half of

---

ary composition and not by the spectator's reception of tragic material. Chariton writes of his final book that, "it is a purification of those grim events in the preceeding books" (καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν, 8.1.4).

Chariton's text (44%) is direct speech.[13] We hear the characters speak at great length, as if becoming audience to the actors in the story as they perform their respective roles. Furthermore, Alberto Borgogno has investigated the many quotations of Menander[14] in Chariton's text and has concluded that Menander's appeal to the Aphrodisian novelist rested in the balance between ethics and artistry in his plays.[15] Goold has written that, "The story of *Callirhoe*, as opposed to its setting, is rather akin to the subject matter of New Comedy, and the action, as in those plays, springs from the effects of love upon the various characters (who seem themselves not so much aristocrats as members of middle-class society)."[16] More specifically, Hunter has noted that Chaereas' seemingly fatal assault on Callirhoe evokes the soldier's assault on Glycera's hair in the *Perikeiromenē*. Likewise Callirhoe's refusal of Dionysius and Dionysius' own unwillingness to use force (especially during his complaint to Leonas at 2.6.1) echoes the plight of Thrasonides in the *Misoumenos*.[17]

Also relevant is Susan Lape's fascinating argument that Menandrian comedy sustained well into the 4th century BC the maintenance of Athenian democratic ideology, despite the disappearance of democratic political institutions in Athens. In its repeated staging of marriage between citizens overcoming myriad obstacles, Menandrian comedy reaffirmed the deeply held belief that "deviation from the state's reproductive rules" produced "'citizens' characterized by an innate hostility to the city and its democracy."[18] It seems reasonable to extend Lape's argument. I don't mean to suggest that the 1st century appropriation of themes from or even the direct quotation of Menander's comedies necessarily evoked the maintenance of racial purity that underpinned Athenian democratic ideology of the 4th century BC. I do suggest however that the narrative structures, or plots, of Menandrian comedy allowed the novelist to represent (or even to ironize) marriage as a stable, civilizing force within a new, multicultural, imperialist context. Though defining Athenianness in terms of racial purity had little or no value for the Roman Empire's international audience, sustaining the ideology of Greek

---

[13] Hägg 1971: 91. See also Reardon 1999: 173.

[14] 1.4.2: *Nauklēros* fr. 290 K-T; 1.4.3: *Samia* fr. 542 K-T; 1.7.1: *Arrēphoros* fr. 59.4 K-T; 2.1.5: *Hērōs* fr. 2 K-T; 3.2.2: *Dyskolos* 842, *Perikeiromenē* 435, *Samia* 727; 3.3.9: *Halieus* fr. 18 K-T; 6.3.2: *Hērōs* fr. 1 K-T; 8.8.12: *Dyskolos* 841ff.

[15] Borgogno 1971.

[16] Goold 1995: 13.

[17] Hunter 1994: 1063–1065.

[18] Lape 2004: 8.

democratic freedom in the face of external, tyrannical forces was still possible through the transmission of Athenian *paideia*.

The appropriation and reconceptualization of certain generic commonplaces of New Comedy were important means of conveying the interrelatedness of the themes of freedom and tyranny. Though New Comedy generally deals more with private citizens than with individuals of elevated status, the themes of freedom and tyranny are nevertheless expressed on the comic stage within the domestic relationships of master and servant. The character type of the trickster slave (the *servus callidus*) subverts normal power relations within the household, so that the slave's master (usually an *adulescens amans*) falls prey to the machinations of the slave (*inter alios* the character of Onesimus in Menander's *Epitrepontes*, Palaestrio in Plautus' *Miles Gloriosus*, and Syrus in Terence's *Adelphoe*).[19] Variations on such *servi callidi* are the finely drawn characters of Phocas and Plangon in Chariton's novel. Plangon, Callirhoe's faithful co-conspirator, plots not only to lie to Dionysius about Callirhoe's intention to marry him, but even conceals from her master the fact that he will be raising another man's child in his own house (3.1.1ff.). In aligning herself with Callirhoe, the object of her master's obsessive desire, Plangon has secured for herself a champion in the household, and she thereby gains some measure of power over her master. "She is clearly typecast," writes Schmeling, "as the mischievous slave who tends to her master's (Dionysius') business, but who carefully notices how this business can be turned to her own benefit."[20] Plangon's success at convincing Dionysius of Callirhoe's desire to marry proves how a master's domestic power is easily dissolved when a man has already become the victim of Eros.

Later in the novel, when Phocas discovers that Chaereas has landed in Miletus to find Callirhoe, the slave takes matters into his own hands and contrives an ambush of the Syracusan trireme (3.7.1–3). When Dionysius, his master, forces him to tell what has happened, Phocas reassures him, "It is nothing bad, my master, for I bring to you stories of great benefits. If the first bits of them are rather upsetting, don't be distressed or pained on this account. But just you wait until you have heard the whole story. For the end of the story is to your advantage" (φαῦλον μὲν … οὐδέν ἐστιν, ὦ δέσποτα, μεγάλων γὰρ ἀγαθῶν φέρω σοι διηγήματα· εἰ δὲ σκυθρωπότερά ἐστιν αὐτῶν τὰ πρῶτα, διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν ἀγωνιάσῃς μηδὲ λυπήθῃς, ἀλλὰ περίμεινον, ἕως οὗ πάντα ἀκούσῃς· χρηστὸν γὰρ ἔχει σοι τὸ τέλος, 3.9.8). Schmeling notes

[19] Duckworth 1994: 249–253, 288–291.
[20] Schmeling 1974: 144.

that, "This speech of Phocas to Dionysius … was taken almost directly from the repertory of tricks played on masters by the servants in Greek New Comedy and Latin comedy: slaves first report the bad news, enjoy their master's suffering, and then report the good."[21]

Since the novel is thoroughly informed by Menandrian *topoi*, Chariton's readers, of diverse cultural backgrounds, might be reminded that Menander's plays were in the 4th century BC popular representations of Athenian private life, however fanciful that depiction of "real life" was. And so despite the frequently dismissive attitude towards Athens among Chariton's characters, those same characters are framed to a significant degree by a particularly *Athenian* conceptualization of reality. Oudot has argued that the evasion of the classical Athenian influence in Chariton's text is a response primarily to the historiographic tradition, whereas Athenian drama is confronted more directly in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*.[22] I would argue though, that Chariton responds equally to the influence of Athenian drama in his fictitious reconstruction of the classical past.

This is best seen at those times in the novel when the narrator himself acts as if he were composing a stage drama instead of a prose narrative.[23] During the trial scene at Babylon, for instance, when Chaereas, believed long dead, is introduced by Mithridates into the courtroom, the narrator transforms the entire scene into the climax of a dramatic performance:

> Ἔτι δὲ λέγοντος (οὕτω γὰρ ἦν διατεταγμένον) προῆλθε Χαιρέας αὐτός. ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ Καλλιρόη ἀνέκραγεν "Χαιρέα, ζῇς;" καὶ ὥρμησεν αὐτῷ προσδραμεῖν· κατέσχε δὲ Διονύσιος καὶ μέσος γενόμενος οὐκ εἴασεν ἀλλήλοις περιπλακῆναι. τίς ἂν φράσῃ κατ᾽ ἀξίαν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ δικαστηρίου; ποῖος ποιητὴς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς παράδοξον μῦθον οὕτως εἰσήγαγεν; ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ παρεῖναι μυρίων παθῶν πλῆρει· πάντα ἦν ὁμοῦ, δάκρυα, χαρά, θάμβος, ἔλεος, ἀπιστία, εὐχαί.
> While [Mithridates] was still speaking (for it had been so arranged), Chaereas himself came forward. And Callirhoe, seeing him, cried out, "Chaereas! You are alive?" And she started to run to him, but Dionysius, coming between them, did not allow them to embrace each other. Who would be able to worthily report the scene of the courtroom? What dramatic poet ever introduced such an incredible plot onto the stage? You would have thought you were present in a theatre filled with countless

[21] Schmeling 1974: 110.
[22] Oudot 1992: 107.
[23] Schmeling 1974: 97.

> emotions. There was everything all at once: tears, joy, astonishment, pity, disbelief, prayer. (5.8.1–2)

The appropriation of Athenian legal discourse throughout the novel and especially in the trial scenes will be explored fully in the following chapter; for now, though, I wish to focus on the passage's dramatic conceptualization. Maarit Kaimio has argued that the prominent qualities of this passage are typical of the devices which Chariton employs to guide his audience: "authorial comments upon the merits of the scene, the emphasis on emotions, especially on simultaneous, conflicting emotions, and the reactions of both the principal characters and the crowd following their actions, the emotions being emphasized by the comparison with a dramatic performance."[24] It is also noteworthy that the narrator's addresses to the reader, framed as rhetorical questions intended to elevate his status as a literary artist, have an agonistic quality. On one level, the narrator provocatively figures himself as a skilled technician without peer, the culmination of a long literary tradition. Whatever we might imagine this scene could have been in the hands of Achilles Tatius, or Heliodorus, we are made to think – if only momentarily – that only Chariton's narrator could accurately describe the emotional confusion of that courtroom. Oddly enough, though, it is not with prose writers that this narrator wishes to be compared, but with dramatic poets. His claim that no poet could have staged this work (ἐπὶ σκηνῆς … εἰσήγαγεν) is cast in the vivid language of theatrical production.[25] In other words, the narrator conceives of himself as engaged in a dramatic competition, evocative of those held yearly at Athens during the City Dionysia and Lenaia. It is as if Chariton's narrator pleads with us, his readers, that for having produced a scene of such transcendent irony, his name might be engraved for all time in an imaginary *didaskalia* alongside the tradition's most hallowed poets and *chorēgoi*.

The passage's allusion to the civic origins of dramatic competition is also suggestive of the parasitic relationship between democracy and tyrannical imperialism that characterizes many of Athens' ideas about itself. It is well known that at the inauguration of the Great Dionysia in the 5th century, a carefully orchestrated parade of imperialist propaganda was marched before the eyes of an international audience as a way of announcing loud and clear the power and glory of the Athenian state. Before the dramatic performances even began, there were performances of a more explicitly politi-

[24] Kaimio 1996: 50.
[25] Cf. Ar. *Ach*. 11; Pl. *Resp*. 381d, *Ap*. 35b.

cal nature: the ritual purification of the theatre of Dionysus by the ten leading Athenian generals, the announcement of the year's civic benefactors, the ostentatious display of the silver tribute provided by the imperial "allies," and finally the parade of war orphans raised at public expense to don hoplite armor and participate in the Athenian military machine.[26] It is also generally acknowledged, that in spite of these bald expressions of Athenian imperialism, the dramas themselves staged a ritual inversion of social structures. The dramatic performances provided a valuable opportunity for meditation and reflection on civic identity and the city's potentially deleterious policies both home and abroad. This kind of critical thinking was fundamental in a democratic state that demanded of its citizens the ability to look at a problem from multiple perspectives.[27]

Chariton's text invites the reader to engage in just this kind of empathic experience. Sharing the perspective of the audience in the courtroom, we are asked to see through the eyes of all the major players: "Chaereas they blessed; with Mithridates they rejoiced; they grieved with Dionysius; about Callirhoe they were baffled. That woman was especially astonished and she stood speechless, glancing only at Chaereas with her eyes wide open" (Χαιρέαν ἐμακάριζον, Μιθριδάτῃ συνέχαιρον, συνελυποῦντο Διονυσίῳ, περὶ Καλλιρόης ἠπόρουν. μάλιστα γὰρ ἦν ἐκείνη τεθορυβημένη καὶ ἄναυδος εἱστήκει, μόνον ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς Χαιρέαν ἀποβλέπουσα, 5.8.3). But the democratic power inherent in Chariton's dramatic conceptualization of this scene poses a threat to tyranny, as evidenced by the narratorial comment on the reaction of the Persian King: "I should think that even the king at that moment wanted to be Chaereas" (δοκεῖ δ' ἄν μοι καὶ βασιλεὺς τότε θέλειν Χαιρέας εἶναι). As demonstrated in the ekphrasis of the Persian court prior to the commencement of the trial and as made explicit elsewhere in the novel, Artaxerxes' power in the Persian Empire is absolute. But Chariton's narrative charts the destructive effects of Eros on a power even as absolute as the Persian King's: he loses all sight of his responsibilities as regent and becomes obsessed with catching the attentions of and possessing Callirhoe, the object of his desire.[28] Until this point in the novel, Callirhoe's beauty had been merely a curiosity to the King (4.1.8, 5.2.6). It is clear though that the dissolution of Artaxerxes' identity begins amid the orgy of vision described at the height of the trial in Babylon. We are made to see the King as he sees Callirhoe's passion aroused by the sight of Chaereas.

[26] See Goldhill 1990: 97–129.
[27] See Raaflaub 1990 and Roberts 1994: 30–31.
[28] Cf. Balot 1998: 150–154.

Artaxerxes would apparently be willing to give up his position of absolute authority – a position won at the cost of his own brother's life, as Xenophon reminds us in the *Anabasis* – if only he might elicit in Callirhoe the kind of response that Chaereas has elicited. In the topsy-turvy world of erotic inversion that the novel depicts, *that* is power.

And yet, despite the democratic effects of offering to his readers a variety of emotional responses from multiple perspectives, there is in this scene an overwhelming emphasis on narrative authority. In the classical period, tragedy and comedy both had the dangerous potential of deconstructing Athenian ideology before the eyes of an influential international audience, and yet Athens was content to open that Pandora's box so long as dramatic performances were framed within a civic context that reinforced Athens' supreme authority over her allies. Similarly, at the climax of the trial scene in Babylon, Chariton explodes the perspectival dynamic of his narrative, indulging both his characters and his readers in a melodramatic conflict of emotions. For a moment, we are motivated to sympathize with all of the actors in the story, the point being that everyone's desire and claim to truth are equally valid, resulting in an hermeneutic crisis that can only be resolved by *krisis*, judgment. It is left to the reader to decide what that judgment will be, but like the imperialist apparatus of Athens' civic and religious festival, Chariton's narrative voice emphasizes its absolute authority over the narrative events: "Who would be able to worthily report the scene of the courtroom? What dramatic poet ever introduced such an incredible plot onto the stage?" (5.8.2). They are seemingly innocent rhetorical questions, but they leave in the mind of the reader the indelible impression that there is a literary artist at work and that the reader's response has been carefully crafted and manipulated by the narrative authority.

Moving from considerations of the generic influence of Athenian drama on the novel, I will be concerned in the following sections with two very specific allusions in Chariton's text: the first is to Euripides' *Medea* (2.9.3) and the second is to Sophocles' *Ajax* (3.8.8). Allusion to these two tragedies, I maintain, allows the reader to formulate relationships between Chariton's text and literature from the period that the novel purports to depict. By figuring Callirhoe first as Medea and then as Ajax, Chariton (a) invites interpretations that distinguish his heroine from the destructive protagonists of traditional literature, and (b) consequently distinguishes his own text as an original departure from 5th century Athenian tragedy.

3 Euripides

One of the more famous passages from Chariton's novel is when Callirhoe, after having discovered that she is pregnant with Chaereas' child, delivers a long soliloquy in which she debates the abortion of her unborn child. Midway through her speech, the narrator intercedes and indicates that Callirhoe changes her mind and considers keeping the child:

> πάλιν δὲ μετενόει καί πως ἔλεος αὐτὴν τοῦ κατὰ γαστρὸς εἰσῄει. "βουλεύῃ τεκνοκτονῆσαι; πασῶν ἀσεβ<εστάτη, μ>αίνῃ καὶ Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμούς. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Σκυθίδος ἀγριωτέρα δόξεις· ἐκείνη μὲν γὰρ ἐχθρὸν εἶχε τὸν ἄνδρα, σὺ δὲ τὸ Χαιρέου τέκνον θέλεις ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ μηδὲ ὑπόμνημα τοῦ περιβοήτου γάμου καταλιπεῖν …"
> Then again she changed her mind and it seems pity for the child in her womb invaded her. "Do you want to murder your own children? Most unholy of all women, you are raving mad and you take up the reasoning of Medea. But you shall seem more barbaric then even a Scythian[29] woman: Medea held her husband in contempt, but you want to slaughter the child of Chaereas and to leave behind not even a reminder of your famed marriage …" (2.9.3–5)

The passage has a strong Euripidean flavor, not only for the allusion to Euripides' *Medea*, but also for the verb τεκνοκτονῆσαι, a borrowing of the Euripidean adjective τεκνοκτονός (*HF* 1155). It is possible that Chariton was not alluding specifically to Euripides' tragedy, but that he was alluding rather to the Middle Comedy tradition of mythological burlesque. *Medea* comedies were written by Eubulus, Strattis, Cantharus, Antiphanes, Carcinus, Dicaeogenes, and Theodorides. If the fragment of Strattis' comedy is a fair representative of the rest, then the comic Medea seems inclined more to wisecracking than to philosophizing about the efficacy of child-murder.[30] Such a representation of Medea is consistent with Middle Comedy's ten-

---

[29] Reardon notes that, "She is described here as Scythian – inaccurately, since she was from Colchis, on the east coast of the Black Sea. This is done to emphasize her savagery, since Scythia (southern Russia) was a byword for a land of savage barbarians; it was geographically close enough to Colchis for Chariton's rhetorical purpose here" (1989: 47). See also Plepelits 1976: 172.

[30] In Strattis' comedy, Medea quips to the father of Jason's new bride: "Do you know what your forehead looks like to me, Creon? I know! It looks like a bowl turned upside down!" (οἶσθ' ᾧ προσέοικεν, ὦ Κρέων, τὸ βρέγμα σου; | ἐγῷδα· δείνῳ περὶ κάτω τετραμμένῳ, Ath. 467e). It is uncertain however who the speaker is.

dency to reduce the grandiosity of myth to the level of the everyday.[31] One can easily imagine, though, that a comic Medea is comic primarily in that she resists the infanticide that is so much a part of her tragic persona; thus the possibility remains that when Callirhoe stops short of killing her own child, she is following in the tradition of the mythological heroine of Middle Comedy. Nevertheless, the authors of the *Medea* comedies were most certainly parodying Euripides,[32] and so if Chariton was indeed influenced in this scene by a comic *Medea*, then he was influenced at least indirectly by the Euripidean model. But the tone of Callirhoe's speech is not parodic, and the scene's intertwining of the themes of πάθος and λογισμός seems particularly Euripidean.[33] Callirhoe realizes that her intention to kill the child is a form of madness (πασῶν ἀσεβ<εστάτη, μ>αίνῃ),[34] and she calls her logic "Medean" (Μηδείας … λογισμούς). Her reasoning is therefore unreasonable, and the ironic use of the word λογισμούς here suggests the same vacillation between passion and reasoning which characterized Euripides' heroine.

In Euripides' play, the chorus of Corinthian women tells Medea that neither the city nor any of her family takes pity on her as she suffers the most terrible of all griefs: Jason's marriage to another woman (σὲ γὰρ οὐ πόλις, οὐ φίλων τις οἰκτιρεῖ παθοῦσαν | δεινότατα παθέων, 656–657).[35] As a result of that grief and suffering, Medea wants nothing more than to inflict pain and suffering in turn upon Jason. When, however, her sons look upon her and smile (1040), Medea's resolve is shaken, and she begins to alternate between her murderous conviction and maternal tenderness. But her hesitation (καρδία γὰρ οἴχεται, 1042) is articulated from the perspective of one who has already crossed over: the daring act of child-murder is for Medea the only reasonable means of sustaining her integrity.

καίτοι τί πάσχω; βούλομαι γέλωτ' ὀφλεῖν
ἐχθροὺς μεθεῖσα τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀζημίους;
τολμητέον τάδ'· ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης,
τὸ καὶ προσέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί.

---

[31] Nesselrath 1990: 218–223.

[32] See Hunter 1983: 149–150 and Nesselrath 1990: 279.

[33] The scene is notable for the absence of Tyche's intervention. Callirhoe determines the plot through her own will to power. See Smith 2005: 169–70.

[34] I follow Goold and Reardon, who adopt Reiske's and Jackson's emendations. F (πασῶν ἀσεβαίνη) is clearly corrupt, but Blake's conjecture imposes too much upon the text (Ἰάσων ἀσελγαίνει).

[35] I follow Diggle's text.

> What am I feeling? Do I want to be laughed at, allowing my enemies to go unpunished? I must be daring in my actions. Nay, admitting cowardly reason in my thoughts makes me weak. (1049–1052)

She will not become a joke for her enemies. Logic and reasoning are envisioned as outside forces that threaten her determination; they are weakening, feminizing agents capable of dissolving her ironically masculine steadfastness. The messenger's lengthy description of the gruesome deaths of Creon and Jason's new wife only strengthens Medea's resolve, and his final words to her indicate the utter futility of reasoning in the face of uncontrollable rage and passion: "I would say without fear that those among men who seem to be wise and who are anxious about reason – these men are charged with the greatest folly" (οὐδ' ἂν τρέσας εἴποιμι τοὺς σοφοὺς βροτῶν | δοκοῦντας εἶναι καὶ μεριμνητὰς λόγων | τούτους μεγίστην μωρίαν ὀφλισκάνειν, 1225–1227). Medea consequently steels her courage as would a soldier heading into battle: "Come then, my heart, and arm yourself!" (ἀλλ εἶ' ὁπλίζου, καρδία, 1242). For Medea, reason only gets in the way of her determination; it dissolves courage and prevents one from achieving what is necessary, however dreadful.

Callirhoe's perspective, however, is quite different from Medea's. Medea, after all, hated her husband (ἐκείνη μὲν γὰρ ἐχθρὸν εἶχε τὸν ἄνδρα, Ch. 2.9.4), whereas Callirhoe still loves Chaereas, which fact compels her to think of her unborn child as a memorial of their famed marriage (ὑπόμνημα τοῦ περιβοήτου γάμου). As a symbol of her persistant love for Chaereas, Callirhoe's child must live. And whereas Medea's predicament is constructed as a conflict between passion (πάθος) and reason (λόγος), in which pity for her children is incapable of tempering her murderous resolve, Callirhoe allows reason (λογισμός, 2.9.3) and pity (ἔλεος) to shape her course of action.[36] To calculate an alternative to the abortion is for Callirhoe not a weakness, but rather the very salvation of her love for Chaereas. Callirhoe realizes that only through her unborn son will she be symbolically reunited with her husband: "You, child," she says to the baby in her womb, "will return your parents to each other" (σύ, τέκνον, ἀλλήλοις ἀποδώσεις τοὺς γονεῖς, 2.9.5). At the end of her soliloquy, Callirhoe is described by the narrator as still "reckoning" (λογιζομένη, 2.9.6) her course of action. And so for Chariton's heroine, λογισμός is not a sign of weakness, but rather a prudent weighing of alternatives and a means of deciding what is best, not only for oneself (as in Medea's case) but for all parties involved. When Callirhoe

[36] Kaimio 1995: 56.

finally decides to keep the child and raise it as Dionysius' own, she does so only after carefully considering the points of view of both her son and Chaereas. Consideration of her first true husband, and not of herself, is what ultimately convinces her: "I name you, Chaereas, as my witness: you are the one who weds me to Dionysius" (μαρτύρομαί σε, Χαιρέα, σύ με Διονυσίῳ νυμφαγωγεῖς, 2.11.3).[37]

Schmeling interprets this scene in the novel as part of the author's strategy for keeping the reader aware of what the future holds for the heroine and her child, for Callirhoe prophetically declares that one day her son will sail from Ionia to Syracuse and inform both Chaereas and Hermocrates of what she herself has suffered (2.9.5) – in narratological terms we could say that the embedded fabula determines the primary fabula.[38] Schmeling also understands the mythic reference to Medea in terms of the presumably genteel, bourgeois expectations of the author and reader: "The fact that Callirhoe does not go through with the threatened abortion probably reflected on the middle-class morality transferred from Chariton to the aristocratic expectant mother."[39] Callirhoe's decision not to abort is imagined therefore as an abortive attempt at tragedy that would have been contrary to the aesthetics of the intended readership. But defining an intended readership is a risky venture, and I am more inclined to interpret the allusion to Euripides based on the text's internal evidence.

Margaret Anne Doody writes that, "Kallirhoé's tone to the child in her womb is intimate and coaxing – her horror at herself for wanting to kill her own child (she thinks she is like Euripides' Medea) mingles with her strong desire that the child should not know the pains of slavery."[40] Callirhoe tells her child to "depart as a free person, without having suffered miseries" (ἄπιθι ἐλεύθερος, ἀπαθὴς κακῶν, 2.9.3). Bearing the child would only mean a life of slavery, a life serving a foreign master.[41] Callirhoe had previously

---

[37] Schwartz provocatively argues that "In an elite family, Callirhoe's son's double paternity would have been considered an asset in the political stratagems of the elite, rather than a flaw in the familial structure or as a failure of Callirhoe's maternal instincts" (1999: 52). But this interpretation neglects Chariton's emphasis at the end of the novel on Callirhoe's deception, shame, and silence regarding her relationship with Dionysius. Furthermore, Schwartz' claim that the novel depicts Chaereas' integration into the *oikos* of Hermocrates denies the many suggestions that Chaereas has politically challenged or displaced his father-in-law in Syracuse.

[38] See Bal 1997: 54–55.

[39] Schmeling 1974: 98.

[40] Doody 1996: 37–38.

[41] For a discussion of the socio-economic factors motivating Callirhoe's intended abortion, see Kapparis 2002: 120–124.

expressed anxiety over her own enslavement to a foreign (more specifically, an Athenian) master (1.11.3). And so Callirhoe here projects onto her unborn child her own concerns about freedom and slavery, mastery and servitude, themes that inform the novel as a whole. As the previous chapter has demonstrated, Athens stands as a prominent symbol for and locus of these oppositions, and Chariton's evocation of Euripides in this scene engages with the ideological tensions in the novel's background.

For the men in the novel, themes of freedom and slavery, democracy and tyranny are played out both on the personal level and on the public level. Hermocrates must strike a balance between private motivations and the public policy of a democratic state (3.4.15–17). Dionysius and Artaxerxes must struggle with erotic passion to maintain control over themselves and their *oikos* and empire respectively.[42] Chaereas' own self-control in his private life is overwhelmed early on by an "innate jealousy" (τῆς ἐμφύτου ζηλοτυπίας, 8.1.15), and at the end of the novel the reader is left wondering if Chaereas' hubristic tendencies will prove problematic even in his participation in Syracuse's affairs of state. Balot writes that the mention of Chaereas' jealousy at the beginning and end of the story "gives the novel a sense of circularity … But circularity is problematic, for closure requires linearity and development. This feature of the last scenes makes us wonder whether Chaereas is still not ready to be married, or whether the cycle will repeat itself if Chaereas again finds reason to be jealous."[43] Considering, though, that Chaereas' actions in the latter half of the book and even in his final scene are of a very public nature, I am inclined to expand the ambiguity identified by Balot: the question is not just whether Chaereas has enough self-control to be a good husband, but also whether he has enough self-control to be a good statesman. For the men in the novel, the spheres of private and public life are deeply interconnected.

But as a woman, Callirhoe ostensibly has no public role of her own to play. Her existence is defined at the beginning of the novel as the daughter of the famous general Hermocrates, who defeated the Athenians; at the end of the novel, she is the bride of the famous general Chaereas, who defeated the Persian King. She is made a commodity in the basest sense by Theron and his pirates, who by selling her to Dionysius enslave her as an utterly powerless individual. It is at this point in the novel, at the very nadir of her social and political influence, when Callirhoe must consider the enslavement by birth or liberation by death of her unborn child. Doody writes that, "This

[42] Balot 1998: 145–154.
[43] Balot 1998: 160.

weight of decision – whether to let a child that will be born in slavery live or die? – is a female source of conflict, as well as an anguish that only a slave can know."[44] And so Callirhoe gives voice to notions of freedom and tyranny from a uniquely feminine perspective shut off from masculine interference. In this regard, Callirhoe is empowered within the narrative, given control not only over her own fate but also the fate of her child. Medea is similarly empowered, though her murderous nature is made all the more threatening at the end of Euripides' tragedy when she turns her dragon-guided chariot towards Athens. Euripides' fifth-century audience leaves the theatre of Dionysus haunted by the notion that Medea's destructive will to power, deaf to reason – the specter of a dehumanizing war – might yet haunt their democracy. But the feminine need not signify devastation and a boundless rage, and in Callirhoe, Chariton presents the alternative.

But what are the public ramifications of Callirhoe's private choice? Callirhoe asks herself, "What sort of children of gods and of kings do we hear about, born in slavery, who later receive what is due to them from their fathers – children like Zethus, Amphion, and Cyrus?" (πόσους ἀκούομεν θεῶν παῖδας καὶ βασιλέων ἐν δουλείᾳ γεννηθέντας ὕστερον ἀπολαβόντας τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἀξίωμα, τὸν Ζῆθον καὶ τὸν Ἀμφίονα καὶ Κῦρον; 2.9.5). Callirhoe's son, raised in the East, will one day return to Syracuse, himself a new Cyrus – as benevolent and prudent perhaps as the one depicted by Xenophon in his *Cyropaideia*, but a King nevertheless, modeled on the Persian prototype. But Syracuse is not a city of kings, and so the reader wonders what this Syracusan girl is doing imagining her son as an imperial ruler. It is a curious dream indeed for a girl raised on democratic principles. But Callirhoe is not really a girl of the people; rather, she has always defined herself by her elevated status as an aristocrat and as the daughter of Hermocrates, who vanquished the Athenians. Medea's impending arrival at Athens at the end of Euripides' tragedy generates questions about the relationship between the present violence of war and the violence of the mythic past. As Callirhoe's fateful decision to give birth to her son engages with the novel's thematic concerns about mastery/slavery and tyranny/freedom, Chariton's text, like Euripides', also generates questions about the future of the depicted world: will Callirhoe's son be an Eastern-style king, or will he champion the democratic ideals embodied by Syracuse? As expected from an author who revels in ironies and ambiguities, the questions remain open at the novel's end.

[44] Doody 1996: 38.

4 Sophocles

Somewhat later in the novel Chariton incorporates into Callirhoe's language also an allusion to Sophocles' *Ajax*. Shortly after Callirhoe gives birth to her child, Dionysius holds a sacrificial feast of thanksgiving at his country estate, near the temple of Aphrodite, and in a quiet moment Callirhoe takes the child inside the temple, reveals him to her patron deity, and prays:

> "… δὸς δή μοι γενέσθαι τὸν υἱὸν εὐτυχέστερον μὲν τῶν γονέων, ὅμοιον δὲ τῷ πάππῳ· πλεύσειε δὲ καὶ οὗτος ἐπὶ τριήρους στρατηγικῆς, καί τις εἴποι, ναυμαχοῦντος αὐτοῦ, 'κρείττων Ἑρμοκράτους ὁ ἔκγονος·' ἡσθήσεται μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὁ πάππος ἔχων τῆς ἀρετῆς διάδοχον, ἡσθησόμεθα δὲ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τεθνεῶτες …"
> "… Grant to me that my son become more fortunate than his parents and a man like his grandfather. May even this boy sail upon the general's warship, and when he engages in sea battle, may someone say, 'Greater than Hermocrates is the grandson!' For even his grandfather will take pleasure in having a successor of his valor, and we his parents will take pleasure in him even in our death …" (3.8.8)

Callirhoe's words are similar to Ajax's speech to his son in Sophocles' tragedy: "Boy, may you become more fortunate than your father, but like him in other respects. And be not base" (ὦ παῖ, γένοιο πατρὸς εὐτυχέστερος, | τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ὁμοῖος· καὶ γένοι' ἂν οὐ κακός, 550–551).[45] Chariton adopts the Sophoclean prayer to his own prose, echoing four elements: (1) a form of the verb γίγνομαι, (2) the comparative adjective εὐτυχέστερος, (3) the genitive of comparison (πατρός in Sophocles; γονέων in Chariton), and (4) the adjective ὁμοῖος. A close examination of the texts, however, reveals the great differences in tone and context between the two passages. The most prominent difference seems to be that, whereas Callirhoe prays that her son be luckier than his parents and similar to his grandfather, Ajax hopes that his son will be more fortunate than and similar to himself alone.

Callirhoe hopes that her son will not only fulfill the role established by Hermocrates, but that he will surpass his progenitor. She imagines a time when the people of Syracuse, when the child's parents, when Hermocrates himself will rejoice in the better fortunes and the greater achievements of her son. Callirhoe's prayer, therefore, truly looks to a better future for her son.

---

[45] The similarity is noted by Plepelits 1976: 177–178. I follow Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's text.

Ajax's speech on the other hand, while it purports to be forward-looking and centered on Eurysaces, is really all about Ajax. Callirhoe looked to the future salvation of her son, but Ajax asserts that his son's infancy is the sweetest time of life, when he has not yet learned of either joy or pain (ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἥδιστος βίος | ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθῃς, 554–555). Any future achievement, however great, is still a fall from the unknowing innocence of youth. By Ajax's reckoning, even a joyous future will inflict pain upon his son. Feeling anything at all is a hardship; oblivion is the ideal. Ajax demands that, when he does finaly grow to be a man, Eurysaces display himself as worthy of his father's name (ὅταν δ' ἵκῃ πρὸς τοῦτο, δεῖ σ' ὅπως πατρὸς | δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς οἷος ἐξ οἵου 'τράφης, 556–557). In Ajax's vision of the future, there is little opportunity for Eurysaces to stake out an heroic identity for himself; instead, he is destined always to be defined by his father's greatness. He will not be his own man, but a shadow of Ajax's own past glory.

According to the heroic model, glory is reflected back upon an individual by the achievements of successive generations; hence Achilles takes pride in Neoptolemus when in the underworld he hears from Odysseus about his son's skill in combat and his role in the plot of the Trojan Horse (*Od*. 11.560–616). Tales of future glory are no comfort for Ajax, however, whose fate is already sealed by his own rigid code of conduct. What begins as a touching moment between father and son, so reminiscent of Hector and Astyanax upon the walls of Troy (*Il*. 6.466ff.), ultimately becomes a moment which turns back upon itself, trapped in the impossibility of the tragic present. Ajax can barely endure the pathetic image of his son as he handles the over-sized shield which bears his name (Soph. *Aj*. 574ff.). He is soon overwhelmed, and he demands that Tecmessa take the child away. He realizes that he was on the verge of feminine weakness, for pity and lamentation belong to women (κάρτα τοι φιλοίκτιστον γυνή, 580). And so Ajax seals himself off from the weakening effects of family (πύκαζε θᾶσσον, 581) and continues his solitary struggle against the cosmos. Even the contemplation of Eurysaces' future glory is diminished by Ajax's own implacable sense of honor, for he ends the speech to his son by saying that, "it is not the wise physician's advice to sing songs over a wound that needs the knife" (οὐ πρὸς ἰατροῦ σοφοῦ | θρηνεῖν ἐπῳδὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πήματι, 581–582). Words are an ineffectual charm for the self-destructive action required of man.

Chariton cleverly adapts Ajax's gendered perspective on lamentation for his own heroine. If "woman is a thing most prone to pity" (κάρτα τοι φιλοίκτιστον γυνή), then Callirhoe plays her role to the hilt. Where the sight

of Eurysaces playing with the shield that bears his name was potentially enough to weaken Ajax's resolve and forced him to steel his determination, by contrast Callirhoe's focus upon her child gives way to a full stream of tears and an account of the heroine's own sufferings (τέθνηκα, ἀνέζηκα, λελῄστευμαι, πέφευγα, πέπραμαι, δεδούλευκα· τίθημι δὲ καὶ τὸν δεύτερον γάμον ἔτι μοι τούτων βαρύτερον, 3.8.9). Like Ajax, Callirhoe frames her child from the point of view of her own suffering, but unlike Ajax, who turns away from his son and hands Eurysaces off to his mother, Callirhoe moves beyond her suffering and pleads with Aphrodite for the salvation of her son (ἀλλὰ μίαν ἀντὶ πάντων αἰτοῦμαι χάριν παρὰ σοῦ καὶ διὰ σοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν· σῶζέ μου τὸν ὀρφανόν).

Unlike both Ajax and Medea therefore, Callirhoe transcends the self-centered, destructive mode of tragedy. By his two allusions to 5th century Athenian tragedy Chariton has mapped out two alternative modes of behavior for his heroine: following tragic models, Callirhoe may kill her child or she may kill herself; she may become a Medea, or she may become an Ajax. On the one hand, these alternatives create suspense for the reader who might expect Callirhoe to proceed toward a tragic end: will she become an infanticide or a suicide? On the other hand, the narrative always pulls away from the initially tragic tendency, and the allusions to tragedy end up re-affirming the novel's difference from an established literary genre. The reader witnesses Callirhoe fall from one misfortune to the next, but the narrator continually guides the reader toward a happy ending which is more akin to comedy than tragedy.

5 Athenian Law, Rhetoric, and Identity

1 Lysias and Forensic Oratory

As the secretary of a lawyer from Aphrodisias, Chariton would have had experience in the rhetoric and legal practices of the first century CE in Roman Asia Minor. Whatever familiarity Chariton might have had with Hellenistic treatises on law and rhetorical style[1] would undoubtedly have been grounded in an appreciation of the speeches of Lysias, the great model of the pure, simplified Attic style. The Lysian influence may be most strongly felt in the scene of Chaereas' assault on his wife following the various intrigues of Callirhoe's Italian suitors, who have contrived to make it seem that Callirhoe has been unfaithful to her husband. In a jealous rage Chaereas kicks his wife in the stomach and she collapses unconscious (1.4.11–12). Believing her dead (she shows no evidence to the contrary), Chaereas expresses his guilt at the death of his wife and he pleads with the people of Syracuse to cast him into the sea as a murderer. As a result of his impassioned plea, the people of Syracuse and most importantly Hermocrates himself are sympathetic to Chaereas; they realize that Callirhoe's "death" was not his fault and that he was the victim of a plot by the angry Italian suitors.

We appear to be confronted here with at least a partial image from classical Athenian law. As Chaereas prepares to stop the presumed adultery transpiring in his house, the narrator states that he intended "to kill the adulterer in the act" (ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ τὸν μοιχὸν ἀναιρήσων, 1.4.10). Chaereas' murderous intention seems to be in accordance with the law cited by Lysias in his defense of Euphiletus, that "if someone should take an adulterer, he may do with him whatever he likes" (ἐάν τις μοιχὸν λάβῃ, ὅ τι ἂν οὖν βούληται χρῆσθαι, Lys. 1.49). This is what Adele Scafuro, in her reconstruction of Athenian law based on New Comedy, calls a "self-help remedy" which would not require the punitive intervention of the judicial authorities: "If the dikasts (called *ephetai* in these cases) vote in his favor, then the killer suffers

[1] See esp. Doulamis 2001, who compares elements of Callirhoe's lament at 3.10.4 with features outlined in the treatise "On Style" (Περὶ ἑρμενείας) by Demetrius of Phalerum (late 4th/early 3rd century).

no penalty."[2] Despite the more than four-hundred years which had passed since Lysias' defense of Euphiletus, the law was still relevant in the Greek world of the Roman empire during the 1st century CE.[3] Konstantin Kapparis has provided a concise account of the similarities between the *diēgēsis* in Lysias' speech "On the Murder of Eratosthenes" and the narration of Chaereas' seemingly fatal assault of Callirhoe in Chariton's novel. Lysias' careful exposition of the chain of events leading to Euphiletus' murder of Eratosthenes is paralleled in Chariton's text by the elaborate planning of the Italian suitors as they attempt to rouse Chaereas' jealousy. In both narratives, servants and informers play significant roles. Also, in both texts the husbands return home from their farms: in Lysias, Euphiletus' unexpected return from his farm leads to Eratosthenes' murder (1.22–23), whereas in Chariton,

---

[2] Scafuro 1997: 196.

[3] Karabélias suggests that despite the scene's conformity with what is known of classical Athenian domestic law, "Il y a tout lieu de croire que telle est la situation dans les cités grecques du Haut-Empire, à l'époque de Chariton" (Karabélias 1988: 381). Hunter, on the other hand, argues that even though it is possible that Athens' adultery law was common among other Greek states, nevertheless, "it is important to register that, at the very least, Chariton archaises by assimilating the law of fifth-century Syracuse to that of the best known (particularly to a legal clerk) classical city. At one level, this has historical verisimilitude, and certainly does not jar with the rest of the novel; but it also points us again towards Chariton's concern with the status of his tale" (Hunter 1994: 1081). In his 2nd century CE treatise on rhetoric, Apsines of Gadara refers to a complicated case in which a military general, arrested for treason and handed over to another general for questioning about co-conspirators, is killed by that general because of the captive's adulterous affair with his wife. The general responsible for the murder is then brought to trial on a charge of complicity for not having learned the names of the first general's co-conspirators (τὸν προδότην ἔδει δεδέσθαι παρὰ τῷ στρατηγῷ, ἔστ' ἂν εἴπῃ τοὺς ἄλλους· στρατηγὸς ἁλοὺς προδοσίας ἐδέθη παρὰ τῷ συστρατήγῳ, ὁ δ' ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτὸν ὡς ἐπ' αἰτίᾳ μοιχείας καὶ κρίνεται συνειδότος, 4.15.5–8). Disregarding the larger issue of treason, the second general's murder of the first general on the grounds of adultery indeed seems to point directly back to the classical Athenian law described in Lysias 1. Apsines explains that the second general's objection to the charge of complicity against him was grounded precisely in his right as a cuckolded husband to inflict punishment upon the adulterer: "(the speaker) says that the facts (of the adultery) are detected independently and it was for this reason, different from the other charge, that it was permitted for him to kill the man if he overlooked the information to be obtained from him (about the conspirators)" (φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὰ μὲν δι' ἑαυτῶν φωρᾶται· περὶ δὲ τοῦ καὶ ἄλλως [ἂν] ἐγγενέσθαι διαφθεῖραι τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὐτῳ, εἰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ μήνυσιν ὑφεωρᾶτο, 4.15.10–12; translation by Dilts and Kennedy [1997: 149]). The case cited by Apsines thus seems to support Karabélias' claim that the legal rights of a husband to kill an adulterer were upheld in the Greek world in the imperial period as well as in the classical period. Though Chaereas' attempt to catch a μοιχός ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ does not recall the *precise* scenario of Lysias 1 and may reflect legal realities contemporary with the author, the narrative nevertheless evokes Lysias' famous speech as part of the historical décor.

Chaereas' excuse for leaving his wife at home is that he had to go to his farm (1.4.8). Furthermore, both episodes end in death (or, in Chariton's case, apparent death). One cannot, however, disregard the differences, the most obvious being that, "in Lysias the adulterous affair is presented by the speaker as a true situation, while in Chariton it is only a sinister device."[4] Kapparis concludes that Chariton "read carefully the narrative of Lysias and borrowed a number of elements which he reshuffled to suit his purposes. The novelist obtained some ideas from Lysias, but his account does not rest slavishly on that of the orator."

A further allusion to Lysias' speech occurs later in the novel, after Callirhoe's arrival in Miletus: both Lysias' Euphiletus and Chariton's Dionysius hand over the management of their households to their wives after the births of their sons. Of Euphiletus, Lysias writes that "When my son was born, I trusted my wife and I handed over all of my affairs to her" (ἐπειδὴ δέ μοι παιδίον γίγνεται, ἐπίστευον ἤδη καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ ἐκείνῃ παρέδωκα, Lys. 1.6). Likewise, Chariton's narrator says that, "in the seventh month after their marriage she gave birth to her son … and Dionysius, on account of his happiness, yielded to his wife in everything and made her the mistress of his household" (ἑβδόμῳ γὰρ μηνὶ μετὰ τοὺς γάμους υἱὸν ἔτεκε … κἀκεῖνος ὑπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς πάντων παρεχώρησε τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ δέσποιναν αὐτὴν ἀπέδειξε τῆς οἰκίας, Ch. 3.7.7). Euphiletus' remark is uttered in his own defense, for he hopes to express to the jury that he placed his wife in control of the household based on the trust which she had demonstrated after the birth of their child; against the background of such trust, her adulterous infidelity seems all the worse. Dionysius, however, is exactly the opposite kind of husband: he is so emotionally obsessed with Callirhoe that he loses sight of his own integrity. He hands over control of his household to Callirhoe not based on a cultivated trust but simply because he is a slave to the young woman's erotic charms. According to Kapparis, though, Dionysius' appointment of Callirhoe as the mistress of the household is of no real significance for the reader, since the reader is already amply aware of Dionysius' obsession with his wife. The narratorial remark is "unexpected, if not superfluous,"[5] the point being that it is a calculated allusion to Lysias. Kapparis departs from Sophie Trenkner, who argues that Chariton was not modeling his narrative on Lysias, but was rather re-working themes of jealousy and suspicion from the folklore tradition. What similarities there are between the narratives of Lysias and Chariton can be explained by the hypothesis that

[4] Kapparis 2000: 382.
[5] Kapparis 2000: 383.

Lysias himself "stylized his characters and situations to conform with traditional types and motifs."[6] It need not be the case, though, that Chariton had a single generic model in mind when he was writing either this episode or the episode of Chaereas' attack on his wife. The text in fact presents to us a palimpsest of generic frames with which we might read the novel. In addition to oratory and the folklore tradition, the influences of historiography and new comedy were also formative in Chariton's conceptualization of the episode of Chaereas' jealous attack.[7] It is, however, forensic discourse that comes to the fore in the scene immediately following Chaereas' assault on his wife, as the narrator swiftly guides the reader to Chaereas' trial before Hermocrates and the Syracusan people.

Despite the allusions to Lysias' famous speech and to one of the most famous of all Athenian laws, the traditional rights of the husband are for Chaereas irrelevant in his own circumstances. Readers sensitive to the scene's intertextual relationship with Lysias' speech on the murder of Eratosthenes might reasonably expect in the ensuing trial an argument based on the traditional prerogatives of a husband who was under the assumption that he was being cuckolded. Instead, Chaereas publicly acknowledges his guilt and pleads with Hermocrates and the other Syracusans to kill him for the crime that he has committed. Chaereas' behavior is here marked by the narrator as a curious departure from rhetorical strategies that would have been expected for a murderer in Chaereas' position. There are any number of ways in which Chaereas could have argued for his acquittal. How then is Chaereas' apparent rejection of these expected arguments to be interpreted within the framework of forensic oratory suggested by the numerous allusions to Lysias and the subsequent setting of a public trial? How, in other words, can Chariton's text be construed not just as influenced by, but as a literary response to Lysian oratory, or, for that matter, to the entire tradition of Athenian oratory? For as much as the novel announces its affiliation with Athenian oratory and rhetoric, Chaereas' refusal to formulate traditional legal arguments and his refusal to argue his way out of being responsible for Callirhoe's death are indications of the novel's departure from the conceptual world of one of its formative influences.

The emotional world of romance may absorb elements of traditional Athenian oratory while at the same time attempting to resolve in a positive manner its ethical dubiousness. Though criminal trials in classical Athens

---

[6] Trenkner 1958: 159. See also Porter 2003, who, *contra* Kapparis, emphasizes the influence of the comic tradition and downplays the influence of Lysias 1.

[7] Hunter 1994: 1082.

were designed as a means of democratically rectifying disruptions to the civil and social order, it is well known from Aristophanes' comic scenarios that the responsibility of Athens' citizen-jurors was not always taken as seriously as it ought to have been and that Athenian justice was as vulnerable to political manipulation and emotion as was justice in other times and places throughout history. Furthermore the rhetoric often employed in traditional *ēthopoiia* was meant to persuade jurors of the defendant's innocence, regardless of whether or not he was really innocent. That is, the rhetoric of Athenian oratory was a great advantage to the guilty. This background has significant bearing on Chaereas' admission of guilt and his plea that he be publicly executed, as is evidenced by the emphasis on Chaereas' behavior as paradoxical: "something novel and never before done in a courtroom" (πρᾶγμα καινὸν καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ μηδεπώποτε πραχθέν, 1.5.4). The narrator sets the scene with details familiar from classical Athenian oratory: the trial is held in the agora (1.5.3), the accusation against the defendant is announced (1.5.4), and the water is measured out for the water-clock (μετρηθέντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ὕδατος). Chaereas however, here anonymously identified as simply "the murderer" (ὁ φονεύς), is said to have employed none of the arguments appropriate for a defense (τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν δικαίων): he made no mention of false accusation (οὐ τὴν διαβολήν), jealousy (οὐ τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν, by which he might have appealed to the rights of a husband who has caught his wife *in flagrante delicto*), or that the murder of his wife was involuntary (οὐ τὸ ἀκούσιον). Instead, Chaereas bitterly accuses himself and is the first to cast the vote condemning himself (αὐτοῦ κατηγόρησε πικρότερον καὶ πρῶτος τὴν καταδικάζουσαν ψῆφον ἤνεγκεν). Awash in a popular culture whose movies and television programs time and again stage the emotional breakdown and weepy admission of guilt by defendants in courtroom dramas, modern readers are perhaps insensitive to the novelty of Chaereas' public admission. Admissions of guilt and elaborate expressions of remorse such as Chaereas' were, in fact, exceedingly rare in the Athenian trials of the classical period.[8] For the narrator's paradoxographical comment to have any meaning, the reader must be aware of the lack of evidence in the forensic tradition for just this sort of emotional outpouring of remorse.

To understand the absolute novelty of Chaereas' behavior, one must further take into consideration through whose perspective this scene is written. The reader may understand and appreciate that Chariton has contrived a novel (καινόν) approach to the representation of a murder trial. But the reader is sufficiently prepared by the narrator to expect such behavior from

[8] See Cairns 1999: 171–172 and Konstan 2000: 134.

Chaereas, who was eager to end his own life even before the trial began and who was prevented from killing himself only by the intervention of his friend Polycharmus (1.5.2). By the time we get to the trial, therefore, we already know that Chaereas has a death wish, and so from the reader's point of view at least Chaereas' behavior hardly comes as a surprise. Hermocrates and the Syracusan *dēmos* however have not been privy to Chaereas' remorse and attempt at suicide, and the trial scene is in fact composed in such a way that the reader experiences Chaereas' monologue as focalized through his Syracusan judges and fellow citizens. The atmosphere in the courtroom is one of grief combined with bitter anger, for the news of Callirhoe's death had aroused a howling sadness throughout the streets of the city all the way down to the sea (1.5.1). Lamentation was heard everywhere, and the narrator likens the situation to the sacking of a city (τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐῴκει πόλεως ἁλώσει). Callirhoe's death is a public outrage. What the entirety of the Athenian fleet was incapable of doing, has been accomplished by one young man – an idea that will be explicitly applied to the tomb robber Theron later in the novel (3.4.18). Chaereas on the other hand is presented throughout the trial in an objective manner. Although we are given his speech in direct discourse, the narrator does not allow us to experience Chaereas' point of view through indirect discourse. Once the trial begins, we are not given any narrative indications of what Chaereas thinks or feels. Like Hermocrates and the jury, we are presented only with the defendant and what he has to say for himself.

What then might be the democratic attitude behind the Syracusan perspective privileged by the narrator? Experience in criminal trials would have prepared the Syracusans for precisely those familiar defenses named by the narrator, namely that the accusation against the defendant was false, that he had been motivated by jealousy, or that the deed had been involuntary. If Chaereas were in fact to try and argue his way to an acquittal, the obstacles he would have had to overcome would have been considerable. His persuasion would have had to conquer not only the public animus against him, but also the sophisticated democratic cynicism of his fellow citizens. Regardless of the sincerity of Chaereas' remorse, of which the narrator has made the reader fully aware, the most cynical among the Syracusans might even have seen in Chaereas' speech a sophistic attempt at emotional manipulation. Is Chaereas' declaration that he has "taken from the people its crown" (1.5.5) a subtle reminder to his audience that he too was not long ago and in the midst of a civic assembly hailed as the "first of the city's trophies" (1.1.11)? He calls on the people to cast his unholy body into the sea (τὸ ἀσεβὲς

καταποντώσατε σῶμα, 1.5.5). But is he not thereby obliquely asking his audience to recall how they saved him once before, when the erotic wasting of his body (τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ φθίνοντος, 1.1.8) and the absence of his sculpted flesh from the gymnasium aroused longing in his peers and potential *erastai* (ἐπόθει δὲ τὸ γυμνάσιον Χαιρέαν καὶ ὥσπερ ἔρημον ἦν. ἐφίλει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ νεολαία, 1.1.10)? Chaereas' apparent remorse might well have been interpreted as a clever ploy by a citizen of Syracuse, especially a citizen wearied by long experience in similar trials and subsequently wary of forensic rhetoric.

And yet these are not the kind of cynical responses that Chaereas' speech provokes in his audience. Rather than provoking ire and disbelief, Chaereas is instead greeted by a shower of lamentations from the people of Syracuse, and there is wry humor in the narrator's tone: "When he had finished speaking, lamentation broke out, and everyone, forgetting the dead girl, was grieving for the young man who was living" (ταῦτα λέγοντος θρῆνος ἐξερράγη, καὶ πάντες ἀφέντες τὴν νεκρὰν τόν ζῶντα ἐπένθουν, 1.5.6). In fact, Hermocrates himself, aware of the suitors' plot, intercedes and articulates Chaereas' defense for him: "I know," he says, "that what happened was involuntary" (ἐγὼ … ἐπίσταμαι τὸ συμβὰν ἀκούσιον). This completes the paradox: not only has the defendant accused and condemned himself, but the injured party has also confounded expectations by submitting one of the defendant's expected arguments for acquittal.

In the Syracuse that Chariton depicts, Chaereas' public outpouring of emotion is equated with the sincerity of his inner state, and the power of rhetoric, so fundamental in the development of Athenian oratory, is for the moment neutralized: the people of Syracuse apparently know the truth when they see and hear it. All of the expectations of the courtroom are overturned in Chaereas' case. This is not, of course, to say that rhetoric has no power either in this text or in the narrative world conjured by the text. On the contrary: the fact that the narrator marks emotion's power over rhetoric in Chaereas' case as "something novel" (πρᾶγμα καινόν, 1.5.4) makes the reader all the more aware of the episode's artificial nature. The narrator's strategy of paradoxography should be considered within the context of the novel's other paradoxographical remarks, which serve to highlight the narrator's literary achievement in crafting novelty (cf. 3.8.6; 5.8.2). The novelty of Chaereas' strange and unexpected behavior makes the reader aware that the idealization of the hero by means of emotional honesty has been carefully contrived by the narrator. Ironically, this new kind of hero, who appears to eschew an ethically dubious rhetoric, has himself been rhetorically engineered. Re-

gardless of Chaereas' emotional sincerity at this point, the power of rhetoric in the world of the novel will be amply demonstrated elsewhere, when all the major male characters are presented as rationalizing their personal desires by means of a sophisticated rhetorical self-fashioning (Dionysius: 3.2.6–9; Artaxerxes: 6.1.8–12).[9] Even Chaereas is able to overcome his apparently self-defining commitment to his bride when he is persuaded by Polycharmus towards a new love and a consolation for Callirhoe (εἰς ἔρωτα καινὸν καὶ Καλλιρόης παραμύθιον, 8.1.6). And the heroine herself must summon all her skills at sophistic reasoning (λογισμούς, 2.9.3) to persuade herself to become the wife of two men.

2 Citizens, slaves, and torture

The majority of book two is set in Miletus. Theron has sold Callirhoe to Leonas, the steward of the estate belonging to Dionysius, the wealthiest man in Ionia and friend to the Great King of Persia. Dionysius, recently widowed, had become despondent, and Leonas hoped that his recent purchase would revive his master's spirits. Though pleased that the new girl is beautiful, Dionysius is skeptical when he hears that she is a slave, for, he says, "it is impossible for a body to be beautiful when it has not been born free" (ἀδύνατον … καλὸν εἶναι σῶμα μὴ πεφυκὸς ἐλεύθερον, 2.1.5). Eventually Dionysius' concerns are proved to be well-founded: after selling Callirhoe, Theron sailed at once from Miletus, breaking his agreement with Leonas that he would be present at the girl's legal registration as a slave. When it becomes clear to Leonas that the shady merchant has fled the city, he reports back to Dionysius with great embarrassment that he has lost a talent of his master's money. Learning that the seller has fled with his money and has left the girl in Leonas' possession, Dionysius declares that, "the man was a kidnapper, then, and has sold to you someone else's slave for this reason in a deserted place" (ἀνδραποδιστὴς ἄρα ἦν, καὶ ἀλλοτρίαν σοι πέπρακε δούλην διὰ τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἐρημίας, 2.1.8). Leonas then explains the story (fabricated by Theron) that the girl is from Sybaris in Italy and that her former mistress sold her because she had been jealous of her beauty. But if he has called Theron an ἀνδραποδιστής, Dionysius likely does not believe the story that the girl was sold to Theron, and instead suspects him of having stolen the girl from Sybaris.

---

[9] See Balot 1998.

A number of elements suggest that Chariton was synthesizing traditional material from classical Athenian law and at the same time supplying details from civic procedures of the 1st century CE regarding the sale of slaves. Karabélias, following Zimmermann,[10] convincingly argues that the necessity of registering Callirhoe in Miletus with a written contract of sale (καταγραφή, 1.14.3–4; 2.1.4; 2.1.6) is a detail belonging more to the 1st century CE than the classical period. The καταγραφή, the legal registry transacted publicly in the agora (hence Theron's desire to avoid the registry) enabled the state to impose taxation on the sale of slaves, a practice not in place until the Hellenistic era and which was certainly not in place at the dramatic date of the novel.[11]

Despite the anachronism of the slave registry, the entire scenario seems to have its origin in the plots of Athenian New Comedy. Scafuro notes that in Menander's *Sikyonioi* (272) the term ἀνδραποδιστής "is applied to a self-proclaimed citizen and his companions in response to their treatment of a girl whose identity is yet to be proven; she had been kidnapped from Athens and sold in a slave market in Karia to a 'Sikyonian captain' (*Sik*. 13–14), possibly to the same man who is designated as one of the *andrapodistai* at 272."[12] The charge of ἀνδραποδισμός could denote the kidnapping of slaves *or* free men (cf. Pollux 3.78), and in Theron's case the charge becomes doubly true, for even though Callirhoe is actually a free citizen of Syracuse, the conceit is that she was stolen from the fictitious woman of Sybaris – a crime less egregious than the enslavement of a free citizen, but a crime nonetheless.

After discovering that Leonas has been duped by Theron, Dionysius orders Leonas to find out if there are any citizens of Sybaris currently visiting Miletus. Though the narrator provides no commentary on this point, it seems that Chariton is referring to Dionysius' right to receive a ransom in return for delivering the girl back to her original owner, the supposed woman of Sybaris. Scafuro notes that if there were no formal agreement between states concerning reparations for kidnapped slaves or free citizens, then the slave's freedom or return to its rightful owner "would depend on the slave-buyer's willingness to accept a ransom for the individual; there was no legal requirement that he should do so. If he agreed, then relatives or friends might

[10] Zimmermann 1957a: 72–81.

[11] Following Pringsheim (*The Greek Law of Sale*. Weimar. 1950: 239), Karabélias writes that, "La documentation disponible ne nous permet pas de considérer qu'une taxe pour la vente d'esclaves fût valable dans l'Athènes classique. Une telle taxe commence à être connue seulement à partir de l'époque hellénistique" (1988: 385).

[12] Scafuro 1997: 402.

come to the financial assistance of the victim, or else a wealthy citizen in the foreign *polis* might intervene and pay the ransom, perhaps as a gesture to gain political influence in the victim's home *polis* and to acquire prestige in his own."[13] Though such procedures belonged to the classical period and are attested specifically for Athenian citizens and slaves of Athenian citizens,[14] it is uncertain whether such procedures were practiced also in the first century CE. Nevertheless, Chariton's attention to legal detail suggests what Morgan calls a strategy of "make-believe."[15] Trenkner notes that "piracy, the scourge of Greek waters, produced numerous stories of abduction and separation."[16] Chariton's legal specifics therefore provide substance for the framework of an otherwise generally familiar folk motif, thereby reinforcing the historical plausibility of the story.

But the obsession with the legal details of selling and purchasing slaves also reflects Dionysius' deeper ethical anxieties. On the one hand, Chariton represents a Greek world in which freedom is cherished, and the legal minutiae regarding the sale and public registry of slaves belong to a wider body of cultural technologies meant to preserve the distinctions between free citizen and slave. Dionysius is therefore concerned not just with obeying the law, but with preserving the status of freeborn citizens, hence Dionysius' refusal at first to admit into his household a slave who had been acquired illegally and his desire to restore her to her original owner (2.1.9). But Leonas has other plans: he is intent upon arranging a meeting between Dionysius and his new slave girl. And despite his master's best intentions, Leonas' superlative description of the girl has an insidious effect on Dionysius' morals. In an apparently offhand manner, but in fact choosing his opportunity wisely (καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον εὑρών, 2.3.1), Leonas suggests to Dionysius that he visit his country estate, ostensibly to inspect the herds and the crops, but really so that he will see the girl for himself. Dionysius wastes no time and prepares a lavish retinue that is consistent with his extravagent nature (φύσει γὰρ ἦν ὁ Διονύσιος μεγαλοπρεπής, 2.3.4); during his rustication he will have all the comforts of his home in the city. It is, however, a retinue with which he has no intention of travelling. Instead, he departs well ahead of his train with only four companions, "for a procession was inappropriate for one who was in mourning" (πενθοῦντί τε γὰρ μὴ πρέπειν πομπήν). The brief episode un-

[13] Scafuro 1997: 404. See also Karabélias 1988: 385.

[14] See A.R.W. Harrison (*The Law of Athens. I: The Family and Property*. Oxford) 1968: 166. Cf. also Scafuro 1997: 400–405.

[15] Morgan 1993: 205.

[16] Trenkner 1958: 49.

derscores how easy it is for Dionysius to manipulate notions of what is socially appropriate to suit his own desires: in this instance, he allows himself to indulge in the pleasures of friends and the material comforts to which he is accustomed and naturally inclined, while at the same time maintaining the public persona of the grieving widower.

The episode anticipates how Dionysius will react when he finally encounters Callirhoe. Upon first hearing of her purchase, he was concerned to follow the letter of the law, instructing Leonas to do his best to restore what he believes to be a stolen slave to her rightful owner. But when he finally sees Callirhoe for himself, it becomes abundantly clear that Callirhoe is no slave. She seems in fact more than a mere mortal (2.3.7), and he goes away from their first meeting already consumed by erotic desire. Alone, he is outraged by his own weakness: "For this reason then you came to the country, so that you might celebrate a marriage while still dressed in black?! And a marriage to a slave no less, and one furthermore who belongs to someone else. For you don't even have a bill of sale for her!" (τοῦτου γε ⟨ἕνεκεν⟩ ἦκες εἰς ἀγρὸν ἵνα μελανείμων γάμους θύσῃς, καὶ γάμους δούλης, τάχα δὲ καὶ ἀλλοτρίας; οὐχ ἔχεις γὰρ αὐτῆς οὐδὲ τὴν καταγραφήν, 2.4.5). The narrator however emphasizes in strong language the futility of Dionysius' moral scruples: "But Eros desired victory over the man's good intentions and he considered Dionysius' moderation a transgression. He therefore besieged with hotter fire the soul philosophizing in a state of desire" (ἐφιλονίκει δὲ ὁ Ἔρως βουλευομένῳ καλῶς καὶ ὕβριν ἐδόκει τὴν σοφροσύνην τὴν ἐκείνου· διὰ τοῦτο ἐπυρπόλει σφροδρότερον ψυχὴν ἐν ἔρωτι φιλοσοφοῦσαν). There will of course be no return of Callirhoe to the fictitious woman of Sybaris, either for a ransom like that attested in Athenian New Comedy or to satisfy Dionysius' sense of what is right. Even when he discovers Calliroe's true identity, Dionysius cannot resist his own desire to possess her. Gone not only is Dionysius' concern for the law, but also his respect for the hallowed notion of Greek freedom.

Like Chaereas and Dionysius, Hermocrates too is defined in part by the way in which he responds to the power of law in the face of private desires. When Theron is brought back to Syracuse by Chaereas' search party, the citizens are filled with grief at the sight of Callirhoe's stolen funeral offerings, and Callirhoe's mother leads a chorus of women in raising a loud lamentation in the harbor (3.4.2). But Hermocrates is not swayed by the sudden outpouring of emotion; described here by the narrator as στρατηγικός, he declares that it is necessary "to hold a more legal examination" (νομιμωτέραν ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀνάκρισιν, 3.4.3). The narrator marks the importance

of these proceedings by stating that "even the women participated in that assembly" (ἐκείνην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνήγαγον καὶ γυναῖκες, 3.4.4).[17] In the assembly, Theron fabricates a tale that he is a native of Crete and that he himself was kidnapped by tomb-robbers; eventually, though, Theron is proved to be lying by the testimony of a local fisherman who recognizes him as a denizen of the harbor. Under torture Theron finally provides a full and true account of his theft of the tomb and his subsequent sale of Callirhoe (3.4.13–14).

The criminal is sentenced to death, but Chaereas attempts to intervene, pleading that Theron should be kept alive at least for as long as it might take to discover the identity of the man who bought Callirhoe. At this point Hermocrates' rigid adherence to the law is revealed as a flaw, for he denies Chaereas' request and sends Theron to his immediate death.

> τοῦτο Ἑρμοκράτης ἐκώλυσε γενέσθαι "βέλτιον" εἰπὼν "ποιήσασθαι τὴν ζήτησιν ἐπιπονωτέραν ἢ λυθῆναι τοὺς νόμους. δέομαι δὲ ὑμῶν, ἄνδρες Συρακόσιοι, μνησθέντας στρατηγίας τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ τροπαίων ἀποδοῦναί μοι τὴν χάριν εἰς τὴν θυγατέρα. πέμψατε πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· τὴν ἐλευθέραν ἀπολάβωμεν."
>
> Hermocrates prevented this from happening, saying that "it is better to conduct a more painful search than for the laws to be broken. And I beg of you that, recalling my military service and my trophies, you return the favor to me regarding my daughter. Send an embassy on her behalf. Let us take back a free citizen." (3.4.16)

Once again Hermocrates summons the memory of his victory over the Athenians as a means of defining his public persona and elevating his status among his fellow citizens. The benefit of the past victory over the invading Athenians is sufficient enough ground for the continued perseverance of the Syracusans in their hunt for Callirhoe. Since execution immediately following a guilty verdict is correct legal procedure,[18] the people of Syracuse, seemingly dedicated to justice and democracy, should present no obstacle to Theron's execution. And yet Chaereas raises the point that keeping Theron

---

[17] Plepelits, citing Liebenam (*Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*. Leipzig, 1900: 285), notes that during the imperial period women's participation in public assemblies and in municipal offices in the Greek East were not exceptional: "in der Kaiserzeit finden sich auf den Inschriften des griechischen Osten (nicht auf denen des lateinischen Westens) außerordentlich häufig Frauen als städtische Beamte" (1976: 175). See also Korenjak 2002: 398–416.

[18] Karabélias 1988: 389–390; Scafuro 1997: 401.

alive would in fact be more efficacious for the present purposes; Chaereas consequently places Hermocrates in a slightly sticky political situation. Though it is not dramatized within the text, Hermocrates is faced with a dilemma. Will he disobey the laws in order to serve the desires of his people, his son-in-law, and even of himself as father? Or will he remain bound by the laws, unmoved by popular opinion? In this instance, the law reigns supreme, and we can read Hermocrates' impassioned appeal to the people (δέομαι δὲ ὑμῶν) as a means of countering popular disfavor. In order to continue guiding the people, Hermocrates must rhetorically reaffirm his authority within the polis. But in this rhetorical self-promotion via the memory of Athens' military defeat, there is paradoxically also a measure of self-sacrifice. What father would not, after all, want his daughter back home, safe and sound, as quickly as possible? And yet Hermocrates suppresses his paternal instincts and privileges the rule of law. Even Reardon, one of Chariton's great champions, asserts that in this instance Chariton fails in persuading the reader to suspend his or her disbelief. It is unlikely "that Hermocrates would destroy the only lead he has to his lost daughter," and so Reardon counts this scene as one of the novel's "defects in plot and narrative."[19] But the scene need not prompt readerly disbelief. Rather than a narrative weakness, the scene underscores the novel's preoccupation with the challenges of prudent leadership and the often blurry line between democracy and tyranny. It also provides an insight into Hermocrates' character, revealing that his overly-rigid devotion to the rule of law comes at a great cost. When Chaereas returns from the East at the end of the novel, Hermocrates' authority is threatened, and this scene in which he executes his daughter's abductor before discovering her whereabouts lays the foundation for his easy displacement by a younger, more successful στρατηγός.

So thoroughly defined by his victory over the Athenians, Hermocrates ironically becomes more than an ideal Athenian during Theron's trial. Karabélias writes that, "the rapidity of this procedure is in perfect concordance with what we know of Athenian expeditive judicial procedures of the classical period, namely the ἀπαγωγὴ τῶν κακούργων before the appropriate magistrates who can put the κακοῦργοι to death."[20] Given Theron's epithets in the novel (τυμβωρύχος, πειρατής, λῃστής, ἀνδραποδιστής), he would

[19] Reardon 1999: 183.

[20] "La rapidité de cette procédure est en parfaite concordance avec ce que nous savons des procédures judiciaires expéditives athéniennes de l'époque classique, à savoir l'ἀπαγωγὴ τῶν κακούργων devant les magistrats compétants, qui peuvent mettre à mort les κακοῦργοι" (Karabélias 1988: 389 – 390).

certainly in an Athenian context have been brought before the Eleven and summarily executed.[21] The same fate befalls Theron in Syracuse, despite his earlier desire to escape the calumny of Athens' democratic magistrates, who he described as "worse than tyrants" (τυράννων βαρύτεροι, 1.11.7). Hermocrates and the other Syracusans also surpass the tyranny of the Athenians when they torture Theron without consideration of his status as citizen. When I mentioned Theron's torture above, I did so in very general terms merely to indicate that Theron resisted identifying himself truthfully in court. The fact is, though, that the narrator is quite specific in detailing the implements of torture at Syracuse. The narrator states that, "the wheel, the rack, fire, and whips" (τροχὸς ⟨καὶ⟩ καταπέλτης καὶ πῦρ καὶ μάστιγες, 3.4.7) accompanied Theron into court, and then when he refuses to reveal his identity, the Syracusans "at once summoned the torturers and the whips were applied to the villain" (βασανιστὰς εὐθὺς ἐκάλουν καὶ μάστιγες προσεφέροντο τῷ δυσσεβεῖ, 3.4.12). Theron finally yields to the court only after he has been "burned and cut" (καιόμενος δὲ καὶ τεμνόμενος). With the exception of slaves and non-citizens of free status, Athenians were not tortured to provide proof in criminal proceedings.[22] We are nowhere informed that Theron is *not* a citizen of Syracuse, but the implication is that he is a citizen. At the moment when torture is applied, the Syracusans have already realized that Theron is not from Crete and they have in fact learned from the anonymous fisherman that Theron has been previously seen around their own harbor (3.4.11). If the trial had been conducted in Athens, it would have behooved the court to determine whether this denizen of the harbor was in fact one of their own citizens. So egregious, however, is the alleged crime to the supposedly democratic, judicially-minded Syracusans, that they impose the horrors of torture[23] without knowing for certain if they are torturing a free man. By emphasizing Syracuse's relationship with Athens, Chariton motivates a comparison between the Syracusans' judicial choices and the practice of their Athenian counterparts, especially in regards to the treatment of citi-

---

[21] Scafuro 1997: 401.

[22] Karabélias 1988: 391. See also Gagarin 1996.

[23] The narrative attitude towards this act of torture remains somewhat ambiguous. Theron is clearly painted as a villain, and the narrative comment regarding his deception of the Syracusans is seemingly straightforward: "for it was to be the most wicked (τὸ σχετλιώτατον) of all situations for the Syracusans to believe that he alone was saved through piety who had been saved through impiety" (3.4.10). But the graphic depiction of the torture and the boastful remark after his crucifixion ("He had carried off as captured booty the daughter of Hermocrates, whom not even the Athenians had taken," 3.4.18) suggest also a sympathetic voice that contradicts Theron's apparent vilification.

zens and the applicability of torture. Contrary to the idealizing gloss with which the heroine's polis is frequently depicted, the legal comparison suggests that Syracuse's "guided democracy"[24] contains within it some disturbingly tyrannical tendencies. If the magistrates of the Athenian Areopagus are τυράννων βαρύτεροι, then how much worse are Hermocrates and his fellow Syracusans?

3 Asianism & Atticism: Blurring the Lines

The trial in Babylon, one of the novel's climactic scenes, begins with Dionysius' lengthy speech, in which he immediately sets a morally superior tone, bestowing lavish praise upon the Great King and calling Mithridates' alleged attempt to seduce his wife "licentiousness and insolence" (ἀσέλγειαν καὶ ὕβριν, 5.6.1). Dionysius says that, "Mithridates, being not my enemy, but rather my guest and friend, plotted against me, and for no other of my possessions than that which was more honored by me than my body and spirit: my wife" (Μιθριδάτης γάρ, οὐκ ἐχθρὸς ὢν ἀλλὰ ξένος καὶ φίλος, ἐπεβούλευσέ μοι, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄλλο τι τῶν κτημάτων, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ τιμιώτερον ἐμοὶ σώματός τε καὶ ψυχῆς, τὴν γυναῖκα, 5.6.2). By insulting himself, Dionysius claims, Mithridates has in turn insulted the King, and he concludes the *prooimion* of his speech by cautioning the King about Mithridates' future insolence should he not be punished. Dionysius then proceeds with the *diēgēsis*, clearly and effectively narrating the events of Mithridates' alleged seduction, which sounds itself like the plot, if not from New Comedy or romance, then certainly from a Lysian oration (5.6.5–8). He describes in detail how he intercepted the letter which was purportedly written by Callirhoe's dead first husband Chaereas, but which Dionysius himself alleges must have been written by his treacherous guest-friend Mithridates. Transitioning from the narration, Dionysius then declares that "the argument is irrefutable, for one of two things must be: either Chaereas is alive, or else Mithridates is proven to be an adulterer" (αἱ δὲ ἀποδείξεις ἄφυκτοι· δεῖ γὰρ δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ Χαιρέαν ζῆν, ἢ Μιθριδάτην ἠλέγχθαι μοιχόν, 5.6.9). Dionysius provides as evidence the letter in question, which he believes Mithridates to have written under the name "Chaereas," and he asks the clerk to read it aloud. By way of conclusion Dionysius pleads with Artaxerxes: "Consider, your highness, how shameless the adulterer is, when he pretends

[24] Hunter 1994: 1077.

to be even a corpse!" (λόγισαι δέ, βασιλεῦ, πῶς ἀναίσχυντός ἐστι μοιχός, ὅπου καὶ νεκροῦ καταψεύδεται, 5.6.10).

Technically this is not a case of *moicheia* such as those found on the Attic comic stage. Though Dionysius calls Mithridates a μοιχός, Scafuro notes that this term is reserved in Attic comedy for an "adulterer or fornicator; the term might conceivably refer to a rapist; it is used of an alleged seducer of a concubine, caught in the act of kissing her, and the verb is used of another concubine's seducer, to denote the act itself."[25] In fact, however, not only has Mithridates not been "caught in the act" (ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ), but there has not even been a seduction. Dionysius' use of the term here suggests, rather, that only in his own mind is Mithridates' status as μοιχός a foregone conclusion. If Dionysius himself had not intercepted the letter to his wife, and if Callirhoe and Mithridates had entered into an adulterous affair, then Mithridates would rightly be termed a μοιχός. As the case stands however, Mithridates is unjustly slandered by the term. The real substance of the charge against Mithridates is ἐπιβούλευσις, meaning "plotting" or "treachery" (4.6.1; 5.6.2), especially grievous in Mithridates' case since he was both ξένος and φίλος (5.6.2) to Dionysius. In Attic oratory, however, variants of the term ἐπιβούλευσις describe murderous plots (Andoc. 4.15; Antiph. 1.3, 1.28, 2.1.1, 2.1.5), conspiracies of treason or political scheming (Lys. 13.12, 13.17, 28.8), plots of extortion (Dem. 22.1), or simply deception (Isoc. 4.148). The orators do not use the term to describe seductive plots of adultery. The language used by Dionysius during the trial scene therefore emphasizes the fact that what is essentially a private matter (a jealous husband's suspicion) is being settled within a public discourse.[26]

Despite these subtle manipulations, Dionysius' speech represents an image of high classical Attic oratory embedded within a novelistic text.[27] Set against Dionysius' Attic rhetoric is the more theatrical Asianist[28] rhetoric of Mithridates, who criticizes the innate deception and lying nature of his

[25] Scafuro 1997: 476.

[26] Cf. Hunter 1994: 1078; Alvares 1997: 621; Balot 1998: 151–152.

[27] Schmeling 1974: 116–117; Goold 1995: 265.

[28] The incorporation in the novel of the rhetorical distinctions between Asianism and Atticism is anachronistic. Even in the Hellenistic period, it is unlikely that Asianism and Atticism could be identified as distinct doctrines: "Au contraire, ces termes n'étaient que des mots de ralliement de la controverse Néo-attique à Rome au milieu du I^{er} siècle. Ils n'ont pas de signification pour la période hellénistique sauf pour désigner des mouvements stylistiques qui étaient assez vagues et qui se sont développés naturellement dès le IV^{e} siècle" (Wooten 1975: 104). Nevertheless, the allusion to the ongoing rhetorical debate in Chariton's text indicates an engagement with larger cultural concerns and an awareness of (at least Greek) literary fashions in Rome. More on this below.

Greek opponent: Dionysius is not to be trusted (5.7.1). Mithridates' own presentation of the case, however, plays with dramatic conventions. There are an abundance of rhetorical questions, and Mithridates several times assumes the voice of his opponent as if his speech were a dramatic dialogue. Concluding his *diēgēsis* with a series of short, rapid clauses, Mithridates openly challenges Dionysius to withdraw the accusations against him: "If you persist, you will regret it. You will cast a vote against yourself. I'm warning you, you will lose Callirhoe. The King will find not me, but you to be the adulterer" (ἂν δὲ ἐπιμείνῃς, μετανοήσεις· κατὰ σαυτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον οἴσεις. προλέγω σοι, Καλλιρόην ἀπολέσεις. οὐκ ἐμὲ βασιλεὺς ἀλλὰ σὲ μοιχὸν εὑρήσει, 5.7.7). But of course Dionysius does not withdraw the accusation, and Mithridates brings his speech to an even more theatrical climax by raising his voice as if he were divinely inspired:

> "θεοὶ" φησὶ "βασίλειοι ἐπουράνιοί τε καὶ ὑποχθόνιοι, βοηθήσατε ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ, πολλάκις ὑμῖν εὐξαμένῳ δικαίως καὶ θύσαντι μεγαλοπρεπῶς· ἀπόδοτέ μοι τὴν ἀμοιβὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας συκοφαντουμένῳ· χρήσατέ μοι κἂν εἰς τὴν δίκην Χαιρέαν. φάνηθι, δαῖμον ἀγαθέ· καλεῖ σε ἡ σὴ Καλλιρόη· μεταξὺ δὲ ἀμφοτέρων, ἐμοῦ τε καὶ Διονυσίου στὰς, εἰπε βασιλεῖ τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ἡμῶν μοιχός."
> "Royal gods," he said, "who dwell in heaven and below the earth, come to the aid of a good and noble man who has often prayed to you in due manner and made rich sacrifices. Reward me for my piety now that I am falsely accused! Furnish for me Chaereas, if only for this trial! Appear, dearly departed! Your Callirhoe summons you! Standing between us both, myself and Dionysius, declare to the king who amongst us is the adulterer!" (5.7.10)

With Chaereas waiting in the wings, there really is no reason for Mithridates to speak at length; the very existence of Chaereas, in fact, renders superfluous any of Mithridates' attempts at persuasion. But the Asianist style was believed most persuasive by means of its dramatic effects,[29] and drama is exactly what Mithridates achieves in this scene. The dramatic showmanship of Mithridates' performance may be considered within the context of a contemporary fascination with occult knowledge and superstition: Jean Alvares

[29] "L'art oratoire n'était plus important comme instrument politique après que les Grecs avaient perdu leur liberté; les orateurs pouvaient donc rechercher des effets frappants, sacrifier le sens au son, et essayer, non pas de persuader, mais de frapper et d'éblouir l'auditeur" (Wooten 1975: 95).

has persuasively proposed that Mithridates is actually parodying the exaggeratedly mystical performances of 1st century CE *magoi*, who were both "keepers of the occult wisdom of the East and fatuous con-artists."[30] This insightful detail further strengthens the contrast between the measured, logical Atticism of Dionysius' speech and the supernatural, bombastic Asianism of Mithridates' speech.[31]

At the end of the 5th century BC, however, the dramatic date of the narrative, the Atticist/Asianist debate did not yet even exist. But Chariton's anachronistic imposition of the literary debate on the scene suggests that the trial be interpreted not only legally as a contest between husband and alleged adulterer, but as a conflict between cultural perspectives. The idea of the trial as a re-staging of cultural stereotypes gains further support when, before the trial, Dionysius is said by the narrator to lay upon his Asian garments a simple, distinctly Greek robe: (Ἑλληνικῷ σχήματι Μιλησίαν στολὴν ἀμπεχόμενος, 5.4.7). Though Dionysius and Mithridates both speak Greek, Dionysius appears to pass himself off as a "true" Greek, a persona achieved by his clothes and by the classical structure and "pure" style of his speech. Though he is a Milesian by birth, he here declares his cultural affiliations as Attic, and therefore superior. Yet the "Greekness" of the whole affair and in particular Dionysius' Attic stylization are oddly contextualized within a trial before the Persian King. The generic appropriation of Attic oratory within the context of an eastern court and its contrast with an Asianist oratorical style create tonal, cultural, and chronological incongruities. Chariton's characters are hyper-aware of the perceived differences between Greek and non-Greek, but the trial in Babylon is constructed in such a way as to highlight how even oratory, the rhetorical stronghold of Athenocentric Hellenism, is vulnerable to alien influence and may be reconceptualized to subvert the perception of Attic cultural superiority. In this scene therefore Dionysius becomes the object of the narrative's satiric gaze.

The efficaciousness of Dionysius' hyper-Greek persona and Attic style, or, rather, their non-effectiveness, subtly questions the cultural privilege of Attic rhetoric and all things Athenian. Mithridates' climactic presentation of Chaereas in the flesh refutes everything that Dionysius says in his speech and in effect neutralizes the power and presumed authority of Attic rhetoric. If the simplicity of Dionysius' Hellenic costume and in particular the pure Attic style of his speech are signs meant to reinforce his cultural superiority and to persuade the King that he himself is in the right, then the utter failure

[30] Alvares 2000: 383.
[31] See also Schmeling 1974: 22–23.

of Dionysius' Hellenic persona and Attic rhetoric in the face of the incontrovertible truth should provoke a wry laugh from the learned reader. Even though the discursive world of the text is constructed in large part by allusions to classical Athenian authors, allusions which counterbalance the vicious anti-Athenianism of the characters (particularly the Syracusans), it should not be forgotten that the entirety of the story is told by a personality that identifies itself in the prologue as "Chariton the Aphrodisian" (1.1.1). The Asianist style isn't necessarily "diseased," "unrestrained," "redundant," "fat," and "greasy" as its loudest critics claim.[32] In fact, one may even trace the genealogy of Asianism back to an Athenian source: the orator Hegesias of Magnesia, regarded as the first to have corrupted the "pure" Attic style, is thought to have been the student of Charisius and even so great a figure as Demosthenes.[33] The Athenian tradition is inescapable in the literary construction of a fictional world, but Asianism's defeat of Atticism in Chariton's climactic trial scene playfully reverses accepted tropes and exposes the often vain posturing of Attic cultural imperialism.

The trial scene has subtle political ramifications as well. Karabélias writes that, despite the Greek idiom of the scene's presentation, the trial is decided not by a jury of peers, but by a tribunal headed by the Persian King.[34] Dionysius' speech, conforming to rhetorical standards of the 1st century CE, would have been recognized by Chariton's readers as belonging to

---

[32] Cic., *Brutus* 51, *Orator* 25. Both of these texts were written in 46, by which time the traits of Asianism had been identified by Cicero as "un style bien déterminé"; in the *De Oratore*, however, written in 55, Cicero uses the term "Asiatic" only in the geographic sense (Wooten 1975: 94).

[33] Wooten 1975: 95, 97.

[34] Karabélias 1988: 394. Karabélias also suggests that the trial before Artaxerxes is actually modeled on the Roman *conventus*, a law court over which a Roman governor presided in the major cities of his province, and thus "le monarque achéménide rend la justice à l'image de l'Empereur romain du Haut-Empire. L'introduction de l'instance, le rôle primordial du président, la délibération après consultation des membres du tribunal nous renvoient à la procédure suivie devant le Conseil du Prince ainsi qu'aux décisions rendues par les gouverneurs ou par les délegués dans les provinces de l'Empire romain" (Karabélias 1988: 394). Alvares argues that by constructing a tacit parallel between the trial in Babylon and a Roman *conventus* Chariton invites the reader to consider contemporary attitudes toward Roman rule and "to recognize the experience of Greeks and other non-Romans within the system of Roman jurisprudence" (Alvares 2001–2002: 122–123). It is tantalizing to read "Rome" for "Persia" at the end of Chariton's novel. But since Chariton's novel is a fantasy about the Greek past and not about Rome *per se*, I am more inclined to read beyond political parallels with the 1st century CE and look instead to the themes of tyranny and freedom which inform the narrative as a whole.

"the best Greek rhetorical form of his time."[35] We are consequently to believe that Dionysius, who "surpasses all the men of Ionia in education" (παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων ὑπερέχοντα, 1.12.6), has received the very best rhetorical training of the day. It might even be plausible to think that he had an Athenian tutor. But this image of democratically cultivated Attic oratory is subsumed in Chariton's novel beneath the apparatus of tyrannical justice. Even within Chariton's literary fantasy, the notion of Greek freedom is eclipsed by a foreign imperial judicial power. Dionysius must plead his case not in a Greek courtroom before a panel of Greek jurors, but in the δικαστήριον of the Persian tyrant.[36] As a result, Dionysius' constructed Greek persona appears both culturally and politically vulnerable. The scene is relevant to the production of Greek culture within a Roman imperial context, but not necessarily in a way that simplifies "Roman" and "Greek" as oppressor and oppressed respectively, for Chariton's novel complicates if not transcends these binary oppositions. Dionysius' Hellenic identity is depicted in the novel as a layered costume to complement if not utterly disguise his Milesian identity; he is, in other words, as much complicit with Athenian cultural imperialism as he is with the seductive power of the Persian monarchy. Just as Dionysius occupies a geographically in-between space (Ionia), so too do his cultural affiliations vacillate between east and

---

[35] Schmeling 1974: 116–117.

[36] Karabélias writes that, "La 'liberté grecque' ne favorise point une forme univoque de droit. A l'époque de Chariton, la situation a complètement changé et ce que la Grèce a perdu sur le plan de l'autonomie et de l'indépendence politiques, elle le retrouve en uniformité institutionelle. La locution νόμοι ἑλληνικοί, dépourvue de sens à l'époque classique, ne différencie pas seulement, sous le Haut-Empire romain, le droit grec face au droit romain; elle dénote, aussi, un état de choses réel pour les sujets grecs. Les Grecs ont enfin *un* 'droit grec'" (1990: 396). The tension between classical oratorical forms and contemporary political realities is articulated also by the late 2nd/early 3rd century CE rhetorician known as Anonymus Seguerianus: "often we are addressing tyrants or kings, who would not suffer our describing things they regard as useless, but immediately force us to give an explanation about the subject" (πολλάκις δὲ καὶ πρὸς τυράννους ἢ βασιλεῖς λέγομεν, οἱ οὐκ ἂν ἀνάσχοιντο ἡμῶν ἀνόνητα παρ' αὐτοῖς διηγεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ εὐθὺς ἀπολογήσασθαι περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἀναγκάζουσι, 122; translation by Dilts and Kennedy). Dilts and Kennedy note that the rhetorician's remark here is "odd … in that declamations are rarely if ever imagined as addressed to tyrants or kings. Although attempts at tyranny or the killing of tyrants are common themes, the audience is regularly assumed to be an assembly or jury, as in the Athenian democracy. Epideictic oratory was sometimes addressed to a ruler, but usually lacks a narration. In actual court oratory under the Roman empire the official trying the case might, of course, feel he knew the facts and show impatience if a speaker tried to recount them, but the author does not elsewhere show interest in the judicial procedures of his time" (1997: 35n121).

west. The novel is, after all, the unique literary expression of a perspective that, like Dionysius, is indeed not Athenocentric, is certainly neither Roman nor Persian, and is not even "purely" Greek.

4 A Panegyric Discourse?

Marcelle Laplace has provided an insightful analysis of the ways in which Chariton's novel is informed both by Isocratean rhetoric and by Plato's rhetorical theory as loosely set forth in the *Phaedrus*. Though I question Laplace's conclusions regarding the function of panegyric discourse in the novel, it is worthwhile to consider Laplace's argument in detail, as it elucidates the formative role of a specific trend in Athenian oratory on the novel's composition. For her association of Chariton's novel with Plato's *Phaedrus*, Laplace begins with Chariton's own designation of his work as a σύγγραμμα (8.1.4, and the verbal form at 8.8.16, the final word of the novel). The term has powerful resonance in the historiographic tradition (Thuc. 1.1), but the term can also refer generally to works of prose, especially those composed for ceremonial recitation.[37] Describing the bloated oratory of a public speaker, Socrates says to Phaedrus that, "Describing himself with a great deal of reverence the writer (ὁ συγγραφεύς) praises himself – then he goes on to speak after this, displaying to his admirers his own wisdom, sometimes drawing out a rather lengthy composition (σύγγραμμα). Or does this seem to you to be something other than a composed narrative (λόγος συγγεγραμμένος)?" (*Phdr.* 258a). Socrates goes on to point out that his criticism is aimed not at the idea of writing generally, but at bad writing. To dismiss writing altogether at this point would spoil the erotic progress and overtone of the whole dialogue. Ultimately he will criticize writing's mimetic limitations (275d–e), but for now Socrates wants to continue engaging the handsome young Phaedrus in conversation, and so in this context Socrates does not hesitate to declare that there is nothing inherently wrong with writing for the sake of writing, "whether the composition be political or private, in meter, as the poet composes, or without meter, as does the private citizen" (εἴτε πολιτικὸν σύγγραμμα εἴτε ἰδιωτικόν, ἐν μέτρῳ ὡς ποιητὴς ἢ ἄνευ μέτρου ὡς ἰδιώτης, 258d). In the terms set forth in the *Phaedrus*, therefore, Chariton's σύγγραμμα would be described as a composition intended more for rhetori-

[37] "En effet, les termes συγγράφειν/σύγγραμα ne sont pas réservés aux écrits historiques: ils s'appliquent à toute composition écrite en prose, et notamment à l'éloquence d'apparat" (Laplace 1997: 43).

cal display (ἐπιδεικνύμενος) than for arguing real public policy. Furthermore, Chariton's prose medium (ἄνευ μέτρου) would classify his composition as a work of only private significance (σύγγραμμα … ἰδιωτικόν).

But Plato's distinction between public writing and private writing is, according to Laplace, a revision of Isocrates' distinction between prose works that are written and those which are spoken.[38] In his first letter to Dionysius of Syracuse, Isocrates says, "everyone trusts those who speak more than they do those who write, and they listen to the former as though they were listening to proposals, whereas they listen to the latter as though they were listening to an artistic composition" (πάντες τοῖς λεγομένοις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεύουσι, καὶ τῶν μὲν ὡς εἰσηγημάτων, τῶν δ' ὡς ποιημάτων ποιοῦνται τὴν ἀκρόασιν, 1.2).[39] He goes on to say to Dionysius that his intention is not to present his reader with a mere "composition" (συγγράματος, 1.5), for he is not disposed to the kind of "rhetorical showpieces" (τὰς ἐπιδείξεις) for which the "solemn assemblies" (αἱ πανηγύρεις, 1.6) are the more appropriate venue. According to the Isocratean schema, then, a σύγγραμμα is a composition more akin to true poetry (ποιημάτων) than to the practical proposals of oratory (εἰσηγημάτων); a σύγγραμμα is in the same class as epideictic oratory, and like epideictic oratory a σύγγραμμα is better suited to public festivals (αἱ πανηγύρεις) than to the proceedings of the assembly. It is upon this foundation that Laplace makes her case that Chariton's narrative grew out of panegyric discourse (λόγος πανηγυρικός).[40] Laplace writes that, "Constitué d'une histoire qui débuta lors de la fête publique d'Aphrodite, et, une fois achevée, fut racontée devant le peuple rassemblé au théâtre de Syracuse en un jour béni des dieux (VIII 7, 2), le roman de Chariton … est un «discours panégyrique» … en l'honneur des héros d'une cité rivale d'Athènes, et un éloge des «réussites paradoxales», dans les deux domaines, privé et politique, de l'Amour et d'Aphrodite."[41]

Not surprisingly, though, given Chariton's affinity for paradox and irony, both the panegyric elements of Isocratean discourse and the rhetorical theory of Plato's *Phaedrus* are inverted in Chariton's text. In Isocrates' speeches, the Persians represent the great enemies, but in Chariton's novel, the Greeks, after conquering their enemies, reach a peace with the Persians. For Isocrates, Hellenic virtue is located in Athens, but for the characters in Chariton's novel, Hellenic virtue is distinctly Dorian. And finally, whereas

---

[38] Laplace 1997: 43.

[39] I follow's Norlin's Loeb edition of Isocrates. Translations are my own.

[40] "il ressortit au discourse panégyrique (λόγος πανηγυρικός)" (Laplace 1997: 40).

[41] Laplace 1997: 70–71.

Isocratean discourse is expressly a public discourse, Chariton's novel embraces both the public and the private, and very often blurs the lines between the two (consider how Chaereas' erotic wasting at the beginning of the novel becomes the intense focus of public deliberations in the assembly, and how the private intrigues within Dionysius' household become material for a public display in Babylon). The overarching power of Aphrodite dissolves distinctions between public and private: private discourse *becomes* public discourse in Chariton's novel, and vice versa. The Platonic binary characterization of a σύγγραμμα as either πολιτικὸν or ἰδιωτικόν is therefore dissolved within Chariton's narrative.[42]

Not only is Chariton's novel a panegyric framework for a love story, but the story itself depicts a culture in which oratory is the primary means of public communication and fashions the identity of the public individual. After Chaereas and Callirhoe have landed safely back in Syracuse, they are brought to the theatre by the people, where Hermocrates insists that Chaereas provide a full account of his adventures abroad and the manner in which he rescued Callirhoe from the East. Hermocrates himself narrates the events of the story up until the point at which Chaereas and Polycharmus departed for the East aboard the Syracusan trireme. He concludes his narrative by saying, "this much we know, but now you narrate for us the things that happened after you sailed from here" (ταῦτα ἴσμεν· σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν διήγησαι τὰ μετὰ τὸν ἔκπλουν συνενεχθέντα τὸν σὸν ἐντεῦθεν, 8.7.8). Chaereas then proceeds to narrate (διηγεῖτο, 8.7.9, the same verb used by the narrator in 1.1.1) his story in full. When he attempts at one point to pass over his enslavement and near death by crucifixion, the crowd demands all the details (λέγε πάντα, 8.8.1). It is by re-telling the story of his journey abroad and victorious return homeward that Chaereas constitutes his new identity before his fellow citizens and secures his political ascendancy within the polis.[43] Laplace sees in Hermocrates' extended recapitulation and Chaereas' "exhaustive narration" the pleasurable satisfaction which Chariton himself desires his readers to experience at the end of the novel (καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις

[42] "Cependant, sa fiction se situe dans un rapport paradoxal aux discours d'Isocrate, parce que les Perses y deviennent les amis des Grecs qui les ont vaincus, parce que cette paix résulte de l'action et du prestige non de la cité attique, mais de la cité dorienne de Syracuse, et parce que, sous le patronage d'Aphrodite, les intérêts privés et les intérêts politiques sont intimement imbriqués. De sorte que Chariton illustre l'unicité de l'art oratoire que prone Platon, contrairement à Isocrate" (Laplace 1997: 41).

[43] Chaereas' speech is an example of the way in which, "In ancient times the autobiographical and biographical self-consciousness of an individual and his life was first laid bare and shaped in the public square" (Bakhtin 1981: 131).

σκυθρωπῶν, 8.1.4). In a meta-narrative sense, Chariton the author becomes "le double réel des orateurs fictifs Hermocrate et Chairéas."[44]

But what are the more specific elements of "panegyric discourse" in Chariton's novel? Four recurring themes of Isocratean panegyric are Athenian democracy, judicial procedure, commercial wealth, and maritime supremacy. All of these elements can be found in Chariton's text, but in the world of the novel these qualities serve to praise Syracuse, not Athens. Laplace cites Isocrates' remarks in the *Panathenaikos* about Athens' institution of the most liberal, the most just, and the most expedient form of government (*Pan*. 130). Similar sentiments are expressed about the administration of Syracuse's government throughout Chariton's novel: the political assembly (1.1.11–12), the trial of Chaereas (1.5.2–6.1), and the trial of Theron (3.4.3–18). Within the larger political arena, at the end of the novel, Syracuse has entered into an "alliance" with the first man of Ionia, Dionysius (8.7.9–12), and has gained the friendship of the Persian King after reconciliation (8.4.3, 8.8.10): "Si incontestés sont désormais l'autorité et le prestige de la cité démocratique sicilienne."[45]

For the praise of Athens' legal institutions, Laplace cites first the *Areopagitikos*, in which Isocrates writes that the founding fathers had resolved "that it was necessary for the people, like a tyrant (ὥσπερ τύραννον), to establish authorities and to correct those who have strayed and to pass judgment about things which are in dispute" (7.26). The severity of Athens' legal authorities is expressed also in Chariton's novel, but in this context it is ironically voiced from the perspective of a criminal. What for Isocrates was a point of praise for Athens, becomes for Theron a point of criticism (Ἄρειος πάγος εὐθὺς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄρχοντες τυράννων βαρύτεροι, 1.11.6). For Theron, Athens' Areopagus is a thing to be avoided, not praised. When Theron is finally sentenced to death in Syracuse, the tyranny of the law in that city, under the guidance of Hermocrates, demands the pirate's immediate execution even before Chaereas can learn the name of the man to whom Callirhoe had been sold in Ionia (3.4.16). And so Theron's criticism of legal procedure, though it applies to Athens, holds true even in Syracuse. Given the story's Doric orientation, it is Syracuse, and not Athens, which gets the privilege of meting out justice in Chariton's novel.

The themes of Athens' commercial wealth and maritime supremacy are linked in Isocratean discourse, and Syracuse's commercial wealth and maritime supremacy are similarly linked in Chariton's narrative. In the *Peri Anti-*

[44] Laplace 1997: 46.
[45] Laplace 1997: 54.

doseōs, Isocrates asserts that men who praise Athens say that "it is the only city, and that the rest in Greece are villages. And they might correctly say that Athens is the capital of Greece both on account of its size and on account of the wealth which arises here for the benefit of the other cities" (καὶ φασιν οἱ μὲν τοιοῦτοι μόνην εἶναι ταύτην πόλιν, τὰς δ' ἄλλας κώμας, καὶ δικαίως ἂν αὐτὴν ἄστυ τῆς Ἑλλάδος προσαγορεύεσθαι καὶ διὰ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ διὰ τὰς εὐπορίας τὰς ἐνθένδε τοῖς ἄλλοις γιγνομένας, 15.299). Likewise in the *Panegyrikos*: "no one would be able to show that another city is as powerful in land warfare as our own city is distinguished in naval warfare" (οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἂν ἑτέραν πόλιν ἐπιδείξειε τοσοῦτον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ κατὰ γῆν ὑπερέχουσαν, ὅσον τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις τοῖς κατὰ θάλατταν διαφέρουσαν, 4. 21). And on the significance of the battle of Salamis in securing Athens' hegemony over the Greek world he says, "There is no one so hostile to us that he would not agree that we won the war on account of that sea battle and that our city was the cause of that victory" (οὐδεὶς δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἔχει δυσμενῶς, ὅς τις οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν διὰ μὲν τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἡμᾶς τῷ πολέμῳ κρατῆσαι, ταύτης δὲ τὴν πόλιν αἰτίαν γενέσθαι, 4.98).

These sentiments of Athenian superiority are to be contrasted in Chariton's novel with Chaereas' military reputation among the Egyptians and his triumphant return to Syracuse. After his victory over Tyre, Chaereas is persuaded by the Egyptian pharaoh to take charge of the naval battle: "But I think the sea is more appropriate for you, for you Syracusans defeated even the Athenians in a sea battle" (οἴομαι δὲ οἰκειότερόν σοι εἶναι τὴν θάλασσαν· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οἱ Συρακόσιοι καὶ Ἀθηναίους κατεναυμαχήσατε, 7.5.7). If Syracuse's naval superiority has been championed by Hermocrates, Callirhoe, and the other Syracusans throughout the novel, then that superiority is strengthened even more by Chaereas' transformation into a victorious general. Later, as the spoils of his war in the East are unloaded before his fellow citizens, all are amazed at the great wealth: silver, gold, ivory, amber, luxurious clothing, and even personal items once belonging to the Persian King. The narrator reports that, "the whole city was filled, not with Attic poverty as previously from the Sicilian war, but, most surprisingly, with Medic spoils in peacetime" (ἐνεπλήσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, οὐχ ὡς πρότερον ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Σικελικοῦ πενίας Ἀττικῆς, ἀλλὰ, τὸ καινότατον, ἐν εἰρήνῃ λαφύρων Μηδικῶν, 8.6.12). Like the Isocratean praise of democracy and legal procedure, the praise of commercial wealth and military superiority is

transferred in Chariton's narrative from Athens to Syracuse, reinforcing Laplace's argument that the novel is born out of panegyric discourse.[46]

Laplace's paper is helpful for its elucidation of Athenian panegyric discourse in Chariton's novel. And yet, though she acknowledges Chariton's paradoxical inversions of Isocratean and Platonic rhetorical theory, Laplace nevertheless maintains that Chariton's appropriated panegyric discourse continues to function within his narrative as a discourse of praise. In other words, Laplace does not address the subversive implications for an inverted panegyric discourse. She states that, "Dans le roman de Chariton, Syracuse tient le rôle dévolu à Athènes dans les discours d'Isocrate. La comparaison entre Athènes et Sparte … est remplacée par le parallèle entre Syracuse et Athènes …"[47] By Laplace's account, Syracuse, as the subject of a panegyric discourse, is idealized. Syracuse's democracy, therefore, remains unproblematic and unquestioned by Laplace; consequently she does not address the concerns about freedom and tyranny which run throughout the narrative. Similarly, Chaereas and Callirhoe themselves become idealized heroes,[48] without any trace of the contradictions and inconsistencies which have in recent years motivated interpretations of a less idealizing nature.[49] Laplace clearly demonstrates that Chariton's narrative was influenced by Isocratean panegyric discourse, but there is more than a simple transference of praise from Athens to Syracuse. The instability of Chaereas' innate jealousy and what Katherine Haynes has provocatively called Callirhoe's "manipulation of chastity"[50] indicate that there are elements in Chariton's narrative that subvert the very notion of panegyric discourse.

5 Demosthenes and Aeschines

The appropriation of Isocrates' panegyric discourse is augmented in Chariton's narrative by distinct allusions to Demosthenes and Aeschines. Since the Athenian defeat in the Sicilian Expedition is the most important historical event for the characters in the novel, and since the novel suggests a general decline in the fortunes of the Athenians, it seems appropriate that Chariton's allusions to Demosthenes and Aeschines point the reader in the

[46] "Toute cette richesse apportée à Syracuse en temps de paix, comme par un navire de commerce, est le signe du triomphe maritime de la cité" (Laplace 1997: 56).
[47] Laplace 1997: 53.
[48] Laplace 1997: 70–71.
[49] Goldhill 1995, Balot 1998.
[50] Haynes 2003: 49–50.

direction of the Battle of Chaeronea in 338 BC, when Athens ceased to exist as an independent state and finally fell beneath the yoke of Macedonian power. In 337/6 Demosthenes became one of ten commissioners in Athens appointed to preside over the repairs of the city walls, and he was also placed in charge of the Theoric Fund, which meant that he was, as Aeschines informs us, in charge of "nearly the whole administration of the state" (σχεδὸν τὴν ὅλην διοίκησιν … τῆς πόλεως, Aeschin. 3.25).[51] As a result of Demosthenes' service to the state and on account of his own private generosity, Ctesiphon proposed to award Demosthenes with a gold crown at the Great Dionysia of 336. The presentation of the crown was prevented, however, by Demosthenes' political opponent Aeschines, who filed a γραφὴ παρανόμων against Ctesiphon, claiming that his proposal to award Demosthenes the crown was in fact illegal. The actual trial did not take place for six years, until August of 330. While the γραφὴ παρανόμων was aimed nominally at Ctesiphon, Aeschines was really after Demosthenes, and the most important part of his speech *Kata Ktesiphōntos* is spent arguing that his political opponent is unworthy of being awarded a crown for his service to the state. Demosthenes' speech *Hyper Ktesiphōntos* is accordingly not so much a defense of Ctesiphon as it is a defense of his own political career.[52]

Late in his speech, Aeschines makes an impassioned plea to the Athenian jurors that they not allow Demosthenes to be crowned publicly in the theatre before the pan-Hellenic audience of the Great Dionysia. Far from benefitting Athens, he claims, Demosthenes is rather the symbol of Greek enslavement to Macedon. To proceed with awarding Demosthenes the crown would be to remind the Thebans of their disaster, brought about as the direct result of their alliance with Athens which Demosthenes himself proposed.

> No! By Zeus and the gods, I beseech you, Athenian gentlemen, do not erect in the orchestra of Dionysus a trophy of your defeat, and do not before all the Greeks convict the Athenian people of having lost their mind, and do not remind the pitiable Thebans of their incurable and fatal wounds, … but since you were not present in body, come, at least in your thoughts look upon their misfortunes, and consider how they looked upon their city as it was being taken, the destruction of their walls, the burning of their houses, their wives and children dragged off into slavery, the elder men and women weeping as they at last unlearn their free-

[51] The text of Aeschines is from Dilts' Teubner edition. Translations are my own.

[52] For a precise account of the charges brought by the indictment, see Goodwin 1990: 257–258.

> dom (ὀψὲ μεταμανθάνοντας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν). (Aeschin. *In Ctes.*, 156–157)

Chariton alludes directly to this passage when Callirhoe meets Dionsysius for the first time in the novel. Having been sold by Theron to the steward Leonas, Callirhoe has been kept at Dionysius' sea-side estate and has been waiting patiently for Dionysius' arrival from Miletus. When Dionysius finally makes the journey to his estate, he stops off at the shrine of Aphrodite, where Callirhoe was coincidentally also paying homage to the goddess. Dionysius, confused and believing that the woman standing before him is Aphrodite incarnate, is reassured by Leonas that the girl is none other than his most recent purchase. When she is instructed by Leonas to greet Dionysius, the narrator states that, "Callirhoe, having bent downward at the name of her master, released a fountain of tears, at last unlearning her freedom" (Καλλιρόη μὲν οὖν πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου κάτω κύψασα πηγὴν ἀφῆκε δακρύων ὀψὲ μεταμανθάνουσα τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, 2.3.6).[53] A beautiful young girl from Syracuse's best family thus experiences a fate worse than death, for she must now bow down before a foreign master, and Chariton's language poignantly brings out the opposition between master and servant, freedom and slavery which forms the novel's most prominent thematic current.

The quotation of Aeschines also expands the narrative frame and motivates the reader to consider not only Callirhoe's slavery, but also the Thebans' recollection of their own slavery as they hypothetically look upon the crowned Demosthenes. And it is not just the slavery of the Thebans which Aeschines evokes in his audience's thoughts, for the slavery of Thebes is now also the slavery of all Greece, and Demosthenes himself is the very monument to that slavery and loss of freedom. Aeschines remarks that Demosthenes' crown will be awarded during Dionysus' great festival at Athens, and it will consequently be in the theatre of Dionysus where the Thebans will be forced to remember their enslavement to a Macedonian master. In Chariton's story, by contrast, Callirhoe's recognition of her own enslavement to a Milesian master takes place appropriately in the temple of the goddess who provides over all the action of the novel: Aphrodite.

Demosthenes' speech, ostensibly in defense of Ctesiphon, but really a defense of his own career of service to the Athenian polis, contains a narra-

---

[53] See Papanikolaou 1973: 23. Chariton also applies the quotation of Aeschines to Chaereas and Polycharmus when they too suffer a reversal of fortune and become the slaves of a Carian master (4.2.4).

tive of the events which took place in Athens as news of the seizure of Elateia (339) reached their city:

> It was evening, and someone arrived with the message (ἑσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, ἦκε δ' ἀγγέλλων τις) for the officials presiding over the council that Elateia was taken. After the news was announced, some of the officials, rising at once from the midst of their meals, dragged the occupants from their stalls in the agora and set fire to the wicker hurdles,[54] and others of the officials summoned the generals and ordered the trumpeter. And the city was filled with an uproar. The next morning, the officials ordered the council to the council house, and you yourselves proceeded to the assembly, and before that council could proceed to business and pass a vote, the whole of the people were already seated up on the hill. And then, after the council entered and the officials announced what had been announced to them and they brought in the messenger and after that man spoke, the herald asked, "Who wants to speak?" and no one stood. Even though the herald asked repeatedly, no one stood, despite the fact that all the generals were present, and all the orators, and despite the fact that the homeland was calling upon someone to speak on behalf of our salvation … (Dem. *De cor.*, 169–170)[55]

The overwhelming silence of the Athenians after hearing the news is emphasized by Demosthenes as a means of defending his own speech before the assembly at that time: in the absence of any advice from his fellow citizens, his words stood out. Eight years after the event, Demosthenes' proposal to ally with Thebes and confront Philip was necessarily seen as the course of action which ended in Athens' defeat at the hands of Macedon; but Demosthenes' defense is to attempt as vividly as possible to remind the jury that *at the time* his proposal seemed to be the best course of action, for to

---

[54] A strange action on the part of the *prytaneis*. Goodwin explains that, "while some (οἱ μὲν) of the Prytanes were engaging in clearing the booths, others (οἱ δὲ) were summoning the ten Generals. The Generals and the Prytanes had the duty of calling special meetings of the Assembly (ἐκκλησίας συγκλήτους): see Thuc. IV. 118 … There can, therefore, be hardly a doubt that the two acts were connected with summoning the Assembly. To do this effectually it was necessary to alarm the whole of Attica immediately; and the natural method for this was to light bonfires on some of the hills near Athens, which would be a signal to distant demes to light fires on their own hills. A fire on Lycabettus could thus give signals directly and indirectly to the whole of Attica, and probably this was understood as a call of the citizens to a special Assembly" (1990: 107n5).

[55] I follow Dilts' Oxford Classical Text; the translation is my own.

have allowed Philip to overrun Thebes would have been to allow Athens herself to become all the more vulnerable. The description of the panic at Athens evokes in the minds of his audience the advent of disaster and the beginning of the end of Athenian freedom.

Twice in his novel, in the first and final books, Chariton alludes to this most famous Demosthenic passage, though at both instances, the circumstances are far less dire than the impending fall of Athens. In Book 1, after Chaereas and Callirhoe have been married in Syracuse, the narrator states that, "It was evening, and someone arrived with the message that Ariston, Chariton's father, fell from a ladder on his farm and had very little hope of surviving. Though Chaereas loved his father, when he heard the news he was nevertheless upset more because he intended on heading out alone, for it was not proper to take his bride out in public" (Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν, ἦκε δὲ ἀγγέλλων τις ὅτι Ἀρίστων ὁ πατὴρ Χαιρέου πεσὼν ἀπὸ κλίμακος ἐν ἀγρῷ πάνυ ὀλίγας ἔχει τοῦ ζῆν τὰς ἐλπίδας. ὁ δὲ Χαιρέας ἀκούσας, καίτοι φιλοπάτωρ ὤν, ὅμως ἐλυπήθη πλέον ὅτι ἔμελλεν ἀπελεύσεσθαι μόνος· οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἐξάγειν ἤδη τὴν κόρην, 1.3.1). Except for a missing γάρ, the introductory clause of Chariton's narrative here is identical to the opening of Demosthenes' narrative διατύπωσις.[56] But whereas Demosthenes' messenger reports the devastating news of Elateia's seizure by Philip of Macedon, Chariton's messenger reports merely that Chaereas' father has fallen off a ladder, and it seems that we are in the context more of New Comedy than of high oratory. But in fact Chaereas' departure to his father's farm is not as insignificant an event as it may seem, for by leaving Callirhoe alone he begins the series of events which result in her *Scheintod* and all the misfortunes that follow.[57] I would add that Chariton's allusion to the panic at Athens in 339 follows in his own text the ironic commingling of tyrannical and democratic tendencies, for the plot against Chaereas is set in motion only after the rival Italian suitors have elected (ἐπεψηφίσαντο, 1.2.6) the tyrant from Acragas (ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος, 1.2.4) to be their chief conspirator. It is a humorous paradox that the Italian men elect to follow a tyrant, but the implicit tension between tyr-

[56] Allan Kershaw writes that the omission of the γάρ is not "a creative omission, but an error, and it would be a simple matter to supply the missing word were it not for the fact that in the final book (8.1.5) Chariton again writes Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν. It is unlikely that the novelist had a faulty Demosthenes (in which case we should add the suitably bracketed particle to his text); it is highly likely that he was working from memory. It is often the case that the more familiar the words, the less reliable the memory" (1991: 16). See also Papanikolaou 1973: 22.

[57] Reardon notes that Chariton uses Demosthenes' phrase "to foreshadow a rise in tension" (1989: 25n10).

anny and democracy in this scene reinforces Chariton's subsequent allusion to Demosthenes and underscores the anxiety of 339 and the twilight of Athenian freedom.

Chariton's second quotation of Demosthenes' *Peri tou Stephanou* occurs in Book 8, after the narrator informs his readers that this final book of the novel will describe events far more cheerful than those of the preceding books:

> νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι· καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν. οὐκέτι λῃστεία καὶ δουλεία καὶ δίκη καὶ μάχη καὶ ἀποκαρτέρησις καὶ πόλεμος καὶ ἅλωσις, ἀλλὰ ἔρωτες δίκαιοι ἐν τούτῳ <καὶ> νόμιμοι γάμοι. πῶς οὖν ἡ θεὸς ἐφώτισε τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγνοουμένους ἔδειξεν ἀλλήλοις λέξω.
>
> Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν, ἔτι δὲ πολλὰ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων κατελέλειπτο.
>
> And I think that this final composition will be the most pleasing for my readers, for it is a cleansing of the grim events of the first books. In this book there will be no more piracy and slavery and trials and battles and suicide by hunger and war and capture. But rather there will be proper loves and lawful marriages. How therefore the goddess illuminated the truth and revealed the unsuspecting lovers to each other I shall tell.
>
> It was evening, and much of the captured material was left on shore. (8.1.4–5)

If he has reassured his readers that this final book of the novel will see an end to battles, wars, and captures, then it is at least disconcerting that the very next line of text begins with a quotation from Demosthenes' speech, for an allusion to the devastating news of Elateia's capture in no way fulfills the narrator's promise of "proper loves and lawful marriages" (ἔρωτες δίκαιοι <καὶ> νόμιμοι γάμοι). Mention of "captured material" (τῶν αἰχμαλώτων) further compounds the irony of the narrator's assertion that there would be "no more capture in this book" (οὐκέτι … ἅλωσις ἐν τούτῳ). To be sure, events in Book 8 do begin to turn to the heroes' advantage, and by the end of the novel we find them reunited and restored in Syracuse. But the allusion to Elateia's seizure, though brief and indirect, is unexpected.

But the quotation of Demosthenes at 8.1.5 is not as complete as the quotation at 1.3.1, making no mention of the arrival of a messenger. When a messenger does eventually arrive upon the scene, it is only after the romantic interlude that depicts the much anticipated reunion of Chaereas and Calli-

rhoe (8.1.6–17). After their night of lovemaking, the narrator resumes his exposition of the Egyptian rebellion: while it was still dark (Ἔτι δὲ νυκτὸς, 8.2.1), an Egyptian reached Chaereas' camp on Aradus and reported that, "the Persian King has killed the Egyptian pharaoh and has sent part of his army to Egypt to establish control of things there, and all of the rest he leads in this direction and he is nearly here" (βασιλεὺς ὁ Περσῶν ἀνῄρηκε τὸν Αἰγύπτιον καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν τὴν μὲν εἰς Αἴγυπτον πέπομφε καταστησομένην τὰ ἐκεῖ, τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν ἄγει πᾶσαν ἐνθάδε καὶ ὅσον οὔπω πάρεστι, 8.2.3). And so the anticipated report of capture and defeat prompted by the quotation of Demosthenes at 8.1.5 (Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν), though delayed, is eventually fulfilled by Chariton's narrator. The romantic interlude between Chaereas and Callirhoe began as evening fell (8.1.5) and was interrupted immediately prior to sunrise of the next day, for the narrator remarks twice upon the arrival of the Egyptian messenger that it was still night (Ἔτι δὲ νυκτὸς, 8.2.1; ἔτι σκότους ὄντος, 8.2.3). The delay between the narrator's announcement of evening and the arrival of the messenger is therefore significant in terms of the unity of narrative time, for all of the events in Book 8 thus far have transpired within the space of a single night, from the fall of evening to the darkness just before dawn. The quotation of Demosthenes from Book 1 (Ἑσπέρα μὲν ἦν, ἦκε δὲ ἀγγέλλων τις, 1.3.1) that foreshadowed the misfortunes of the young couple is therefore transformed in Book 8 to account for their reunion. Even though the messenger brings news of the Egyptian pharaoh's death and defeat, Chaereas and Callirhoe are nevertheless directed homeward to Syracuse; the misfortune of the Egyptian pharaoh, in other words, ultimately works to their own advantage. The Demosthenic moment in Book 8 therefore expands to encompass the erotic passion of the lawful husband and wife and consequently to signify the narrative's movement toward conclusion.

On another level, though, since Demosthenes' narrative after the messenger's arrival is about Athens and the anxiety of her people on the eve of defeat, Chariton's allusion to Demosthenes is also in some way about Athens. At the beginning and end of the novel the reader is manipulated by the narrator to imagine, however briefly, that evening in 339 when news was brought to Athens of Philip's encroaching army. The quotations of Demosthenes evoke in the reader's mind vivid images of the Athenians' panic, for the advancing Macedonian army would come to mean the end of Athens' freedom. Consequently, the appearance of the Demosthenic quotation in a text so concerned with notions of freedom and tyranny, mastery and slavery motivates the reader to make connections between Chariton's narrative and

the impending fall of Athens as depicted by Demosthenes. The quotations of Demosthenes in Books 1 and 8 of Chariton's text, I maintain, provide the novel as a whole with a thematic frame that suggests Athenian decline. This frame parallels the pervading anti-Athenian sentiment among the characters in the novel and reinforces the marked displacement of Athens into the background of the world depicted by the narrative. But even such a subtle narrative gesture is not without paradox, for while Chariton alludes to the historic defeat of Athens and the rise of Macedonian hegemony, he does so through the powerful medium of Athenian oratory. By inserting within his narrative a passage of Demosthenes in "intonational quotation marks,"[58] Chariton subtly reinforces Athens' overarching cultural influence even as he notes its political and military decline.

[58] Bakhtin would describe Chariton's quotation of Demosthenes as a "novelistic image of another's style" that "must be taken in *intonational quotation marks* within the system of direct authorial speech (postulated by us here), that is, taken as if the image were parodic and ironic." Bakhtin goes on to explain that, "The image of another's language and outlook on the world …, simultaneously represented *and* representing, is extremely typical of the novel; the greatest novelistic images (for example, the figure of Don Quixote) belong precisely to this type. These descriptive and expressive means that are direct and poetic (in the narrow sense) retain their direct significance when they are incorporated into such a figure, but at the same time they are 'qualified' and 'externalized,' shown as something historically relative, delimited and incomplete – in the novel they, so to speak, criticize themselves" (1981: 44–45).

6 Historiography and Empire

1 The Prologue

The intertextual relationship between Chariton's novel and Greek historiography is immediately discernable from the novel's brief prologue: "I, Chariton of Aphrodisias, secretary of the rhetor Athenagorus, shall relate a love story[1] which took place in Syracuse" (Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισιεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι, 1.1.1). There are of course two important echoes of Greek literature here: the introductions to the histories of both Herodotus and Thucydides. But Chariton does not blindly imitate his models. Herodotus' introduction is demonstrative of the work as a whole (Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε), while Thucydides presents himself in the third-person as the narrating subject who composed his history (Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε). Chariton's narrator, by contrast, uses a first-person verb in the future tense (διηγήσομαι), which motivates anticipation for the love story to come and grounds the narrating act in the present tense shared by the reader. This is profoundly different from Thucydides, who introduces his history as a thing composed in the past which will nevertheless last for all time (κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεί, 1.22.4); Thucydides' readers, in other words, look back not just to the events of the past, but also to the act of composition, and this reinforces the integrity of the narrator as a witness to those past events. Contrast to this Chariton's future tense verb διηγήσομαι: it is as if the narrator is sitting beside the reader in the present tense and the anticipated love story will be a kind of impromptu narrative performance. Chariton's narrative voice is immediate and intimate, as opposed to the distanced past voice of Thucydides.[2]

---

[1] This is Goold's translation (1995: 29) for the phrase πάθος ἐρωτικὸν.

[2] In this respect I differ from Morgan, who argues that Chariton "pretends to narrate as if he were a contemporary of the events he writes about, as those earlier historians [Herodotus and Thucydides] were"; but Morgan then finds that, "the pretence is full of holes; one can find reflections of Chariton's own period, places Hellenized before their time, and so on" (1993: 205–206). My account, by contrast, locating the narrative act in the present tense, admits anachronisms as negligible deviations in an imaginative extempore performance. But Morgan, too, is willing to ignore the "holes" which he finds in the nar-

And this immediacy is sustained throughout the novel as the narrator continually calls attention to himself, not just by the use of verbs in the first-person (*inter alia* 5.1.2; 5.8.3; 8.1.4), but also by his many rhetorical questions (the first appears at 1.1.12), by his non-narrative remarks (such as 1.4.2), and by continually interrupting the narrative with quotations from Homer. Chariton's narrator therefore, while he is external to the events depicted, is also at the same time perceptible to the reader. In other words, he is not just narrating in the third person and allowing the fabula to be focalized through the perspectives of his characters, but rather he himself is also a focalizer.[3] Though our narrator plays no role in the events of the fabula, those events are nevertheless filtered through what appears to be a very real personality.[4]

But leaving aside the differences between the temporal aspects of the narratives of Thucydides' history and Chariton's novel, we are nevertheless to understand Chariton's prologue as an allusion to Athenian historiography, and this allusion provides the first frame within which to read the πάθος ἐρωτικόν. But a πάθος ἐρωτικόν is certainly not the traditional material for history; to be sure, there is ἔρως in Herodotus, but his history of the Persian Wars is not *about* ἔρως. And it is this incongruity between the narrative frame (historiography) and the subject matter (a love story) which opens up for Chariton an imaginative departure from literary tradition.[5] As Alvares puts it, "Chariton offers material that both recalls conventional Greek historiography and yet has been transformed to make the reader aware that this material belongs to the history of a different *sort* of world, one that revolves around Aphrodite and Eros and the appreciation of romantic values, all fully integrated into the historical process."[6] The reader is therefore asked to understand the romantic subject matter within the context of a past validated by Athenian historiography. The story has not yet even begun, and the literary

---

rative: "Nonetheless, Chariton is making a definite effort to adopt a fictitious narratorial persona which contributes to his text's power to make believe" (206). See also Laplace 1997: 41. For more on Laplace's argument, see my analysis in Chapter 5.

[3] See Bal 1997: 25–29.

[4] See also Puccini-Delby 2001: 88.

[5] Cf. Reardon: "Some sophisticated writers of prose in the second century appear to keep their distance from fiction, to offer a justification for writing it. Thus, the romances of Longus and Achilles Tatius are theoretically both commentaries on pictures" (1991: 48). See also Morgan: "The problem is that novels are fictions couched in a form appropriate to and implying something else: factual history. What makes them dangerous is that they blur an essential dividing line between truth and untruth" (1993: 178). See also Hunter 1994: 1056–1071.

[6] Alvares 1997: 625.

tradition of classical Athens is already established as one of the frames within which to read the love affair between Chaereas and Callirhoe.[7]

2 *Novel Approaches to Thucydidean Historiography*

There are in fact numerous quotations of Thucydidean prose throughout Chariton's novel[8] that both heighten the register of Chariton's own prose and convey to the romantic narrative the feel of historiography. And yet the influence of Thucydides on Chariton's text is less superficial than it is pervasive, as Robert Luginbill has shown in his brilliant close reading of the outbreak of the Egyptian rebellion, a critical turning point in the novel for our understanding of the hero Chaereas, who for the first time enters "into the 'real world' of political and military action."[9]

But Chariton's allusive relationship to Thucydides is discernable not only on a passage-by-passage basis; in a sense, Chariton's entire narrative responds to Thucydidean historiography. It has been discussed elsewhere that prose narrative was an unexpected medium for composing what was essentially a fiction: prose was the medium for conveying fact and truth, whereas poetry had traditionally been the appropriate medium for literature of the imagination.[10] In the strictest sense, this generic rule was codified by Thucydides himself at the close of his "archaeology" in the first book of his history:

> Καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοί τε ὧν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθέν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν· ὡς δ' ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται. τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ

[7] Daude writes that, "Le texte de Chariton est ainsi né des noces tumultueuses d'Éros et de l'histoire. L'auteur nous en avertit lui-même en situant dès le début ses *Erotica* dans un chronotope mixte, fait de la Syracuse des poètes bucoliques, lieu de la naissance de l'amour, et de la Syracuse thucydidéenne du stratège Hermocrate" (2001: 138).

[8] *Inter alia* Ch. 1.1.1: Thuc. 1.1.1; Ch. 1.14.6: Thuc. 3.30.1; Ch. 7.5.11: Thuc. 2.8.1; Ch. 8.8.16: Thuc. 1.1.1. See also the first chapter of Papanikolaou 1973.

[9] Luginbill 2000: 2. See Chapter 3.

[10] Cf. Reardon 1991: 48 and Morgan 1993: 178.

> ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξελθών.
>
> And with respect to what each person said in my narrative, either when they were anticipating war or were already involved in war, it was difficult to remember verbatim the accuracy of what was said, both for me regarding what I myself heard, and for others who reported to me. And so the speeches depict the manner in which I think each of them would have certainly spoken regarding what was necessary at any given time, coming closest to the complete sentiment of what was really said. I thought it best to write down the events of the war, finding out about them not from whatever source that happened to be at hand, nor even relying on my own impressions. Rather, regarding both those things at which I myself was present and which were told to me by others, I relate each event with as much accuracy as possible. (1.22.1–2)

Bryan Reardon expresses it best when he writes that by pronouncing a strict methodology Thucydides "implicitly criticizes earlier historiography for its inadequate critical standards and cavalier attitude to historical truth. And with fact comes fiction. Fiction cannot be recognized as fiction until fact is recognized as fact. But once fact is so recognized, once its importance as fact is understood, fiction is born, as a corollary and in the same movement. In a sense, the theory of romance appeared, by inversion, when Thucydides published his 'manifesto' laying down the nature of true historiography."[11] If as Reardon suggests the idea of romance is paradoxically born with Thucydides' history, then the relationship between Thucydides and Chariton goes far deeper than mere quotation and allusion.

Of all the Greek novels, only two are pervasively concerned with narrative ἀκρίβεια as a major theme: Chariton's *Callirhoe* and Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*. John Winkler has written of Heliodorus' novel that when Knemon demands of Kalasiris μὴ παραδραμεῖν σε τοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀκρίβειαν (3.14.1), he "makes a demand which we may make our own for the entire novel: that not a single word slip by without scrutiny for its precise meaning."[12] Furthermore, the distinctions between historical narratives and fictitious narratives are very much what Heliodorus' novel is *about*: "If Heliodorus had really wanted to create an historiographic verisimilitude he would have spoken in the first person as Herodian, Polybios, and Herodotos do," or for that matter as Chariton's narrator himself sometimes does. Winkler concludes that, "The

[11] Reardon 1991: 59–60.
[12] Winkler 1999: 295.

provocative absence of this identifiable persona, however, is of the essence of the *Aithiopika* as an impersonal, structured ascent of problematic language resolving itself."[13] I suggest that this theme in Heliodorus is a sophisticated development of a theme nascent in Chariton's novel, in which all of the main characters at one point or another express anxiety about narrative precision: they want to make sure that they are telling their stories correctly, or that they are hearing the complete truth in all its details. But it is also clear at these moments in the story that, despite the desire for precision and accuracy, the situations are clouded by layers of deception or ambiguity: either the characters willingly deceive each other, or, more interestingly, they deceive themselves. At these moments in his story, Chariton deftly uses variants of the word ἀκρίβεια,[14] and consequently, given the quasi-historical quality of his narrative, a reader is invited to theorize about the relationship between Chariton's novel and Thucydidean historiography.[15] Winkler has argued that, "Heliodorus to be sure employs his share of borrowed phrases [from historiography] used for ornament alone … but … he is not just using a well-known device of realistic narration but posing a problem, setting up terms with which we may think about this particular literary construct."[16] The same may be said of Chariton.

After discovering that she is pregnant with Chaereas' child, Callirhoe struggles with her difficult decision: will she abort the child, or will she give birth and raise the child as if it belongs to Dionysius. The slave Plangon intercedes on Callirhoe's behalf, but, as Schmeling puts it, "her special area

---

[13] Winkler 1999: 327–328.

[14] There are seven such scenes: 2.10.7; 3.1.6; 3.3.3; 3.9.3; 3.9.11; 4.2.11; and 8.1.17. Only three times does Chariton use a variant of ἀκρίβεια without the subtle interference of deception or ambiguity, at 2.7.2, 4.6.1 and 6.6.6. The *Lessico dei romanzieri greci* records thirty appearances of ἀκρίβεια or its variants in Heliodorus, five in Achilles Tatius, three in Longus, and only one in Xenophon of Ephesus.

[15] Here I follow Bakhtin's theory that a word's connotations are echoes of the genre within which the word was galvanized to take on a potent meaning. The connotations of a word like ἀκρίβεια, therefore, result from the word's powerful generic implication in Thucydidean historiography. Morson and Emerson explain that, "Although a word's aura may seem to belong 'to the world of language as such' – to its dictionary meaning – the aura actually belongs 'to that genre in which the given word usually functions. It is the echo of the generic whole that resounds in the word' (SG, p. 88)" (1990: 294). The source of Morson and Emerson's quotation ("SG") is Bakhtin's essay, "The Problem of Speech Genres," in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (Emerson and Holquist, eds.; McGee, trans.; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986).

[16] Winkler 1999: 326.

of competence was trickery."[17] Believing that it is in her own best interests to persuade Callirhoe to accept marriage to Dionysius, Plangon uses reverse psychology on Callirhoe, suggesting that perhaps she should abort her child, knowing that Callirhoe's maternal instincts will prevent her from going through with the abortion. Plangon instructs her to become reconciled to the life of a slave: "Adapt to your present fortune and truly become a slave!" (συνάρμοσαι τῇ παρούσῃ τύχῃ καὶ ἀκριβῶς γενοῦ δούλη, 2.10.7). Though her advice is emphatic that Callirhoe should thoroughly embrace her new enslavement, Plangon expects the girl to do exactly the opposite. The narrator notes that because of her noble birth Callirhoe is unaware of the slave's base deception, but he acknowledges that the more Plangon presses for the abortion, all the more does Callirhoe resist and lean instead toward a marriage with Dionysius.

Eventually Callirhoe decides to give birth to the child, but she wants Dionysius' assurance that he intends to marry her and not merely to retain her as a concubine. Plangon promises Callirhoe that she can secure the marriage, and when Plangon then confronts Dionysius, he is eager to hear exactly what his beloved has said. He commands Plangon, "Don't extract anything, and don't add anything, but tell me precisely what she said" (μηδὲν ἀφέλῃς, μηδὲ προσθῇς, ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς μνημόνευσον, 3.1.6). Plangon then proceeds to give a detailed account in direct speech of what Callirhoe purportedly said (3.1.6–8). But, if we are to trust the narrator, then we know that the words Plangon utters were never spoken by the heroine. The speech certainly *sounds* like something Callirhoe would say (cf. ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, Thuc. 1.22.1), and in this regard Plangon, like Thucydides, is a skilled literary technician. But her words are in fact craft, and not a verbatim account. What she purports to be truth is really just a fabrication. And so despite his plea for a precise account (ἀκριβῶς μνημόνευσον, Ch. 3.1.6), Dionysius is nevertheless a victim of the slave woman's fiction.

Meanwhile, back in Syracuse, word has spread that Callirhoe's tomb has been discovered empty, and the traditionally distorting voice of Rumor itself is the messenger of the strange paradox (ἄγγελος δὲ Φήμη ταχεῖα Συρακοσίοις ἐμήνυσε τὸ παράδοξον, 3.3.2). The people are filled with trepidation; since no one dares to enter the tomb, one man is appointed to do so by Hermocrates. When the man returns from the tomb, he is said by the narrator

[17] Schmeling 1974: 96. He goes on to note "that this episode, involving the tricks of a slave, represents a motif from Greek New Comedy and Roman comedy which became a standard pose for slaves in imaginative literature" (97).

to have reported "everything precisely" (πάντα ἀκριβῶς ἐμήνυσεν). But despite the precision of the report, the narrator goes on to say that, "It seemed unbelievable that not even the corpse lay there" (ἄπιστον ἐδόκει τὸ μηδὲ τὴν νεκρὰν κεῖσθαι, 3.3.3). Earlier Chariton showed that a slave's deception could be just as precise and detailed as an accurate account of the truth. Here, though, the narrator acknowledges that his own tale (the disappearance of a seemingly dead girl from her tomb), even though it is accurately reported within the fabula through the agency of an anonymous messenger, is met with incredulity by the characters themselves. However careful and precise the narration, it remains inherently implausible. As unbelievable as it may seem, Rumor's paradoxical report and the messenger's accurate account match up exactly. In Chariton's constructed world, it is difficult to distinguish between Φήμη and ἀκρίβεια. The literary gestures which mimic historiography (the overtly Thucydidean prologue, for instance) contrast with the fantastic quality of the story, and therefore enhance the novel's paradoxical nature.

The complicated relationship between ἀκρίβεια and truth is expressed also in the problematic ethical formations of Chariton's characters. Dionysius, who has been agitated by his own jealousy, is delighted when he hears that his estate manager Phocas has set fire to the Syracusan trireme which was sent to retrieve Callirhoe from Miletus. Phocas tells his master to cheer up: "Chaereas is dead; the ship has been destroyed; there is no longer any reason to fear" (Χαιρέας τέθνηκεν· ἀπόλωλεν ἡ ναῦς· οὐδεὶς ἔτι φόβος, 3.9.10). The narrator then explains that "These words revived Dionysius and little by little returning again to himself he started asking in a detailed manner about everything" (ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ψυχὴν ἐνέθηκε Διονυσίῳ, καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον πάλιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος ἀκριβῶς ἐπυνθάνετο πάντα, 3.9.11). After Phocas' full account is related in indirect speech, the narrator indicates the great joy felt by Dionysius after hearing the news. Dionysius knows that the destruction of the ship was wrong (he calls it an ἀδίκημα at 3.9.12) and he concedes that he himself would never have given such an order; nevertheless he is relieved that Chaereas now seems to be out of the picture. Succumbing to the nagging suspicion that Chaereas' corpse has not been produced, Dionysius tells Phocas that he should have sought out the young man's body, and he manages to mitigate his jealousy with some slight concern for religious piety, "for he would have happened upon a proper burial and I myself would have been able to be more confident" (καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἂν ἔτυχε τάφου κἀγὼ βεβαιότερον ἔσχον τὸ θαρρεῖν).

Ryan Balot correctly asserts that Dionysius' need for secrecy in this matter (σιγᾶν, 3.10.1) "makes sense only if he believes *he has done something wrong* … Although Dionysius has not himself committed a murder, he is so overtaken by erotic passion that he feels surprisingly little compunction about his steward's and his own underhanded activities."[18] And so Dionysius' anxious desire to know all the details (ἀκριβῶς ἐπυνθάνετο πάντα, 3.9.11) about Phocas' attack on the Syracusan trireme, though it is an attempt to discover truth, is ultimately part of Dionysius' strategy for *preventing* the truth from being known. He wants Phocas to give him a detailed account of what really happened only so that he might conceal select facts from Callirhoe. Balot suggests that, "Erotic attack has transformed Dionysius into a competitive, paranoid lover, who has almost begun to lose the moral way of looking at things."[19] I would add that Dionysius' moral dilemma participates also in the novel's meta-narrative commentary on the problematic relationship between history and fiction. Earlier Chariton established a paradoxical equality between Φήμη and ἀκρίβεια (3.3.2–3): sometimes even a precise account is bound to seem unbelievable, and part of the pleasure of Chariton's narrative is being able to discern what John Morgan has called the narrator's "strategies of realism,"[20] or the ways in which the narrator tries to persuade the reader that he or she is reading fact and not fiction. Here, though, Chariton depicts how, under the influence of Aphrodite and Eros, the significance of narrative precision, the bedrock of Thucydidean historiography, is transformed. It is no longer a means to an educative end as it is in Thucydides (1.22.4), but rather ἀκρίβεια becomes a means of deception: the more details Dionysius knows, the better able he is to craft a fiction for his bride.

The final reference to narrative ἀκρίβεια in the text occurs in the last book of the novel, after Chaereas and Callirhoe have been reunited on Aradus. Callirhoe has told her husband everything she can about her time in the east, passing over in silence that which she is too ashamed to tell (8.1.15). Sensing the arousal of his innate jealousy, Callirhoe quickly shifts the topic from her marriage with Dionysius and instead tells Chaereas about his son. For his part, Chaereas declares that, though he might have treated the Persian King somewhat harshly in his rush to vengeance, he has not shamed Callirhoe. He tells his wife that he has filled the land and the sea with victory trophies, and the narrator adds that Chaereas "gave a detailed

[18] Balot 1998: 149–150.
[19] Balot 1998: 150.
[20] Morgan 1993: 205.

account of everything, priding himself on his successes" (πάντα ἀκριβῶς διηγήσατο, ἐναβρυνόμενος τοῖς κατορθώμασιν, 8.1.17). Hägg persuasively argues that such a recapitulation in indirect speech implies that Chaereas' account does not contradict events as they were depicted in the narrative. When a character's version of events *do* contradict what really happened, the character's account is related in direct speech and can therefore be checked against the account of the narrator, "which," Hägg asserts, "is intended for objective information."[21] In other words, according to Hägg, since the narrator merely tells us that Chaereas described everything in detail, without showing us what he really said, we must take Chaereas at his word (or, rather, at the narrator's word). By Hägg's formulation, Chaereas' account of events is legitimized by the narrator.

A full interpretation of the reunion between Chaereas and Callirhoe depends upon a comparison with the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope in the *Odyssey*; Chariton even quotes the Homeric scene within his own text.[22] It is clear in Chariton's text that Callirhoe is not entirely forthcoming about Dionysius: "when she came to Miletus in her story, she became silent in shame" (ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦκεν εἰς Μίλητον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, Καλλιρόη μὲν ἐσιώπησε αἰδουμένη, 8.1.15).[23] On the one hand, Callirhoe's silence about her sexual life with Dionysius places her in the role of the cunning Odysseus, implying perhaps that Chaereas may be read as a steadfast Penelope figure. A re-evaluation of the Homeric text however reveals that there is no simple binary opposition between Odysseus' fictive revision of events and Penelope's truthful steadfastness. Penelope is often vocal about her enmity towards the suitors, but there are indications in Homer's text that Penelope sometimes feels flattered by her uninvited guests (Hom. *Od*. 15.20–24 and 18.158–165) and that she even sympathizes with them from time to time (19.535–553).[24] What she says to Odysseus upon his return (23.302–305) is only what she thinks he might want to hear, since she is in fact tacit about her latent sympathies for the suitors. Penelope's silence about her occasional complicity with the suitors parallels not only Odysseus' manipulation of actual events, but also Cal-

---

[21] Hägg 1971: 253. Consider Plangon's speech to Dionysius when she falsely quotes Callirhoe (3.1.6), or Phocas' claim that Chaereas is dead, when in fact he is not (3.9.10).

[22] ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο (Ch. 8.1.17=Hom. *Od*. 23.296).

[23] See Goldhill 1995: 132.

[24] This last example is the dream that Penelope tells to Odysseus, in which her pet geese are killed by an attacking eagle. Bernard Knox writes that, "In the dream the eagle identifies himself as Odysseus and the geese as the suitors, but not before Penelope has spoken of her delight in watching the geese and her unbridled sorrow at their destruction" (1996: 54).

lirhoe's elision of the whole truth: all of the players are either concealing information or providing a distorted account of events. Is it realistic therefore to assume that Chaereas' own account is free of distortion? Even if he provides Callirhoe with an account of events as legitimized by the narrator (as Hägg shows), what is there to say that Chaereas does not embellish the truth for his own rhetorical glorification?

The narrator says that Chaereas "gave a detailed account of everything" (πάντα ἀκριβῶς διηγήσατο, 8.1.17), but Chariton has already dissolved the simple equality between ἀκρίβεια and truth. For Chariton, narrative precision and descriptive accuracy do not reflect real history *per se*; rather they are part of the arsenal of the literary artificer, tools of make believe. It is also significant that the narrator uses the verb διηγήσατο to describe Chaereas' narrative action, for this is the same verb with which the narrator introduces his own story at the beginning of the novel (πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι, 1.1.1). In that instance the narrator was calling attention to the paradoxical union between prose narrative (i.e. historiography) and imaginative fiction, and so when the narrator applies the verb to Chaereas at the end of the novel, the reader naturally wonders if Chaereas too is blurring the line between fiction and history. The reader is similarly cautioned by the description of Chaereas as "priding himself on his successes" (ἐναβρυνόμενος τοῖς κατορθώμασιν, 8.1.17). There is more than a hint of arrogance here, and we must believe that in his transformation into valiant war hero Chaereas has also become something of an Odyssean braggart or a *miles gloriosus* of New Comedy. And so, even if he does provide his wife with a truthful account of his martial achievements, there is sufficient evidence for reading πάντα ἀκριβῶς not as a mirror of actual events, but as an amplified version of the truth.

Chariton's narrative cleverly plays with the notion of narrative precision (ἀκρίβεια) and demonstrates that in addition to being a tool for reporting what actually happened, ἀκρίβεια also has a function within the scheme of creative lying. As a tenet of Thucydidean methodology, ἀκρίβεια is destabilized by Chariton's narrative, and the historical novel thereby undermines the very notion of "true history." Chariton is not alone in this literary game. It is little wonder that in the following century Lucian describes the detailed account of his fantastic journey to the moon and to the limits of the known world as ἀληθῆ διηγήματα. Chariton's text certainly suggests an admiration for Thucydidean prose, but at the same time the text does not hesitate to parody Thucydides' declaration of precision and truth. I do not mean to suggest that Chariton trivializes legitimate historical inquiry. I suggest rather

that Chariton lays bare the impossibility of a completely truthful account and a narrative devoid of the pleasures of fiction. Despite the intent for truth, prose narrative is unavoidably also a form of *mimēsis*: rhetoric and literary artifice always distort. By blurring the line between fact and fiction and by revealing the fluidity between genres (history, epic, drama, oratory) in the novel, Chariton calls attention to the artificial quality of his own text and, by extension, even to the self-proclaimed precision of a Thucydidean account. If a πάθος ἐρωτικόν can be dressed up to read like history, then as a consequence historiography's latent artificiality and potential for fiction become all the more apparent.[25]

3 *Xenophon's Legacy: Persia and Power in the Athenian Imagination*

Chariton's novel alludes to Xenophon's *Cyropaideia* more than to any other work of an Athenian writer.[26] As Perry saw it, Xenophon's proto-novel was the primary inspiration for Chariton's novel, and there is much in Xenophon's work to inspire romance, not least of which are the education and formation of a great man (Cyrus himself) and the erotic devotion that is depicted between Abradatas, the king of Susa, and his wife Panthea. More particularly, it is the collision of these two spheres (the education of the great man embodying σωφροσύνη and the destructive power of ἔρως) in Xenophon's work that would have such a fundamental role in shaping Chariton's novel.

James Tatum writes that, "Cyrus' strategies for empire require that he maintain a certain distance from other people."[27] Xenophon's text is, after all, about the cultivation of an individual whose self-mastery (ἐγκρατεῖα) is

---

[25] Thucydides wrote that the methodological ἀκρίβεια of his history would detract from its pleasure (Thuc. 1.22). Hunter explains, though, that, "Neither theory nor practice, of course, ever envisaged a completely strict division between, on the one hand, pleasure-giving fiction (usually associated with poetry) and, on the other, a truthfulness which was indifferent to pleasure and usually associated with prose." And, while Hunter notes that there is in Chariton's novel a charming "didacticism which benefits readers," the *telos* of Chariton's novel (cf. esp. Ch. 8.1.4) is ultimately "the pleasure of fiction," a decidedly un-Thucydidean goal (Hunter 1994: 1070).

[26] Cf. Papanikolaou 1973: 19–20. The quotations and evocations are numerous: Ch. 2.3.10 = Xen. *Cyr*. 5.1.24; Ch. 2.5.7 = Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.3; Ch. 4.1.12 = Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.6; Ch. 4.5.3 = Xen. *Cyr*. 4.1.3; Ch. 5.2.2 = Xen. *Cyr*. 2.1.9; Ch. 5.2.9 = Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.11; Ch. 5.3.10 = Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.10; Ch. 6.3.9 = Xen. *Cyr*. 7.5.53; Ch. 6.4.2 = Xen. *Cyr*. 8.3.13; Ch. 6.8.7 = Xen. *Cyr*. 6.1.30; Ch. 6.9.5 = Xen. *Cyr*. 7.1.32; Ch. 6.9.6 = Xen. *Cyr*. 4.2.2.

[27] Tatum 1989: 163.

such that he provides a stable focus for an emerging empire, and part of the cultivation of Cyrus' steadfast character is a trial before the destabilizing force of *erōs*. Panthea "is said to have been the most beautiful woman in Asia" (καλλίστη δὴ λέγεται ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ γυνὴ γενέσθαι, 4.6.11),[28] and for this reason she is chosen as a gift for the conquering Cyrus as part of the spoils of war. There follows a lengthy dialogue on love, reminiscent of the erotic dialogues of both Plato and Xenophon and indicative of the anxieties about *erōs* that characterize so much of the literature from the classical period.[29] Cyrus, who has not yet laid eyes upon the woman, has handed over guardianship of Panthea to his childhood friend Araspas, who *has* seen Panthea. Naturally, Araspas is curious why Cyrus would deny himself the pleasure of Panthea's beauty. Cyrus says, "I myself have seen men weep in pain on account of love, and I have seen them become slaves to the objects of their desire, even though before they were in love they thought it an especially base thing to be a slave" (ἀλλ' ἐγώ, ἔφη, ἑώρακα καὶ κλαίοντας ὑπὸ λύπης δι' ἔρωτα, καὶ δουλεύοντάς γε τοῖς ἐρωμένοις καὶ μάλα κακὸν νομίζοντας πρὶν ἐρᾶν τὸ δουλεύειν, 5.1.12). Against this position, Araspas claims that "such men are inferior" (οἱ τοιοῦτοι μοχθηροί, 5.1.13), but Araspas himself quickly falls in love with his charge and becomes enslaved by his desire for Panthea (5.1.18), proving that he is in fact the weaker man.

Tatum points out that whereas Cyrus denies himself the pleasure of looking at Panthea, in Chariton's novel, "the lovers' first gaze is the point of departure for the hero and heroine."[30] We are reminded that when they first saw each other, Chaereas and Callirhoe "swiftly infected each other with erotic passion" (ταχέως οὖν πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἀντέδωκαν ἀλλήλοις, 1.1.6). The erotic moment, which for Xenophon's subject was so problematic, becomes for Chariton the departure for romance. For Xenophon, *erōs* is merely one obstacle among many which are necessary for Cyrus to overcome, but for Chariton, *erōs* is the organizing principle of his narrative. Arthur Heiser-

[28] I follow Marchant's Oxford text. Translations of Xenophon, unless otherwise stated, are my own.

[29] This anxiety was of course the focus for Foucault as he analyzed "how sexual behavior was constituted, in Greek thought, as a domain of ethical practice in the form of the *aphrodisia*, of pleasurable acts situated in an agonistic field of forces difficult to control. In order to take the form of a conduct that was rationally and morally admissible, these acts required a strategy of moderation and timing, of quantity and opportunity; and this strategy aimed at an exact self-mastery – as its culmination and consummation – whereby the subject would be 'stronger than himself' even in the power that he exercised over others" (1990: 250). Not surprisingly, these are precisely the concerns of Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*.

[30] Tatum 1989: 166.

man has said that Aphrodite "is at once [Callirhoe's] divine enemy and her divine protectress, the source of her worldly success and her moral suffering. Chariton's plot resolves all the paradoxes from which it springs by reconciling our desire to be Aphrodisian with our desire to be good."[31] Chaereas' own sufferings, on the other hand, are the result of his insult to Aphrodite (ὕβρισεν εἰς τὴν χάριν, 8.1.3). By the end of the novel he is reconciled with Aphrodite and restored to his bride, but the reader is left wondering whether his erotic attachment will continue to provoke his innate jealousy, prompting another insult to the goddess.

The ethical concerns of Xenophon's fictional biography are reflected even in the depiction of Chariton's secondary characters, especially Dionysius and Artaxerxes. Dionysius' erotic obsession with Callirhoe produces a physical wasting and a nearly complete dissolution of his character (2.4.4–5). Tatum accurately assesses the way in which Chariton's novel responds to the work of the Athenian writer:

> If Dionysius was a reader of the *Cyropaedia* it did not fortify him for the sight of Callirhoe. For Cyrus, the fairest woman in all of Asia is a momentary intrusion of the destabilizing power of Eros in the tightly controlled world of his evolving empire. The opposite is the case with Dionysius. He has the misfortune of trying to be a responsible officeholder in a world that is as masterfully run by Eros as Cyrus' world is run by him. Hence the charming inversion of ordinary values typical of Chariton and the Greek novelists: the god Eros regards Dionysius' efforts to maintain self-restraint (*sophrosynê*) as *hybris*, its very opposite. Dionysius has already lost the case he is trying to argue, and he knows it.[32]

This inversion of values that Tatum sees in reference to Dionysius occurs also with Artaxerxes in what is perhaps one of the most colorful set-pieces of the novel, the hunting scene. A brief exposition of the hunting motif in the *Cyropaideia* is necessary for establishing the material upon which Chariton drew for his novel.

In Xenophon's work, the hunt is invested with much value in the educational formation of a great leader.[33] During the extended exposition of the

---

[31] Heiserman 1977: 77.

[32] Tatum 1989: 168.

[33] See also Xenophon's *Cynegetikos* 1.1–18 and 12.1, in which the author discusses the hunt's divine origins and its value as training for war. The edition of Phillips and Willcock (1999) is particularly helpful for the technical aspects of Xenophon's treatise.

customs and character of the Persian state (as fictitiously depicted by Xenophon), the narrator of the *Cyropaideia* explains that the Persians "teach hunting at public expense, and the king himself, just as in war, leads the ephebes in the hunting party; he himself both hunts and teaches the others how to hunt, because this seems to them the truest exercise for war" (δημοσίᾳ τοῦ θηρᾶν ἐπιμέλονται, καὶ βασιλεὺς ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ ἡγεμών ἐστι αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός τε θηρᾷ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιμελεῖται ὅπως ἂν θηρῶσιν, ὅτι ἀληθεστάτη αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ εἶναι αὕτη ἡ μελέτη τῶν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, 1.2.10). Later we learn of Cyrus' own enthusiasm for the hunt. Having been carefully instructed on how to behave while out in the open, Cyrus nevertheless forgets everything that he was taught when he catches sight of a deer (πάντων ἐπιλαθόμενος ὧν ἤκουσεν, 1.4.8), and he impetuously rides off in pursuit, "seeing nothing but in which direction it fled" (οὐδὲν ἄλλο ὁρῶν ἢ ὅπῃ ἔφευγε). Though his behavior is reprimanded by both his guardians and his uncle, he is nevertheless granted a second opportunity to hunt in the wild. Astyages, Cyrus' grandfather, instructs his men that they should not throw their spears "until Cyrus has had his fill of hunting" (πρὶν Κῦρος ἐμπλησθείη θηρῶν, 1.4.14), but Cyrus explains to his grandfather that he would only truly enjoy the hunt if his companions should "compete, so that each might perform his very best" (διαγωνίζεσθαι ὅπως <ἂν> ἕκαστος κράτιστα δύναιτο). Cyrus has already belittled the easy hunt of the stocked *paradeison* (1.4.11), and he here further demonstrates his desire for true competition; if the educative purpose of the hunt is preparation for war, then the hunt should be as similar to war as possible.

Immediately following the accounts of Cyrus' youthful hunting expeditions among the Medes, the narrator explains that at that time the Assyrian prince had set out on his own hunting expedition along the borders between Media and Assyria and was making preparations for incursions even into Median territory. The reason for the Assyrian prince's sudden activity, the narrator explains, was so that he might provide for the feasting of his marriage celebration. Conscious of the dangers involved in an expedition into neighboring territory, the prince had taken with him a large body of cavalry and peltasts (1.4.16). Word is then sent to Astyages that enemy Assyrians have entered Median territory, and at once the Medes set off into the countryside to meet the invaders. Cyrus, still a very young man of only fifteen or sixteen years old and inexperienced in real warfare, is eager to join with his grandfather's men: "he put on his armor then for the first time, thinking that he would never have the opportunity, so eager was he to arm himself completely. And the armor which his grandfather had made for his body fit him

beautifully. Thus having armed himself completely, he set out upon his horse" (αὐτὸς πρῶτον τότε ὅπλα ἐνδύς, οὔποτε οἰόμενος· οὕτως ἐπεθύμει αὐτοῖς ἐξοπλίσασθαι· μάλα δὲ καλὰ ἦν καὶ ἁρμόττοντα αὐτῷ ἃ ὁ πάππος περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐπεποίητο. οὕτω δὴ ἐξοπλισάμενος προσήλασε τῷ ἵππῳ, 1.4.18). Cyrus devises an effective plan for the battle against the Assyrians, but he is overwhelmed by his zeal and his impetuous nature gets the better of him, as the narrator illustrates with a quasi-epic simile: "Just as when a well-bred but inexperienced hunting dog charges without foresight at a boar, so even Cyrus charged, aiming only to strike the enemy falling into his hands, and mindful of nothing else" (ὥσπερ δὲ κύων γενναῖος ἄπειρος ἀπρονοήτως φέρεται πρὸς κάπρον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κῦρος ἐφέρετο, μόνον ὁρῶν τὸ παίειν τὸν ἁλισκόμενον, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν προνοῶν, 1.4.21). After the victory, Cyrus continues to revel in his success, so much so that to Astyages he seems "frenzied with daring" (μαινόμενον … τῇ τολμῃ, 1.4.24). As they make their way homeward, "Cyrus rode amidst the bodies of the fallen enemies and gazed upon them in wonder" (τοὺς πεπτωκότας περιελαύνων ἐθεᾶτο). When Cyrus is brought back before Astyages, he sees that "his grandfather's face is angry on account of his gloating" (τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πάππου ἠγριωμένον ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ τῇ αὐτοῦ).

This is problematic behavior for a man who is supposed to be marked by prudence and who will one day establish the great Persian Empire. But Cyrus does in fact become a prudent man; as he matures, he outgrows his recklessness. Tatum writes that, "Cyrus learns to repress this kind of revealing conduct: it does not become the young man who has done so well as the grandson of Astyages. This lesson in discretion is the last thing he learns from his grandfather."[34] Therefore that seemingly insignificant glower of disapproval from Astyages is actually full of meaning for its recipient; it is a didactic gesture from one generation to another, an ethics lesson taught with signs rather than with language.

For the depiction of the Persian King in his own narrative, Chariton appropriates the ethics of the hunt deployed by Xenophon, but whereas Cyrus' growth is positive (he overcomes the strategic and ethical obstacles in hunt and warfare), Artaxerxes fails and becomes the victim of the god Eros. Artaxerxes' hunting party is organized at the suggestion of the eunuch Artaxates as a means of distracting the King from thoughts of Callirhoe. The Persian nobility and a portion of the army ride out with their king, but of all who are worth gazing upon, Artaxerxes shines most (πάντων δὲ ὄντων ἀξιοθεάτων διαπρεπέστατος ἦν, 6.4.1). He is described as wearing the very finest hunt-

[34] Tatum 1989: 111.

ing garments, and he is said even to carry exotic paraphernalia: his horse is decked out in gold armor and he himself carries a gold dagger and is armed with Chinese arrows.[35] The narrator says that,

> καθῆστο δὲ σοβαρός· ἔστι γὰρ ἴδιον ἔρωτος <τὸ> φιλόκοσμον· ἤθελε δὲ μέσος ὑπὸ Καλλιρόης ὁραθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τῆς πόλεως ἁπάσης ἐξιὼν περιέβλεπεν εἴ που κἀκείνη θεᾶται τὴν πομπήν. ταχέως δὲ ἐνεπλήσθη τὰ ὄρη βοώντων, θεόντων, κυνῶν ὑλασσόντων, ἵππων χρεμετιζόντων, θηρῶν ἐλαυνομένων. ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ ὁ θόρυβος ἐκεῖνος αὐτὸν ἐξέστησεν ἂν [καὶ] τὸν Ἔρωτα· τέρψις γὰρ ἦν μετ᾽ ἀγωνίας καὶ χαρὰ μετὰ φόβου καὶ κίνδυνος ἡδύς.
>
> Artaxerxes sat pompous in the saddle, for Love loves dressing up. He wanted to be seen in the very center by Callirhoe, and setting out through the whole city he looked around to see if she was watching the procession. Quickly the mountains were filled with men shouting, running, dogs barking, horses whinnying, and game being chased. The excitement and that uproar would have amazed even Eros himself, for there was enjoyment in the contest, there was fear in the delight, and the danger of it all was sweet. (6.4.3–4)

In Xenophon's text, Cyrus and his young companions take great pleasure in the exercise of the hunt, but the purpose of the hunt is very clearly marked as education for war (consider how Cyrus' hunting bleeds gradually into a *real* war with the hunting Assyrians). In Chariton's text, by contrast, the King and his followers hunt for leisurely distraction and, most importantly, to be seen as objects of desire. Notice particularly Chariton's adjectives for emphasizing surface appearance (σοβαρός, φιλόκοσμον, σεμνός) or the abundance of verbs of seeing (ὁραθῆναι, περιέβλεπεν, θεᾶται, ἔβλεπε). In the motivations behind the hunt there is already in Chariton's narrative a marked difference from Xenophon's text.

Though not obvious, there is a latent eroticism in Xenophon's depiction of the hunt in the *Cyropaideia*, for the battle against the Assyrians was brought about by the Assyrian prince's desire to hunt and provide game for his wedding celebrations (γαμεῖν μέλλων, 1.4.16). Furthermore, Cyrus's armor is said to fit his body beautifully (καλά, 1.4.18). But where Chariton de-emphasizes the hunt's didactic purposes, he cleverly amplifies the hunt's latent erotic dynamic: for Xenophon's Persians, the hunt was a metaphor for war, but within Chariton's narrative, the hunt becomes a metaphor for the

[35] Cf. Alvares 1993: 75–77.

erotic pursuit. Though he is dressed in hunting attire and though he is ostensibly hunting game, Artaxerxes is really just a lover pursuing the object of his desire. The game is twice described with passive participles (θηρῶν ἐλαυνομένων, διωκομένων), a play on the manner of referring to objects of desire in the passive voice as ἐρώμενοι/ἐρώμεναι. The emotional vicissitudes of the hunt match exactly the emotions of a furtive sexual tryst: "there was enjoyment in the contest, there was fear in the delight, and the danger of it all was sweet" (τέρψις γὰρ ἦν μετ' ἀγωνίας, καὶ χαρὰ μετὰ φόβου, καὶ κίνδυνος ἡδύς). Hence the narrator's remark that even Eros would have been amazed at the hunters' excitement. A reader could easily imagine the same sentiments in a poem by one of the Roman elegiac poets.

When Cyrus does finally engage in battle after training in the hunt, the simile employed by the narrator to describe his *aristeia* fixes upon his single-mindedness and his focus on the task at hand (μόνον ὁρῶν τὸ παίειν τὸν ἁλισκόμενον, 1.4.21). He charges at the enemy without forethought (ἀπρονοήτως), but he is nevertheless successful in his endeavor. In his description of Artaxerxes, by contrast, Chariton highlights the Persian King's distractedness.

> ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς οὔτε ἵππον ἔβλεπε, τοσούτων [ἱππέων] αὐτῷ παραθεόντων, οὔτε θηρίον, τοσούτων διωκομένων, οὔτε κυνὸς ἤκουε, τοσούτων ὑλακτούντων, οὔτε ἀνθρώπου, πάντων βοώντων. ἔβλεπε δὲ Καλλιρόην μόνην τὴν μὴ παροῦσαν, καὶ ἤκουεν ἐκείνης τῆς μὴ λαλούσης.
> But the king saw no horse, though so many horses ran along side him; he saw no game, though so much game was being pursued; he heard no dog, though so many dogs were barking; and he heard no man, though all were shouting. Though she was not present, he saw Callirhoe only, and he heard her, though she was not speaking. (6.4.4–5)

The rhetorical parallelism reinforces Artaxerxes' inability to see not only the quarry before him, but his entire surroundings. Amidst the bucolic setting and amidst the noises of dogs and men, the narrator stresses that Callirhoe is *not* present, that she is *not* speaking. Cyrus saw only the goal before him, namely striking down whoever passed before his view. Artaxerxes, on the other hand is consumed by what is absent: he hears and sees *only* Callirhoe. If Artaxerxes' hunting party was engineered by his eunuch as a distraction for the King from his obsession over Callirhoe, then the hunt has failed utterly in its intention.

Artaxerxes' defeat is marked by the narrator when he explains that "Eros accompanied him to the hunt" (συνεξῆλθε γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν ὁ Ἔρως αὐτῷ, 6.4.5). We were told by the narrator at the beginning of the novel that Eros rejoices in unexpected triumphs (χαίρει τοῖς παραδόξοις κατορθώμασιν, 1.1.4), and this scene in particular is evidence for his delight in the ironic, for the King thought that Eros "set fire to his soul by means of that very thing which was meant to cure him" (δι' αὐτῆς τῆς θεραπείας ἐξέκαυσε τὴν ψυχήν, 6.4.5). Eros whispers into the King's ear about what Callirhoe would look like if she were here beside him, and he excites the King with a nearly pornographic description of the young woman, "having girded her dress up to her knees, her arms naked, her face flushed red, her breast heaving" (κνήμας ἀνεζωσμένην καὶ βραχίονας γεγυμνωμένην, πρόσωπον ἐρυθήματος πλῆρες, στῆθος ἀσταθμήτον). Artaxerxes does not resist the erotic image etched before his mind's eye, and he is burned further by love as he imagines Callirhoe before him.[36]

I return to Tatum's conclusion that, "For Cyrus, the fairest woman in all of Asia is a momentary intrusion of the destabilizing power of Eros in the tightly controlled world of his evolving empire. The opposite is the case with Dionysius."[37] The opposite is also the case with Artaxerxes. Though for Xenophon the hunt and the Panthea episodes were distinct modes for representing Cyrus' developing σωφροσύνη (self-mastery in war and self-mastery in the face of *erōs* respectively), Chariton coalesces these two modes into a single mode of representation which has a double effect. First, given an erotic context, the hunt's significance as a war game is diminished, suggesting the overall decadence of the Persian court. This assumption is challenged, though, when Artaxerxes successfully quashes the Egyptian rebellion at the end of the novel (8.1.3) – once again, Eros delights in unexpected triumphs. Second, in Xenophon's text the hunt was an ennobling exercise, but in Chariton's text it serves to reveal the essential weakness of a supposedly powerful man. Cyrus said that Eros made slaves out of men (Xen. *Cyr*. 5.1.12), and so he therefore refused to lay eyes upon the most beautiful woman in Asia. And even though Cyrus was vulnerable to the temptations of gazing boastfully upon the bodies of those fallen in battle, Cyrus' grandfather prevented the development of this kind of behavior by applying the necessary ethical correction (1.4.24). Artaxerxes on the other hand is consumed by the gaze even when the object of his desire is absent. The narrator makes much of Artaxerxes' preening and his dramatic, royal apparel, but the

[36] See also Daude 2001: 147–148.
[37] Tatum 1989: 168.

result of the hunt compels the reader to revise his or her prior interpretation: the King's grandeur and majestic appearance are subverted to become not a show of power but a mark of passivity, for it is Artaxerxes himself who is manipulated (cf. ἔστι γὰρ ἴδιον ἔρωτος τὸ φιλόκοσμον, 6.4.3, with Cyrus' arming for battle against the Assyrians, Xen. *Cyr*. 1.4.18). In what is supposed to have been an ennobling exercise, Artaxerxes is instead transformed into a slave, conquered by Eros. Though he started out as the hunter, he nevertheless ends up as the hunted. Chariton clearly looked to Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia* for inspiration, but he just as clearly bends Xenophontean tropes to suit the purposes of romance.

Laplace has noted the parallel between Cyrus' refusal to lay eyes upon Panthea and Chaereas' own refusal to lay eyes upon the beautiful woman who has become his captive on Aradus, and who in fact, though he does not know it, is his wife, Callirhoe (7.6.4–7). Cyrus' protection of Panthea and the part he played in reuniting Panthea with her husband Abradatas secure Abradatas' assistance in Cyrus' army. Panthea says to her husband, "I think that we owe a great favor to Cyrus because when I became a captive and when I was chosen to belong to him, he thought I was unworthy of being owned as a slave or even as a free woman with a dishonored name, and he watched over me on your behalf, receiving me just as he would the wife of his own brother" (καὶ Κύρῳ δὲ μεγάλην τινὰ δοκῶ ἡμᾶς χάριν ὀφείλειν, ὅτι με αἰχμάλωτον γενομένην καὶ ἐξαιρεθεῖσαν αὐτῷ οὔτε ὡς δούλην ἠξίωσε κεκτῆσθαι οὔτε ὡς ἐλευθέραν ἐν ἀτίμῳ ὀνόματι, διεφύλαξε δὲ σοὶ ὥσπερ ἀδελφοῦ γυναῖκα λαβών, 6.4.7).[38] As a result of Cyrus' ethical steadfastness and his preservation of Panthea for her husband Abradatas, Eros' problematic relationship with ideal leadership is resolved, or, as Laplace puts it, "Les exigences de l'amour conjugal et de la politique sont satisfaites."[39]

In Chariton's novel, however, Aphrodite is, as Schmeling has written, "the prime mover of the plot."[40] While Eros is demonstrated to have a disruptive effect on all the characters' lives, it is paradoxically the *erōs* of the conjugal union which binds together the hero and heroine and forms the conclusion of the novel. Though Chaereas is at first hesitant to lay eyes upon

---

[38] On the similarity of Callirhoe's language to that of Panthea, Reardon writes that, "L'histoire romantique et bien connue d'Abradatas et Pantheia apporte au roman de Xénophon une charge émotive véhiculée par la situation angoissante d'une femme. C'est pour cela que Chariton l'évoque. Son roman, plus que les autres, est fait de cela: moins des aventures de ses héros que de la situation angoissante de son héroïne, qu'il met à tout moment au premier plan de son action" (2001: 21).

[39] Laplace 1997: 67.

[40] Schmeling 1974: 21.

his beautiful captive, and though he recognizes his moral duty in honoring the girl's chastity (πρέπει γάρ μοι σωφροσύνην τιμᾶν, 7.6.12), he himself is not undone when he finally lays eyes upon the girl. The experience becomes for Chaereas not the enslaving form of Eros feared by Cyrus and experienced within the novel by Dionysius and Artaxerxes, but rather a "mutual passion"[41] that is marked by fidelity in marriage. Laplace notes that in Chariton's novel, as in Xenophon's, "retrouvailles conjugales et pacte d'amitié entre ennemis militaires réconciliés composent aussi le dénouement heureux ménagé par Aphrodite."[42] Just as the reunion between Panthea and Abradatas benefits Cyrus' imperial strategy, so the reunions of Callirhoe and Chaereas and Artaxerxes and Stateira stabilize the relationship between Syracuse and Persia (8.4.1–3). But even such idealizations of conjugal *erōs* are made problematic within the narrative: the reader, like the Persians in Babylon (6.1.5), wonder if Chaereas' innate jealousy will again be aroused, and Callirhoe herself blushes at and passes over in silence the subject of her own sexual activity as Dionysius' wife (8.1.15).

Chariton also drew upon Xenophon's *Anabasis* for inspiration, an appropriate model considering that in the second half of the novel Chariton and his band of Greek mercenaries (like Xenophon and his own mercenaries) assist in a plot to overthrow the Persian King, become stranded in the East, and then set out on a long journey homeward. More specifically, in his depiction of Chaereas' leadership qualities, Chariton draws upon Xenophon's own assumption of leadership in the *Anabasis* and the speech that he delivers to his men before they engage with an enemy Persian army (3.2.7–32).[43] But just as he had adapted the hunting motif for his own purposes, so here does Chariton modify Xenophon's behavior and the content of his speech so that it better fits his own text. Xenophon's lengthy speech is intended to bolster the spirits of his mercenary army on the eve of battle. They have already been defeated in the battle of Cunaxa, in which Cyrus (not the Cyrus of the *Cyropaedeia*, but a descendant of that Great King)[44] attempted to wrest

---

[41] Konstan 1994: 57.

[42] Laplace 1997: 67.

[43] Laplace (1997: 51) discusses this speech briefly in establishing Chariton's text as a response to both Xenophon's *Anabasis* and Isocrates' *Philippus*, in which Isocrates refers to the expedition of Xenophon's Ten-Thousand as an attempt to incite Philip of Macedon "to take the lead of both the unity of the Greeks and the expedition against the barbarians" (προστῆναι τῆς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁμονοίας καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους στρατείας, 5.16).

[44] Tatum notes that the death of Panthea's husband Abradatas in the *Cyropaedeia* "is a variation of the death of Cyrus the Younger at Cunaxa as Xenophon describes it in the

power from his brother Artaxerxes (the same Artaxerxes depicted in Chariton's novel), who had taken the throne after the death of their father Darius. Now stranded in enemy territory, the Greek army is faced yet again by the Persian foe. Xenophon advises the captains to take immediate action against the Persians, but instead of making a violent grab for power, he prudently offers to take up the position of rallying the troops, letting the choice rest with the captains themselves. "If you want to set out for this purpose," he says, "then I myself want to follow you; but if you yourselves appoint me as leader, then I make no excuse for my youth; rather I think that I am mature enough to protect myself from what is bad" (κἀγὼ δέ, εἰ μὲν ὑμεῖς ἐθέλετε ἐξορμᾶν ἐπὶ ταῦτα, ἕπεσθαι ὑμῖν βούλομαι, εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς τάττετ' ἐμὲ ἡγεῖσθαι οὐδὲν προφασίζομαι τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκμάζειν ἡγοῦμαι ἐρύκειν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ τὰ κακά, 3.1.25).

Addressing the army, Xenophon says first that he and his men are pious, whereas the Persians are impious; therefore the Greeks have the gods on their side. And even though the Greeks are outnumbered by the Persians, the gods are powerful enough to turn the tide of a battle in their favor, should the gods so wish it (ὅταν βούλωνται, 3.2.10). Brave men are saved, he says, with the help of the gods (σὺν τοῖς θεοῖς, 3.2.11). He reminds them of the threat that the Persians presented to their forefathers, when Darius' army intended to wipe out Athens in 490 BC; the Athenians dared to resist them (ὑποστῆναι αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι) and were victorious at Marathon. And then later in 480 BC, when Xerxes gathered together an unimaginably large army (ἀναρίθμητον στρατιάν, 3.2.13), even at that time did their own forefathers defeat the forefathers of the Persians. Xenophon declares that, "the proof of these past events is to see the trophies, and the greatest witness of these past events is the freedom of those cities in which you yourselves were born and raised, for you abase yourselves before no mortal master, but before the gods. You belong to such ancestors as these" (ὧν ἔστι μὲν τεκμήρια ὁρᾶν τὰ τρόπαια, μέγιστον δὲ μαρτύριον ἡ ἐλευθερία τῶν πόλεων ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐγένεσθε καὶ ἐτράφητε· οὐδένα γὰρ ἄνθρωπον δεσπότην ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε.

Anabasis … The episode of Cunaxa revisited can also be related to the imperial designs of the monarch and the novelist of the *Cyropaideia*. Abradatas is an ideal warrior for a monarch like Cyrus because he is willing to fight and die for his leader. And he is not much more than an embodiment of that virtue. He dies like Cyrus the Younger because Xenophon wishes to place Cyrus the Younger and the grand scheme which ended at Cunaxa into the place they belong, so far as the *Cyropaedeia* is concerned: heroic adventure and bravery must be subordinate to the imperial designs of the new ruler" (1989: 181–182). For more on the intertextuality within the corpus of Xenophon's works, see Sage 1991 and 1995.

τοιούτων μέν ἐστε προγόνων). When Xenophon's men, fighting in the army of Cyrus at Cunaxa, first went up against the Persians, they saw that the enemy army was unimaginably large (πλῆθος ἄμετρον ὁρῶντες, 3.2.16). Nevertheless they dared to march against them with the aid of their forefathers' spirit and thought (σὺν τῷ πατρῴῳ φρονήματι). Xenophon concludes his lengthy speech by soliciting any better plans from among the soldiers, for he does not let his personal pride interfere with the pursuit of their common salvation (εἰ δέ τι ἄλλο βέλτιον ἢ ταύτῃ, τολμάτω καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης διδάσκειν· πάντες γὰρ κοινῆς σωτηρίας δεόμεθα, 3.2.32).

Chaereas' speech to his men is far shorter than Xenophon's, but he strikes all the same notes. Like Xenophon, Chaereas remarks that the affairs of mortals are ultimately in the hands of the gods, and he piously tells the Egyptian leader that victory is possible with the aid of the gods (νικῶμεν γάρ, ἂν θεοὶ θέλωσι, 7.3.4). Addressing his chosen soldiers before their invasion of Tyre, he says that because they are Greeks, they are more valorous than others; their task is therefore easier than it may seem. Like Xenophon, Chaereas provides as an historical example the valor of the Greeks during the Persian Wars, but whereas Xenophon focused on the Athenian victory at Marathon, Chaereas focuses instead on the Spartan resistance at Thermopylae, saying that just as many Greeks at that time provided a bulwark against Xerxes' army (Ἕλληνες ἐν Θερμοπύλαις τοσοῦτοι Ξέρξην ὑπέστησαν, 7.3.9). Whereas Xerxes' army was five million strong (πεντακόσιαι μυριάδες), the Tyrians are not nearly so many in number. Rather, he says, the Tyrians are few and they rely upon disdain and pretension, and not upon thought and prudence (καταφρονήσει μετ' ἀλαζονείας, οὐ φρονήματι μετ' εὐβουλίας χρώμενοι).

Just as Xenophon allowed his leadership to be voted upon by the captains (Xen. *An*. 3.1.25), so too does Chaereas put it to a vote among his men. He says, "I myself am not eager to be general; rather I am prepared to follow whoever should desire to lead you" (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ στρατηγίας, ἀλλ' ἕτοιμος ἀκολουθεῖν ὅστις ἂν ὑμῶν ἄρχειν θέλῃ, Ch. 7.3.10). If someone else should desire to take the lead, then Chaereas will be an obedient leader, since he is eager not for his own glory but for the glory of all of them in common (ἐπεὶ καὶ δόξης οὐκ ἐμῆς ἀλλὰ κοινῆς ὀρέγομαι). But of course all the men cheer him on and declare that, "you are our general!" (σὺ στρατήγει). Chaereas once again mentions the importance of religious piety and notes that they will be glorified with the help of the gods (σὺν θεοῖς ἔνδοξοι, 7.3.11). Re-emphasizing the Thermopylae analogy, Chaereas recalls the three-hundred of Othryades and Leonidas and says that his own men will be equally

commemorated (ὡς πάντες ὑμνοῦσι τοὺς μετὰ Ὀθρυάδου ἢ τοὺς μετὰ Λεωνίδου, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς μετὰ Χαιρέου τριακοσίους ἀνευφημήσουσιν).[45]

Though Leonidas was a great hero from history, and though he and his Spartans succeeded in fending off the Persian army for two days, they all died at the hands of the enemy. Why then does Chariton alter the Xenophontean model at this point? Why, in other words, does he change Xenophon's reference to the Athenian victory at Marathon and put in Chaereas' mouth instead a reference to Spartan glory at Thermopylae? Within each context, each reference makes perfect sense. Xenophon, after all, was an Athenian, and so we might expect him to remind his fellow Greeks of the victory at Marathon. But in Chariton's novel, the narrator has made no mention of *any* Athenians among Chaereas' troops (7.3.7), and Chaereas is trying to appeal specifically to their Dorian sense of pride. He even marks himself not just as a Greek, but as a Dorian by race (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς Ἕλλην εἰμί, Συρακόσιος, γένος Δωριεύς, 7.3.8). Within the context of the novel, therefore, a reference to Thermopylae instead of Marathon is entirely appropriate.

Considering, though, how carefully Athens has been depicted or referred to in the novel, I am not inclined to pass over this elision of Athenian history with a single explanation alone. Throughout the novel, Syracusans such as Hermocrates and Callirhoe continually mention Athens as a means of talking about themselves, asserting that their glory derives from their victory over Athens. The pirate Theron provides an extensive criticism of the character of the Athenian polis and remarks that the judicial procedure of this presumably democratic state is more akin to tyranny (1.11.6–8). Similarly Artaxerxes expresses his relationship to Hermocrates and Syracuse by their shared enmity of Athens (5.8.8). For as much as the characters declare their outright hatred of or mere opposition to Athens, they nevertheless reinforce its cultural significance by constantly referring to it. Though they adopt a pose of resistance, they cannot escape Athens' overarching influence. I maintain that on the meta-narrative level Chariton self-consciously adopts the attitude of his characters and plays with the notion of an unavoidable confrontation with the Athenian literary tradition.

We saw this critical authorial humor first when the narrator flirted with the idea of taking the plot to Athens, only to turn abruptly away from that

[45] The text here is corrupt. F has Μιθριδάτου, which is surely incorrect; Reardon prints D'Orville's Μιλτιάδου, but I prefer D'Orville's other conjecture: Ὀθρυάδου, a more appropriate exemplum since he, like Leonidas (whose place in the text is secure), is Spartan and both men led a force of 300 men, Othryades in supplication of Croesus (Hdt. 1.82), and Leonidas in the defensive action at Thermopylae.

option by allowing Theron to convince his pirates to sail off for Miletus instead (1.11.6–8). As the narrator reports via direct discourse Chaereas' speech to his men, Chariton establishes a dialogic relationship between his text and Xenophon's, but then noticeably elides a reference to Athenian glory at Marathon, preferring instead a reference to Spartan glory at Thermopylae, even if that means darkening the victory of Chaereas' three-hundred with a sense of impending doom: Leonidas and his men achieved an eternal fame, but they met a bloody death. Of course, the foreshadowing motivated by the allusion is empty, for Chaereas and his men eventually return safely to Syracuse. Chariton acknowledges his indebtedness to classical Athenian literature and in the same gesture asserts his innovation; the allusive technique suggests Chariton's continuity with the literary tradition and paradoxically also marks his departure from it. Chariton plays with the Athenian literary tradition, allowing himself to become inspired by, but not hesitating to bend or shape his models as desired. He therefore locates part of his originality as a literary artist in his revision of the Athenian literary past.

4 Paradigms of Empire and The Invasion Motif

When Callirhoe consents to a marriage in Miletus, Dionysius is eager for the wedding, not only because he is lovesick for Callirhoe (like Chaereas before him), but also because he fears the swift flight of Rumor (Φήμη, 3.2.7). In his anxiety he imagines that Syracuse has already heard about Callirhoe's abduction by pirates, and he worries that Miletus will itself soon be invaded by the warships of Hermocrates, who will demand back his daughter (καταπλεύσουσιν ἤδη τριήρεις Συρακοσίων καὶ Ἑρμοκράτης στρατηγὸς ἀπαιτῶν τὴν θυγατέρα, 3.2.8). This is an interesting reversal of the picture of Syracuse received from historiography and constructed thus far by Chariton's own narrative: famed as the great defender against Athenian aggression, in Dionysius' mind Syracuse here becomes itself an aggressor. Syracuse might be more justified in an attack against Miletus than was Athens' invasion of Syracuse. But the momentary image of Syracuse sailing against a foreign state reinforces for the reader the latent similarities between Syracuse and its arch-rival, Athens. We already know that, like Athens, Syracuse is characterized by a πολυπραγμοσύνη, and Dionysius corroborates that characterization when he imagines that Syracuse could be easily set in motion by the activities of Φήμη.

Meanwhile, back in Sicily, the people of Syracuse arrange for the embassy to set sail at public expense and on the very same flagship which led the Syracusans to victory over the Athenians and which still bears the symbols of that victory (Συρακόσιοι δὲ δημοσίᾳ τὸν στόλον ἐξέπεμψαν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο εἰς ἀξίωμα προστεθῇ τῆς πρεσβείας. καθείλκυσαν οὖν ἐκείνην τὴν τριήρη τὴν στρατηγικήν, ἔχουσαν ἔτι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς νίκης, 3.5.2–3). When he earlier pleaded with the people of Syracuse to stand by him after Theron's trial, Hermocrates issued the order not to retrieve his daughter, but to "take back a free-born girl" (τὴν ἐλευθέραν ἀπολάβωμεν, 3.4.16). Identifying Callirhoe by her political status, Hermocrates thereby rhetorically defines the rescue mission not as a personal vendetta but as the prerogative of the state. She has, in other words, become a symbol of Syracuse – as an earth-bound Aphrodite, Callirhoe is envisioned as the city's quasi-divine patron. Just as they define themselves in part by their mastery of naval warfare and their victory over the Athenians, the Syracusans also depend upon Callirhoe's divine beauty to enhance their reputation. Callirhoe, in other words, has become more than herself, for in addition to being the daughter of Hermocrates and the wife of Chaereas, she is now also a culturally distinguished and distinguishing emblem of Syracuse generally. And so when the flagship sets out bearing the symbols of the victory over Athens, the reader is invited to imagine Syracuse as mustering all its most powerful regalia, puffing itself up to its most impressive stature. The σημεῖα had earlier been incorporated into Callirhoe's funeral procession as a means of communicating the social order to a domestic audience (1.6.2), but here the σημεῖα τῆς νίκης are deployed for an international audience across the sea. This embassy has been charged with a duty of paramount importance: to bring back a possession which rightly belongs to them, the ἄγαλμα τῆς ὅλης Σικελίας (1.1.1), Syracuse's most precious possession.

The narrator's description of the embassy's departure is another of the novel's important crowd scenes, and as an expression of the *ēthos* of the Syracusan people, it deserves close analysis:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦκεν ἡ κυρία τῆς ἀναγωγῆς ἡμέρα, τὸ πλῆθος εἰς τὸν λιμένα συνέδραμεν, οὐκ ἄνδρες μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες, καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοῦ δάκρυα, εὐχαί, στεναγμοί, παραμυθία, φόβος, θάρσος, ἀπόγνωσις, ἐλπίς.
>
> When the day designated for the expedition arrived, the crowd gathered together at the harbor, not only the men, but women and children too,

> and all at once there were tears, prayers, groans, encouragements, fear, bravery, despair, hope. (3.5.3)

Massimo Fusillo has noted that, "Antithesis and asyndeton depict the people as participating in the love story, giving it an epic and public resonance. Chariton often points out that the people of Syracuse were even more receptive to the couple's adventures than to the famous victory over the Athenians."[46] Fusillo is right to connect this passage with the theme of Athenian defeat that has been so prevalent in the novel up to this point. Only a few lines earlier, the narrator remarked that the embassy's trireme was still bearing the standards of the victory over the Athenians (ἔχουσαν ἔτι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς νίκης, 3.5.3). The combination of that image together with this scene of public farewell at the launch of a naval expedition, motivates a close comparison with a different farewell scene: Thucydides' account of the Athenian people bidding goodbye to their fleet at the launch of the Sicilian expedition.

In one of the most famous passages from his history, as the Athenian army makes its way from Athens to the Piraeus in 415, Thucydides writes that:

> ξυγκατέβη δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὅμιλος ἅπας ὡς εἰπεῖν ὁ ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ἀστῶν καὶ ξένων, οἱ μὲν ἐπιχώριοι τοὺς σφετέρους αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι προπέμποντες, οἱ μὲν ἑταίρους, οἱ δὲ ξυγγενεῖς, οἱ δὲ υἱεῖς, καὶ μετ' ἐλπίδος τε ἅμα ἰόντες καὶ ὀλοφυρμῶν …
> And even another whole crowd went down with them, that is to say, everyone in the city, both townspeople and foreigners, everyone living in the country sending off their own men, some sending off their companions, others their relatives, others their sons, and all of them together proceeding with both hope and lamentations … (6.30.2)

Then after an extensive account of the magnitude of the Athenians' naval force and their preparations for departure, Thucydides comments that,

---

[46] Fusillo 1999: 68. Fusillo brilliantly demonstrates that the conflict of emotions is a common motif in the Greek romances, and in Chariton in particular, "we end up with a framework of variants which may be used for this *topos*. On a thematic axis the conflict of emotions may imply a group of characters and assume a more theatrical dimension, or a single character, with a more psychological one. At a stylistic level it takes the form either of an asyndetic accumulation of abstract nouns or more elaborate forms based on verbs" (67).

> εἰ γάρ τις ἐλογίσατο τήν τε τῆς πόλεως ἀνάλωσιν δημοσίαν καὶ τῶν στρατευομένων τὴν ἰδίαν, … πολλὰ ἂν τάλαντα ηὑρέθη ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τὰ πάντα ἐξαγόμενα. καὶ ὁ στόλος οὐχ ἧσσον τόλμης τε θάμβει καὶ ὄψεως λαμπρότητι περιβόητος ἐγένετο ἢ στρατιᾶς πρὸς οὓς ἐπῆσαν ὑπερβολῇ, καὶ ὅτι μέγιστος ἤδη διάπλους ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας καὶ ἐπὶ μεγίστῃ ἐλπίδι τῶν μελλόντων πρὸς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐπεχειρήθη.
> If someone reckoned both the public expenditure of the city and the private expenditure of those serving in the army, … then it would be found that a great many talents of all that they possessed were being taken out of the city. And the expedition was no less famed for the amazement of its daring and the splendor of its appearance than for the superiority of the army against whom they were advancing, and because it was now the greatest naval voyage from home yet attempted and the most ambitious in its expectations considering the resources of those undertaking it.[47] (6.31.5–6)

When the ships are at last ready to depart, the members of the army "perform the prayers customary prior to an expedition, not each to their own ship, but all the people together under the guidance of a herald" (εὐχὰς δὲ τὰς νομιζομένας πρὸ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς οὐ κατὰ ναῦν ἑκάστην, ξύμπαντες δὲ ὑπὸ κήρυκος ἐποιοῦντο, 6.32.1). Thucydides recounts that the army was joined in these final preparations and words of farewell by the general populace: "A different crowd prayed along with them, consisting of the citizens on land and any other well-wishers who were present. Then having raised the *paian* and having completed their libations, they set sail" (ξυνεπηύχοντο δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὅμιλος ὁ ἐκ τῆς γῆς τῶν τε πολιτῶν καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος εὔνους παρῆν σφίσιν. παιανίσαντες δὲ καὶ τελεώσαντες τὰς σπονδὰς ἀνήγοντο, 6.32.2).

Not only is the scene in Chariton's novel generally reminiscent of the Thucydidean scene, but Chariton also uses some of the same vocabulary as Thucydides in describing both the expedition and the emotions stirred by the expedition. Both authors refer to the expedition as a στόλος (Thuc. 6.31.6; Ch. 3.5.2), and both authors note that the expedition has been funded at public expense (ἀνάλωσιν δημοσίαν, Thuc. 6.31.5; δημοσίᾳ, Ch. 3.5.2). In Thycidides and Chariton, the actual naval launch itself is referred to as an ἀναγωγή (Thuc. 6.32.1; Ch. 3.5.3). The Sicilian expedition is said by Thucydides to have been renowned for its daring (τόλμης, 6.31.6) and for the splendor of its appearance (ὄψεως λαμπρότητι), and it was the greatest naval undertaking in history (μέγιστος ἤδη διάπλους). Similarly, the Syracusans

[47] The last sentence is adapted from Crawley's translation in Strassler 1998.

want their public involvement in the expedition to increase the embassy's prestige (καὶ τοῦτο εἰς ἀξίωμα προστεθῇ τῆς πρεσβείας, 3.5.2). Thucydides says that the entire polis accompanies the fleet, and he emphasizes the close communal bonds of the people as they bid farewell to companions, relatives, and sons (6.30.2); the narrator in Chariton's novel likewise notes that the crowd which gathers on the shore consists not just of the men, but also of the women and children (3.5.3). In Thucydides' narrative, there is an uncomfortable intermingling of hope and lament (μετ' ἐλπίδος τε ἅμα ἰόντες καὶ ὀλοφυρμῶν, 6.30.2), and the launch of the fleet is precededed by prayers (εὐχὰς, 6.32.1), the raising of the *paian*, and libations. The asyndetic catalogue with which Chariton's scene climaxes sets a similar, though more impressionistic mood, in which religious ritual is augmented by the conflicting emotions of expectation and sadness (καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοῦ δάκρυα, εὐχαί, στεναγμοί, παραμυθία, φόβος, θάρσος, ἀπόγνωσις, ἐλπίς, 3.5.3).

Chariton has therefore modelled his depiction of a Syracusan expedition to Ionia on Thucydides' account of the Athenian expedition to Syracuse. Earlier I suggested that Dionysius' anxiety concerning a possible invasion by Hermocrates and the Syracusan fleet (3.2.8) was an ironic reversal of the picture of Syracuse received from historiography, in which Syracuse is traditionally drawn as the sympathetic defender against foreign invasion. Here, however, that reversal is transformed from a potentiality to an actuality. Bolstered by their recent victory over the Athenians, and proudly displaying the symbols of that victory on their flagship, the Syracusan embassy has become the image of a "Sicilian expedition" in miniature, with Syracuse no longer the object, but the subject of invasion. By continually emphasizing an opposition to Athens as an integral part of Syracuse's self-constructed identity, the narrator gradually reveals Syracuse's evolution into precisely that which it has so vehemently opposed. I grant that there are major contextual differences between Athens' Sicilian expedition and the Syracusan embassy to retrieve Callirhoe: the one is an expression of undisguised, imperialist aggression, while the other is a comparatively benign search and recovery operation for a kidnapped citizen. Nevertheless, the common tone and lexical similarities between the Thucydidean passage and Chariton's description motivate a strong intertextual reading: this is our author at his most playfully allusive, consciously evoking a famous literary passage and simultaneously inverting it for his own paradoxical purposes. Bearing the σημεῖα τῆς νίκης, appropriating for itself the qualities of its defeated opponent, the Syracusan embassy unwittingly becomes an alternate version of its enemy.

Like the expedition of the Athenians, the Syracusan embassy is also ill-fated. The narrator shifts the reader's attention to events on Dionysius' estate, where Phocas, Dionysius' estate manager, discovers that a foreign trireme has landed. After befriending the crew he learns that they have arrived to retrieve Callirhoe. Hoping to prevent trouble for his master, Phocas takes affairs into his own hands and persuades a garrison of local non-Greeks (φρούριον βαρβάρων, 3.7.2) to attack the crew and set fire to their ship at midnight. With the raid accomplished, the locals enslave the surviving Syracusans, among whom are Chaereas and Polycharmus who are sold together to a man in Caria named Mithridates. Later, Dionysius stages a public inquiry, having instructed Phocas to conceal only the fact that the attack on the trireme was orchestrated and that some of the crew were still alive. With Callirhoe present, local people from the surrounding countryside (who had been told exactly what to say)[48] are summoned by Dionysius and asked to give testimony to what had happened. They all provide the same account: "Unknown barbarian pirates making an attack during the night set fire to a Greek warship which had anchored on the beach the previous day, and the next morning we saw the water mixed with blood and corpses borne beneath the waves" (βάρβαροί ποθεν λῃσταὶ νυκτὸς καταδραμόντες ἐνέπρησαν Ἑλληνικὴν τριήρη τῆς προτεραίας ὁρμισθεῖσαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς· καί μεθ' ἡμέραν εἴδομεν αἵματι μεμιγμένον ὕδωρ καὶ νεκροὺς ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων φερομένους, 3.10.2). Cleverly placing this description in the mouths of ἄγροικοι whose testimony has been carefully scripted, the narrator emphasizes the layers of deceit: he wants us to read this passage not as his own omniscient text (i.e. history), but as fabricated text, as pure artifice. Having previously informed the reader that Dionysius' entire inquiry is a staged event, the narrator places the reader in a position of superiority whereby we may better appreciate the subtle ironies of the drama. As a consequence the reader becomes all the more aware of the highly literary texture of the scene. If the launch of the embassy from Syracuse was composed as a Sicilian expedition in miniature, with Syracuse now cast in the role of invader, then the embassy gets an appropriately Thucydidean end in the fictional account of the Ionian countryfolk. The image of bloodied waters and a shore choked by corpses is strikingly reminiscent of Thucydides' description of the desperately thirsty Athenians as they are slaughtered in Sicily: "and the water at once was spoiled, though it was being drunk no less, bloodied as it was and mixed with mud, and it was being fought over by the majority of them" (καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ εὐθὺς

[48] The text is corrupt at this point. Reardon rightly obelizes συγκαλέσας πεισθέντα (3.10.1), but Reiske's emendation makes sense: πεισθέντας τοὺς ἀγροίκους.

διέφθαρτο, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἐπίνετό τε ὁμοῦ τῷ πηλῷ ἡματωμένον καὶ περιμάχητον ἦν τοῖς πολλοῖς, 7.84.5).

Ironically, the final occurrence of the invasion motif in the novel casts Chaereas and Callirhoe themselves as aggressors against Syracuse. Encountering favorable winds during their crossing, Chaereas' and Callirhoe's sea voyage to Sicily from the east is completed in safety. When they are finally in sight of Sicily, the focus suddenly shifts to the shores of Syracuse: "And as people from the city saw them, someone said, 'From where are those triremes advancing? Surely they are not Attic! Come, let us inform Hermocrates'" (ὡς δὲ εἶδον αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, εἶπέ τις "πόθεν τριήρεις προσπλέουσι; μή τι Ἀττικαί; φέρε οὖν μηνύσωμεν Ἑρμοκράτει," 8.6.2). The memory of the Athenian invasion is still fresh in the minds of the people of Syracuse, but the reader is able to look past the people's anxiety and see the humor in the swift shift of perspective – a perfect example of what Hägg has called Chariton's narrative "gliding."[49] Granted the perspectives of both the returning triremes and the Syracusans as they gaze off into the horizon, we are able to appreciate better the irony of the mistaken identity. We of course know that the triremes belong to Chaereas and not to the Athenians, and the crowd's reaction to the possibility of another Athenian invasion seems all the more exaggerated.

The scene is comic, to be sure, but one is tempted to read more deeply into the fact that Chaereas is mistaken for an Athenian invader. Given the meaning that Athens holds for the people of Syracuse (a foreign aggressor, an *other* in opposition to which their own identity is constructed), the mistaken identity at 8.6.2 implies a rather sinister transformation on the part of the novel's hero. The Chaereas who is returning from the East is not the same Chaereas who ventured forth from Syracuse to recover his stolen bride. Chaereas has risen in the world since leaving home: at first reduced to slavery, he nevertheless threw himself headfirst into a deadly venture against the Persian King, the very man preventing the reunion with his wife, and in so doing he donned the mantle of a victorious naval general. In the final chapter, I will consider what kind of problematic Athenian Chaereas is imagined as having become. But within the remainder of Book 8 there is ample evidence that Chaereas' advent on the Sicilian shore is not simply the homecoming of a hero, that Chaeras' return in fact has significant political ramifications for Syracuse. And the narrator, I maintain, invites the reader to interpret such political ramifications by focalizing Chaereas' return through the perspective of the Syracusan people, who mistake his triremes for an invad-

[49] Hägg 1971: 38.

ing Athenian fleet. Before looking at Chariton's depiction of the homecoming of his hero and heroine, it is first necessary to consider as part of the classical imperial paradigm the tradition of ethical and political transformations central to Herodotean and Thucydidean representation of 5th century Athens.

The motif of imperial transformation or becoming-like-one's-own-enemy has strong precedents in Greek historiography. Herodotus' elaborate narratives about the ironic reversals suffered as the result of man's hubristic transgressions against ethical, natural, and divine limits may be read as cautionary tales for the Athenians of the late 5th century about the dangers of imperialism.[50] The earliest such story in Herodotus' history has particular resonance with Chariton's novel. Candaules, the ruler of Sardis, is said to conceive an *erōs* for – wonder of wonders – his own wife (ὁ Κανδαύλης ἠράσθη τῆς ἑωυτοῦ γυναικός, Hdt. 1.8.1) and to boast of her beauty to his bodyguard and confidant, Gyges, whom he allows to spy on his wife as she undresses. But when Candaules' wife quickly understands that she is secretly being spied upon, she summons Gyges and offers him one of two options: "There are now two roads present before you, Gyges, and I grant you the choice down which you might turn" (νῦν τοι δυῶν ὁδῶν παρεουσέων, Γύγη, δίδωμι αἵρεσιν, ὁκοτέρην βούλεαι τραπέσθαι, 1.11.2). Gyges must either kill Candaules and gain for himself both Candaules' wife and kingdom, or he must kill himself for having seen what he ought not to have seen. Gyges chooses to save himself. Ironically, Candaules' pride in his greatest possession, his wife, leads to his destruction at her own hands.

In Chariton's novel, nearly the exact same words are used by the eunuch Artaxates when he presents Callirhoe with the option of either submitting to the Persian King's erotic advances or facing the deadly consequences of disobeying the King. "It is up to you," says Artaxates, "down which of two roads you want to turn" (πάρεστιν οὖν σοι δυοῖν ὁδοῖν ὁποτέραν βούλει τρέπεσθαι, Ch. 6.7.7).[51] As usual, though, Chariton cleverly inverts the Herodotean themes to suit his own narrative. In Herodotus' story, Candaules is beaten at his own game by his wife: the husband may attempt erotic deception, but *successful* erotic deception is the province of the woman. In Chariton's story, on the other hand, Callirhoe retains her integrity, despite the fact that she is the object of desire. Even though she is conscious of the power of her beauty, in this situation she does not *use* that power to her own advan-

[50] See Moles 2002 and Blösel 2004, who sees in Herodotus' characterization of Themistocles a reflection of the contradictions which define contemporary Athenian imperialism.

[51] Papanikolaou 1973: 17–18; Goold 1995: 313.

tage in any obvious way. In Chariton's narrative, erotic beauty makes Callirhoe not a mistress of deceit and cunning (as it does Candaules' wife), but rather a victim trapped amid the royal intrigues at Babylon. The allusion to the story of Gyges and Candaules furthermore reminds the reader of the voyeuristic impulses triggered by Callirhoe and, on a metatextual level, by *Callirhoe*. Just as Gyges becomes the secret viewer of Candaules' wife as she undresses in her bedroom, so too does the reader become the secret viewer of Callirhoe as she bathes in Miletus (2.2.2–4).[52] The Herodotean intertext subtly subverts readerly σωφροσύνη, inviting reflection upon how the desire generated by erotic fiction may destabilize the ethical integrity of the reader, just as erotic desire destroys Herodotus' Candaules and nearly destroys Chariton's Dionysius and Artaxerxes.[53]

The loss of power resulting from individual overreaching is staged again by Herodotus in the story of Croesus, who, failing to conquer the empire that he believes was promised to him by the Delphic oracle, is revealed to be a fool of Fortune when he becomes the subject of the man by whom he was defeated, Cyrus the Great. Croesus' diminished status is complete when he dedicates as a gift at Delphi his own fetters (1.90). He who once thought himself to be the most blessed of all men is in the end reduced to a slave. But such reversals brought about by man's *hybris* are not just charming stories from a legendary past, as indicated by Herodotus' depiction of Xerxes' transgressive crossing of the Hellespont (7.36ff.). Herodotus' elaborate account of the crossing is a narrative turning of the screw, compelling the reader to wonder at Xerxes' own blindness when he fails to recognize the dreadful import of his being mistaken for Zeus by one of the locals. "O Zeus," a man of the Hellespont says, "why did you take the form of a Persian man and use the name Xerxes instead of Zeus? And do you wish to destroy Greece, leading all your people with you? You could have done this without them" (7.56). But Xerxes succumbs to his own vanity, remaining ignorant of the transgressive nature of his imperial designs. Chariton's own penchant for narrative irony is deeply Herodotean, for the narrative energy of both texts seems to stem from an Eros who "delights in paradoxical successes" (χαίρει τοῖς παραδόξοις κατορθώμασιν, 1.1.4).

---

[52] Elsom 1992: 221–222; Egger 1994; Hunter 1994: 1073–1076; Haynes 2003: 47.

[53] Compare the narrator's prayer for moderation in the prologue of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*: ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν. For the influence of the Gyges and Candaules story on later romantic fiction generally, see Trenkner 1958: 4, 24ff.

But personal greed and imperial aggression are not solely Persian characteristics in Herodotus, as is indicated by a critique of Athenian foreign policy in Book 8 of the *History*. Themistocles himself, the architect of Athenian naval power and the chief cause of Athens' victory over the Persians in 479, becomes for Herodotus the symbol of 5th century Athenian imperialism.[54] Attempting to extort money from the Andrians, Themistocles declares that, "the Athenians came with two great gods to aid them, Persuasion and Necessity [Πειθώ τε καὶ Ἀναγκαίην]" (8.111.2). Themistocles is characterized by an insatiable greed (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαύετο πλεονεκτέων, 8.112.1), and when he threatens the Andrians that if they do not pay, he will "lead the army of the Greeks against them and destroy them by siege" (ἐπάξει τὴν στρατιὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ πολιορκέων ἐξαιρήσει), it is hard not to see the kind of Athenians depicted by Thucydides in the Melian dialogue or the Sicilian Expedition. Readers of Herodotus' *History* are trained by the narrative to expect such expressions of *hybris* and military over-reaching to be corrected by tragic reversals of fortune similar to those suffered by Candaules, Croesus, and Xerxes. The Athenian imperialism articulated by Themistocles should therefore trigger the danger sense in Herodotus' knowing readers, and the message should come across loud and clear: Athenians beware. Athens of course does not heed Herodotus' warning, and we must turn to Thucydides for a fuller account of Athens' transformation from champion of Greek freedom to imperial tyrant.

The siege and destruction of Melos and the Sicilian Expedition are only the most famous of Thucydides' narratives of Athenian aggression. But even in his account of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides' history paints a picture of democratic Athens as dangerously tyrannical. After Sparta's recognition in 432 that the growing Athenian power must be dealt with (1.118.2), there follows a series of antagonistic embassies back and forth from Sparta and Athens as a means of generating pretexts for war. The Spartans' first demand is that the Athenians drive out the curse of the goddess, a curse born nearly a hundred years before, when the Athenians treacherously murdered the would-be usurper and tyrant Cylon even after he had laid himself as a suppliant at the feet of Athena Polias on the Acropolis. There was in fact a practical aim in Sparta's demand, for they knew that Pericles' genealogy was implicated in the legendary curse and their hope was that he might be driven from Athens in order to expiate the goddess (1.127.1). But Sparta's demand is also rhetorically shrewd, for it points to an

[54] Cf. Blösel 2004: 293.

episode from the past that implies Athenian predisposition to tyranny and treachery, even when dealing with its own internal affairs.

Athens responds that Sparta must do its own share of ritual purification and attone both for the curse of Taenarum (which involved the slaying of some Helot suppliants of Poseidon) and the curse of the goddess of the Bronze House, for which Thucydides provides a lengthy narrative. The story centers around the Spartan Pausanias, who nearly forty years before was discovered to have curried favor with Xerxes against the Greek confederacy. This hero of Plataea is said to have "Medized" – the worst possible behavior for a supposed champion of Greek freedom. After being encouraged by Xerxes, Pausanias "was much more elevated and could no longer live in his usual style, but went out of Byzantium dressed in Median fashions [σκευὰς Μηδικάς], and Medes and Egyptians acted as his bodyguards [Μῆδοι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐδορυφόρουν] as he proceeded through Thrace; he dined at a Persian table [τράπεζαν Περσικήν], and he was unable to conceal his intention; rather, in little things [ἔργοις βραχέσι] he gave away what he had in mind to do later on a larger scale [μειζόνως]" (1.130.1). When Pausanias becomes aware that his treachery has been found out, he retreats to the temple of the goddess of the Bronze House, where he is barricaded in and starved by his fellow citizens – an act of impiety for which the Athenians now in 432 demand expiation.

But before returning completely to the narrative frame (the embassies and the pretexts for war in 432), Thucydides takes a moment to connect the Athenian Themistocles with the Medizing Spartan Pausanias. When the Spartans demand the punishment of Themistocles, just as they themselves had punished Pausanias, the Athenians willingly comply, for Themistocles had already been ostracized from the city. Pursued therefore by his own people, Themistocles flees to the Persian king Artaxerxes, son of Xerxes and grandfather of the Artaxerxes who reigns in Chariton's novel. While at the Persian court, Themistocles spends his time learning the language and customs of his former enemies, and eventually he "became a great man there, such as no one of the Greeks ever had before, and this was because of the reputation that preceded him and the hope that he held out to the king of enslaving [δουλώσειν] the Greek world, but especially because he showed himself to be intelligent by example" (1.138.2). Thucydides eulogizes Themistocles' innate skill in dealing with crisis, but even in eulogy Themistocles is not cleared of the charge of submitting to Persian slavery. The accounts of Themistocles' death are ambiguous: did he really succumb to disease, as Thucydides claims, or did he, as "some people say" (λέγουσι δέ τινες) com-

mit suicide because he "thought he was unable to fulfill what he had promised the King" (1.138.4)? In the end, Themistocles is defined by Thucydides not as the greatest of Athenian generals and statesmen, but as satrap over Asiatic Magnesia, Lampsacus, and Myos – a position given to him by the Persian King (1.138.5). The secret interment of Themistocles' bones in Attic soil bears a powerful symbolic meaning. Since it was illegal to bury in Attica a traitorous outlaw, the burial of Themistocles' remains is accomplished by his relatives "without the knowledge of the Athenians" (κρύφα Ἀθηναίων, 1.138.6). Though Athens has openly disavowed its former savior, this symbol of unbridled greed and thirst for power is unwittingly sown in Athens' own soil. Athens' imperial desires will be realized only through a process of gradual maturation, and the transformation into an imperial power (Athens' own figurative Medizing) will be complete when she finally launches her massive naval expedition against Sicily in 415. The *sphragis* with which Thucydides concludes his parallel accounts of Pausanias' and Themistocles' deaths suggests that the seductions of Persian imperial desires may tempt not only the Athenians, but the Spartans as well: "So ends the stories of Pausanias the Lacedaimonian and Themistocles the Athenian, the most distinguished Greeks of their time" (1.138.6). The whole of the Greek world, in other words, is vulnerable to the eastern imperial impulse.

This is the paradigm that the historiographic tradition provides for readers of Chariton's narrative of empire: the seductions of empire and the corruption of Greek freedom are conceived by Herodotus and Thucydides through the metaphors of Persian luxury and Greek Medizing. Against the background pattern of Persian and Athenian imperialism Chariton represents the *nostos* of Chaereas and Callirhoe, conflating anxieties of both Persian and Athenian expansionism and suggesting a continuity of tyrannical transformations. Just as Athenian democracy became vulnerable to the overwhelming imperialist desires that characterized Persian expansionism, so too is the Syracusan democracy now vulnerable to the powerful seductions of the east represented by the return of their hero and heroine. If it is not explicit, Chariton's narrative at least begs the question: will Chaereas and Callirhoe heed the warnings of Herodotus and Thucydides, or will they, like Pausanias and Themistocles, like Athens itself, fall prey to their own imperial *erōs*?

With this question in mind, we may now return to the scene of Chaereas' and Callirhoe's homecoming and the Syracusans' mistaken fear that their ships on the horizon represent a second Athenian invasion. The Syracusans send out ships to discover that the advancing fleet is not Athenian, but the

anxiety evoked by Athenian imperial aggression is not entirely neutralized and hovers in the background throughout the dénouement of the novel. When the triremes finally reach shore, the people are abuzz with curiosity, though no one could have imagined that Chaereas was even still alive. Regarding Callirhoe's father the narrator remarks that "Hermocrates held public office, but was in mourning, and at that time he was present, though he eluded notice" (Ἑρμοκράτης δὲ ἐπολιτεύετο μέν, ἀλλὰ πενθῶν, καὶ τότε εἱστήκει μέν, λανθάνων δέ, 8.6.7). The marked use of μέν and δέ in the description of Hermocrates suggests an internal tension or conflict: on the one hand Hermocrates must fulfill his role as head of state, but on the other hand his role as grieving father prevents him from fulfilling completely his political duty. Such conflict has been apparent throughout the novel, particularly during Callirhoe's funeral procession, where a father's loss becomes a state event (1.6.2–5), and during the trial of Theron, when Hermocrates must rise above his personal grief to act in an official capacity (3.4.16). In other words, Hermocrates is a man divided, and his elusive presence on the shore (λανθάνων δέ) seems to foreshadow his gradual eclipse by his now more famous son-in-law.

The curiosity of the people reaches a climax (πάντων δὲ ἀπορούντων, 8.6.7) as they look upon the deck of the first warship where a tent of Babylonian tapestries has been erected. When the tapestries are drawn apart, like the curtains of a stage, Chaereas is revealed to the people by his general's uniform (σχῆμα ἔχων στρατηγοῦ) as the commander of the fleet, and Callirhoe is seated magnificently beside him upon a couch of beaten gold and wrapped in Tyrian purple (ἐπὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης ἀνακειμένη, Τυρίαν ἀμπεχομένη πορφύραν).[55] Have Chaereas and Callirhoe Medized? The people are thunderstruck at the revelation of the couple, and Hermocrates leaps aboard the ship to embrace his daughter.

Comparisons between Chaereas' return and the events of the recent past are further explored when the rest of the incoming ships finally reach the harbor. The narrator says that, "Then quickly the harbor was filled, and there

[55] The κλίνη χρυσήλατος is a recurring object in Callirhoe's story: she is borne on such a couch during her funeral procession (1.6.2–3), she sleeps with Dionysius and dreams of Chaereas on such a bed (3.7.5–6), she and Chaereas celebrate their reunion on such a bed (8.1.14), and it is on this bed that she is revealed to the people of Syracuse (8.6.7–8). "Contrary to what one might expect," writes Alvares, "gold-plated beds were not fanatically exotic," and by the first century CE they are considered to be "more general articles of luxury" (1993: 64–5). During the funeral, the gold-plated bed symbolized Callirhoe's "nearly divine status" (66), but more generally the bed signifies "wealth and Easternness" (67).

was that scene which took place after the Attic naval battle, for these triremes too sailed back from war crowned with victory, having had the advantage of a Syracusan general" (ταχέως οὖν ὁ λιμὴν ἐπληροῦτο, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σχῆμα τὸ μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν τὴν Ἀττικήν· καὶ αὗται γὰρ αἱ τριήρεις ἐκ πολέμου κατέπλεον ἐστεφανωμέναι, χρησάμεναι Συρακοσίῳ στρατηγῷ, 8.6.10). Syracuse's victory over the Athenians has been the single most important historical event for the people of Syracuse; it has defined to a great extent their collective identity. The arrival of Chaereas' victorious fleet replays the same scene, though that earlier, purely military victory is augmented now by an erotic victory. The wreaths decorating the warships (αἱ τριήρεις … ἐστεφανωμέναι) recall both the wreaths that garlanded Syracusan doorways on the night of Callirhoe and Chaereas' marriage (1.1.13) and the wreaths with which they were showered the night of their reunion on Aradus (8.1.12). Miletus too was garlanded (3.2.15) on the day of Callirhoe's marriage to Dionysius, but since Chaereas has now regained his bride, he has also appropriated for himself the nuptial imagery of the wreath. The wreaths borne by Chaereas' ship are therefore doubly symbolic of war and *erōs*.

Hermocrates' fleet of 413 and Chaereas' returning vessels both had the advantage of a Syracusan general (χρησάμεναι Συρακοσίῳ στρατηγῷ, 8.6.10), and by saying as much the narrator implies a comparison between Hermocrates and Chaereas. Chaereas then addresses his own father and Hermocrates together and bids them to accept from him the wealth of the Great Persian King.

> καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκέλευσεν ἐκκομίζεσθαι ἄργυρόν τε καὶ χρυσὸν ἀναρίθμητον, εἶτα ἐλέφαντα καὶ ἤλεκτρον καὶ ἐσθῆτα καὶ πᾶσαν ὕλης τέχνης τε πολυτέλειαν ἐπέδειξε Συρακοσίοις καὶ κλίνην καὶ τράπεζαν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, ὥστε ἐνεπλήσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, οὐχ ὡς πρότερον ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Σικελικοῦ πενίας Ἀττικῆς, ἀλλὰ, τὸ καινότατον, ἐν εἰρήνῃ λαφύρων Μηδικῶν.
>
> And straightaway he ordered both the silver and countless amounts of gold to be brought out, and then ivory and amber and clothing and every extravagance of material and skill did he show to the Syracusans, even a couch and table belonging to the Great King. And so the whole city was filled, not with Attic poverty as previously from the Sicilian war, but, most surprisingly, with Medic spoils in peacetime. (8.6.12)

It is significant first that the above remarks are not focalized through any one character, or, for that matter, through the voice of the Syracusan people as a

whole. One might go so far as to say that this is an instance of double-focalization (introduced by the ὡς), indicating the perspective of both the narrator *and* the people of Syracuse. The comparison between Chaereas and Hermocrates previously implied is here made explicit by the narrator. The catalogue of Chaereas' spoils of war emphasizes the wealth and significance of his achievement, but this new wealth puts the earlier victory over the Athenians to shame. The spoils of that bloody war were, in the narrator's words, nothing more than "Attic poverty" (πενίας Ἀττικῆς). But ironically in a time of peace (τὸ καινότατον, ἐν εἰρήνῃ) Chaereas has bestowed upon his country an unimaginable bounty from the East.[56] A primary function of the figure of Athens in the novel has been as a means of self-definition and self-glorification for Hermocrates and the Syracusans. But here the narrator changes that function. Before, Athens' glory reflected the even greater glory of Syracuse. Now, however, Athens is trivialized for its poverty, which in turn trivializes Hermocrates' victory over the Athens. Here the expected figure of Athens is inverted for an altogether different purpose: to assert the superiority of Chaereas' martial and erotic achievement and his newfound popular appeal. In the end, the narrator uses Hermocrates' own means of self-definition and self-glorification against him as an indication of his impending displacement by his son-in-law. The democratic people of Syracuse enthusiastically welcome home a general laden with eastern luxury (cf. the σκευὰς Μηδικάς and the τράπεζαν Περσικήν favored by Pausanias at Thuc. 1.130.1).

The people of Syracuse then compel both Chaereas and Callirhoe to proceed to the assembly, where, before listening to a full account of their adventures, they take a moment to thank the gods for their blessings: "First then the people, looking up to heaven, praised the gods, and they felt sure that the favor for this day was greater than for the day of their victory celebrations" (πρῶτον οὖν ὁ δῆμος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέψας εὐφήμει τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ χάριν ἠπίστατο μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἢ τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων …, 8.7.2). Their thanks for the restoration of Syracuse's favorite couple distinctly recall their earlier reaction, reported by the narrator, to the engagement of the young people in Book 1. That day as well did the Syracusans consider "sweeter than the day of their victory celebrations" (ἥδιον ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ἤγαγον οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων, 1.1.13). Once again Athens, and more specifically its defeat, serves as a point of reference for Syracuse's cultural and political life. The Syracusans at first believed (ἤγαγον) that the day of engagement was sweeter than the day of the victory celebrations, but that engagement led to a chain of events that have been

[56] Oudot 1992: 103.

both personally and publicly devastating. And so one naturally wonders if the people's same expression of delight and thanks this time around is equally vain. Though they claim to be sure (ἠπίστατο, 8.7.2), the narrator has made it clear that, barring the guarantee of Aphrodite, the only certainty in his fictional world is uncertainty itself.

At the behest of Hermocrates, who provides a full account of the events in Syracuse leading up to Chaereas' departure, Chaereas launches out on a complete narration of his adventures. The reader is therefore privileged to read the entire fabula in two parts, from the perspective of two different men: Callirhoe's father and her husband (8.7.4–8.8.11).[57] The bi-partite structure of this recapitulation of the fabula suggests a political transition within Syracuse: while Hermocrates lets go his influence within the theatre of the public assembly, Chaereas' influence is in the ascendancy. Chaereas concludes his narrative with the announcement that this is not the last time that Greek ships will be seen on the horizon, for "even another fleet of yours will come from Ionia, and the descendant of Hermocrates will lead it" (ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἄλλος στόλος ἐξ Ἰωνίας ὑμέτερος· ἄξει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἑρμοκράτους ἔκγονος, 8.8.11). Syracuse must look to the East for its political future.

His narrative complete, and comfortable now in his public role, ready to perform his share in the administration of the state, Chaereas proposes citizenship for his fellow Greek mercenaries. After a vote, the Greeks immediately take their place in the city's assembly, and Chaereas grants them each a talent for a successful future as citizens of Syracuse. The narrator ends the episode by noting that "Hermocrates distributed land to the Egyptians, and so they were able to farm" (τοῖς δὲ Αἰγυπτίοις ἀπένειμε χώραν Ἑρμοκράτης, ὥστε ἔχειν αὐτοὺς γεωργεῖν, 8.8.14). Though Hermocrates is still nominally in charge of Syracuse and though there is no direct indication that he has lost his popular appeal, it is nevertheless abundantly clear that Chaereas is a rising star in Syracuse's political arena.

Shifting the scene away from the proceedings in the assembly, the narrator concludes with a quiet moment between Callirhoe and her patron deity Aphrodite. With prayers of thanks, Callirhoe reassures the goddess that she does not begrudge her for her many sufferings. She only pleads that she

---

[57] Laplace notes that, "le rapport entre cette solennité finale, où se déploie principalement l'éloquence de Chairéas, le rôle de Chariton, spectateur-auditeur, supposé de cette fête, et sa fonction de narrateur soucieux du plaisir de ses lecteurs est souligné par la répétition, à chacun de ces trois points du vue, du même commentaire éthique et esthétique sur l'agencement des événements dans la réalité imaginée et dans la narration" (1997: 45).

never again be separated from the husband she loves, that they might live and die together. But it is the narrator who has the final word in the novel: "Such is the story about Callirhoe that I have composed" (Τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα, 8.8.16). The sentence is resonant with echoes of Greek historiography, for the verb συγγράφειν is the same word that Thucydides uses to describe his history of the Peloponnesian war (Thuc. 1.1.1). Just as at the beginning of the novel, the narrator signals to the reader in his quiet dénouement that, though his narrative is an imaginative departure from the historiographic tradition, it is also paradoxically indebted to that tradition. It is a playful indication of the novel's conflicting tendencies, that for as much as the characters in the story resist Athens' military and political hegemony, the narrator bids the reader farewell by alluding to Athens' greatest writer of history.

But Chariton's literary playfulness has a dark side as well. On the face of it, we're given a happy ending: hero and heroine are reunited and return home victorious after their various tribulations. But the final stark reminder of the historiographic discourse on empire within which we are invited to read the novel's dénouement motivates questions that linger in the mind after the narrator's final utterance. The displacement of Hermocrates within Syracuse's guided democracy, the cult of personality suggested by Chaereas' and Callirhoe's celebrated return from the East, and the promised advent of their son from Ionia: all raise concerns about Syracuse's tyrannical future.

5 Rome and the Imagined World

In Chapter 2 I suggested that, based upon the analogies between Rome and Athens popular in both Greek and Latin literature of the 1st century BC and 1st century CE, Chariton's Athens might in some capacity also refer obliquely to Rome. Subsequently, however, I have shown that Chariton's Athens is a polyvalent symbol and may be interpreted in multiple ways; I therefore resist the idea of a one-to-one, allegorical correspondence between Chariton's Athens and Rome. And yet, the Roman imperial context of the 1st century CE is a potential referent for much of the novel's political background and foreground. Simon Swain asserts as much when he writes that, "since Greek identity could not be grounded in the real political world, it had to assert itself in the cultural domain and do so as loudly as possible. The result of this is that, however close individuals got to Rome, overall we notice a certain dis-

tance."[58] Swain of course refers primarily to the sophists of the 2nd century, who penetrated very close indeed to the center of Roman imperial power, but his remarks are equally valid for a writer like Chariton. To repeat Schwartz's apt remark: Rome is "both nowhere and everywhere" in the novel.[59]

Douglas Edwards, Catherine Connors, Jean Alvares and Saundra Schwartz all tend to read Chariton's novel as a literary negotiation between center and periphery, an expression of cultural authority that acknowledges a foreign power on the one hand, but at the same time maintains the cultural independence of the imperial subject and resists complete assimilation. When looking for Rome in the novel, all these scholars situate it not in any one particular imagined geographic location, maintaining rather that Chariton's novel *suggests* Rome as a potential referent. The proposal that I have been indicating goes further: Athens is not a symbol for Rome, but ideas about freedom and empire, relevant to all Greek cultural production in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE, are evoked in Chariton's novel primarily by allusion to a classical Athenian discourse that both reaffirmed and problematized the ideological antithesis between democracy and tyranny. Athenian literature of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, in other words, provided Chariton with the means by which an indirect cultural negotiation with Rome might find expression.

Earlier I wrote that Chariton's text resists a straightforward allegorical interpretation. In the depiction of the Egyptian rebellion against Persia, we cannot read a simple one-to-one correspondence with the Sicilian Expedition, though Chariton does, by his allusions to Thucydides and Xenophon, ask us to read it through the frame of Athenian historiography. Many of the themes may be the same (imperialism, aggression, the intervention of Tyche), but specific elements in the novel do not equate with what one might presume to be their historical counterparts. Thus, the Persians do not necessarily play the role of the Syracusans, and the Egyptians cannot be understood simply as stand-ins for the Athenians. Rome likewise is not depicted in the novel in any straightforward manner. It is certainly inviting to read Persia as Rome. Citing Philostratus, Lucian, and Dio of Prusa, Alvares notes that, "atticizing Greek often applied terms that once described Persian government to Roman administration, with the Roman emperor even called the Great King."[60] Furthermore, the deference of Pharnaces and Mithridates to Dionysius, the most important man in Ionia, "recalls interactions between

[58] Swain 1996: 89.
[59] Schwartz 2003: 391.
[60] Alvares 2001–2002: 120.

high Roman imperial officials and local Greek elites."[61] There is even the suggestion that Mithridates' estate, managed by "an *ergostolos* (4.2.2), the Greek translation of a Roman term," is something of an anachronism from the imperial period. And the trial in Babylon is thought to be similar "to the imperial *conventus*."[62] But despite these parallels, Alvares seems to concede that Persia functions not so much as a symbol for Rome, but rather to suggest more generally "the realities [of] imperial power."[63] Upon closer inspection, one begins to find parallels to Roman power throughout the novel. Schmeling even interprets Chaereas' victorious return to Syracuse "as the triumphant entry of a *Roman* general into Rome."[64] I re-assert that Chariton is more concerned with impressionistic evocation than he is with historical allegory: rather than construct an overly rigid historical parallel, Chariton demonstrates how recurring themes continually shape historical events.

If Chariton is to relate to Rome in any capacity it is within the relationship between the governing body and the governed body, the master and the servant. Margaret Doody's description of the novel's political dimension is tempting: "The Sicilian expedition is a major subject of Thucydides, who tells the story from the Athenian point of view. Here we move to the world of the resistance. In drafting the anti-Athenian Sicilian hero as the heroine's progenitor, Chariton (not himself a Sicilian) seems to be making an anti-imperial point. 'Sicily' comes to represent an escape from tyranny. At the end, some of the bravest among Persia's subjugated peoples (Greeks, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Cypriots) choose to join Chaireas in his return to a free land. A concept of political freedom, even political revolt, hovers behind *Chaireas and Kallirhoē*."[65] But in Chariton's novel, the distinction between freedom and tyranny is not always so clear. Consider Artaxerxes: the supreme ruler of the Persian Empire is reduced to the plaything of Eros; the active hunter becomes the passive hunted. Similarly, Athens, the paragon of democracy, is focalized through the perspective of Theron to become a place where the state officials are more severe than tyrants. Furthermore, when read against the background of imperial paradigms presented in Athenian historiography, Chariton's novel charts an ideological development of the returning hero and heroine from guided democracy to Persian style tyranny. In moving beyond ideological binarism, Chariton's text begins to occupy a

[61] Alvares 2001–2002: 121. See also Jones 1992b: 162.
[62] Alvares 2001–2002: 122. See also Karabélias 1988: 393–394.
[63] Alvares 2001–2002: 121.
[64] Schmeling 1974: 129.
[65] Doody 1996: 36.

more in-between space, acknowledging the complexities and compromises that take place in imperial co-existence.[66]

Chariton's narrator calls his work a πάθος ἐρωτικόν, and it is in those terms that we must first approach the novel. Closely linked with Eros in the πάθος ἐρωτικόν is the ethical concern about σωφροσύνη, self-control. Consider, for example, the anxiety of Longus' narrator as he sets out to tell the story of Daphnis and Chloe: "May the god allow me to write the experiences of others in a state of self-control" (ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν, praef. 4). Self-control is especially problematic in Chariton's novel for the men, namely Chaereas, Dionysius, and Artaxerxes. And from concerns about self-control, a reader moves to questions about prudent leadership: we see how Eros affects Artaxerxes' rule of the empire, and we naturally have questions about the stability of Chaereas' future political career in Syracuse. In its depiction of the Egyptian rebellion, the novel furthermore addresses a subject's resistance to tyranny. In Syracuse, on the other hand, the novel problematizes the simple opposition between democracy and tyranny. Chariton knows that as far as the individual is concerned, true democracy demands the suppression of tyrannical tendencies, and so the reader is made to question the dynamics of Syracusan government and Hermocrates' (and Chaereas') role in that government. Chariton furthermore stages his action against the background of the Sicilian Expedition, perhaps the most famous cautionary tale against unbridled greed and imperialist aggression, and for the Syracusans, the wounds of the Sicilian Expedition are still fresh. Perhaps the greatest paradox in Chariton's novel therefore is not that it is a love story wrapped in the medium of history, but rather that it is a love story which manages to be so politically oriented.

As a critique of imperial power, or rather as a negotiation with imperial power, Chariton's novel does not *need* to mention Rome at all. I conclude with a brief summary of Daniel Selden's theory that the Greek novels are

---

[66] Post-colonial theory is helpful in understanding Chariton's perspective. Homi K. Bhabha provides an interesting entrée for the cultural historian's take on the novel: "Private and public, past and present, the psyche and the social develop an interstitial intimacy. In is an intimacy that questions binary divisions through which such spheres of social experience are often spatially opposed. These spheres of life are linked through an 'in-between' temporality that takes the measure of dwelling at home, while producing an image of the world of history. This is the moment of aesthetic distance that provides the narrative with a double-edge, which like the coloured South African subject represents a hybridity, a difference 'within', a subject that inhabits the rim of an 'in-between' reality. And the inscription of this borderline existence inhabits a stillness of time and a strangeness of framing that creates the discursive 'image' at the crossroads of history and literature, bridging the home and the world" (1994: 13).

characterized generically not by the similarity of their stories,[67] but by their common syllepsis, or comprehension of prior genres. In Plato's *Laws*, the Athenian interlocutor explains that a once clear division between the genres, upheld as something of a musical rule (οὐκ ἐξῆν ἄλλο εἰς ἄλλο καταχρῆσθαι μέλους εἶδος, 700b), gradually gave way to poetic experimentation such that poets began to create confusion among genres (καὶ πάντα εἰς πάντα συνάγοντες, 700e). Out of this poetic "disrespect for law"[68] (παρανομία) followed freedom (συνεφέσπετο δὲ ἐλευθερία, 701a). And out of this overly daring freedom (διὰ δή τινος ἐλευθερίας λίαν ἀποτετολμημένης, 701b) is born "the freedom which makes men not want to submit to their rulers" (ἡ τοῦ μὴ ἐθέλειν τοῖς ἄρχουσι δουλεύειν), a freedom that generally upsets the social order.

Selden notes that, "Whether or not Plato is seriously suggesting that generic mixture is the leading source of Athens's decadence, there is a close connection in his thought between generic prescription and political hierarchy."[69] Despite the political implications of genre-contamination described by Plato's Athenian, "the hallmark of Hellenistic letters became the crossing of literary kinds."[70] And so on one level Chariton's appropriation of prior genres follows in a long line of such literary maneuvers going at least as far back as Callimachus, if not all the way back to Greek lyric's appropriation of epic.

On another level, though, the generic hybridity of Chariton's novel combines with its implicitly political orientation to suggest a relationship between genre and political hierarchy similar to that articulated by Plato. The similarity with Plato's argument is further reinforced by the fact that in Chariton's novel the tension between democracy and tyranny is continually evoked by references to fifth-century Athens. Political hierarchies are undermined within the text primarily by Aphrodite's subversive power, but political hierarchies are also undermined by the conceptual shifts that accompany shifts in genre. The crafty intervention of the slave Plangon, for

---

[67] See *inter alia* Hägg 1983: 5–80, Reardon 1991: 5, and Bowie 1999: 41. Konstan singles out the similarity of the erotic theme and argues that "*erōs* or passionate love as a uniform and reciprocal emotion conditions the fundamental structure of the ancient Greek novels" (1994: 14). Reardon writes that the romantic pattern (1991: 5) "should not be thought of as a checklist: any given element in this conglomeration may be absent in a particular work, but the overall flavor will remain distinctive. In practice we recognize romance readily enough" (1991: 3).

[68] Selden's translation (1994: 40).

[69] Selden 1994: 40.

[70] Selden 1994: 41.

instance, on behalf of her mistress Callirhoe is a convention from the stage of New Comedy,[71] but her deception of Dionysius is achieved by means of a highly developed narrative ἀκρίβεια that has connotations more with Thucydidean historiography than with New Comedy (3.1.6–8). Ostensibly the frame is romance, but in this scene's confrontation between New Comedy and Thucydidean historiography we have what Selden would call "the point of suture between the two irreconcilably divergent codes."[72] The generic shift accomplishes also a shift in power and gender relations: the female gains control over the male, and the servant gains control over the master. And so while texts such as Chariton's "successfully maintain the separation between kinds enjoined by Plato, they serve no single order, but through syllepsis operate as shifters across the basic categories of cultural construction (class, ethnicity, gender, race)."[73]

It is perhaps misleading, therefore, for a modern reader to be looking for Rome in any specific guise within Chariton's text. The early poetry of Ovid comes into direct confrontation with the *princeps* because it was produced from the center of imperial power, and as such it reflects the political coercion toward panegyric.[74] The consequence of such a direct confrontation with the center was of course Ovid's expulsion to the imperial periphery at Tomis. Chariton on the other hand, as an Aphrodisian, reflects the perspective of one already on the periphery, where communication with Rome was by its very nature indirect. For Chariton and other Greek writers of the early empire, identity was cultivated not by reference to present political realities, but by an active engagement with and reappropriation of the classical literary past. But even reappropriating the past was necessarily indirect, for the subversive discourse about Greek freedom demanded the proper conceptualization, the proper genre.[75] Chariton's novel, with its transgressive generic

---

[71] "Plangon is a recognizable type character from New Comedy and mime. She is clearly typecast as the mischievous slave who tends to her master's (Dionysius) business, but who carefully notices how this business can be turned to her own benefit. From extant evidence it seems clear that people of all social and economic classes were aware of, and in fact expected, certain important slave roles in literature to display or illustrate this motif of the cunning slave" (Schmeling 1974: 144).

[72] Selden 1994: 48.

[73] Selden 1994: 51.

[74] Cf. especially the deeply ironic panegyric of Gaius and Augustus in the *Ars Amatoria* (1.177–216).

[75] "The Greek past functioned as a common framework of communication between Greeks and their rulers. Because of this it was not free to take on any guise it chose. Like any ideological formation serving particular interests, it was a necessarily distorted form of communication marked by certain lacunas, repetitions, and equivocations. Thus some

syllepsis and its sophisticated transformations from freedom to tyranny, demonstrates how shifts in perspective and different conceptualizations of the world contain an inherently disruptive potential. Exalting the power of Venus Aphrodite, the πάθος ἐρωτικόν pays literary tribute to the ruling dynasty at Rome, but with its depiction of the erotic undoing of the Persian King, Eros' supreme victim in the narrative, Chariton's novel also offers a vision, however temporary, of imperial power dissolved. While a reader may therefore discover in the text a multitude of imperialist transformations from freedom to tyranny, the narrative also yields evidence of resistance to empire. Chariton's novel makes the powerful statement that this paradox is necessary for survival and for the cultivation of an imperial identity.

---

explicit emphases of Greek freedom were known by the Greeks to be unwelcome to Rome, if expressed in the wrong context. Correspondingly, properly contextualized declamatory themes taken from the Persian or Peloponnesian Wars could be endlessly recycled for both Greek and Roman consumption in perfect safety" (Swain 1996: 67).

7 Chaereas and Alcibiades

Richard Hunter has provocatively written that Chaereas, "has received even worse treatment at the hands of modern critics than has Callirhoe, despite his intriguing introduction."[1] The name Chaereas has a long tradition in Greek comedy,[2] and it is partially within this tradition that Chariton envisioned the hero of his romantic narrative. It is by now clear, however, that Chariton was not influenced solely by dramatic literature. Inquiries into the influence of Middle and New Comedy will continue to shed light on Chariton's appropriation of the literary tradition, but important work has been done recently to explain Chaereas' character in not only literary-historical terms. Hunter cites as a mark of progress in this area Helen Elsom's thesis that Chaereas participates in "the gender patterning of the whole work,"[3] and Ryan Balot's analysis of the ways in which masculinity is constructed in the narrative has been a valuable contribution to Chariton studies.[4]

Equally important have been the interpretations of Chaereas' historical connotations. Pierre Salmon has argued that Chaereas' adventure in the East is modeled in part on the Egyptian revolt against Persia in 360 BC, in which the Athenian Chabrias joined with the Egyptian King Tachos on an expedition into Syria.[5] More recently still, in his attempt to fix Chariton's date in the mid- to late 1st century CE, Ewen Bowie has suggested that in conceiving of his romantic hero Chariton might have been influenced by political events in Rome of recent decades. Tacitus describes one Cassius Chaerea (Κάσσιος Χαιρέας) as a "young man fierce of spirit" (*adulescens animi ferox*, Tac. *Ann.* 1.32) who, as *cohors praetoria*, assassinated the emperor Gaius Caligula on 24 January 41 CE. The tyrannicide is well attested (Plut. *De superst.* 170e; Josephus *AJ* 18.32–114; Paus. 9.27.4; Cassius Dio 59.29).

---

[1] Hunter 1994: 1079.

[2] Aristophanes *Wasps*, 687; Menander *Aspis, Dyskolos, Phasma* (possibly), *fabula incerta* 1 (Arnott 2000: 426–472).

[3] Hunter 1994: 1079; Elsom 1992.

[4] Balot 1998: 139–162.

[5] Salmon 1961: 365–376; Plepelits 1976: 16–17; Alvares 2001: 12–13.

Bowie writes that, "*adulescens animi ferox* well describes Chariton's young Chaereas."[6]

My own reading of the novel's protagonist begins, appropriately enough, at the beginning of Chariton's novel, where the narrator invites the reader to interpret the young hero Chaereas, based upon his superhuman physical beauty, as a kind of Alcibiades (1.1.3). The tradition of representing Alcibiades in literature is a long one, beginning in the classical period with the comedies of Aristophanes and with a series of forensic speeches from the 390s, after Alcibiades' death in 404/3 BC.[7] We receive a fuller picture, though a picture no less clouded by rhetoric, from Thucydides and the Socratic dialogues of Plato and Xenophon. The expansion of the Alcibiades myth is evidenced in the 1st century BC biography by Cornelius Nepos (discussed in Chapter 2), and the Alcibiades tradition culminates in Plutarch's *Life* at the end of the 1st or the beginning of the 2nd century CE. In much the same manner that Chariton is unconcerned with depicting real historical events with detailed precision, so too is he unconcerned with merely masking Alcibiades for the creation of his hero. Rather, the narrator says that Chaereas is *like* Alcibiades (οἷον … Ἀλκιβιάδην), suggesting that, in addition to his physical similarity to Alcibiades, Chaereas is represented by Chariton's narrator in a mode similar to that in which Alcibiades is represented in the artistic tradition. To say that Chaereas is "like Alcibiades" is to conceptualize the romantic hero, to imply that his depiction will satisfy certain generic expectations. And thus to "genre"[8] Chaereas in this manner is on one

---

[6] Bowie 2002: 55. Though he notes that the name Chaereas appears twice in Thucydides (8.74.1, 3; 86.3), Bowie curiously claims that "it was not a very common name" (2002: 55). Bowie thus seems to be disregarding the frequent use of the name in the comic tradition.

[7] These are Isocrates 16 (περὶ τοῦ ζεύγους), Lysias 14 and 15, and [Andocides] 4. Isocrates 16 is a defense of Alcibiades' son (Alcibiades IV, according to J. K. Davies' *Athenian Propertied Families* [Oxford, 1971]) against the charge of Teisias (Diomedes?) that Alcibiades the father had in fact stolen the famous team of horses with which he was victorious in the Olympic games of 416. The speech turns out to be more about Alcibiades the father than about the son. Lysias 14 and 15 are also ostensibly about Alcibiades IV, prosecuting him for illegally serving with the Athenian cavalry. Ultimately, though, the son's reputation rests on that of his father. [Andocides] 4 is a literary exercise: a diatribe against Alcibiades in the persona of Phaeax, with whom Alcibiades engineered the ostracism of Hyperbolus (Plut., *Alc*. 13.4–5). On the question of whether [Andocides] 4 is a "real" speech or a literary exercise, see M. Edwards 1995: 131–136 and Gribble 1999: 154–158. For the representation of Alcibiades in Athenian rhetoric generally, see Gribble 1999: 90–158.

[8] I follow Alistair Fowler's theory of genre: "What literary coding always does is to confirm the work itself as well as its message, not so much maximizing the efficiency as the

level to expand his significance beyond the fabula, to make him relevant within the historical setting, one of the novel's many strategies of realism.[9] But this strategy is not merely historical window dressing, for on another level Alcibiades carries with him an entire network of connotations, and Chaereas' generic association with Alcibiades provides a way for us to better interpret Chaereas in terms of the novel's major themes, namely *erōs*, tyranny, and gender.

This chapter will be divided into three parts. In the first part I will define the Alcibiades genre as an extension of the paradigmatic "great individual" set forth by David Gribble in *Alcibiades and Athens: a Study in Literary Presentation*. This preliminary, theoretical approach will be helpful for identifying the ways in which Chariton develops Chaereas' superlative nature within the narrative; ultimately, however, this general approach will be insufficient for the articulation of Chaereas' particularly Alcibiadean qualities. In the second part of this chapter, therefore, I will describe some of the more detailed, specific parallels in representations of both Alcibiades and Chaereas: the tradition of art and artifice, lion symbolism, shifting political alliances, and oratorical prowess. The chapter will conclude with a treatment of the major themes of the Alcibiades genre (*erōs*, philosophy, and politics) and their implications for Chaereas within Chariton's narrative. I will argue in this section that the ambivalence of Alcibiades' "ethical gender"[10] within the literary tradition can account for Chaereas' seeming transformation from passive feminine victim to active masculine hero. Furthermore, Alcibiades and Chaereas both represent an *erōs* that, when expressed in the political sphere, is associated with tyranny. Just as in classical literature the discourse of erotics participates in the discourse of philosophy and politics, so too do the erotics of Chariton's novel have a philosophical and political dimension.[11]

---

integrity and the pleasure of its communication." Genre is not a system of categorizing literature, but rather a means of conceptualization and therefore of communication; "It is an instrument not of classification or prescription, but of meaning" (1982: 22).

[9] Morgan 1993: 205.

[10] Gribble 1999: 265.

[11] Following Dover, Foucault, Halperin, and Winkler, Wohl writes that "these four scholars defined the study of ancient sexuality as a field of inquiry and set the terms of debate … In its assumption of the systematicity of sexuality (i.e., its assumption that sexuality is a symbolic system, not just a matter of biological fact or individual urges), this scholarship has made it possible to analyze ancient sexuality in the first place. By linking sexuality as a system to other symbolic systems within Greek society (politics or ethics), it has made sexuality an integral part of the study of Greek culture. The focus on sexual norms and protocols has thus been extremely fruitful and now – a decade or, in Dover's case, a

1 The Paradigm of the "Great Individual"

Gribble makes the case that Alcibiades' powerful persona grew out of a *mentalité* in classical Athenian culture whereby the great individual posed a threat to the integrity of the polis. Raised within the polis, the influence of the great individual nevertheless expanded beyond the city walls to the point that his power encompassed a foreign, and, more specifically, non-Athenian political sphere. Gribble cites the *xenia*-based relationships between Cylon and the Megarian Theagenes (Thuc. 1.126), or the landed estates in the Hellespont region controlled by Miltiades, Pisistratus, and even Alcibiades himself: "Control of such external power bases enabled the individual to live literally and figuratively outside the city … and put him in a position to threaten the city."[12] To counter the threat posed by the great individual, defamatory public rhetoric could frame the great individual as an enemy of the state, and the practice of ostracism effectively expelled from the polis men who were deemed to be overly ambitious or just plain dangerous to the political stability.[13] It is an indication of just how great an individual Alcibiades had become in the literary tradition that Plutarch recounts how Alcibiades was himself a master of crafting his public persona through rhetoric and oratory (Plut. *Alc*. 10.2–3) and how he managed to manipulate the democratic practice of ostracism to his own personal advantage (13.3–5).

The great individual is defined by three qualities: *phusis*, *phronēma*, and his superior status. By *phusis* is meant that innate nature within the great individual which is the source of his outward superiority. *Phronēma* is the great individual's high-mindedness, which one might go so far as to call "aggressive pride."[14] The great individual's superior status is not merely the collection of honorifics by which he is distinguished within his society, but rather something more intangible, a quality that persists beyond society's validation of the great individual. Based on depictions in Thucydides, Xeno-

---

quarter century on – represents a status quo in the study of sexuality" (2002: 14). More recent scholarship has challenged some of the fundamental tenets of the Dover-Foucault-Halperin-Winkler approach to ancient sexuality, particularly Davidson 2001. It is not to be denied that sexual behavior in classical Athens went far beyond what was written about by the likes of Plato. In this regard Aristophanes, Lysias, and Aeschines are better than philosophy for reconstructing "what really happened." Nevertheless, the *erastēs*/*erōmenos* model of Greek *paiderastia* remains useful as a key to understanding normative Athenian behavior in the classical period (Wohl 2002: 15).

[12] Gribble 1999: 6.

[13] Gribble 1999: 45.

[14] Gribble 1999: 14.

phon, and Plato, Alcibiades clearly fits the mold of the great individual, and so too, as I will show, does Chariton's romantic hero, Chaereas.

In the *Republic*, Plato defines *phusis* as the source of an individual's ability to learn, his memory, his courage, and his magnificence generally (εὐμάθεια καὶ μνήμη καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ μεγαλοπρέπεια ταύτης εἶναι τῆς φύσεως, 494b1–3). A great *phusis* will have outward effects on the great individual; he will be wealthy, nobly born, handsome, and will have a great stature (πλούσιός τε καὶ γενναῖος, καὶ ἔτι εὐειδὴς καὶ μέγας, 494c6–7). Plato also writes that *phusis* is the source of those who in both the private and public spheres bring about benefits *and* inflict the most damage. Those who possess a small or insignificant *phusis*, on the other hand, never achieve anything of significance either for the private citizen or for the city at large (σμικρὰ δὲ φύσις οὐδὲν μέγα οὐδέποτε οὐδένα οὔτε ἰδιώτην οὔτε πόλιν δρᾷ, 495b5–6). The point is important, for it reveals that *phusis* by itself is neither inherently good nor bad; the benefits or disadvantages of the best *phusis* are, rather, the results of moral orientation. Also relevant is Callicles' argument in the *Gorgias*, that certain *phuseis* are satisfied only by a superlative status in the society of which they are a part: "Nature, though, herself shows that it is just for the better man to possess more than the lesser man, and likewise for the more powerful man to possess more than the weaker man" (ἡ δέ γε οἶμαι φύσις αὐτὴ ἀποφαίνει αὐτό, ὅτι δίκαιόν ἐστιν τὸν ἀμείνω τοῦ χείρονος πλέον ἔχειν καὶ τὸν δυνατώτερον τοῦ ἀδυνατωτέρου, *Grg.* 483c–d).

Alcibiades' charm in his early years was exactly that kind of physical beauty and mental acuity said by Plato to be the marks of a great *phusis*. Alcibiades is said by Socrates to think that he is "first of all the most beautiful and the greatest (and at sight it's clear enough to everyone that in this you aren't lying), and then that you are of the most mighty family in your city, which happens to be the greatest of all the Greek cities" (οἴει γὰρ δὴ εἶναι πρῶτον μὲν κάλλιστός τε καὶ μέγιστος – καὶ τοῦτο μὲν δὴ παντὶ δῆλον ἰδεῖν ὅτι οὐ ψεύδῃ – ἔπειτα νεανικωτάτου γένους ἐν τῇ σεαυτοῦ πόλει, οὔσῃ μεγίστῃ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων, Plato, *Alc. 1* 104a). As the outward sign of his great inner *phusis*, Alcibiades' surpassing beauty is perhaps his most often remarked upon feature. His beauty was so much a literary and artistic commonplace that Plutarch says it is a subject about which it is not necessary to speak at length (Περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ κάλλους Ἀλκιβιάδου οὐδὲν ἴσως δεῖ λέγειν, Plut., *Alc.* 1.3). Alcibiades' potential for anti-communal behavior such as that theorized by Callicles in the *Gorgias* is amply illustrated by the way in which Alcibiades turned on Athens after eluding the embassy sent to fetch him from Sicily. He escaped what would surely have been a conviction in

the scandal of the Herms and the Eleusinian mysteries, but he was not content to sit quietly in exile. Fleeing to Sparta, Alcibiades denounced his city and zealously incited the Lacedaemonians to send military assistance to the Syracusans in their war against the invading Athenians, effectively helping to bring about Athens' greatest military disaster (Plut., *Alc.* 23.2; Thuc. 6.89–92).

Chaereas too possesses a great *phusis* as his superlative beauty makes clear. He is called by the narrator a "handsome young man" (μειράκιον εὔμορφον, Ch. 1.1.3), and as the son of Ariston, the second most powerful man in the city of Syracuse, Chaereas belongs to a noble family, further evidence of his elevated nature. As he returns home from the *gymnasion*, he is described as "gleaming like a star, for the flush of the wrestling arena bloomed upon the light of his face, like gold upon silver" (στίλβων ὥσπερ ἀστήρ· ἐπήνθει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῷ λαμπρῷ τοῦ προσώπου τὸ ἐρύθημα τῆς παλαίστρας ὥσπερ ἀργύρῳ χρυσός, 1.1.5). When he and Callirhoe see each other for the first time, they are obviously smitten, and the narrator says of their meeting that "beauty was matched with nobility" (τοῦ κάλλους <…>γενει συνελθόντος, 1.1.6).[15] After joining the Egyptian rebellion, it took very little time for Chaereas to become an intimate with the pharaoh, for the Egyptian recognized that Chaereas "was not unacquainted with a noble nature and education" (οἶα δὴ καὶ φύσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ παιδείας οὐκ ἀπρονόητος, 7.2.5).

And so, like Alcibiades, Chaereas wears his physical beauty as the mark of a great inner *phusis*. In the Egyptian's assessment of Chaereas, there is even the indication that the noble *phusis* is related to an innate aptitude for swift learning and education (cf. Plato, *Resp.* 494b1–3). Unlike Alcibiades, though, Chaereas does not rebel against his city. This is not to say, however, that Chaereas' *phusis* does not contain the potential for rebellion, for his alignment with the Egyptian pharaoh against the Persian King is sufficient evidence for the Calliclean argument that the stronger man must display his power before the weaker man (*Grg.* 483c–d). Compared to Chaereas, Artaxerxes is the weaker man by nature and by ethnicity, despite his status as the Great King (he is, for instance, "by nature" unable to control his lust: φύσει δέ ἐστι τὸ βάρβαρον γυναιμανές, Ch. 5.2.6). Therefore, when he believes that Callirhoe has been stolen from him for the last time, Chaereas cannot resist the opportunity to exact his revenge on Artaxerxes (7.1.7–11), thereby displaying his greater *phusis*. And in his letter to Artaxerxes at the end of the novel, Chaereas even declares that war has proven his superiority, "for war

[15] My translation is based on Cobet's suggestion <τῇ εὐ>γενεί<ᾳ>.

is the best arbiter of the stronger and the weaker" (πόλεμος γὰρ ἄριστος κριτὴς τοῦ κρείττονός τε καὶ χείρονος, 8.4.2).

The second quality that defines the great individual is *phronēma*, "a massive sense of personal worth, an aggressive pride … observable in all the heroes of epic and tragedy."[16] Gribble calls specific attention to the Sophoclean heroes Antigone and Ajax. Ajax in particular is twice described by the seer Chalcas as "thinking not according to mortal limits" (μὴ κατ' ἄνθρωπον φρονῇ, Soph. *Aj*. 761; οὐ κατ' ἄνθρωπον φρονῶν, 777). Plato writes that the philosopher will be surrounded by sycophants and hangers-on who want nothing but the power that will one day come into the philosopher's hands. Such attentions have the ability to warp the young mind and unduly elevate his sense of self: "indeed will he not be filled with an impossible sense of expectation, thinking that he will be sufficient to manage the affairs of both Greeks and barbarians, and because of these hopes will he not lift himself up to a lofty position, senselessly filled up by his attitude and his vain arrogance?" (ἆρ' οὐ πληρωθήσεσθαι ἀμηχάνου ἐλπίδος, ἡγούμενον καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἱκανὸν ἔσεσθαι πράττειν, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ὑψηλὸν ἐξαρεῖν αὐτόν, σχηματισμοῦ καὶ φρονήματος κενοῦ ἄνευ νοῦ ἐμπιμπλάμενον; Plato, *Resp*. 494c7–d2). This suggests that *phronēma* is not necessarily a bad quality, or that it is vain *per se*, but only that a *phronēma* which is unduly exaggerated by sycophants is "misguided and unphilosophical."[17] An individual might very well be justified in his high valuation of himself, in which case a true *phronēma* will be beneficial to both the self and the state; it will be more than just vain egotism.

In the first *Alcibiades*, Socrates says of his interlocutor's lovers that, "although they were many and generous, there is no one who did not flee, overpowered by you in arrogance" (πολλῶν γὰρ γενομένων καὶ μεγαλοφρόνων οὐδεὶς ὃς οὐχ ὑπερβληθεὶς τῷ φρονήματι ὑπὸ σοῦ πέφευγεν, Plato, *Alc. 1* 103b). The reason for Alcibiades' arrogance (τὸν δὲ λόγον, ᾧ ὑπερπεφρόνηκας, 104a), Socrates explains, is his overwhelming sense of independence, that he has no need of any other man for anything. Since he recognizes the power of his endowments (physical beauty, wealth, influence) Alcibiades seems to Socrates to "think highly of himself" (μέγα φρονεῖν, 104c1). In Thucydides' *History*, Alcibiades says that his lavish expenditure at the Olympic Games of 416 showed to the rest of the Greeks that Athens was not ruined by war. His own private generosity, therefore, has been beneficial to the whole city, and he says that, "it is only fair that someone think-

[16] Gribble 1999: 14.
[17] Gribble 1999: 15.

ing highly of himself not be considered an equal" (οὐδέ γε ἄδικον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μέγα φρονοῦντα μὴ ἴσον εἶναι, Thuc. 6.16.4).

Xenophon writes of Alcibiades that on account of his beauty (διὰ μὲν κάλλος, Xen. *Mem*. 1.2.24) he was hunted down (θηρώμενος) by both men and women, and on account of his power (διὰ δύναμιν) in the city and among his allies, he was pampered (διαθρυπτόμενος) by a crowd of expert flatterers. Alcibiades was honored by the city and easily became the first among citizens: "Just as competitive athletes who easily become number one care nothing for exercise, so even [Alcibiades] took no care of himself" (ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν γυμνικῶν ἀγώνων ἀθληταὶ ῥᾳδίως πρωτεύοντες ἀμελοῦσι τῆς ἀσκήσεως, οὕτω κἀκεῖνος ἠμέλησεν αὑτοῦ). It was not Socrates, then, who corrupted Alcibiades. Rather, Alcibiades' over-estimation of himself and his arrogant behavior were the result of his corruption by the flattering polis. Since he is a slave to the outward benefits of his noble *phusis*, he consequently neglects the care of the self and the more significant benefits offered by philosophy.

Like Alcibiades, Chaereas also possesses *phronēma*. Upon joining up with the Egyptian rebellion against Persia, "the pharaoh in very little time made Chaereas his companion at table and then even his advisor, for Chaereas displayed both a bold spirit and courage, and together with these also trust" (μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ ὁμοτράπεζον ἐποιήσατο Χαιρέαν, εἶτα καὶ σύμβουλον· ἐπεδείκνυτο γὰρ φρόνησίν τε καὶ θάρσος, μετὰ τούτων δὲ καὶ πίστιν, 7.2.5). Faced with the defiance of Tyre, the pharaoh deems it best that his army should withdraw at last from their campaign against the King. Chaereas though will have no share in the flight (οὐ κοινωνήσω φυγῆς, 7.3.5), and instead proposes that the pharaoh offer him the opportunity to conquer the Tyrians. The narrator says that "the pharaoh, astonished at his bold spirit, allowed him to take his choice of the army, as much as he wanted" (βασιλεὺς δὲ θαυμάσας αὐτοῦ τὸ φρόνημα συνεχώρησεν ὁπόσον βούλεται τῆς στρατιᾶς ἐπίλεκτον λαβεῖν, 7.3.6). Chaereas is further characterized by his *phronēma* when he is reunited with Callirhoe on Aradus. As he recounts his exploits to her, he "prided himself on his success" (ἐναβρυνόμενος τοῖς κατορθώμασιν, 8.1.16).

Though they both possess *phronēma*, Alcibiades' high-mindedness is, according to tradition, the source of many of his misfortunes, whereas Chaereas' bold spirit is what ultimately restores Callirhoe to him. According to Xenophon (quoted above), Alcibiades prided himself so much on his superiority that he led a life of excess, no longer feeling the need to cultivate prudence, and therefore blind to the wisdom offered by Socrates. Thucydides

tells us that during the Sicilian Expedition, Alcibiades had set his sights not just on Syracuse, but on all of Sicily and even Carthage, privately hoping that his military successes would add to his wealth and his reputation (χρήμασί τε καὶ δόξῃ, Thuc. 6.15.2). Likewise in the first *Alcibiades*, Socrates says that if some god were to grant Alcibiades the option between instant death or a life without further advancement and glory, then Alcibiades would surely choose death. Alcibiades' hope, says Socrates, is to gain complete mastery not only of Europe, but of Asia too, and to enter the ranks of men like Cyrus and Xerxes. Alcibiades will not want to live if he cannot fill the world with his name and power (εἰ μὴ ἐμπλήσεις τοῦ σοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως πάντας ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἀνθρώπους, Plato *Alc. 1* 105c). Gribble explains that, "there is an important distinction to be made between the dangerous and hybristic desire for what is unattainable, and the realizable ambitions of the truly great man (hence Aristotle's *megalopsuchia*, when not supported by real greatness, is mere vainglory)."[18]

Chaereas' *phronēma*, however, never seems to reach the extremes of Alcibiades' ambitions. During the slaughter of the Tyrians, "Chaereas alone had self-control" (μόνος ἐσωφρόνησε Χαιρέας, Ch. 7.4.9). And then, immediately after the victory, Chaereas is the only man among his troops who resists the joyous celebration, refraining from sacrificial offerings and refusing to wear the garland (7.4.10). He is temperate even in terms of his carnal appetites: when offered the opportunity to indulge himself with the newly captured beauty on Aradus, he resists, saying that, "It is right for me to honor her chastity" (πρέπει γάρ μοι σωφροσύνην τιμᾶν, 7.6.12). Chaereas' decision to preserve the σωφροσύνη of the captured girl is a mark of his own noble σωφροσύνη. But Chariton's idealization of the young hero is nevertheless incomplete, for Chaereas' σωφροσύνη dissolves in the face of his innate jealousy (ζηλοτυπία, 1.4.12; 6.1.5; 8.1.15; 8.4.4). Furthermore, Chaereas' erotic abstention from the beautiful captive on Aradus is easily conquered by the intervention of his friend Polycharmus, "who wanted him to embark, if it were possible, upon a new love" (βουλόμενος ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτόν, εἴ πως δύναιτο, εἰς ἔρωτα καινόν, 8.1.6). Fortunately for Chaereas' σωφροσύνη, the beautiful girl turns out to be none other than Callirhoe, and he can therefore say that he has been faithful to the last.[19] But Chaereas is at

[18] Gribble 1999: 17.

[19] Cf. Clitophon's sophistic explanation to Leucippe of his own σωφροσύνη (8.5.2) and, even more humorous, his male παρθενία (8.5.7) at the end of Achilles Tatius' novel. Konstan argues that, despite his sexual relationship with Melite, Clitophon's fidelity to Leucippe is not compromised (1994: 53). Similarly, Haynes writes that "this incident does not affect his sincere desire to remain with Leukippe" (2003: 90). I am more in-

least not characterized by the same hybristic desires which characterize Alcibiades. At first, believing Callirhoe completely out of reach, he desires only death and vengeance against the King (7.2.4). But then upon his return to Syracuse, there is every indication in the text that Chaereas will supplant Hermocrates (see Chapter 6), and he seems himself to have been persuaded by Callirhoe's belief in him as πόλεως πρῶτος (6.7.10). If Chaereas' ambitions ever do become hybristic, it is not mentioned in the text. At the end of the narrative the reader is left only with the image of Chaereas' political ascendancy in Syracuse. It is therefore up to the reader to draw his or her own conclusions, based upon the qualities of Chaereas' character, about what kind of πόλεως πρῶτος he will become.

The third distinguishing quality of the great individual is his elevated status. The great individual may very well rise in democratic society to hold political office. He may be charged with the leadership of his people and his homeland. He may even become tyrant. But these are outward signs; the great individual's elevated status must be traced to some intangible quality, for the great individual's difference from his fellow men is sustained even when the individual has been rejected by society. The source of the individual's greatness itself thus lies *beyond* society. It is the kind of heroic greatness attributed more to the likes of Diomedes or Achilles than to mere citizens. Aristotle contrasts someone characterized by *magalopsuchia* with someone who is merely *sōphrōn*, or prudent: "The *megalopsuchos* seems to be one who, being worthy, deems himself worthy of great things; for one who acts contrary to his worth is a fool, whereas one who acts according to his virtue is neither a fool nor senseless … one who is worthy of small things and who deems himself worthy of small things is prudent, but not *megalopsuchos*, for *megalopsuchia* rests in magnitude" (δοκεῖ δὴ μεγαλόψυχος εἶναι ὁ μεγάλων αὑτὸν ἀξιῶν ἄξιος ὤν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ κατ᾽ ἀξίαν αὑτὸ ποιῶν ἠλίθιος, τῶν δὲ κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν οὐδεὶς ἠλίθιος οὐδ᾽ ἀνόητος … ὁ γὰρ μικρῶν ἄξιος καὶ τούτων ἀξιῶν ἑαυτὸν σώφρων, μεγαλόψυχος δ᾽ οὔ· ἐν μεγέθει γὰρ ἡ μεγαλοψυχία, *Eth. Nic.* 1123^{b}1–6). It is this "magnitude" (μέγεθος), paradoxically unquantifiable, which explains the great individual's difference from fellow men.

Thucydides writes that, before the Sicilian Expedition, the enmity towards Alcibiades arose among the Athenians as a result of their anxiety over

---

clined to read the scene as Goldhill (1995) does: a comic negotiation of Clitophon's own sense of chastity. Chaereas' dilemma is more subtle, for the "other woman" turns out to be his own wife. One is reminded of Admetus' acceptance of his "new bride" at the conclusion of Euripides' *Alcestis* (1037ff).

his extravagent lifestyle: "fearing the magnitude of both his physical perversion and the purpose of each little thing he did in whatever context, the majority became his enemies as for one who was eager for tyranny" (φοβηθέντες γὰρ αὐτοῦ οἱ πολλοὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς τε κατὰ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα παρανομίας ἐς τὴν δίαιταν καὶ τῆς διανοίας ὧν καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον ἐν ὅτῳ γίγνοιτο ἔπρασσεν, ὡς τυραννίδος ἐπιθυμοῦντι πολέμιοι καθέστασαν, Thuc. 6.15.4). It is important that Thucydides mentions specifically the magnitude (μέγεθος) of Alcibiades' behavior; he poses a threat not merely because his lifestyle is extravagent, for it seems reasonable that politically influential young men would be extended some license for extravagance. Rather, the problem is that his extravagance has grown *to such a degree* that Alcibiades has set himself apart from the rest of society. Which of course begs the question: when does extravagant behavior (*paranomia*) become *too much*?

Plutarch problematizes exactly the notion of magnitude (μέγεθος) mentioned by Thucydides when he says that it was not the majority of Athenians, but merely the "highly regarded" or "reputable" (οἱ μὲν ἔνδοξοι, Plut. *Alc.* 16.2) men in the city who criticized Alcibiades' lifestyle, whereas the *dēmos* at large were ambivalent in their sentiments toward the young man. Plutarch quotes Aristophanes: "They desire him, they hate him, they want to possess him" (Ποθεῖ μέν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται δ' ἔχειν, Ar. *Ran.* 1425). Christopher Pelling writes that, "Given all the shifts in Alcibiades' career and all the dissent about him, could public reaction really have been so uniform as Thucydides says? No surprise that Plutarch wondered: we should wonder too."[20]

Nevertheless, despite the difficulty in gauging exactly how much he set himself apart (or, was set apart) from society, the classical sources seem to concur that it was a plausible rhetorical strategy to represent Alcibiades as somehow different from his fellow men. In the persona of Alcibiades' son, Isocrates writes that "sometimes men pretend to hate him, saying that in no way was he different from the rest … but I myself, if there were enough time, would show that some things he did rightly accomplish, but of other things he unjustly carries the blame" (καὶ ἐνίοτε μὲν αὐτοῦ προσποιοῦνται καταφρονεῖν, λέγοντες ὡς οὐδὲν διέφερε τῶν ἄλλων, … ἐγὼ δ' εἴ μοι χρόνος ἱκανὸς γένοιτο, ῥᾳδίως ἂν αὐτὸν ἐπιδείξαιμι τὰ μὲν δικαίως πράξαντα, τῶν δ' ἀδίκως αἰτίαν ἔχοντα, Isoc. 16.11). Though some men pretend Alcibiades was not different, the implication is of course that he was different. Alcibiades' ethical difference was expressed outwardly in the public arena. "I am ashamed," writes Isocrates, again in the persona of Alcibiades' son, "to talk about his services here as *chorēgos*, *gymnasiarch*, and *triērach*. For he was

[20] Pelling 2000: 53.

so greatly different from others in the rest of his public services, that … if someone should on his behalf demand compensation for such great services, then it would seem that speeches were being made for trivialities" (περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐνθάδε χορηγιῶν καὶ γυμνασιαρχιῶν καὶ τριηραρχιῶν αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν· τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις διήνεγκεν, ὥσθ' … ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου δ' εἴ τις καὶ τῶν τηλικούτων χάριν ἀπαιτοίη, περὶ μικρῶν ἂν δόξειε τοὺς λόγους ποιεῖσθαι, 16.35). Isocrates' remarks about Athens' antipathy reflect the sentiments of a society which has directly felt both the benefits and the injuries which resulted from Alcibiades' difference, his status as *other*. After his death, feelings about Alcibiades continued to be sharply polarized, and some men made their careers by criticizing the failed policies of his past.[21]

Chaereas, too, has an elevated status among his fellow Syracusans. He is said by the narrator at the very beginning of Chariton's novel to surpass all men (μειράκιον εὔμορφον, πάντων ὑπερέχον, Ch. 1.1.3). But since Chariton's theme is *erōs*, it is within the erotic realm that Chaereas' superior status most obviously reveals itself in the early pages of the novel. Politically, the young man does not yet have prominence in Syracuse. He is born to a noble family, though, and his father Ariston is considered the second man in the city after Hermocrates (πατρὸς Ἀρίστωνος τὰ δεύτερα ἐν Συρακούσαις μετὰ Ἑρμοκράτην φερομένου). And so Chaereas has some influence in that regard. After falling in love with Callirhoe at first sight, the young man begins to waste away physically (ἤδη τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ φθίνοντος, 1.1.8), and he confesses to his father Ariston that he has fallen in love with Hermocrates' daughter. Ariston is not amused: "it is clear that Hermocrates would not give his daughter to you, seeing as he has so many wealthy and royal suitors" (δῆλον γάρ ἐστιν ὅτι Ἑρμοκράτης οὐκ ἂν δοίη σοὶ τὴν θυγατέρα τοσούτους ἔχων μνηστῆρας πλουσίους καὶ βασιλεῖς, 1.1.9). Chaereas therefore continues to waste away to the point that his absence from the *gymnasion* causes much concern among the citizens. At the next regular assembly, the people beg Hermocrates to accept the marriage between Chaereas and his daughter. Despite the crowd of wealthy royal suitors (μνηστῆρας πλουσίους καὶ βασιλεῖς, 1.1.9), the city itself now petitions for marriage (ἡ πόλις μνηστεύεται, 1.1.11), and Hermocrates, patriot that he

[21] Many of the leading Athenians in the 390s could be identified by their support of or opposition to Alcibiades in the previous decade during the Ionian War. "They therefore had a stake in his reputation and public presentation. This helped to keep the polarized debate about Alcibiades, which had been a feature of the years 411–404 BC, alive in the years following 403 BC as well. The first section of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and perhaps much of Thucydides' *History* … reflects the polarized Alcibiades debate taking place at the time these historians were writing" (Gribble 1999: 95–96).

is, is persuaded to consent. The erotic union between the two young people is the only thing that can cure their physical wasting; when Callirhoe realizes that her betrothed is none other than Chaereas, she is revived completely at the sight of him: "just as the light of a lamp nearly gone out grows bright again when oil is poured into it" (ὥσπερ τι λύχνου φῶς ἤδη σβεννύμενον ἐπιχυθέντος ἐλαίου πάλιν ἀνέλαμψε, 1.1.15).[22]

Chaereas' elevated status within Syracuse is a perfect example of what Gribble calls "the intangible quality, located outside the normal allocation of honour by society."[23] The point is made even more apparent by the sudden envy and anger of the rejected suitors, who complain that, "a rentboy in rags, who is stronger than none of the competing kings, has himself effortlessly taken the crown" (ὁ δὲ πόρνος καὶ πένης καὶ μηδενὸς κρείττων βασιλέων ἀγωνισαμένων αὐτὸς ἀκονιτὶ τὸν στέφανον ἥρατο, 1.2.3). This is the first time the reader has heard of Chaereas' impoverished economic state, and the accusation seems to be merely the slanderous exaggeration of a jilted lover: Chaereas is only poor by comparison with the wealthy Italian suitors. Nevertheless, the suitors are perplexed that Hermocrates would choose Chaereas as his son-in-law over themselves. Before Chaereas came along, it appeared as if wealth and political influence were necessary qualifications for gaining the hand of Callirhoe. But Chaereas' ability to transcend these qualifications ("the normal allocation of honor in society") proves his elevated status.[24]

Both Alcibiades and Chaereas meet the qualifications of the "great individual." And yet there is one major difference between Alcibiades and Chaereas in this regard. According to Gribble's formulation, based upon his *phusis*, his *phronēma*, and his elevated status, the great individual must necessarily come into conflict with his society. Alcibiades' conflict with the people of Athens is part of the historical record, but Chaereas never comes into conflict with the people of Syracuse in quite the same manner. He is their favorite at the beginning of the novel, and by the end of the novel he is

---

[22] The simile is an allusion to Xenophon's *Symposium*: ἀλλὰ πίνειν μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἐμοὶ πάνυ δοκεῖ: τῷ γὰρ ὄντι ὁ οἶνος ἄρδων τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς μὲν λύπας, ὥσπερ ὁ μανδραγόρας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, κοιμίζει, τὰς δὲ φιλοφροσύνας, ὥσπερ ἔλαιον φλόγα, ἐγείρει (2.24). See Goold 1995: 35.

[23] Gribble 1999: 17.

[24] Peter Toohey argues that erotic wasting is itself a mark of the individual's elevated moral status: "The externality of erotic infatuation to the subject, when it leads to a passive reaction such as wasting, death, or suicide, is to be associated with currently admired modes of behavior such as sexual fidelity, reciprocity, and purity" (1999: 269). The people of Syracuse recognize Chaereas' physical wasting as a sign of his moral superiority, and therefore argue his case in the assembly.

heralded as a hero. The Syracusans therefore accept Chaereas' superb individual status within the polis; they foster his rise above the body of equals. The threat implied by the kind of superb individualism of a person like Alcibiades is furthermore "particularly urgent in the democratic polis."[25] But Chaereas is not acknowledged as a political threat by the people of Syracuse. He is of course a threat to the rival suitors of Callirhoe, and like the political opponents of Alcibiades (cf. Thuc. 6.28), they attempt to manipulate his erotic and hence his political decline by opportunism and deception. And even though the suitors are not Syracusan citizens, they articulate their erotic plot against Chaereas in political terms (1.2.4–6). Apart from the suitors, the one most likely to be threatened by Chaereas' ascendancy to the position of "first man of the city" is Hermocrates, not a representative of the body of equals, but himself the victorious στρατηγός and the "first man of the city" as the novel opens. If, therefore, the superb individual poses a threat to the democratic polis, and since Chaereas in all other regards fits the definition of the great individual, then Chaereas' complete acceptance by the people of Syracuse makes that city's putative democracy problematic.

2 "Parallel Lives"

A comparison between the representation of Alcibiades in Plutarch's *Life* and the depiction of Chaereas in Chariton's novel reveals a number of similarities worth recording here. The personae of both figures are cultivated in part through artistic representation (painting and sculpture); furthermore both Alcibiades and Chaereas are characterized by lion symbolism, shifting political alliances, and oratorical skill. In this section I will discuss these shared themes, but it is important to remember that Chariton was not simply constructing an Alcibiades in disguise for the hero of his novel. Rather, motifs from the Alcibiades tradition provided a host of alternatives and tropes for conceptualizing a legendary classical hero within a romantic narrative.

As depicted by Plutarch, Alcibiades is a notorious lover of fine things, especially the graphic arts. Plutarch writes that among his youthful indiscretions, which received only mildest criticisms from the Athenians (they called them "childish amusements and ambition," παιδιὰς καὶ φιλοτιμίας, Plut. *Alc*. 16.3), Alcibiades once "locked up the painter Agatharchon in his house, and then after he had painted his house he let him go with a payment" (οἷον ἦν καὶ τὸ Ἀγάθαρχον εἶρξαι τὸν ζωγράφον, εἶτα γράψαντα τὴν οἰκίαν ἀφεῖναι

[25] Gribble 1999: 18.

δωρησάμενον, 16.4). Plutarch is apologetic of Alcibiades' behavior: even when Alcibiades was most overbearing, he was actually quite harmless. Yes, he imprisoned Agatharchon, but the young man was simply mad about art, and besides, it was not as if he didn't pay Agatharchon for his services. "In the later anecdotal tradition," writes Gribble, "Alcibiades' transgressiveness is much less alarming, much less obviously political."[26]

Only shortly afterwards in Plutarch's narrative, Alcibiades becomes himself the subject of artistic expression. In honor of his victory in the Nemean games,[27] Alcibiades was depicted in a painting by Aristophon to be a familiar of the personified Nemea.

> Ἀριστοφῶντος δὲ Νεμέαν γράψαντος ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις αὐτῆς καθήμενον Ἀλκιβιάδην ἔχουσαν, ἐθεῶντο καὶ συνέτρεχον χαίροντες. οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τούτοις ἐδυσχέραινον ὡς τυραννικοῖς καὶ παρανόμοις. ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ Ἀρχέστρατος οὐκ ἀπὸ τρόπου λέγειν ὡς ἡ Ἑλλὰς οὐκ ἂν ἤνεγκε δύο Ἀλκιβιάδας.
>
> When Aristophon painted Nemea holding Alcibiades as he sat in her arms, they gazed at it in amazement and joyfully flocked to it. But the older men were scornful even of this as tyrannical and lawless. And Archestratos seemed not unreasonable when he said that Greece would not endure two Alcibiades. (16.5)

The source of the crowd's delight is uncertain. Do they enjoy the artistry of the painting? Or do they enjoy more the fact that Alcibiades has been included in the representation of Nemea? In any case, the fact that Alcibiades had become a subject worthy of artistic depiction unsettles the older men in the city, a reminder that in Plutarch's account, the Athenian *dēmos* is stratified in its reaction to Alcibiades, whereas in Thucydides' depiction, reaction to Alcibiades is unilateral (6.15.4).[28] What is even more disturbing to the elders is that Alcibiades is given near divine status in the painting.[29] Was it

---

[26] Gribble 1999: 266–267.

[27] Cf. Pausanias 1.22.7 and Perrin 1986: 43.

[28] In Xenophon (*Hell*. 1.4.13–17) and Diodorus Siculus (13.68.4–6), the reaction of the *dēmos* is yet more varied than in Plutarch. See Pelling 2000: 53.

[29] "The claim that an individual is godlike is not one that is likely to be made in the context of classical Greek polis. But Isocrates, encouraging Philip to invade the Persian empire (Isoc. 5.41), writes that when he has conquered the barbarians, 'there will be nothing left except to become a god'; and in his encomium of Evagoras there are clear hints that we are dealing with a figure who is in some sense more than mortal, though Isocrates is careful to avoid the actual claim of divinity" (Gribble 1999: 18).

Aristophon's idea to paint Alcibiades into the picture, or was it Alcibiades' suggestion? It would be bad enough if the painting is an example of Alcibiades' self-aggrandizement. But if the people condone, or worse, celebrate Alcibiades' depiction in such a manner, then it is clear that Alcibiades poses a real threat to the democracy of equal citizens. The relationship being cultivated between Alcibiades and the *dēmos*, the elders surmise, is a dangerous one, preparing the way for tyranny. Archestratos' quip that "Greece would not endure two Alcibiades" indicates that Alcibiades had reached the limits of what would be considered acceptable behavior within the democratic polis, and it is significant that this sentiment is associated so closely with Alcibiades' representation in art, suggesting that Alcibiades' identity as a tyrant is a constructed persona achieved through artifice.

Within this context, Chaereas' description by the narrator in Chariton's novel appears all the more striking for its historical connotations. The narrator says that, "there was a certain Chaereas, a handsome young man, surpassing all, the sort of Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, or Alcibiades that both sculptors and painters portray" (Χαιρέας γάρ τις ἦν μειράκιον εὔμορφον, πάντων ὑπερέχον, οἷον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἱππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται τε καὶ γραφεῖς ⟨ἀπο⟩δεικνύουσι, Ch. 1.1.3). Alcibiades' inclusion with Achilles, Nireus, and Hippolytus on one level frames the historical as part of the distant mythological or legendary past, consequently opening up the historical realm for fictive expansion. Alternative history and romance therefore become the work of craftsmen like sculptors and painters, and it is among the ranks of such artisans that Chariton's narrator envisions himself the master.

Hunter has convincingly argued that the description of Callirhoe bathing is a narrative evocation of Praxiteles' statue at Knidos of the bathing Aphrodite: "Her skin gleamed white, shining naturally like marble, and her flesh was so delicate that you would fear lest the touch of one of your fingers might cause a serious wound" (ὁ χρὼς γὰρ λευκὸς ἔστιλψεν εὐθὺς μαρμαρυγῇ τινι ὅμοιον ἀπολάμπων· τρυφερὰ δὲ σάρξ, ὥστε δεδοικέναι μὴ καὶ ἡ τῶν δακτύλων ἐπαφὴ μέγα τραῦμα ποιήσῃ, 2.2.2).[30] Brigitte Egger writes that, "On a purely technical level, this sculptural method of representation presumably facilitated the depiction of [Callirhoe's] body," but it "was also a

[30] Hunter 1994: 1076. There are several parallels in Greek and Latin imperial literature: Pygmalion's sculpted maiden in *Met*. 10.256–258; Petronius' Circe in the *Satyrica* 126.13–18; [Lucian's] *Amores* 13–17. Egger cites also Photis in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (2.17) and Circe in Petronius' *Satyrica* (126) as human "statues in overtly libidinous contexts" (Egger 1994: 38).

way to circumvent literary and social restrictions on the direct representation of femininity and the sexuality of a romance heroine."[31] I would add that this is also true for Chaereas: describing the young hero's physical attributes and stunning good looks in terms of sculptural analogy circumvents the representation of overt male sexuality. In Chariton's novel there are several accounts of male sexuality (cf. Dionysius, Mithridates, Pharnaces, Artaxerxes), but only insomuch as the male characters are sexual *subjects* (ἐρασταί) and not themselves the *objects* of erotic desire (ἐρώμενοι). And since the descriptions of the youthful bodies of the hero and heroine are oblique, they are also seductively teasing; indirect representation is all the more tantalizing because it hints at what can only be imagined. Later, when the narrator describes Callirhoe, newly become a mother, with her child in her arms, the narrator calls his creation "the most beautiful image, such that no painter has painted, nor sculptor sculpted, nor poet recorded until now, for not one of them has made Artemis or Athene holding a baby in her arms" (θέαμα κάλλιστον, οἷον οὔτε ζωγράφος ἔγραψεν οὔτε πλάστης ἔπλασεν οὔτε ποιητὴς ἱστόρησε μέχρι νῦν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν Ἄρτεμιν ἢ Ἀθηνᾶν βρέφος ἐν ἀγκάλαις κομίζουσαν, 3.8.6). Artemis and Athene are maiden goddesses, but Chariton's ethically pure maiden turns out to be also sexually active, for Chariton's maiden becomes the wife of two men and even gives birth. It is an alluring paradox, and hints at a stereotypical male fantasy: the virgin whore. Blurring the simple opposition between active and passive sexual identities, Helen Elsom sees this image not as the construction of the narrator but as Callirhoe's intentional representation of herself as a paradox, indicating her own crisis of identity as maiden/mother: "Callirhoe is posing, and standing in for Aphrodite … [she] sets herself up as a work of art, a painting or sculpture. As before, she is a willing but unwilling object."[32]

It is clear therefore that, following a long ekphrastic tradition, Chariton represents sexuality in part by analogy to sculpture, art, and artifice. Hunter argues that statues, and for that matter *ekphraseis* of statues and paintings, are canvasses upon which we project our desires. He writes that, "the 'Callirhoe = statue' equation, prominently positioned at the head of the romance, where, as we have already seen, there are programmatic and generic indicators shared with the so-called 'sophistic' romances, is a central stratagem both in allowing us to generalise from Callirhoe's experience to our own, and in preventing any naively simple acceptance of the 'historicity' of the

[31] Egger 1994: 38.
[32] Elsom 1992: 224.

work."[33] I think that this is equally true of Chaereas: narrative analogy to the sculptural tradition of figures like Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus and Alcibiades on one level generalizes the hero and presents him to the reader as someone of remarkable physical beauty, but someone nonetheless familiar. The reference to Alcibiades, however, reminds the reader that this particular πάθος ἐρωτικόν is also a fictive expansion of a recognizably historical past, and so the reader is invited to bring to his or her interpretation of the text all of the potent connotations that the name Alcibiades would have had in the history and literature of the classical period.

I return to the disgruntled reaction of the Athenian πρεσβύτεροι upon viewing Aristophon's artistic rendering of Alcibiades, and Archestratos' remark that "Greece would not endure two Alcibiades" (Plut. *Alc*. 16.5). If we are to believe Plutarch's anecdote, then within the context of a democratic polis, the idealized artistic depiction of an individual markedly set that individual apart from his fellow citizens, a public[34] acknowledgment of that individual's elevated status within society. Likewise, when the narrator notes Chaereas' similarity to portrait busts and paintings of legendary and historical figures (Alcibiades in particular), he marks Chaereas as a superior individual. The narrator specifically idealizes Chaereas' physical beauty, the attribute that will make him most obviously appropriate as the hero of a romantic narrative that celebrates Aphrodite and Eros. But Aphrodite's power is not merely an abstract idea in Chariton's novel; rather, Aphrodite's power is consolidated most significantly in the narrative when the unavoidable force of desire subverts human institutions (this is seen most notably when Artaxerxes' erotic obsession with Callirhoe leads him to neglect the administration of his empire in Book 6). A reader naturally wonders then what capacity Chaereas' superior Aphrodisian endowments and his subsequent elevated status within society will have on Syracuse's democratic society. Chaereas' innate jealousy (ἐμφύτος ζηλοτυπία, 8.1.15) has already proven his transgressive potential for tyranny within the household, and the narrative thereby motivates the reader to question how Chaereas' tyrannical tendencies will be expressed on the wider political stage.

The painting of Alcibiades in the arms of the personified Nemea suggests also Alcibiades' frequent association with lion imagery. Helena Fracchia has noted that in artistic representations from the 6th century BC, Nemea

[33] Hunter 1994: 1076.

[34] Pausanias (1.22.7) notes that the painting was housed in a prominent spot near the propylaia on the acropolis.

"may be a bystander to Herakles' contest with the Nemea lion,"[35] though the identification of Nemea is by no means certain. A mid-4th century BC painting by Nikias is said by Pliny the elder (*HN* 35.27.131) to have depicted the personified Nemea bearing a palm as she rides atop a lion.[36] More intriguing still is a gemstone from ca. 400 BC depicting Nemea and Herakles after he has slain the lion, and over both their heads presides the figure of Eros.[37] It is quite possible therefore that Aristophon's painting of Alcibiades in the arms of Nemea would have evoked associations of the young man's leonine qualities. Plutarch reports that in his youth Alcibiades bit his opponent once during a wrestling match. After releasing his grip, the opponent said, "You bite like girls do, Alcibiades," to which Alcibiades replied that he had not done as women do, "but as lions do" (ἀλλ' ὡς οἱ λέοντες, Plut. *Alc*. 2.2). Most famous of all is the remark of Aeschylus in Aristophanes' *Frogs*. When asked by Dionysus, "What is to be done about Alcibiades?", Aeschylus replies, "It's not good to rear a lion cub in the city. If you do raise one to maturity, then cater to its ways"[38] (οὐ χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν. | ἢν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν, Ar. *Ran.* 1431–1432). Lions symbolize a dangerous combination of pride and power; paradoxically, though, in the case of Alcibiades, the lion is an enemy not from the wild and uncultivated world, but an enemy from within the Athenians' own city walls.[39]

Chaereas is assigned his own leonine imagery in Chariton's novel during the narrator's description of the capture of Tyre. As Chaereas rushes forward in his attack on the city, the narrator quotes a line from Homer: "he struck this way and that, and the terrible groaning of his victims rose up" (τύπτε δ' ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὤρνυτ' ἀεικής, Ch. 7.4.6=Hom. *Il*. 10.483).[40] In Homer, the line describes Diomedes, and there follows immediately in the text an extended simile: "as a lion attacking shepherdless flocks and intending slaughter leaps upon goats or sheep, so the son of Tydeus attacked the Thracian men" (ὡς δὲ λέων μήλοισιν ἀσημάντοισιν ἐπελθών, | ὣς μὲν Θρήϊκας ἄνδρας ἐπῴχετο Τυδέος υἱός, Hom. *Il*. 10.485–486). Chariton's narrator

---

[35] Fracchia 1992: 733.

[36] *LIMC* VI.1: 731=Nemea 1.

[37] *LIMC* VI.1: 732=Nemea 9 (=Herakles 1920).

[38] Henderson's translation (2002: 221). There is a variant of the first line: μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν. Henderson notes that "we cannot tell which belonged to the original and which to the revision. Oracular references to the lion often point to tyrants or political strongmen, e.g. *Knights* 1037–44, Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 717–36" (2002: 221).

[39] See Cornford 1969: 188–200; Gleason 1990: 404–405; Gribble 1999: 1–2; Wohl 2002: 134–135, 147–148.

[40] The verb in Homer is κτεῖνε, not τύπτε as Chariton writes.

also introduces a simile, but in his own voice now and no longer by Homeric quotation: "Each slaughtered his own man, like lions falling upon a herd of unguarded cattle" (ἄλλος δὲ ἄλλον ἐφόνευεν, ὥσπερ λέοντες εἰς ἀγέλην βοῶν ἐμπεσόντες ἀφύλακτον, Ch. 7.4.6). The template for Chaereas and his men here is of course the Homeric Diomedes, but considering Chaereas' similarity to Alcibiades, marked by the narrator at the beginning of the novel, the lion simile accommodates also a connotation of Chaereas' Alcibiadean persona. And although the lion imagery traditionally associated with Alcibiades denotes his transgressive nature, Chaereas manages nevertheless to retain his demeanor and not yield completely to the mayhem surrounding him, for "amidst the indescribable confusion, Chaereas alone maintained self-control" (Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀδιηγήτῳ τούτῳ ταράχῳ μόνος ἐσωφρόνησε Χαιρέας, 7.4.9).

The daring quality shared by both Alcibiades and Chaereas endows them both also with the ability to shift political alliances. Plutarch explains that one of Alcibiades' greatest talents was the apparent ease with which he assimilated himself into different societies:

> ἦν γὰρ ὥς φασι μία δεινότης αὕτη τῶν πολλῶν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ μηχανὴ θήρας ἀνθρώπων, συνεξομοιοῦσθαι καὶ συνομοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι καὶ ταῖς διαίταις, ὀξυτέρας τρεπομένῳ τροπὰς τοῦ χαμαιλέοντος. πλὴν ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὡς λέγεται, πρὸς ἓν ἐξαδυνατεῖ χρῶμα τὸ λευκὸν ἀφομοιοῦν ἑαυτόν: Ἀλκιβιάδῃ δὲ διὰ χρηστῶν ἰόντι καὶ πονηρῶν ὁμοίως οὐδὲν ἦν ἀμίμητον οὐδ' ἀνεπιτήδευτον …
> There was in Alcibiades, as they say, this one power above all others and his means of hunting men: to assimilate and adapt himself in the customs and lifestyles of others as he shifted in ways more acute than the chameleon. That animal, though, so it is said, is quite unable to transform itself into one color alone: white. But for Alcibiades, who moved among good and wicked men alike, nothing was unable to be imitated and nothing was left untried … (Plut. *Alc*. 23.4)

The idea was a familiar one in the Alcibiades tradition, so much so that it served as the conclusion in Cornelius Nepos' *Life* (Nep. *Alc*. 11), and the prominence of the theme in the biographies of both Nepos and Plutarch suggests an origin in the Hellenistic period, perhaps with the historian Satyrus (cf. Athenaeus 354b).[41] Implicated in the scandal surrounding the Spartan

[41] Gribble writes that, "The schema may have begun as a strategy for reconciling the diverse, sometimes polarized depictions of the various Alcibiades anecdotes assembled

king Agis and his wife Timaea (Plut. *Alc*. 22.7), Alcibiades flees Sparta for Persia, where he gains the confidence of Tissaphernes and becomes his intimate advisor: "being flattered, he so surrendered to Alcibiades that he surpassed Alcibiades in returning the flattery" (οὕτως ἐνεδίδου τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ κολακευόμενος ὥσθ' ὑπερβάλλειν αὐτὸς ἀντικολακεύων ἐκεῖνον, 24.6). Alcibiades' advice to Tissaphernes is not to attack either the Athenians or the Spartans too harshly at once, but rather to wait and allow both the Spartans and Athenians to become gradually weakened by war. Plutarch writes that, "Tissaphernes was easily persuaded and it was clear that he loved Alcibiades and was amazed by him, and so Alcibiades was admired by the Greeks on both sides, and the Athenians, since they were faring poorly, were regretting their judgments of him" (ὁ δ' ἐπείθετο ῥᾳδίως καὶ δῆλος ἦν ἀγαπῶν καὶ θαυμάζων, ὥστ' ἀποβλέπεσθαι τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἑκατέρωθεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, τοὺς δ' Ἀθηναίους καὶ μεταμέλεσθαι τοῖς γνωσθεῖσι περὶ αὐτοῦ κακῶς πάσχοντας, 25.2). The language describing Tissaphernes' affection and admiration is strong (ἀγαπῶν καὶ θαυμάζων), and Alcibiades' assimilation within the Persian camp is so complete as to inspire envy in the very people who rejected him from their polis.

Chaereas' participation in the Egyptian rebellion is suggestive of Alcibiades' alignment with Tissaphernes. After finding their way to the Egyptian camp, Chaereas and Polycharmus are introduced to the pharaoh and Chaereas explains their situation. He declares that they are both Greeks, and that he has come to retrieve his bride Callirhoe from Babylon, but that "Artaxerxes has treated us like a tyrant" (τετυρράνηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης, Ch. 7.2.4). The pharaoh is pleased (ἥσθη, 7.2.5) to hear of Chaereas' vengeful fury and his desire to inflict pain on the Persian enemy, and he immediately orders Chaereas to be equipped with armor and to be assigned a tent within the camp, "and not long afterward the pharaoh made Chaereas his table companion, and then his advisor" (μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ ὁμοτράπεζον ἐποιήσατο Χαιρέαν, εἶτα καὶ σύμβουλον). Though fond of his character, the pharaoh is even more delighted by Chaereas' "desire for victory against the king" (ἡ πρὸς βασιλέα φιλονεικία, 7.2.6). Like Alcibiades, Chaereas' assimilation within the enemy camp proves harmful for the enemy, for Chaereas' intimacy with the pharaoh leads him to the sole command of the successful venture against Tyre, which the narrator calls an ἔργον μέγα (7.2.6).

---

from classical authors (the glorious Olympic display at Athens, the stories of Ionian debauchery, the hobnobbing with Persians, the demagoguery). These diverse pictures are reconciled by seeing Alcibiades as the man who was able to practice various *bioi*" (1999: 38).

Alcibiades' and Chaereas' ability to insinuate themselves alongside the leaders of foreign armies rests in part in the nature of their characters. Tissaphernes admired Alcibiades' wily Odyssean nature (τὸ πολύτροπον, Plut. *Alc*. 24.4) and his remarkable cleverness (περιττὸν αὐτοῦ τῆς δεινότητος). The Egyptian pharaoh on the other hand admires Chaereas' bold spirit, courage, and trust (φρόνησίν τε καὶ θάρσος, μετὰ τούτων δὲ καὶ πίστιν, Ch. 7.2.5), and he recognizes Chaereas' noble nature and education (καὶ φύσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ παιδείας οὐκ ἀπρονοήτος). Equally important is the individual's ability to persuade, both in intimate conversation and on the public stage. Thucydides' history suggests that the Sicilian expedition was due in no small part to the speech delivered by Alcibiades in the assembly, for despite his scandalous lifestyle and the allegations of his tyrannical tendencies (Thuc. 6.15.4), after hearing him speak the Athenians were all the more eager for the campaign than they had been previously (πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ὥρμηντο στρατεύειν, 6.19.1). Demosthenes says that Alcibiades' fellow Athenians thought he was not only the best general, but was also the best of their speakers (καὶ στρατηγὸς ἄριστος, καὶ λέγειν ἐδόκει πάντων, ὥς φασιν, εἶναι δεινότατος, Dem. 21.145). According to Plutarch, Alcibiades himself thought that he could gain the most influence among the majority in Athens not by means of his wealth or noble birth, but by means of his rhetorical grace (ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ἠξίου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς τοῦ λόγου χάριτος ἰσχύειν ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς, Plut. *Alc*. 10.2).[42]

Like Alcibiades, Chaereas is depicted by Chariton as a rhetorically persuasive hero. But at the beginning of the novel, as I have discussed in detail in Chapter 5, Chaereas' forensic achievement is wholly unintentional, a paradox constructed by the narrator to prevent the young hero's execution for "murdering" Callirhoe. At that moment, Chaereas proceeded to defame himself publicly as a prosecutor might be expected to do, claiming that he deserved to be stoned to death because he had robbed the *dēmos* of its crown (1.5.4). Chaereas' acquittal came ironically as a surprise contrary to his de-

[42] The alternate tradition, though, is that, while Alcibiades was charming in private conversation, he was dreadful at public speaking. In the *Demes*, Eupolis writes of Alcibiades that, "he was the best at chatting, the very worst at speaking" (λαλεῖν ἄριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν, Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.* 1.281). Plutarch records that "Alcibiades would often get tripped up in the midst of speaking and would become silent and pause when his speech eluded him, then resuming with careful consideration" (πολλάκις ἐσφάλλετο καὶ μεταξὺ λέγων ἀπεσιώπα καὶ διέλειπε λέξεως διαφυγούσης, αὐτόν ἀναλαμβάνων καὶ διασκοπούμενος, Plut. *Alc*. 10.3). This anecdote does not have a negative tone, though, and one gets the sense that Alcibiades' halting and then careful, deliberate pace is part of his oratorical charm.

sire for death. But in Chapter 3 I discussed how Chaereas' speech to his soldiers on Cyprus (8.2.10ff.) was an expert rhetorical manipulation of his audience's desires and expectations. Far from being the weak young man of the beginning of the novel, Chaereas is at the novel's end not only a skilled general but also, like Alcibiades, a skilled orator. Alcibiades' greatest arena for the demonstration of his oratorical prowess was the civic assembly at Athens, and Chaereas too is given the opportunity at the conclusion of the novel to deliver a rhetorical performance before the gathered citizenry of Syracuse (8.6.3–8.8.12).

This scene bears a remarkable similarity to the depictions of Alcibiades' return to Athens in 407 BC.[43] Plutarch cites the account of Duris, who writes that "the oarsmen of Alcibiades rowed to the music of a flute blown by Chrysogonus the Pythian victor; that they kept time to a rhythmic call from the lips of Callipides the tragic actor; that both these artists were arrayed in the long tunics, flowing robes, and other adornment of their profession; and that the commander's ship put into harbours with a sail of purple hue, as though, after a drinking bout, he were off on a revel"[44] (ᾗ δὲ Δοῦρις ὁ Σάμιος Ἀλκιβιάδου φάσκων ἀπόγονος εἶναι προστίθησι τούτοις, αὐλεῖν μὲν εἰρεσίαν τοῖς ἐλαύνουσι Χρυσόγονον τὸν πυθιονίκην, κελεύειν δὲ Καλλιππίδην τὸν τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ὑποκριτήν, στατοὺς καὶ ξυστίδας καὶ τὸν ἄλλον ἐναγώνιον ἀμπεχομένους κόσμον, ἱστίῳ δ' ἁλουργῷ τὴν ναυαρχίδα προσφέρεσθαι τοῖς λιμέσιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ μέθης ἐπικωμάζοντος, Plut. *Alc*. 32.2). The extravagance of Chaereas' arrival does not approach the outrageousness of Alcibiades' arrival as depicted by Duris, and yet Chaereas' return to Syracuse is not without playful conceits. The ruse (engineered by Chaereas) that the fleet is Egyptian, the tapestries concealing him and Callirhoe on the deck of the trireme, and the clothing of Tyrian purple (Ch. 8.6.1–8) all suggest the kind of luxury and extravagance for which Alcibiades was best known.

Both Alcibiades and Chaereas are greeted by the jubilation of the *dēmos*, and both are led to the seats of their respective public assemblies. Plutarch writes that, "at that time Alcibiades was present when the people met for the assembly, partly weeping for and lamenting his own experiences, but accusing the people of only small and insignificant offenses, and attributing the whole affair to his own wicked fortune and to the envious spirit that attended him" (τότε δὲ τοῦ δήμου συνελθόντος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρελθὼν ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, καὶ τὰ μὲν αὑτοῦ πάθη κλαύσας καὶ ὀλοφυράμενος, ἐγκαλέσας δὲ μικρὰ καὶ μέτρια τῷ δήμῳ, τὸ δὲ σύμπαν ἀναθεὶς αὑτοῦ τινι τύχῃ πονηρᾷ

[43] Hunter 1994: 1058.
[44] Perrin's translation (1986: 93–95).

καὶ φθονερῷ δαίμονι, Plut. *Alc*. 33.2). Plutarch had juxtaposed to Duris' depiction of the transgressively proud Alcibiades a figure rather more humbled by the past enmity of the Athenians, a figure actually fearful of the reception he would receive at Athens (32.3). In this passage, though, Plutarch deftly weaves together the two alternate depictions to present Alcibiades as a shrewd political orator, entering into a dialogue with the *dēmos*. On the one hand he asks for their sympathy, and yet on the other hand he diminishes the culpability of the *dēmos* in his sufferings. And though the *dēmos* is partly responsible for his expulsion, Alcibiades concedes that he is also partly responsible. As depicted by Plutarch, Alcibiades at this moment neither completely abases himself before the *dēmos*, nor insults them with his anti-democratic behavior.[45] Rather, Alcibiades maintains the enthusiastic support of the *dēmos* by rhetorically occupying the space between these two extremes, allowing the *dēmos* to participate in the re-activation of his public persona.[46] Alcibiades is so successful in fact that he is named "general, possessing full powers over both land and sea" (καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός, 33.3),[47] a status which soon dooms him to a second exile from Athens (35.1).

After his triumphant return to his own polis, Chaereas is ushered by the people of Syracuse into the theatre, where they are eager to hear an account of all his adventures (ἀκοῦσαι βουλόμενον πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀποδημίας διηγήματα, Ch. 8.7.3). But instead of launching at once upon a lengthy narrative, Chaereas is said by the narrator to have taken up his story only at the very end of the events, for he did not want to concern the people with the rather grim events of the beginning of his story (κἀκεῖνος ἀπὸ τῶν τελευταίων ἤρξατο, λυπεῖν οὐ θέλων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ σκυθρωποῖς τὸν λαόν). The people are unsatisfied, though, and they demand to hear everything from the beginning and that nothing be left out (ἐρωτῶμεν, ἄνωθεν ἄρξαι, πάντα ἡμῖν λέγε, μηδὲν παραλίπῃς). And yet Chaereas still hesitates because he is

---

[45] Cf. Pelling 2000: 53–54.

[46] Gribble notes that "bold and statesman like qualities predominate" in Plutarch's depiction of Alcibiades' return to Athens (1999: 280). On Duris' exaggerated account, Wohl writes that, "Alcibiades stages a drama of his own tyranny so explicit and theatrical that Plutarch rejects the narrative altogether: he finds it unlikely that Alcibiades would vaunt himself so (*entruphēsai*) before the Athenians after his long exile and prefers to imagine that Alcibiades really returned diffident and fearful (*Alc*. 32.2). Plutarch wants Alcibiades to be the modest eromenos of a manly Athenian demos, waiting coyly to be invited ashore. Instead, the citizens prostrate themselves like a sycophantic chorus before a tragic tyrant" (2002: 150–151).

[47] Cf. Xen. *Hell*. 1.4.20: ἁπάντων ἡγεμὼν αὐτοκράτωρ.

embarrassed that not everything turned out exactly as he had wished (ὤκνει Χαιρέας, ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς τῶν οὐ κατὰ γνώμην συμβάντων αἰδούμενος, 8.7.4).

Hermocrates steps in and helps the young man by beginning his story for him, recounting as a kind of prelude to Chaereas' own story the events leading up to the expedition from Syracuse to Ionia, and when he reaches this point, he says to Chaereas, "Now you yourself describe to us the things that happened after you sailed off from here" (σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν διήγησαι τὰ μετὰ τὸν ἔκπλουν συνενεχθέντα τὸν σὸν ἐντεῦθεν, 8.7.8). Somewhat more encouraged, Chaereas begins his own narrative (Ὁ δὲ Χαιρέας ἔνθεν ἑλὼν διηγεῖτο, 8.7.9), and though the story is about himself and his wife, he never neglects the civic context of which his story is now a part. As at the beginning of the novel, private affairs are drawn out into public space and become the subject of civic discourse.[48] Always mindful of his audience's expectations and sensitivities, Chaereas treats Callirhoe's marriage to Dionysius with the utmost delicacy; "Fear not," he assures the *dēmos*, "Callirhoe was not a slave!" (μὴ φοβηθῆτε· οὐκ ἐδούλευσεν, 8.7.10). Furthermore, Callirhoe's decision to keep her child becomes in Chaereas' rhetoric a political decision, for she was not merely preserving the welfare of her own child, but desired rather "to preserve one of your own citizens" (σῶσαι τὸν πολίτην ὑμῖν, 8.7.11). This in turn becomes a plea for the citizens of Syracuse to recognize his child as a fellow citizen, and not just as a wealthy, extravagant influence from the East: "For a citizen of yours, men of Syracuse, is being raised in Miletus by a distinguished gentleman to become himself a wealthy man, for Dionysius comes from a distinguished Greek family. Let us not begrudge him his great inheritance" (τρέφεται γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες Συρακόσιοι, πολίτης ἐν Μιλήτῳ πλούσιος ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς ἐνδόξου· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνου τὸ γένος ἔνδοξον Ἑλληνικόν. μὴ φθονήσωμεν αὐτῷ μεγάλης κληρονομίας, 8.7.12).

At the subject of Chaereas' own slavery, the crowd broke out in lamentation (θρῆνον ἐξέρρηξεν ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ πλῆθος, 8.8.2); taking their cue, Chaereas amplifies the crowd's desire to hear more by expressing reticence to proceed with the more grim events which followed (ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι τὰ ἐξῆς σιωπᾶν, σκυθρωπότερα γάρ ἐστι τῶν πρώτων). The *dēmos* will have none of his silence though, for they are eager to hear everything (ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐξεβόησε "λέγε πάντα"). He tells of his fortunate rescue from crucifixion, his letter to Callirhoe which was intercepted by Dionysius, the trial at Babylon, and the events of the Egyptian rebellion. He reveals more than a hint of his ambition and power when he states that, had the pharaoh not decided to

[48] Alvares 1997: 616.

wage war without him, he would have been able to make the pharaoh the master of all Asia (ἐδυνάμην οὖν καὶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ἀποδεῖξαι πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας δεσπότην, εἰ μὴ χωρὶς ἐμοῦ μαχόμενος ἀνῃρέθη, 8.8.10). Even in apparent defeat, though, Chaereas depicts himself as victorious, for the friendship of the Persian King that he managed to regain after the rebellion was not for his own benefit, but for the benefit of the Syracusan people (φίλον ὑμῖν ἐποίησα τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα). The bond between East and West will be further secured by the future arrival of another Syracusan fleet which will one day sail from Ionia bearing the grandson of Hermocrates (ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἄλλος στόλος ἐξ Ἰωνίας ὑμέτερος· ἄξει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἑρμοκράτους ἔκγονος, 8.8.11). The picture that Chaereas paints of himself is not just as heroic lover or triumphant στρατηγός, but as ambassador and politician; he presents himself as the champion of the polis, and the polis loves him for it (Εὐχαὶ παρὰ πάντων ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπηκολούθησαν, 8.8.12).

The reluctant orator at the beginning of this scene (ὤκνει Χαιρέας, 8.7.4) has by the end of his speech become, like Alcibiades upon his return to Athens, the darling of the people. Like any good public speaker, Chaereas does not merely stand and declaim, but actively engages with his audience, playing to their hopes and expectations, teasing them into a state of suspense. Likewise the people's response to Chaereas is itself the fulfillment of a public role, for by allowing Chaereas' rhetoric to work and function properly, the people yield to their own collective desire to see Chaereas' public persona fashioned in this manner.[49] Far from being simply a one-way means of communication between speaker and audience, Chaereas' oratory is the product of a rhetorical dialogue between speaker and audience. In other words, both Chaereas and the *dēmos* share in the construction of Chaereas' public identity. Nevertheless, to enter into such a dialogue successfully, Chaereas must be proficient in the appropriate rhetoric of public discourse, a proficiency that is amply proven by the rousing response of the *dēmos*.

It is also significant that the narrative development of Chaereas as a brilliant orator focuses at the end of the novel on proficiency in a very specific type of oratorical sub-genre, namely the διήγησις.[50] The transferal of political power in Syracuse from one generation to another is expressed and performed through the medium of oratorical narrative. Throughout the scene of Chaereas' oratorical display in the theatre of Syracuse (8.7.3–8.8.12), variants of the word διήγησις are used four times in the text (8.7.3; 8.7.5; 8.7.8;

[49] Cf. Wohl's discussion of *dēmerastia* (2002: 144–158), in relation to Alcibiades' own co-constructed persona.

[50] Cf. Arist. *Rh.* 16 ($1416^{b}16$–$1417^{b}20$).

8.7.9), an indication that the narrator is drawing a strong parallel between his own rhetorical activity (διηγήσομαι, 1.1.1; 5.1.2) and that of Chaereas. Though the novel closes with the quiet scene of Callirhoe giving thanks to the goddess Aphrodite for her safe return home (8.8.15–16), it is Chaereas who at the end of the novel is endowed with the power of narrative.[51]

3 Eros, Philosophy, Politics

Alcibiades' *paranomia*, or excessive behavior, is well documented in the literary tradition by anecdotes about his erotic appetites. Of all the aspects of Alcibiades' character, the erotic became the focus of attention perhaps because his sexuality was the aspect of his character most vulnerable to titillating anecdotal exaggeration. The tradition began in the classical period during Alcibiades' own lifetime, when references to his excessive sexual desires were incorporated into a general social critique of excessive appetites and behavior. In a fragment of the comic poet Eupolis, Alcibiades' debauched sexual appetite and his boast of having invented the practice of drinking in the morning after a night of drunkenness (ἐπιπίνειν, frag. 385 K.-A.) both carry the charge of λακκοπρωκτία, or "tank-assedness," a term which, though "general in its applicability,"[52] suggests "an unquenchable and disgusting desire for pleasure."[53] The chorus leader of Aristophanes' *Acharnians* calls Alcibiades a "gossipy faggot" (εὐρύπρωκτος καὶ λάλος, Ar. *Ach.* 716). The word εὐρύπρωκτος, describing a man whose anus has been widened by frequent anal intercourse, is "the most common" term in Attic Old Comedy for a homosexual pathic, and it "seems not to have developed into a

[51] See Trenkner 1958: 154–162 for the significance of rhetorical διήγησις in the development of ancient narrative. See also Laplace, who writes that, "La narration écrite de Chariton relate donc des faites qui, à l'exception du comportement du public, de l'attitude des héros de l'aventure lors de l'assemblée finale, et des commentaires d'auteur au cours de l'ensemble de la narration, ont été l'objet d'exposés oraux présentés devant le peuple de Syracuse en un circonstance solennelle. Avant d'être retranscrite en un roman, l'histoire d'amour de Chairéas et Callirhoé est le thème de discours prononcés devant la foule rassemblée au théâtre de Syracuse. Et l'écrivain Chariton est le double réel des orateurs fictifs Hermocrate et Chairéas" (1997: 46). See also Reardon 1991: 95.

[52] Henderson 1991: 210.

[53] Gribble 1999: 79. James Davidson writes that *paranomia* "is not merely delinquency, some general disregard for all laws or authority, it is a disregard for the limits of appetite, for the laws and protocols that control desire, particularly in Alcibiades' case, the rules that govern sex and drinking" (1997: 299).

more general term of abuse but to have retained its homosexual meaning."[54] For Wohl, the term marks Alcibiades as "a sexual degenerate" and "encapsulates [the] unsavory combination of passivity and depraved excess."[55] An equally extreme presentation of Alcibiades' sexual excesses may be found in Attic oratory: in his first speech against Alcibiades, Lysias twice accuses him of incest (Lys. 14.28, 41). Elsewhere Lysias narrates the story that both Alcibiades and his uncle Axiochus together married Medontis of Abydus; when Medontis later gave birth to a daughter, Alcibiades and Axiochus shared her as they had shared the girl's mother (Athenaeus 12.434f–535a). Such character assassination is common in Attic oratory, but for Alcibiades it carried with it the special connotation of tyrannical behavior.[56]

3.1 Gender Ambiguity

Plutarch writes that "opinion about Alcibiades was undecided on account of the unevenness of his nature" (ἄκριτος ἦν ἡ δόξα περὶ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἀνωμαλίαν, Plut. *Alc*. 16.6). This idea seems to be crystallized in the image of Alcibiades in battle as he bears a shield that depicts Eros brandishing a thunderbolt (16.1–2). The shield is a sign of his dual nature, for while the thunderbolt represents a virile masculinity, the figure of Eros suggests a feminized softness and desire. The charge of effeminacy appears also to have fallen upon Alcibiades' son in the years after Alcibiades' death. Archippus says of Alcibiades' son that, "he walks wantonly, dragging his robe behind him, so that he might appear to be especially like his father" (βαδίζει … διακεχλιδώς, θοιμάτιον ἕλκων, ὅπως ἐμφερὴς μάλιστα τῷ πατρὶ δόξειεν εἶναι, Arch. frag. 48 K.-A.=Plut. *Alc*. 1.7). The adverb διακεχλιδώς is formed from the root χλιδή, which means "delicacy, luxury, effeminacy, wantonness," and "connotes the inverse of the hard and manly warrior."[57] The sins of the father, in other words, are laid upon the son.

The ambivalence of Alcibiades' "ethical gender"[58] is symptomatic of a more widespread ambivalence in the Alcibiades tradition. The conclusion of Plutarch's *Life* is particularly interesting in this regard. We are told that Alcibiades is living in Phrygia with an *hetaira* named Timandra, and that on the night he is killed he has a dream in which "he appeared to be wearing the

[54] Henderson 1991: 210. Cf. also Eupolis, frag. 385.4 K.-A.
[55] Wohl 2002: 134.
[56] Wohl 2002: 139.
[57] Wohl 2002: 133.
[58] Gribble 1999: 265.

garments of the *hetaira*, and that she herself, holding his head in her arms, was marking and applying make-up on his face like a woman" (ἐδόκει περικεῖσθαι μὲν αὐτὸς τὴν ἐσθῆτα τῆς ἑταίρας, ἐκείνην δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις ἔχουσαν αὐτοῦ κοσμεῖν τὸ πρόσωπον ὥσπερ γυναικὸς ὑπογράφουσαν καὶ ψιμυθιοῦσαν, Plut. *Alc*. 39.2). But this is not the only vision that Alcibiades is said to have had on the last night of his life, "for others report that he saw in his sleep the followers of Bagaios cutting off his own head and his body being burned" (ἕτεροι δέ φασιν ἰδεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμνοντας αὐτοῦ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Βαγαῖον ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις καὶ τὸ σῶμα καιόμενον). When the assassins set fire to his house, Alcibiades is drawn out, sword in hand, and killed from afar by javelins and arrows. The *hetaira* Timandra is then said to have wrapped Alcbiades in her garments (the partial fulfillment of his first dream) and to have provided him with a decent burial (39.3–4). Gribble writes that, "Alcibiades dies in a brave final stand against his enemies, certainly, but ambushed at night in bed with a *hetaira*, who buries him in women's clothes, an uncomfortable reminder of the dissolute, 'feminine' Alcibiades of the early *Life*, and of the fundamental tension between Alcibiades as lion and Alcibiades as woman, with which we began."[59] Wohl concludes similarly that "This version of his death is a parodic replay of his life: the extravagance, effeminacy, luxury, and foreignness that had characterized him become in the end obscene and pathetic. Alcibiades lived his life along the boundaries of Athenian masculinity; in death he crosses those boundaries, becoming a foreigner and a woman."[60]

But then, as if to pull the rug from beneath the reader's feet, Plutarch adds that there are other accounts of Alcibiades' end:

> αἰτίαν δέ φασιν οὐ Φαρνάβαζον οὐδὲ Λύσανδρον οὐδὲ Λακεδαιμονίους παρασχεῖν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην γνωρίμων τινῶν διεφθαρκότα γύναιον ἔχειν σὺν αὑτῷ, τοὺς δ' ἀδελφοὺς τοῦ γυναίου τὴν ὕβριν οὐ μετρίως φέροντας ἐμπρῆσαί τε τὴν οἰκίαν νύκτωρ, ἐν ᾗ διαιτώμενος ἐτύγχανεν ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, καὶ καταβαλεῖν αὐτόν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξαλλόμενον.
>
> They say that the cause was not Pharnabazus, nor Lysander, nor the Lacedaemonians, but that Alcibiades himself, having ruined a girl belonging to some people of good reputation, kept the girl with himself. And the brothers of this girl, unable to bear the transgression with moderation, set fire in the night to the house in which he happened to be liv-

[59] Gribble 1999: 281.
[60] Wohl 2002: 142.

> ing and shot him down, as was reported, as he ran out through the fire. (Plut. *Alc*. 39.5)

Not only is Alcibiades' final dream ambivalent, but there is ambivalence too regarding the circumstances of his death. Gribble posits that the purpose of this final narrative ambivalence is to problematize "the moral significance of the death," for in the Plutarchan *Lives*, "the death of the hero is often deeply suggestive of his character as a whole, and the carefully calculated uncertainties surrounding the death of Alcibiades are thematically suggestive in their own way."[61] Wohl writes that, "It is typical that politics and sexuality cannot be segregated even in his death: he dies first as a general, then as a libertine."[62]

A similar ambiguity of ethical gender famously surrounds the heroes of the Greek romances. Konstan traces the feminization of the romantic hero back to the influence of New Comedy and elegiac love poetry: "There is always something fey about the young lovers in New Comedy, and when the elegiac poets compare the efforts of the long-suffering lover to the rigors of a soldier on campaign, as in Ovid's pithy formula, *militat omnis amans* ('every lover does battle,' *Amores* 1.9.1), there is a deliberately comical conflation of two conventionally opposite stereotypes, the manly warrior and the effete *inamorato*."[63] Konstan perhaps overemphasizes the influence of love elegy on the romance tradition; nevertheless, though love elegy and romance proceeded along separate courses of stylistic development, both genres share tropes in common with New Comedy. Haynes reminds us that the interpretation of the romantic heroes as feminine goes at least as far back as Rohde, who described the amorous young men as "*schwachlich*."[64] Bowie's remark in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* about Chaereas' "feeble figure"[65] is a typical reaction.

Chariton's depiction of Chaereas is particularly frustrating, for throughout most of the novel Chaereas fulfills the stereotype of the passive romantic hero. His erotic vulnerability is expressed by emotional vicissitudes. When, for instance, he conceives an *erōs* for Callirhoe, his body weakens and wastes as if he has been afflicted with a disease (Ch. 1.1.7ff). And in his several fits of despair at having lost Callirhoe, the young man tends toward

---

[61] Gribble 1999: 281.
[62] Wohl 2002: 142.
[63] Konstan 1994: 180.
[64] Rohde 1960: 356; Haynes 2003: 81. See also Anderson 1982: 88; 1984: 64.
[65] Bowie 1986: 689.

the suicidal. Ironically, though, that same suicidal tendency causes Chaereas at the beginning of Book 7 to throw himself headlong into a crusade of vengeance against the Persian King Artaxerxes. By the end of the novel, Chaereas appears to have shed his mantle of feminine passivity and to have donned instead the uniform of a general (σχῆμα ἔχων στρατηγοῦ, 8.6.8). Drawing on the work of Cedric Whitman, Jean Frappier, and Joseph Campbell, Schmeling has convincingly argued that Chaereas' transformation into masculine warrior is a "final act of correction" consistent with the mythic pattern of heroism: at the end of the novel Chaereas "deserves Callirhoe and his famous father-in-law; his adventures and trials have made him a worthy hero, to be admired by his parents, loved by his wife, and worshipped by the common people of Syracuse, desperately in need of a hero."[66]

Taking a more psychological approach, Suzanne MacAlister has argued that Chaereas' suicidal gesture mid-way through the novel is not really suicidal at all, but rather a strategy of testing his masculine resolve. As he is preparing to sail off to the east in search of Callirhoe, Chaereas is confronted with the lamentations of his parents. The narrator states that, "Chaereas was crushed before the appeals of his parents, and he threw himself off the ship into the sea, wishing to die so that he might flee his choice between two options, either not to seek out Callirhoe or to cause his parents' pain. Diving in quickly, the sailors barely raised him up" (κατεκλάσθη Χαιρέας πρὸς τὰς τῶν γονέων ἱκεσίας καὶ ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς νεὼς εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἀποθανεῖν θέλων, ἵνα φύγῃ δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ [τὸ] μὴ ζητεῖν Καλλιρόην ἢ [τὸ] λυπῆσαι τοὺς γονεῖς· ταχέως δὲ ἀπορρίψαντες οἱ ναῦται μόλις αὐτὸν ἀνεκούφισαν, 3.5.6). Rather than read this behavior as feminine weakness, we may perhaps understand it as a self-inflicted trial of determination. "In jumping into the sea," writes MacAlister, "Chaereas makes a gesture involving a deliberate gamble with death from which he emerges with a renewed commitment to his mission, no longer vulnerable to the frustration and ambivalence brought about by his parents' last-minute intervention."[67] This test of masculine resolve is paradoxical, though, in that it is expressed in typically feminine behavior. Rather than stand up and face his parents' pain, Chaereas attempts to "escape" (ἵνα φύγῃ) his responsibilities. By ceding his future to a "gamble with death," as MacAlister puts it, Chaereas refuses to take the initiative himself.[68]

---

[66] Schmeling 1974: 135.

[67] MacAlister 1996: 28.

[68] Cf. Toohey 2004:162–171, who reads Chaereas' suicide attempt as performative.

Following Reardon's remark that, "In romantic psychology, the female is a better focus for romance than the male,"[69] Haynes argues that the depiction of a specifically *romantic* hero necessitates a process of feminization, for the world of the romance is a decidedly feminine world, ruled by the powers of love and emotion. The suddenness of Chaereas' transformation into στρατηγός can then be understood as the result of a masculine "unease" which demands "proofs of masculinity."[70] My own approach, though, is different, for we need not envision a rupture in the depiction of Chaereas in the novel. Chaereas' martial *aristeia* in Books 7 and 8 does not necessarily disrupt "earlier textual signals" and upset "a consistent set of values by which to judge heroic actions."[71] A key to understanding Chaereas' ambivalent ethical gender, I argue, is the narrator's programmatic comparison to Alcibiades at the beginning of the novel, for by conceptualizing his hero as an Alcibiadean character, Chariton accommodates a whole series of paradoxical characterizations. Just as Chaereas can appear to be both ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος simultaneously (1.1.3; 1.3.6), so too can he simultaneously sustain masculine and feminine personae.

In Plutarch, Alcibiades' femininity is marked in part by a "transgressive pursuit of pleasure"[72] or *paranomia*. Chaereas' pursuit of pleasure, by contrast, is subordinate to his retrieval of Callirhoe. Pleasure, in other words, is meaningless for Chaereas until Callirhoe is at his side once more.[73] Once Callirhoe is again in his possession, I argue, he is every bit as vulnerable to the seductions of pleasure as is Alcibiades. He is at his most dangerously vulnerable when he is unable to sustain his focus on his naval duties on his return journey to Syracuse and entrusts the leadership of the fleet to Polycharmus so that he might devote all of his attention to Callirhoe (Πολύχαρμος ἐπικαταπλεῖ ταῖς ἄλλαις τριήρεσιν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν πεπιστευμένος τὸν

[69] Reardon 1991: 99.
[70] Haynes 2003: 100.
[71] Haynes 2003: 100.
[72] Gribble 1999: 266.
[73] And yet there is an indication in the text that Chaereas indulges in pleasures even without Callirhoe at his side. After he is rescued from crucifixion, Chaereas is treated lavishly by Mithridates: "At once Mithridates ordered his slaves to take Chaereas and Polycharmus to the baths and to minister to their bodies, and when they had been washed he dressed them in expensive Greek garments. He himself invited his friends to a drinking party and Chaereas' rescue became a celebration. The drinking was deep, the courtesy sweet, and there was no lack of rejoicing" (εὐθὺς οὖν προσέταξε τοῖς οἰκέταις ἄγειν ἐπὶ λουτρὰ καὶ τὰ σώματα θεραπεῦσαι, λουσαμένοις δὲ περιθεῖναι χλαμύδας Ἑλληνικὰς πολυτελεῖς· αὐτὸς δὲ γνωρίμους εἰς [τὸ] συμπόσιον παρεκάλει καὶ ἔθυε Χαιρέου σωτηρία. πότος ἦν μακρὸς καὶ ἡδεῖα φιλοφρόνησις καὶ θυμηδίας οὐδὲν ἐνέδει, Ch. 4.3.7)

ἄλλον στόλον ἀπὸ Κύπρου διὰ τὸ μηκέτι Χαιρέαν ἄλλῳ τινὶ σχολάζειν δύνασθαι πλὴν Καλλιρόῃ μόνῃ, 8.6.9). If Chaereas' disavowal of his duties is transgressive, as I suggest, then why is his transgression not remarked upon in the text either by the narrator or by any other character? In fact, a reader must backtrack to account for Chaereas' (un)involvement in the return trans-Mediterranean voyage.

We are informed, first, that the Athenians still present a threat on the open sea (8.2.12), and that the journey from Cyprus to Syracuse is a long one (8.2.13). Furthermore, Chaereas himself, the narrator tells us, is afraid of yet more divine retribution (8.5.6). Though the journey is ultimately accomplished in safety, and despite the fact that the fleet is not entirely out of danger, the narrator gives absolutely no indication that Chaereas, curled up in bed with Callirhoe, has been neglecting his duty as στρατηγός. The reader is made to believe by a deft narrative manipulation that Chaereas has been in charge of the fleet for the entire journey from Cyprus to Syracuse. It is only after their safe arrival at Sicily when the narrator reveals that Polycharmus has actually been the one in charge.

The image of Chaereas as the heroic στρατηγός, returning triumphantly to his polis, becomes upon closer inspection the effect of a narrative sleight of hand. Such a narrative strategy is appropriate though, since there are all sorts of deceptions and conceits at play in the scene of Chaereas' return to Syracuse. The decoration of the triremes and the fleet's close sailing formation (ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐφάνησαν Συρακοῦσαι, τοῖς τριηράρχαις ἐκέλευσε κοσμῆσαι τὰς τριήρεις καὶ ἅμα συντεταγμέναις πλεῖν, 8.6.2) prompt the Syracusans on shore to think that the island is once again under attack by the Athenians. The Syracusans are kept in further suspense when they are told that the fleet are Egyptian merchants (8.6.4). The deceptions do not end there, for once they reach shore, Chaereas and Callirhoe are veiled from view by the Babylonian tapestries of a tent set up on the deck of their ship, and their dramatic unveiling comes as a climax to the preceding charades (8.6.7). The narrative illusion that Chaereas is the one still in charge of the fleet is, I maintain, part of the elaborate games of deception deployed in this scene. Not only are the Syracusans kept in suspense and manipulated by a series of deceptions, but the reader too is manipulated by the narrator.

The entire episode is reminiscent of Alcibiades' triumphant return to Athens after his long exile (407 BC), recounted by Xenophon, Ephorus, Theopompus, Timaeus, Duris, Nepos, and Plutarch (see above, section 2). Plutarch's account reveals a variety of depictions and demonstrates to what extent Alcibiades' βίος had become mythologized by Greek writers. The

account of Duris in particular (Plut. *Alc*. 32.2–3), though discounted by Plutarch, nevertheless exhibits Alcibiades' feminine *paranomia*. Like Alcibiades, Chaereas orders his ships to be decorated, and the entry of the ships into the harbor becomes a spectacle for the citizenry gathered on shore. But Chaereas' ornamentation of his fleet is nowhere nearly as ornate as Alcibiades' fleet in the account of Duris. In fact, one could argue that Chaereas' games of deception are just part of his excitement at finally being home. As far as the reader is concerned at first glance, Chaereas *is* the idealized, heroized, masculine figure which the narrative appears to make him out to be. The idealized representation of Chaereas is undermined only after the reader learns that Chaereas has *not* been in charge of the fleet the whole time, that he has in fact been luxuriously stowed away making love to Callirhoe (8.6.9). By delaying this information, the narrator allows the reader to take part in Chaereas' games of deception; the reader, like the people of Syracuse, is given reason to second-guess his or her certainties and to suspend judgement.[74] It is as if the narrator concedes with a wink and a nod that even though he is cloaked in the uniform of a general, Chaereas is still the feminized hero of the beginning of the novel. Even in terms of a dangerously transgressive pursuit of pleasure (*paranomia*), Chaereas is after all rather like his classical contemporary Alcibiades.

3.2 Erōs tyrannos

Alcibiades' pivotal role in Plato's *Symposium* secured his place in the literary and philosophical discourse on *erōs*. Drawing on Hellenistic historiography in addition to literature from the classical period, Nepos declares at the beginning of his biography that Alcibiades was "by far the most beautiful of all the men of his age" (*omnium aetatis suae multo formosissimus*, Nep. *Alc*. 1). But that which was his virtue was also his vice, for the young man who is

[74] Analyzing the ways in which the narrator guides the reader through the novel, Puccini-Delbey writes that, "Le lecteur est ainsi sans cesse guidé par le narrateur dans la prévision heureuse ou malheureuse du sort des divers personnages. Nous sommes à l'opposé du roman policier où le texte pousse volontairement son lecteur à formuler des prévisions erronées" (2001: 94). While it is true that the narrator frequently guides the reader through the novel's plot and through the vicissitudes of *pathēmata*, I suggest also that there is much for the reader to consider beyond what is articulated explicitly by the narrator. It is perhaps misleading, in other words, to posit as an ideal reader only that reader who unquestioningly follows the narrator as guide. Sometimes, as in this case, it is equally important to consider what the narrator does *not* say about his subject as what he does say. It is only in this way that we can discover the alternate voices which undermine the novel's idealizing *telos*.

defined to a great extent by his erotic nature is bound also to be described as *libidinosus*. By the late 1st century CE, the erotic dynamic was an established part of the Alcibiades tradition, and Plutarch, Chariton's contemporary, begins the erotic depiction of his subject, appropriately enough, by describing Alcibiades' physical beauty: "with respect to his childhood, his youth, and his manhood, beauty bloomed forth in every age and season of his body, and always offered something lovely and pleasant" (καὶ παῖδα καὶ μειράκιον καὶ ἄνδρα πάσῃ συνανθῆσαν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ ὥρᾳ τοῦ σώματος ἐράσμιον καὶ ἡδὺν παρέσχεν, Plut. *Alc*. 1.3). Wohl compares to this description Socrates' claim that of all Alcibiades' lovers he alone remains after the bloom of Alcibiades' youthful beauty has faded (Plato *Alc. 1* 131c–e). Wohl sees Socrates' flattery as a strategy of seduction and writes that, "This moralization is an attempt to legitimate Alcibiades' sex appeal by leeching it of its sex, but in distinguishing so firmly between philosophical desire and common desire, it merely highlights the fact that Alcibiades was attractive to adult men in a way that adult men were not supposed to be."[75] Whatever the transgressive implications of Alcibiades' perennial beauty, it certainly had some pragmatic and political advantages, for "soon many well-to-do men began to crowd around him and follow him around, and the rest were paying attention to him because they were plainly struck by the brilliance of his youthful beauty" (ἤδη δὲ πολλῶν καὶ γενναίων ἀθροιζομένων καὶ περιεπόντων, οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι καταφανεῖς ἦσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς ὥρας ἐκπεπληγμένοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες, Plut. *Alc*. 4.1).

Chariton seems to have had in mind the image of the much-courted Alcibiades when he was developing the character of the young Chaereas at the beginning of his novel. Earlier in this chapter I discussed at length the programmatic description of Chaereas' superlative, Alcibiadean physical beauty, but Callirhoe was not the only person in Syracuse upon whom Chaereas' beauty had such a powerful affect. When we see Chaereas for the first time in the story, he is returning home from the *gymnasion*, "gleaming like a star, for the flush of the wrestling arena bloomed upon the light of his face" (στίλβων ὥσπερ ἀστήρ· ἐπήνθει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῷ λαμπρῷ τοῦ προσώπου τὸ ἐρύθημα τῆς παλαίστρας, Ch. 1.1.5). This is the image of the young man that sets Callirhoe's heart ablaze; but Callirhoe is a sheltered girl, whereas Chaereas' appearance, star-like, in the streets of Syracuse is by contrast implied to be a frequent occurrence. When Chaereas becomes distracted by Callirhoe, the narrator says that, "the *gymnasion* longed for Chaereas, and it was nearly deserted, for the crowd of young men loved him" (ἐπόθει δὲ τὸ γυμνάσιον

[75] Wohl 2002: 132.

Χαιρέαν καὶ ὥσπερ ἔρημον ἦν. ἐφίλει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ νεολαία, 1.1.10). Chariton may be describing a purely amicable relationship between Chaereas and the other young men of Syracuse, but the language is erotic, and one is reminded of Aristophanes' famous line about Athens' desirous longing for Alcibiades: ποθεῖ μέν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται δ' ἔχειν (Ar. *Ran.* 1425). The son of the tyrant of Rhegium, one of Callirhoe's Italian suitors, angrily refers to Chaereas as a "rentboy in rags" (πόρνος καὶ πένης, Ch. 1.2.3): is this merely the slander of a jealous rival, or is there perhaps some truth in the remark?[76] Later, when the rival Italian suitors have staged a scene of night revels in the doorway of Chaereas' house, to make it seem as if Callirhoe had been the subject of continued courtship while Chaereas was away visiting his father (Ch. 1.3.2), Chaereas becomes enraged at the prospect of his wife's infidelity. But Callirhoe conducts herself proudly, claiming that, "no one reveled at my father's house; perhaps it is your own vestibule that is accustomed to revels, and your marriage wounds your lovers" (οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν οἰκίαν ἐκώμασεν … τὰ δὲ σὰ πρόθυρα συνήθη τυχόν ἐστι τοῖς κώμοις, καὶ τὸ γεγαμηκέναι σε λυπεῖ τοὺς ἐραστάς, 1.3.6). These are the only references to Greek *paiderastia* in Chariton's novel,[77] and their primary function in the narrative is to mark Chaereas as an object of desire. The focus thus far has been on Chaereas as the erotic other-half of Callirhoe (cf. 1.1.6). But the accusations made by the prince of Rhegium and Callirhoe hint at Chaereas' (promiscuous?) homoerotic past, compelling the reader to see Chaereas not just as the ἐραστής of Callirhoe, but also as an objectified ἐρώμενος, a paradoxical doubling which reinforces his likeness to Alcibiades, established at the beginning of the novel.

Alcibiades' intemperate behavior as husband is also relevant to the development of Chaereas' character. Alcibiades was notorious for indulging his erotic desires outside of marriage, and when Alcibiades' wife could no longer tolerate her husband's philandering, she submitted a plea for divorce in person before the magistrate. Pseudo-Andocides states that, "here indeed he displayed his power, for, having summoned his companions to his side, he snatched his wife out of the agora and departed violently, and he made it clear to all that he disdained the laws, the archons, and the rest of the citizens" (οὗ δὴ μάλιστα τὴν αὑτοῦ δύναμιν ἐπεδείξατο· παρακαλέσας γὰρ τοὺς ἑταίρους, ἁρπάσας ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς τὴν γυναῖκα ᾤχετο βίᾳ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐδήλωσε

[76] Reardon has, rightly I think, retained the reading in F, rejecting the suggestions of Praechter (ἄπορος) and Jakob (μόνος).

[77] Plepelits 1976: 164 and Goold 1995: 41. *Paiderastia* is much more common in the novels of Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles Tatius.

καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν καταφρονῶν, Ps. And. 4.14). In his own account of the story, Plutarch provides an *apologia* for Alcibiades' behavior, claiming that "his violence seems not to have been completely excessive or inhumane" (αὕτη μὲν οὖν οὐ παντελῶς ἔδοξεν ἡ βία παράνομος οὐδ' ἀπάνθρωπος εἶναι, Plut. *Alc*. 8.5), because it was the right of a husband under Athenian law to thwart his wife's attempt at divorce. The historical and cultural contextualization of the story seems to be Plutarch's own attempt to disarm Alcibiades of the exaggerated *hybris* alleged by 5th and 4th century rhetoric.[78] Nevertheless, the image of the intemperate husband was a believable enough representation of Alcibiades for Pseudo-Andocides to have included it in his attack on Alcibiades' character.

The likely parallel for Alcibiades' violent behavior in Chariton's novel is of course Chaereas' assault on his own wife Callirhoe. Tricked into believing that she is having an affair with another man, and thinking that he will catch the adulterous pair *in delicto flagrante*, Chaereas storms into his house: "He had not the voice to rebuke her, but overcome by rage he kicked her as she was approaching him. His foot landed squarely in her diaphragm and stopped the girl's breathing" (κρατούμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐλάκτισε προσιοῦσαν. εὐστόχως οὖν ὁ ποὺς κατὰ τοῦ διαφράγματος ἐνεχθεὶς ἐπέσχε τῆς παιδὸς τὴν ἀναπνοήν, 1.4.11–12). The scene seems to have its origin in the folk theme of a lover's groundless suspicion, such as in the story of Procris and Cephalus (Ov. *Met*. 7.694ff) or the story about "the husband who in the dark felt his son's head near that of his wife and taking him for her lover killed him."[79] It is also possible that the scene has its origins in comedy, though in New Comedy the most frequent kind of violence against young marriageable women (i.e. not *hetairai* or *meretrices*) is rape.[80] It is more likely that Chaereas' assault on Callirhoe is a variation of the διήγησις from Lysias' speech against Eratosthenes (see above, Chapter 5). Hunter proposes that Chariton had in mind also an entire anecdotal tradition about tyrannical domestic abuse. Citing W. Ameling's study on "Tyrannen und schwangere Frauen,"[81] Hunter writes that "In kicking his (as it is to turn out) pregnant wife, Chaireas acts out a familiar pattern in the stories of the cruelty of tyrants. Similar deeds are ascribed in various narrative traditions to Periander (Diog. Laert. 1.94), Cambyses (Hdt. 3.32), Herodes Atticus (Phi-

[78] Gribble 1999: 267.

[79] Trenkner 1958: 94. Trenkner cites Pseudo-Plutarch *De Fluv*. 20.1; Phaedrus 3.10; Lucian *Meretr. dial.* 12.4.

[80] Rosivach 1998: 13–50. Menander: *Epitrepontes*, *Geōrgos*, *Hērōs*, *Phasma*, *Plokion*, *Samia*; Plautus: *Aulularia*, *Cistellaria*, *Truculentus*; Terence: *Adelphoe*, *Hecyra*, *Phormio*.

[81] Ameling, W. (1986), "Tyrannen und schwangere Frauen", *Historia* 35, 507–508.

lostratus, VS 2.1.8) and Nero (e.g. Tacitus, Ann. 16.6.1, Suetonius, Nero 35.3)."[82] It is important to remember in this scene that the Italian suitors who have tricked Chaereas into a state of jealousy are either the sons of tyrants (υἱὸς τοῦ Ῥηγίνων τυράννου, Ch. 1.2.2) or are themselves tyrants (ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος, 1.2.4). Hunter concludes that, "jealousy here reduces Chaireas to the level of the 'tyrants' who are plotting against him; he 'imitates' them in becoming their tool." The character-type represented by Alcibiades is also helpful in triggering these associations; like his classical contemporary Alcibiades, Chaereas too tends toward tyrannical behavior: he is incapable of containing his jealous tendencies and therefore acts out violently against his wife.

Ζηλοτυπία[83] combines with the themes of *erōs*, violence, and tyranny to haunt Chaereas throughout Chariton's novel, a potent combination of themes which were prominent also in anecdotes about Alcibiades. Plato's humorous depiction of Alcibiades' jealous, tyrannical behavior in the *Symposium* begins when the young man bursts into the party already drunk and interrupts the orderly manner of drinking which was being practiced before his arrival. Alcibiades is surprised to see Socrates in attendance and jokes that the old man is always turning up where least expected: "God, what is this?! Is this Socrates?! You have lain here waiting to ambush me, as you always appear suddenly where I thought you would least be" (Ὦ Ἡράκλεις, τουτὶ τί ἦν; Σωκράτης οὗτος; ἐλλοχῶν αὖ με ἐνταῦθα κατέκεισο, ὥσπερ εἰώθεις ἐξαίφνης ἀναφαίνεσθαι ὅπου ἐγὼ ᾤμην ἥκιστά σε ἔσεσθαι, Plato *Sym*., 213b8–c2). Noticing the couches, Alcibiades remarks upon Socrates' position at the side of the handsome young Agathon: "you've contrived it, Socrates, so that you could lie down next to the prettiest boy here!" (ἀλλὰ διεμηχανήσω ὅπως παρὰ τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν ἔνδον κατακείσῃ, 213c4–5). In response to Alcibiades' flirtatious drunkenness, Socrates cowers dramatically beside Agathon and explains that, "ever since I have been his lover, it is no longer possible for me either to look upon or to talk with anyone good-looking, or else this one, <u>becoming jealous</u> and resenting me, does the most unbelievable things and yells at me and <u>can barely keep his hands off me</u>. Watch out that he doesn't do something even now; come, help reconcile us, or, if he starts to <u>act violently</u>, defend me, because I really dread his <u>madness and erotic obsession</u>" (ἀπ' ἐκείνου γὰρ τοῦ χρόνου, ἀφ' οὗ τούτου ἠράσθην, οὐκέτι ἔξεστίν μοι οὔτε προσβλέψαι οὔτε διαλεχθῆναι καλῷ οὐδ' ἑνί, ἢ οὑτοσὶ <u>ζηλοτυ-</u>

[82] Hunter 1994: 1080.

[83] On the associations of ζηλοτυπία with sex and violence in classical literature, see Fantham 1986.

πῶν με καὶ φθονῶν θαυμαστὰ ἐργάζεται καὶ λοιδορεῖταί τε καὶ τῷ χεῖρε μόγις ἀπέχεται. ὅρα οὖν μή τι καὶ νῦν ἐργάσηται, ἀλλὰ διάλλαξον ἡμᾶς, ἢ ἐὰν ἐπιχειρῇ βιάζεσθαι, ἐπάμυνε, ὡς ἐγὼ τὴν τούτου μανίαν τε καὶ φιλερασ-τίαν πάνυ ὀρρωδῶ, 213c8–d6). Socrates' reaction, though humorously over-the-top, is nevertheless consistent with the classical depiction of Alcibiades' erotically transgressive behavior (*paranomia*): he is the over-eager ἐρώμε-νος, desperate to be the center of his lover's attention, and becoming violent when his jealousy is aroused. The effect in Plato's scene is comic, to be sure, and it is doubtful that the relationship between Socrates and Alcibiades was actually violent. Nevertheless, it is easy to see how later writers would focus on this scene as inspiration for the anecdotal expansion of Alcibiades' jeal-ous character. In addition to the story in Pseudo-Andocides about Alci-biades' violent treatment of his wife in the midst of the Athenian agora, there is the story recounted by the Hellenistic writer Satyrus, that once "testing his wife, Alcibiades sent to her a thousand darics, as if he were another man" (τὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα πειρῶν ὡς ἕτερος ἔπεμψεν αὐτῇ χιλίους δαρεικούς, Ath. 12.534c). But the Platonic depiction of Alcibiades in particular, with its tightly-knit associations of tyranny, violence (βία), and jealousy (ζηλοτυπία) seems to have had a special resonance with Chariton.

Chaereas' depiction as an intemperate, jealous youth is consistent with the type represented by Alcibiades beginning in the classical period. In their plot to destroy the marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe, the Italian tyrants focus precisely on Chaereas' erotic jealousy as his weakness. The tyrant from Acragas declares to his fellow conspirators that, "I shall arm Jealousy against him, and she, taking Eros as her ally, will accomplish some major damage in our favor" (ἐφοπλιῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ Ζηλοτυπίαν, ἥτις σύμμαχον λαβοῦσα τὸν Ἔρωτα μέγα τι κακὸν διαπράξεται, Ch. 1.2.5). The tyrant ex-plains that, "since he was raised in the *gymnasia* and is not inexperienced with youthful transgressions, Chaereas can in his suspicion easily fall into erotic jealousy" (ὁ δὲ Χαιρέας, οἷα δὴ γυμνασίοις ἐντραφεὶς καὶ νεωτερι-κῶν ἁμαρτημάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος, δύναται ῥᾳδίως ὑποπτεύσας ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἐρωτικὴν ζηλοτυπίαν, 1.2.6). The plan works, but Chaereas' ζηλοτυπία is so uncontrollable that it results in Callirhoe's apparent death. Later in Babylon, as suspense surrounding the pending trial builds to a climax, the women hope that Callirhoe will remain with her savior Dionysius, concerned that Chaereas' anger, fragile and easily aroused, would again put the young woman in danger (τί δὲ ἂν πάλιν ὀργισθῇ Χαιρέας; 6.1.5). And at the end of the novel, Callirhoe herself is twice cautious of arousing her husband's "in-nate jealousy" (ἔμφυτος ζηλοτυπία, 8.1.15; 8.4.4). Chaereas' character is

morally problematic – even in the novel's supposedly idealized conclusion – in much the same way that Alcibiades' character is morally problematic. The violent, jealous, and tyrannical qualities attributed to Alcibiades by (among others) Plato, Pseudo-Andocides, Satyrus, and Plutarch are the same qualities attributed by Chariton to Chaereas, either expressly or by implication.

Alcibiades' relationship with Socrates is perhaps the most important aspect in the development of his character in the literary tradition. Plutarch writes that, although Alcibiades attracted a whole crowd of wealthy, influential ἐρασταί, "Socrates' love for Alcibiades was the great proof of the boy's excellence and good nature" (ὁ δὲ Σωκράτους ἔρως μέγα μαρτύριον ἦν τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐφυΐας τοῦ παιδός, Plut. *Alc*. 6.1). As long as Alcibiades is in Socrates' company, his hedonistic appetites are curbed (Plato *Alc. 1* 131c–e; *Symp*. 216a8–b3, 218c7–d5), but despite the philosophical example provided by Socrates, Alcibiades nevertheless "was of course easily led to pleasures" (Ἀλκιβιάδης δ' ἦν μὲν ἀμέλει καὶ πρὸς ἡδονὰς ἀγώγιμος, Plut. *Alc*. 6.2). Plutarch explains that the cause of Alcibiades' waywardness from the Socratic example was due in part to his παρανομία (cf. Thuc. 6.15.4), and partly to the flattering companions who seized upon his love of fame and distinction (τῆς φιλοτιμίας ἐπιλαμβανόμενοι καὶ τῆς φιλοδοξίας, Plut. *Alc*. 6.3). Plutarch calls these flattering companions Alcibiades' "corrupters" (οἱ διαφθείροντες), and he says that they "drove him too soon towards lofty ambition" (ἐνέβαλλον οὐ καθ' ὥραν εἰς μεγαλοπραγμοσύνην).

Alcibiades' relationship with Socrates has a peculiar analogue at the end of Chariton's novel. After Chaereas has agreed at Paphos to send Stateira back to the Persian King Artaxerxes, Chaereas appoints for the task a man in his camp named Demetrius. This is the first time that the reader learns of this man, and the narrator explains that, "there was a certain Demetrius among the Egyptians, a philospher, an acquaintance of the King, advanced in age, different from the rest of the Egyptians in education and virtue" (ἦν οὖν τις ἐν Αἰγυπτίοις Δημήτριος, φιλόσοφος, βασιλεῖ γνώριμος, ἡλικίᾳ προήκων, παιδείᾳ καὶ ἀρετῇ τῶν ἄλλων Αἰγυπτίων διαφέρων, Ch. 8.3.10). The idea of the romantic hero's encounter with an eastern Socrates is not an invention of Chariton. In Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia*, after his conquest of Armenia Cyrus becomes reacquainted with his boyhood friend, the Armenian prince Tigranes, and Cyrus remembers in particular that when they used to hunt together as boys, a wise man or, perhaps, "sophist" (the ambiguity is likely intentional on Xenophon's part), much admired by Tigranes, would accompany them (σοφιστήν τινα αὐτῷ συνόντα καὶ θαυμαζόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Τιγράνου, Xen. *Cyr*. 3.1.14). Cyrus later asks Tigranes about the philoso-

pher, to which Tigranes replies that his father, the Armenian King, ordered the man to be killed because he thought the philosopher was corrupting him (διαφθείρειν αὐτὸν ἔφη ἐμέ, 3.1.38). Despite his father's accusation of corruption, Tigranes says that the man was καλὸς κἀγαθὸς. Deborah Levine Gera writes that, "We are, of course, immediately reminded of the execution of Socrates and the charge brought against the philosopher."[84] Although he "is not meant to be an exact copy or double of Socrates," the Armenian σοφιστής "shares not only Socrates' fate but some of the philosopher's vocabulary and concerns as well."[85]

Considering the significant influence of Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia* on Chariton's narrative, it is perhaps not surprising that an eastern philosopher-friend in the Socratic mold is to be found in Chaereas' company. Because of his virtue and philosophical nature, Demetrius is charged by Chaereas with the task of accompanying the Persian queen Stateira back home to Persia from Paphos. Calling Demetrius to him, Chaereas says, "I myself wanted to take you with me, but instead I am making you the broker of an important transaction, for I am sending the queen back to the Great King through you. This service will make you even more honored by him and will restore the rest to favor" (ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην <μὲν> μετ' ἐμαυτοῦ σε ἄγειν, ἀλλὰ μεγάλης πράξεως ὑπηρέτην σε ποιοῦμαι· τὴν γὰρ βασιλίδα τῷ μεγάλῳ βασιλεῖ πέμπω διὰ σοῦ. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ σὲ ποιήσει τιμιώτερον ἐκείνῳ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους διαλλάξει, Ch. 8.3.10–11). Since the stylization of Chaereas' character is based in part upon generic literary representations of Alcibiades, and since Alcibiades' relationship with Socrates is so prominent a part of those literary representations, we may with justification read Chaereas' treatment of the φιλόσοφος Demetrius within the frame of the Alcibiades tradition.

Just as Xenophon writes that Alcibiades turned away from Socrates as soon as he was able to engage in politics (τὰ πολιτικά, Xen. *Mem*. 1.2.16), so too does Chaereas abandon his own φιλόσοφος for purposes more politically shrewd than philosophical. Granted, the service performed by Demetrius on one level demonstrates Chaereas' clemency. On another level, though, Chaereas' clemency is not altruistic mercy, but rather an expression of moral and military superiority. In his letter to the Great King, Chaereas writes: "You were intending to judge the trial, but I myself have already been victorious before the eyes of the fairest judge, for war is the best arbiter of the stronger and the weaker" (σὺ μὲν ἔμελλες τὴν δίκην κρίνειν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἤδη νενίκηκα παρὰ τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ δικαστῇ· πόλεμος γὰρ ἄριστος κριτὴς τοῦ κρείττονός τε

[84] Gera 1993: 91.
[85] Gera 1993: 93–94.

καὶ χείρονος, Ch. 8.4.2). And although Demetrius is marked by the narrator for his education and virtue (παιδείᾳ καὶ ἀρετῇ, 8.3.10), Chaereas uses the φιλόσοφος not for propaedeutic purposes, but to secure a political alliance with Persia. Since Chaereas' original intention was to take Demetrius back to Syracuse with him, we may assume that Chaereas wanted to retain Demetrius for the continued cultivation of his own education and virtue. The "important transaction" (μεγάλη πράξις) of restoring the queen to Persia has taken precedence, however, and Chaereas thus alters his plan and puts philosophy in the service of τὰ πολιτικά.

Pertinent to any discussion of Alcibiades' relationship to Socrates is the charge made by the Athenian *dēmos* that, apart from not believing in the gods that the polis believed in, and apart from bringing new spirits into the city, Socrates committed a crime by corrupting the city's young men (ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἕτερα δὲ καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων· ἀδικεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς νέους διαφθείρων, Xen. *Mem*. 1.1.1). In other words, "The demos laid Alcibiades' *paranomia* at Socrates' door, blaming him for transforming their lion cub into a tyrannical lion. Philosophy returns the charge, arguing that it was not Socrates but the demos that corrupted Alcibiades."[86] Xenophon, for example, refuses to defend Alcibiades' career (οὐκ ἀπολογήσομαι, Xen. *Mem*. 1.2.13), and claims, contrary to the accusation against Socrates, that Alcibiades and Critias were already corrupt when they came into Socrates' company, and that, by becoming intimate with Socrates, they intended only to gain the philosophical tools for mastery over others. Xenophon writes that, "as soon as they thought they were more powerful than their companions, departing at once from Socrates they began to engage in politics, the very reason why they reached out to Socrates in the first place" (ὡς γὰρ τάχιστα κρείττονε τῶν συγγιγνομένων ἡγησάσθην εἶναι, εὐθὺς ἀποπηδήσαντε Σωκράτους ἐπραττέτην τὰ πολιτικά, ὧνπερ ἕνεκα Σωκράτους ὠρεχθήτην, 1.2.16). And yet Athens could not resist the lure of Alcibiades; despite his tyrannical tendencies, his *erōs* was the very thing that held the masses in thrall and allowed him to be raised up by them as a collective political fantasy.

A key to deciphering Athens' simultaneous obsession with and fear of Alcibiades is the story of the "tyrannicides" Harmodius and Aristogiton, framed in Thucydides' historical narrative by the scandal of the mutilation of the herms and the profanation of the mysteries. Gomme, Andrews, and Dover argue that the story of Harmodius and Aristogiton stands as a warning to

[86] Wohl 2002: 159.

the Athenians to beware of would-be tyrants.[87] Contrary views hold that the story serves as a critique of the Athenians' irrational fear of tyranny and subsequent rejection of prudent leadership.[88] Thucydides' own pretext for providing a narrative of Harmodius and Aristogiton is the schism between what the Athenians themselves believed about the story (the myth of tyrannicide) and what Thucydides calls the more precise version of the story. Thucydides writes that, "The daring action of Aristogiton and Harmodius was attempted on account of an erotic affair, and by providing an extended narration of this incident, I myself shall make it clear that, about their own tyrants or about how the tyranny came about, neither other people nor the Athenians themselves say anything precise" (τὸ γὰρ Ἀριστογείτονος καὶ Ἁρμοδίου τόλμημα δι' ἐρωτικὴν ξυντυχίαν ἐπεχειρήθη, ἣν ἐγὼ ἐπὶ πλέον διηγησάμενος ἀποφανῶ οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτε αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν λέγοντας, 6.54.1). The passage recalls Thucydides' own claim at the beginning of his history that his methodological precision (ἀκρίβεια, 1.22) would on the one hand detract from its pleasure, but would on the other hand provide an historical document to last for all time. As I discussed in the previous chapter, Chariton turns that notion on its head, taking a different approach to the idea of narrative precision, creating as a very source of pleasure the reader's ability to see through the creative lies of both the narrator and his characters. The introduction to the story of Harmodius and Aristogiton in particular resonates with the very same ideas that Chariton explores in his novel, for the story of Callirhoe is essentially an extended narrative (ἐπὶ πλέον διηγησάμενος, Thuc. 6.54.1; διηγήσομαι, Ch. 1.1.1) about an erotic incident (ἐρωτικὴν ξυντυχίαν, Thuc. 6.54.1; πάθος ἐρωτικόν, Ch. 1.1.1). And just as Thucydides' narrative digression is concerned with tyranny, so too is Chariton's novel.

The Athenians' obsession with Alcibiades is evidence of their own "softness" in the presence of a dominating political ἐραστής. Alcibiades' enemies feared that the *dēmos* would "become soft" for the charismatic young man (ὅτε δῆμος μὴ μαλακίζηται, Thuc. 6.29.3), and this softness in turn threatens to weaken the democracy. The Athenians' desire for Alcibiades is paradoxically also a desire, as Wohl puts it, "to be possessed by him, to be ruled by him as a tyrant. Harmodius and Aristogiton responded to the tyrant's emasculating attention with tyrannicide, and this definitive refutation of the charge of softness becomes the founding gesture of democracy, an assertion

[87] Gomme, Andrews, and Dover 1970: 329.
[88] Stahl 1966: 1–11; Taylor 1981: 161–175; Palmer 1982; Forde 1989: 33–37.

of political agency figured as a defense of erotic autonomy and masculine integrity, *dikaios erōs*."[89] The "erotic affair" (ἐρωτικὴν ξυντυχίαν) which sets the story of Harmodius and Aristogiton in motion is the transgressive lust of Hipparchus, son of Pisistratus, for the young Harmodius:

> γενομένου δὲ Ἁρμοδίου ὥρᾳ ἡλικίας λαμπροῦ Ἀριστογείτων ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀστῶν, μέσος πολίτης, ἐραστὴς ὢν εἶχεν αὐτόν. πειραθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἁρμόδιος ὑπὸ Ἱππάρχου τοῦ Πεισιστράτου καὶ οὐ πεισθεὶς καταγορεύει τῷ Ἀριστογείτονι. ὁ δὲ ἐρωτικῶς περιαλγήσας καὶ φοβηθεὶς τὴν Ἱππάρχου δύναμιν μὴ βίᾳ προσαγάγηται αὐτόν, ἐπιβουλεύει εὐθὺς ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἀξιώσεως κατάλυσιν τῇ τυραννίδι.
>
> When Harmodius bloomed in his youthful beauty, Aristogiton, a man of the common people and a citizen of middle rank, possessed him as a lover. Hipparchus, the son of Pisistratus, tried to seduce Harmodius, but after refusing Hipparchus, Harmodius denounced him to his lover Aristogiton. Greatly offended with respect to his *erōs*, and fearing the power of Hipparchus, lest he might take him violently for himself, Aristogiton at once, such as his rank allowed, plotted destruction for the tyranny. (Thuc. 6.54.2–3)

From the story of Hipparchus' erotic transgression and the retaliation of Aristogiton in the defense of his lover arose Athens' great myth of tyrannicide. Nearly a hundred years later, the Athenian *dēmos* of 415 imagines the mutilation of the herms as its own metaphorical castration, recalling the mythologized story of Harmodius and Aristogiton as a means of once again securing their autonomy in the face of tyranny.

And yet, according to the more precise version of the story as Thucydides tells it, Harmodius and Aristogiton actually *fail* in killing the tyrant. The myth of the tyrannicide became for the Athenians a patriotic valorization of their democracy against tyranny. But myth and history are two different things. Despite what the Athenians *believed* about the tyrannicide, the course of events in the Harmodius and Aristogiton story was actually quite different, "for having heard that the tyranny of Pisistratus and his sons had become harsh in the end, and furthermore that it was destroyed not by themselves and Harmodius, but by the Lacedaemonians, the *dēmos* was always fearful and they were taking everything with suspicion" (ἐπιστάμενος γὰρ ὁ δῆμος ἀκοῇ τὴν Πεισιστράτου καὶ τῶν παίδων τυραννίδα χαλεπὴν τελευτῶσαν γενομένην καὶ προσέτι οὐδ' ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ Ἁρμοδίου καταλυθεῖσαν,

[89] Wohl 2002: 154.

ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐφοβεῖτο αἰεὶ καὶ πάντα ὑπόπτως ἐλάμβανεν, Thuc. 6.53.3). It was the Spartans, in other words, who vanquished Athenian tyranny, and not the legendary heroism of the lovers Harmodius and Aristogiton. We learn from Thucydides that the initial attack against the ruling tyrant Hippias is a failure and that Harmodius and Aristogiton succeed only in killing the tyrant's brother Hipparchus. And not only do Harmodius and Aristogiton not succeed in slaying the tyrant, but their failed attempt at assassination in fact causes Hippias' reign to become cruel and despotic (6.59.1–2).

It appears therefore that the legendary depiction of Harmodius and Aristogiton as tyrannicides was, as James McGlew puts it, "based not on confusion, but on a deliberate rejection of history."[90] What then are the ramifications of the Athenians' acknowledgment of the facts of the story (ἐπιστάμενος γὰρ ὁ δῆμος, 6.53.3) as opposed to the myth that they tell (ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν λέγοντας, 6.54.1)? Amid the scandal surrounding the mutilation of the herms, the myth of tyrannicide fails to comfort the Athenians' sense of its masculine civic identity; historical events actually reveal that the Athenians' past resistance to tyranny was ultimately ineffectual. Blame is laid upon Alcibiades for the mutilation of the herms and the profanation of the mysteries as part of a tyrannical plot against the *dēmos* (6.61.1), but the great paradox is that the *dēmos* itself fell in love with the handsome, charismatic young man, and in their softened state they actually nurtured Alcibiades' perversion within the polis. Thucydides' re-evaluation of the Harmodius and Aristogiton story within the context of the Alcibiades problem reveals the weakness at the very foundation of Athens' myth about its virile democracy. Faced with the problematic figure of Alcibiades, simultaneously stimulating desire and fear, the *dēmos* of 415 recognizes that they are themselves *malakoi*. Wohl concludes that "the 'problem of Alcibiades' is in essence insoluble, for Athens can banish Alcibiades but not its own desire for him."[91] The problem is perhaps best illustrated by Plutarch, when he writes that Alcibiades "was so much the leader of the *dēmos* for the common people and the poor, that they lusted with an amazing lust to be ruled by him as tyrant" (τοὺς δὲ φορτικοὺς καὶ πένητας οὕτως ἐδημαγώγησεν ὥστ' ἐρᾶν ἔρωτα θαυμαστὸν ὑπ' ἐκείνου τυραννεῖσθαι, Plut. *Alc*. 34.6).

For the Athenians, Alcibiades paradoxically represented both a self-destructive *erōs* for tyranny and a warning against a tyrannical threat to democracy. The myth of Harmodius and Aristogiton, a fantasy about the end of

[90] McGlew 1993: 152.
[91] Wohl 2002: 157.

tyranny at Athens, is undone by the polis' problematic fascination with Alcibiades. Athens is consequently forced to acknowledge the erotic nature of its own destructive imperialism, for if Alcibiades' behavior is *paranomon*, so too is Athens' aggressive action against Syracuse in the Sicilian Expedition.[92] In Chariton's novel, Chaereas' triumphant return to Syracuse with Callirhoe heralds the future arrival of their son, the symbol of the *erōs tyrannos* that presides over the entire narrative. But whereas the Athenians were wary of the tyrannical *erōs* represented by Alcibiades, Chariton's Syracusans welcome and actively pursue this *erōs*. The Syracusans themselves plead for Callirhoe's marriage to Chaereas and make *erōs* the business of the state (Ch. 1.1.11–13). And when at the end of the novel Chaereas announces that, "Another fleet as well of yours will come from Ionia, and the grandson of Hermocrates will lead it" (ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἄλλος στόλος ἐξ Ἰωνίας ὑμέτερος· ἄξει δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἑρμοκράτους ἔκγονος, 8.8.11), he is greeted by a burst of prayers from all in attendance (εὐχαὶ παρὰ πάντων ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπηκολούθησαν, 8.8.12). In contrast to the myth of Harmodius and Aristogiton, which is a fantasy about the virile defense of freedom against tyranny, Chariton's narrative may be read as a fantasy about the birth of a tyrant.

4 Conclusion

My reading of Chariton's novel explains the recurring image of Athens as evocative of the paradoxical relationship between freedom and tyranny, a theme around which the entire narrative is structured. The theme is first apparent in the peculiar dissonance between Syracuse's apparently democratic institutions and the simultaneous insistance that Hermocrates is the focus of power within the polis.[93] But the theme then proliferates and affects all the major characters. Eros, the god whose power presides over all the events of the novel, is actually called by the narrator a "harsh tyrant" (Ἔρως, χαλεπὸς τύραννος, 4.2.3). Callirhoe and Chaereas, both free-born Syracusans, are quickly reduced to the status of slaves. The pirate Theron provides an ironic critique of democratic Athenian magistrates as "more severe than tyrants" (τυράννων βαρύτεροι, 1.11.6). The Ionian Dionysius, renowned for his σωφροσύνη, is faced with a moral crisis when he must recognize Callirhoe's free-born status and resist his own trannical *erōs*: "Shall I myself," he asks, "become a tyrant over a free body?" (ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλευθέρου

[92] Wohl 2002: 282.
[93] Hunter 1994: 1077; Alvares 2001–2002: 132–136.

…; 2.6.3). By contrast, however, the tyrant Artaxerxes, a man free to do as he likes with the bodies of his subjects, ultimately loses his self-control and ironically is himself transformed into the obedient slave of the tyrannical god Eros (6.4.5). Furthermore, the novel climaxes with the Egyptian pharaoh's failed democratic rebellion against Persian tyranny.

The theme is not new to the first century CE, but was in fact an integral part of the philosophical and political discourse about Athenian democracy in the classical period, and a major theme in Plato's *Republic* is the gradual transition from democracy to tyranny. Plato writes that a democracy consists of free men and such a polis is filled with freedom and outspokenness, and that in such a polis there is the power to do whatever one wishes (πρῶτον μὲν δὴ ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ ἐλευθερίας ἡ πόλις μεστὴ καὶ παρρησίας γίγνεται, καὶ ἐξουσία ἐν αὐτῇ ποιεῖν ὅτι τις βούλεται, Plato, *Resp.* 557b4–6). It is from such freedom, however, that tyranny is born (562). Plato imagines that democratic man gives birth to a youth who, filled with the freedoms of the democratic state, is "led towards every transgression, called by those leading him 'every freedom'" (ἀγόμενόν τε εἰς πᾶσαν παρανομίαν, ὀνομαζομένην δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγόντων ἐλευθερίαν ἅπασαν, 572d9–e2). Eventually though, the "wicked magicians and tyrant-makers" (οἱ δεινοὶ μάγοι τε καὶ τυραννοποιοί, 572e4) who have led the youth astray are no longer able to control him themselves, and so they scheme to create within him an *erōs* that will be the "ruler of the idle lusts which divide up whatever is ready at hand" (προστάτην τῶν ἀργῶν καὶ τὰ ἕτοιμα διανεμομένων ἐπιθυμίων, 572e6–573a1). From the democratic man is thus born the tyrant, and the tyrant's own tyrant is Eros (τύραννος ὁ Ἔρως, 573b6), perverting whatever is left of decency in the democratic man (573a4–b4).

McGlew writes that in the *Republic* Plato "turns democracy against itself … The pursuit of pleasures, unimpeded by moral or political principles, guides the democratic man in every aspect of his life, including his political activities."[94] Wohl remarks that to see only the difference between democracy and tyranny is to be blind to the deeper relationship that binds the two extremes together: "if the tyrant is the Other to the democratic Athenian, that polarity is neither absolute nor fixed, and the boundary between the two is crisscrossed by desire and identification."[95] But once the deep relationship between democracy and tyranny is accepted, Plato's formulation that democracy becomes increasingly tyrannical instead of vice versa seems nevertheless to contradict Athens' historical transition from tyranny to democracy.

[94] McGlew 1993: 208.
[95] Wohl 2002: 224.

More generally speaking, "nearly every [Greek] state with the exception of Sparta" has passed "through a similar stage of tyranny which ended either in oligarchy or democracy."[96] Upon what historical events might Plato's formulation of political transformation be based? Jowett explains that, "Plato is describing rather the contemporary Sicilian States, which alternated between democracy and tyranny, than the ancient history of Athens or Corinth."

What, then, are the implications of this overarching theme in Chariton's novel? Why, in other words, does the image of Athens haunt the narrative, reminding both the characters and the reader of the ease with which democracy can devolve into tyranny? One answer to that question was formulated at the very beginning of the last century. In 1901, S. A. Naber thought it curious that at the end of the novel the son of Chaereas and Callirhoe does not return with them to Syracuse. Naber rightly notes that the boy had travelled with Callirhoe to Babylon, and in the world depicted in the novel it is not uncommon for children to travel great distances. It is the Persian King's custom, in fact, to travel with his entire household in his train (6.9.6). "And so," writes Naber, "when Aradus was captured, the child was at once able to be returned along with his mother to his father Chaereas, but Chariton preferred to hand the boy over to Dionysius to be raised in Miletus … I think however that I understand why Chariton fashioned the story in this way and depicted Callirhoe more like a step-mother than a mother. To be sure, Chariton wanted this son of Chaereas, who had taken the name of Dionysius from his adoptive father, to be the same famous Dionysius I, who afterwards rules at Syracuse."[97]

The novel may, therefore, be read as a fictive aetiology of the reign of Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse. In advancing this interpretation, Naber has been succeeded most recently by Catherine Connors, who envisions Chariton's literary project as an imaginative re-writing of history: "In contrast to the typical view of Dionysius as a bad tyrant [Diod. Sic. 14.2; Cic., *Tusc.* 5.57–63], Chariton's optimistic imagining of the arrival of Callirhoe's child in Syracuse presents an altogether sunnier picture of the tyrant's future."[98] I maintain, however, that, given the altogether negative depiction of eastern

---

[96] Jowett 1958: 111.

[97] "Itaque urbe Arado capta statim cum matre patri reddi potuerat, sed Chariton maluit puerum Dionysio Milesio tradere educandum … Videor autem mihi intellegere cur Chariton rem ita finxerit depinxeritque Callirhoen novercae quam matris similiorem. Nempe hunc Chaereae filium, qui a patre adoptivo Dionysii nomen nactus erat, Chariton eundem esse voluit illum Dionysium maiorem, qui postea Syracusis rerum positus est" (Naber 1901: 98–99).

[98] Connors 2002: 17.

tyranny in the novel, the reader is invited to look beneath the surface of the novel's idealizing sentimentality (narrative gestures which satisfy certain generic expectations) and see instead the advent in Syracuse of that very despotism in the east from which Chaereas and Callirhoe were fleeing (τετυράννηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης, 7.2.4). In Chariton's narrative the awkward tension between Syracuse's democratic institutions and Hermocrates' powerful figure as πόλεως πρῶτος foreshadows the gradual disintegration of Syracusan democracy and sets the stage for future tyranny. The political relationship forged between Hermocrates and the Persian King Artaxerxes after Athens' defeat in the Sicilian Expedition (2.6.3; 5.8.8) suggests that the foundation for Syracusan tyranny has already been laid. At the end of the novel, Chaereas is the hero who secures for Syracuse their authoritarian future. And the transition from Greek freedom to foreign tyranny was a theme that was highly relevant for a Greek a writer and audience of the 1st century CE.

I conclude by returning to the moment in the narrative when Callirhoe decides that she will not become a child-killing Medea and plots instead to give birth, imagining the possibilities that lie in store for the child not yet born. "What if he should be a son?" Callirhoe asks herself, "What if he should be like his father? What if he should be more fortunate than I? Should a mother kill a child who has been saved from the tomb and from pirates? What kind of children of gods and kings do we hear about who, though born in slavery, later regain what is worthy of their fathers, children like Zethus, Amphion, and Cyrus?" (τί δ' ἂν υἱὸς ᾖ; τί δ' ἂν ὅμοιος τῷ πατρί; τί δ' ἂν εὐτυχέστερος ἐμοῦ; μήτηρ ἀποκτείνῃ τὸν ἐκ ταφοῦ σωθέντα καὶ λῃστῶν; πόσους ἀκούομεν θεῶν παῖδας καὶ βασιλέων ἐν δουλείᾳ γεννηθέντας ὕστερον ἀπολαβόντας τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἀξίωμα, τὸν Ζῆθον καὶ τὸν Ἀμφίονα καὶ Κῦρον; Ch. 2.9.4–5). Callirhoe's soliloquy generates questions about the future of the depicted world, and the reader wonders whether Callirhoe's son will be an Eastern-style king or a champion of the democratic ideals for which Syracuse strives. As expected from an author who revels in ironies and ambiguities, the narrator never provides a definitive answer, though the novel's overarching concern with tyranny anticipates the reign of Dionysius I at Syracuse and suggests exactly that process of political transformation described by Plato in the *Republic*. And although the narrator will conclude his story with Callirhoe's prayer to Aphrodite at the end of Book 8, there is a strong indication in Callirhoe's soliloquy in Book 2 that the narrative will transcend the text of the narrator. As she concludes her soliloquy, Callirhoe addresses her unborn child: "You, my child, will also sail to Sicily for me.

You will seek out your father and grandfather, and you will narrate to them the story of your mother" (πλεύσῃ μοι καὶ σύ, τέκνον, εἰς Σικελίαν· ζητήσεις πατέρα καὶ πάππον, καὶ τὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῖς διηγήσῃ, 2.9.5). Narrative will continue, in other words, but it will be the narrative of a tyrant.

Bibliography

Alvares, J. 1993. *The journey of observation in Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Diss., The University of Texas at Austin.

— 1997. "Chariton's erotic history", *AJPh* 118.4, 613–629.

— 2000. "A Hidden Magus in Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*", *Hermes* 128.3, 383–384.

— 2000b. "Perspective and Ideal in Chariton's Chaireas and Callirhoe", *Acta Classica* 43, 5–14.

— 2001. "Egyptian Unrest of the Roman Era and the reception of Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*", *Maia* 53, 11–19.

— 2001–2002. "Some Political and Ideological Dimensions of Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*", *CJ* 97.2, 113–144.

— 2002. "Love, Loss, and Learning in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*", *CW* 95, 107–115.

— 2002b. "Utopian Themes in Three Greek Romances", *Ancient Narrative* 2, 1–29.

Anderson, G. 1979. Review of K. Plepelits, *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe*, *JHS* 99, 183–184.

— 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*. American Classical Studies, Number 9, Chico, California: Scholars Press.

— 1984. *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Greco-Roman World*, London: Croom Helm; Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Noble.

— 1989. "The *Pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire", *ANRW* II.33.1, 79–207.

Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Andrewes, A. 1956. *The Greek Tyrants*, London: Hutchinson's University Library.

Angelo, M.L. 1975. "Ad Charit. VIII, 5, 5", *SicGymn* 28, 551–556.

Arnott, G.W. 2000. *Menander*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, London: W. Heinemann.

Ascough, R.S. 1996. "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58, 69–81.

Auger, D. 1983. "Rêve, image et récit dans le roman de Chariton", *Ktèma* 8, 39–52.

Babbitt, F.C. 1993. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume IV*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press. First published 1936.

Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*: *Four Essays*, edited by M. Holquist, translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Bal, M. 1997. *Narratology. Introduction to the theory of narrative*. Second edition, Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press. First edition published in 1985.

Ballengee, J. 2005. "Below the Belt: Looking into the Matter of Adventure-Time", in: Bracht Branham (ed.), *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative*. *Ancient Narrative* Supplement 3, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & The University Library Groningen, 130–163.

Balot, R.K. 1998. "Foucault, Chariton and the masculine self", *Helios* 25.2, 139–162.

Bartonkovà, D. 1976. “Prosimetrum, the Mixed Style, in Ancient Literature”, *Eirene* 13, 65–92.

Bartsch,S. and Bartscherer,T. 2005. *Erotikon: Essays on Eros, Ancient and Modern*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bartsch, W. 1934. *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*. Diss. Leipzig Vogel.

Baslez, M.-F.; Hoffmann, P.; and Trédé, edd. 1992. *Le Monde du Roman Grec*: *actes du colloque international tenu à l’École normale supérieure (Paris 17–19 décembre 1987)*, Paris: Presses de l’École normale supérieure.

Baslez, M.-F. 1992. “De l’histoire au roman: la Perse de Chariton”, in: Baslez, Hoffman, and Trédé 1992, 199–212.

Basore, J.W. 1990. *Seneca. Moral Essays, volume II*. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press. First published in 1932.

Berve, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, München: Beck.

Beta, S.; de Carli, E.; and Zanetto, G. 1993. *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, volume 3 (K–O), Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms-Weidmann.

Bhabha, H.K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge.

Billault, A. 1981. “Aspects du roman de Chariton”. *IL* 33, 205–211.

— 1989. “De l’histoire au roman. Hermocrate de Syracuse”, *REG* 102, 540–548.

— 1991. *La Création Romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l’époque impériale*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

— ed. 2000. *ΟΠΩΡΑ. La belle saison de l’hellénisme. Études de littérature antiques offertes au Recteur Jacques Bompaire*. Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Biraud, M. 1985. “L’hypotexte homérique et les rôles amoureux de Callirhoé dans le roman de Chariton”, in: *Sémiologie de l’amour dans les civilizations méditerranéennes: actes du centre des recherches*, Nice: Publications de la Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Nice; Paris: Diffusion, Les Belles Lettres, 21–27.

Blake, W.E. 1929. “Stichometric evidence for text abbreviation in Chariton”, *TAPA* 60, xxvi–xxvii.

— 1931. “The Overtrustful Editors of Chariton”, *TAPA* 62, 68–77.

— 1933. “Some Conjectures for the Text of Chariton”, *CPh* 28, 307–310.

— 1933–1934. “Chariton’s Romance – The First European Novel”, *CJ* 29, 284–288.

— 1936. “Modal Usages in Chariton”, *AJPh* 57.1, 10–23.

— 1938. *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis De Chaerea et Callirhoe Amatoriarum Narrationum libri octo*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

— 1939. *Chariton’s Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press.

Blösel, W. 2004. *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert. Studien zur Geschichte und historiographischen Konstruktion des griechischen Freiheitskampfes 480 v. Chr. Historia Einzelschriften 183*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Bompaire, J. 1977. “Le décor sicilien dans le roman grec”, *REG* 90, 55–68.

Borg, B., ed. 2004. *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic.* Millenium-Studien, Vol. 2, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Borgogno, A. 1971. “Menandro in Caritone”, *RFIC* 99, 257–263.

— 1975. “Sulla struttura degli ‘Apista’ di Antonio Diogene”, *Prometheus* 1, 49–64.

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

— 1977. “The Novels and the Real World”, in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua. Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*, Bangor, 91–96.

.

— 1986. “The Greek Novel”, in: P.E. Easterling and B. Knox (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 683–698.
— 1994. “The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World”, in Tatum 1994, 435–459.
— 1996. “The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels”, in: Schmeling 1996, 87–106.
— 1999. “The Greek Novel”, in: Swain 1999, 39–59.
— 2002. “The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions”, *Ancient Narrative* 2, 47–63.
— 2004. “The Geography of the Second Sophistic: Cultural Variations”, in: Borg 2004, 65–83.
Bowie, E.L. and Harrison, S.J. 1993. “The Romance of the Novel”, *JRS* 83, 159–178.
Branham, R.B. 2000–2001. “Representing Time in Ancient Fiction”, *Ancient Narrative* 1, 1–31.
— 2002a. *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
— 2002b. “A Truer Story of the Novel?”, in: Branham 2002a, 161–186.
— 2005. *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative. Ancient Narrative* Supplement 3, Groningen: Barkuis Publishing and The Groningen University Library.
Briant, P. 2002. “History and Ideology: The Greeks and ‘Persian Decadence’”, in: T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, New York: Routledge, 193–210.
Brioso, S.M. 1987. “El personaje del amigo en la novela griega. Caritón”, *Minerva* 1, 61–74.
— 1989. “Caritón III 5 y sus modelos”, *Minerva* 3, 205–208.
— 1991. “Sobre Caritón 7.6.2 y 6.7 y sus lagunas”, *Habis* 22, 263–272.
Browne, G. 1981. “Ad Charitonem 1.3.7”, *AJPh* 102, 321.
— 1985. “Chariton and Coptic”, *ICS* 10, 135–137.
Cairns, D. 1999. “Representations of Remorse and Reparation in Classical Greece”, in: M. Cox (ed.), *Remorse and Reparation*, London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 171–178.
Calderini, A. 1913. *Prolegomena a ‘Le avventure di Cherea e Calliroe’*, Turin: Fratelli Bocca.
Campbell, R. 1969. *Seneca. Letters from a Stoic (Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium)*, Penguin Books.
Cataudella, Q. 1927. “Riflessi Virgiliani nel romanzo di Caritone”, *Ath* 5, 302–312.
— ed. 1958. *Il Romanzo Classico*, Rome: Casini.
Chew, C. 2003. “The Representation of Violence in the Greek Novels and Martyr Accounts”, in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen 2003, 129–142.
Cobet, C.G. 1859. “Annotationes Criticae ad Charitonem”, *Mnemosyne* 8, 229–303.
Conca, F.; de Carli, E.; and Zanetto, G. 1983. *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, volume 1 (Α–Γ), Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica; Hildesheim and New York: Olms-Weidmann.
— 1989. *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, volume 2 (Δ–Ι), Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms-Weidmann. (For volume 3, cf. Beta, de Carli, and Zanetto 1993).
Connor, W.R. 1968. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, Washington, D.C.: The Center for Hellenic Studies.
Connors, C. 2002. “Chariton’s Syracuse and its Histories of Empire”, in: Paschalis and Frangoulidis 2002, 12–26.
— 2000. “Imperial Space and Time: The Literature of Leisure”, in: O. Taplin (ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 492–518.

Conte, G.B. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by J.B. Solodow. Revised by D. Fowler and G.W. Most, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Corbato, C. 1968. "Da Menandro a Caritone. Studi sulla genesi del romanzo Greco e i suoi rapporti con la commedia nuova (1)", *Quaderni Triestini sul teatro antico* 1, 5–44.

Cornford, F.M. 1969. *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, New York: Greenwood Press. Originally published 1907.

Couraud-Lalanne, S. 1998. "Récit d'un telos erotikon: réflexion sur le statut des jeunes dans le roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias", *REG* 111.2, 518–550.

Cueva, E. 1996. "Plutarch's Ariadne in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*", *AJPh* 117, 473–484.

— 2000. "The Date of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* Revisited", *C&M* 51, 197–208.

— 2004. *The Myths of Fiction: Studies in the Canonical Greek Novels*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Cupane, C. 1979. "La contesa d'amore. Cod. Marc. Gr. 479, f. 33", *Hellenica* 31, 174–183.

Daude, C. 2001. "Le personnage d'Artaxerxès dans le roman de Chariton, Chairéas et Callirhoé: fiction et histoire", in: Pouderon, Hunzinger, and Kasprzyk 2001, 137–148.

Davidson, J.N. 1997. *Courtesans and Fishcakes. The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

— 2001. "Dover, Foucault and Greek Homosexuality: Penetration and the Truth of Sex", *Past & Present* 170, 3–51.

de Fátima Silva, M. 1996. *Quéreas e Calírroe / Cáriton.* Labirintos de Eros 1, Lisboa : Ed. Cosmos.

De Temmerman, K. 2002. "A Note on Chariton's Callirrhoe 1, 4, 9: the Narrator's Opinion", *AC* 71, 137–140.

Delbridge, M.L. 1997. "Prayer in Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe", in: M. Kiley (ed.), *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine*, London and New York, 171–175.

Dihle, A. 1978. "Zur Datierung des Metiochos-Roman", *Wurzburger Jahrbucher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 4, 47–55.

Dilts, M.R., ed. 2002. *Demosthenis Orationes, tomus I*. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dilts, M.R. and Kennedy, G.A., edd. 1997. *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire. Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara*, Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill.

Doody, M.A. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Doulamis, K. 2001. "Rhetoric and Irony in Chariton: a case-study from *Callirhoe*", *Ancient Narrative* 1, 55–72.

— 2002. "The rhetoric of Eros in Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton: a stylistic and interpretative study." Ph.D. Diss., Exeter.

Dover, K.J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Dowden, K. 2005. "Greek Novel and the Ritual of Life: An Exercise in Taxonomy", in: Harrison, Paschalis and Frangoulidis 2005, 23–35.

Duckworth, G.E. 1994. *The Nature of Roman Comedy. A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Second edition, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. First edition published in 1952.

Edwards, D.R. 1985. "Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe: Religion and Politics Do Mix", in: K. H. Richards (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1985. Seminar Papers* 24, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 175–181.

— 1987. *Acts of the Apostles and Chariton's* Chaereas and Callirhoe*. A Literary and Socio-historical Study*, Dissertation, Boston University.
— 1991. "Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus, and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*", in: L. Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 179–201.
— 1994a. "Defining the Web of Power in Asia Minor: the Novelist Chariton and his City of Aphrodisias", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62/63, 699–718.
— 1994b. "Religion, Politics and Entertainment in the Graeco-Roman World: Chariton and his City Aphrodisis", in: U. Bianchi (ed.), *The Notion of Religion in Comparative Research: Selected Proceedings of the XVIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions*, Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 283–297.
— 1998. "Pleasurable Reading or Symbols of Power? Religious Themes and Social Context in Chariton", in: R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins (edd.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series. No. 6*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 31–46.
Edwards, M. 1995. *Greek Orators IV. Andocides*, Warminster, England: Aris and Philips, Ltd.
Egger, B. 1988. "Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman", in: H. Hoffmann (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel I*, Groningen: E. Forsten, 33–66.
— 1990. "Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine", Dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
— 1994. "Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe", in: J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: the Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 31–48.
Ehrenberg, V. 1947. "Polypragmosunè: A Study in Greek Politics", *JHS* 67, 46–67.
Elsom, H. 1992. "Callirhoe: displaying the phallic women", in: A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 212–230.
Erim, K. 1986. *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite*, London: Muller, Blond & White.
Fantham, E. 1986. "ΖΗΛΟΤΥΠΙΑ: a brief excursus into sex, violence and literary history", *Phoenix* 40, 45–57.
Flower, M.A. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios: History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Forde, S. 1989. *The Ambition to Rule: Alcibiades and the Politics of Imperialism in Thucydides*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Foucault, M. 1988. *The Care of the Self. Volume 3 of the History of Sexuality*. Translated by R. Hurley, New York: Vintage Books. Originally published in 1984 as *Le souci de soi*, Paris: Editions Gallimard.
— 1990. *The Use of Pleasure. Volume 2 of the History of Sexuality*. Translated by R. Hurley, New York: Vintage Books. Originally published in 1984 as *L'Usage des plaisirs*, Paris: Editions Gallimard.
Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Fracchia, H. 1992. "Nemea", in: *LIMC* VI.2, Zürich: Artemis, 732–733.
Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E. 1997. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume IIIA: the Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo Greco: polifonia ed eros*. Venice: Marsilio.
— 1990. "Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco", *MD* 25, 27–48.
— 1999. "The Conflict of Emotions", in: Swain 1999, 60–82.
Gagarin, M. 1996. "The Torture of Slaves in Athenian Law", *CP* 91.1, 1–18.
Gasda, A. 1860. *Quaestiones Charitoneae*, Diss., Bratislava.

Geagan, D.J. 1979. "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture. I. 86 B.C.–A.D. 267", *ANRW* II.7.1, 371–437.

Geiger, J. 1985. *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; Wiesbaden: GMBH.

Gera, D.L. 1993. *Xenophon's* Cyropaedia. *Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*, Clarendon Press: Oxford.

Gerschmann, K.H. 1974. *Chariton-Interpretationen*, Diss., Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster.

Giangrande, G. 1974. Review of A. Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien*, *JHS* 94, 197–198.

Gleason, M. 1990. "The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century C.E.", in: D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 389–416.

Golden, M. 1984. "Slavery and Homosexuality at Athens", *Phoenix* 38, 308–324.

Goldhill, S. 1990. "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology," in: J. Winkler and F. Zeitlin (edd.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 97–129.

— 1995. *Foucault's Virginity. Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gomme, A.W.; Andrews, A.; and Dover, K. 1970. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, Volume 4*, Oxford: Oxford University.

Goodwin, W.W. 1990. *Demosthenes. De Corona*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. Originally published in 1904, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goold, G.P. 1995. *Chariton: Callirhoe*. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.

Graindor, P. 1931. *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan*. Cairo: Imprimerie Misr.

Gribble, D. 1999. *Alcibiades and Athens. A Study in Literary Presentation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Griffin, M.T. 1976. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grimal, P., ed. 1958. *Romans Grecs et Latins*. Paris: Gallimard.

Groeneboom, P.M. 1918. "Varia III", *Mnemosyne* n. s. 54, 171.

Guez, J.-P. 2001. "Pourquoi Théron n'est-il pas amoureux?", in: Pouderon, Hunzinger, and Kasprzyk 2001, 101–110.

Guida, A. 1978. "Nota al teso di Caritone e di Senofonte Efesio", *RhM* 121, 195–196.

Hadas, M. 1968. *The Stoic Philosophy of Seneca. Essays and Letters, translated and with an introduction*, New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company. Originally published 1958.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.

— 1972. "Some Technical Aspects of the Characterization in Chariton's Romance", in: *Studi Classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* 2, Catania: Università di Catania, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, 545–556.

— 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford, Berkeley, and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

— 1984. "The Parthenope romance decapitated?", *SO* 59, 61–92.

— 1994. "Orality, literacy, and the 'readership' of the early Greek Novel", in: R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of the Pre-Novel Narrative: the European Tradition*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 47–81.

— 1999. "*Callirhoe* and *Parthenope*: The Beginnings of the Historical Novel", in: Swain 1999, 137–160.
Hansen, W. 1997. "Idealization as a process in ancient Greek story-formation", *SO* 72, 118–123.
Harrison, S.; Paschalis, M.; and Frangoulidis, S., edd. 2005. *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*. *Ancient Narrative* Supplement 4, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & The University Library Groningen.
Haupt, M. 1871. "Coniectanea", *Hermes* 5, 321–322.
Haynes, K. 2000–2001. "Power of the Prude: Configurations of the Feminine in the Greek Novel", *Ancient Narrative* 1, 73–92.
— 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London and New York: Routledge.
Hedrick, C. 1995. "Representing Prayer in Mark and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*", *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22, 239–257.
Heibges, S. 1911. *De clausulis Charitoneis*, Diss., Münster, Halle.
Heiserman, A. 1977. *The Novel Before the Novel. Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Helms, J. 1966. *Character Portrayal in the romance of Chariton*, Tha Hague: Mouton.
Henderson, J. 1987. *Aristophanes' Lysistrata*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
— 1991. *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. Second Edition, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. First edition published 1975.
— 2002. *Aristophanes. Frogs; Assemblywomen; Wealth*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Hernández Lara, C. 1987. "El orden de palabras en Caritón de Afrodisias", *Myrtia* 2, 83–89.
— 1990. "Rhetorical aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias", *GIF* 42, 267–274.
— 1994. *Estudios sobre el Aticismo de Caritón de Afrodisias*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.
Herrenschmidt, C. 2003. "Callirhoé et Chariclée héroïnes monétaires? Une proposition à
propos de *Chéréas et Callirhoé* de Chariton et des *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore", in: M. Gugliemo and E. Bona (edd.), *Forme di comunicazione nel mondo antico e metamorfosi del mito: dal teatro al romanzo*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 216–233.
Hock, R. 1997. "An Extraordinary Friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: the Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances", in: J.T. Fitgerald (ed.), *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 145–162.
Hopkins, K. 1993. "Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery", *P&P* 138, 3–27.
Hunter, R. 1983. *Eubulus. The Fragments,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
— 1994. "History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton", *ANRW* II.34.2, 1055–1086.
Hunter, V. 1992. "Constructing the Body of the Citizen: Corporal Punishment in Classical Athens", *EMC* 36, 271–291.
Jackson, J. 1935. "The Greek Novelists", *CQ* 29, 52–57, 96–12.
Jacoby, F. 1986. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden: Brill.
Jameson, F. 1981. *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
Jones, C.P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
— 1992a. "Hellenistic history in Chariton of Aphrodisias", *Chiron* 22, 91–102.
— 1992b. "La personnalité de Chariton", in: Baslez, Hoffman, and Trédé 1992, 161–167.
— 2004. "Multiple Identities in the age of the Second Sophistic", in: Borg 2004, 13–21
Jouanno, C. 2000. "Chariton et la langage du corps", in: Billault 2000, 73–84.

Jowett, B. 1958. *The Dialogues of Plato. Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions*. Volume 2. Fourth edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press. First edition published in 1871.

Kaimio, M. 1995. "How to manage in the male world: the strategies of the heroine in Chariton's novel", *AAntHung* 36, 119–132.

— 1996. "How to enjoy a Greek novel: Chariton guiding his audience", *Arctos* 30, 49–73.

Kapparis, K. 2000. "Has Chariton Read Lysias 1 'On the Murder of Eratosthenes'?", *Hermes* 128, 380–383.

Kapparis, K.A. 2002. *Abortion in the Ancient World*, London: Duckworth.

Karabélias, E. 1988. "Le roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias et le droit: renversements de situation et exploitation des ambiguités juridiques", *Symposion*, 369–396.

Kasprzyk, D. 2001. "Théron, pirate, conteur et narrateur dans le roman de Chariton, *Chairéas et Callirhoé*", in: Pouderon, Hunzinger, and Kasprzyk 2001, 149–164.

Kennedy, G.A. 1994. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kershaw, A. 1991. "Charition's Demosthenes", *PSN* 21, 16.

Kirby, J.T. 2000. *Secret of the Muses Retold. Classical Influences on Italian Authors of the Twentieth Century*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Knox, B. 1996. "Introduction", in: *The Odyssey*, Translated by R. Fagles, Penguin Books, 3–64.

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

— 2000. "Pity and the Law in Greek Theory and Practice", *Dike* 3, 124–145.

Korenjak, M. 2001. "Ekklesiazusen? Chariton und andere kaiserzeitliche Autoren über Frauen in der Volksversammlung", in: C.U.-R. Rollinger (ed.), *Geschlechter–Frauen–Fremde Ethnien. In antiker Ethnographie, Theorie und Realität*, Innsbruck, Wien, München, and Bozen: Studien Verlag. 398–416.

Lalanne, S. 2006. *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*, Paris: Éditions La Découverte.

Lalleman, P.J. 1997. "Classical echoes (Callimachus, Chariton) in the Acta Iohannis?", *ZPE* 116, 66.

Lape, S. 2004. *Reproducing Athens. Menander's Comedy, Democratic Culture, and the Hellenistic City*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Laplace, M. 1980. "Les légendes troyennes dans le roman de Chariton, Chairéas et Callirhoé", *REG* 93, 83–25.

— 1997. "Le roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence et de la rhétorique: constitution d'un discours panégyrique", *RhM* 140.1, 38–71.

Lasserre, F. 1979. "Prose grecque classicisante", in: Helmut Flashar (ed.), *Le Classicisme à Rome aux Iers siècles avant et après J.-C.: neuf exposés suivis de discussions*, Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 135–163.

Lavelle, B.M. 2004. *Fame, Money, and Power: The Rise of Peisistratos and "Democratic" Tyranny at Athens*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Létoublon, F. 2003. "La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen 2003, 271–288.

Levin, D.N. 1977. "To whom did the ancient novelists address themselves?", *RSCI* 25, 18–29.

Lissarague, F. 2002. "The Athenian Image of the Foreigner", in: T. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, New York: Routledge, 101–124.

Liviabella Furiani, P. 1996. "Bellezza e felicità nel romanzo di Caritone", in: C. Santini and L. Zucchi (edd.), *Ars Narrandi: scritti di narrativa antica in memoria di Luigi Pepe*, Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane,113–131.

Lobur, J.A. 2001. Review of U. Schmitzer, *Velleius Paterculus und das Interesse an der Geschichte im Zeitalter des Tiberius*, *BMCRev* 2001.02.08.

Lucke, C. 1985. "Zum Charitontext auf Papyrus", *ZPE* 58, 21–33.

Luginbill, R.D. 2000. "Chariton's Use of Thucydides' *History* in Introducing the Egyptian Revolt (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* 6.8)", *Mnemosyne* 53.1, 1–11.

MacAlister, S. 1996. *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*, London and New York: Routledge.

Maehler, H. 1976. "Der Metiochos-Parthenope-Roman", *ZPE* 23, 1–20.

Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Manganaro, G. 1958. "A proposito di un passo del romanzo di Caritone", *SicGymn* 11, 108–110.

Marini, N. 1993. "II personaggio di Calliroe come 'nuova Elena' e la mediazione comica di un passo euripideo (Charito III 10–IV 1 = Hel. 1165–1330)", *SIFC* 11, 205–215.

McGlew, J.F. 1993. *Tyranny and Political Culture in Ancient Greece*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Merkelbach, R. 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. Munich: Beck.

Miller, W. 1979. *Xenophon. Cyropaedia, volume 2*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. Originally published in 1914.

— 1983. *Xenophon. Cyropaedia, volume 1*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd. Originally published in 1914.

Moles, J. 2002. "Herodotus and Athens," in: E.J. Bakker, I. de Jong, and H. van Wees (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, Leiden: Brill, 33–52.

Molinié, G. 1979. *Chariton, Le Roman de Chaeréas et Callirhoé*, Paris: Budé.

— 1989. *Chariton, Le Roman de Chaeréas et Callirhoé*. Second edition, revised by A. Billault, Paris: Budé.

Momigliano, A. 1975. *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, J.M. 1986. *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*, Berkeley, California: University of California Press. Originaly published in 1975.

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

— 2005. "Metaphor, Gender, and the Ancient Greek Novel", in: Harrison, Paschalis and Frangoulidis 2005, 1–22.

Morel, W. 1939. "Some remarks on the text of Chariton", *CQ*, 212–213.

Morgan, J.R. 1993. "Make-believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels", in: C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman (edd.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 175–229.

— 2004. "Chariton", in: I. de Jong, R. Nünlist and A. Bowie (edd.), *Narrators, narratees, and narratives in ancient Greek literature. Studies in ancient Greek narrative, Vol. I. Mnemosyne*. Supplement 257, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 479–487.

Morson, G.S. and Emerson, C. 1990. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Muchow, M.D. 1988. *Passionate love and respectable society in three Greek novels*, Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Müller, C.W. 1976. "Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike", *A&A* 22, 115–136.

— 1981. "Der griechische Roman", in: E. Vogt (ed.), *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, ii. Griechische Litteratur*, Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 377–412.

Naber, S.A. 1901. "Ad Charitonem", *Mnemosyne* 29, 92–99.

Nagy, G. 2002. "Reading Bakhtin Reading the Classics: An Epic Fate for Conveyors of the Heroic Past", in: Branham 2002a, 71–96.

Nesselrath, H.-G. 1990. *Die attische Mittlere Komödie. Ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritk und Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Nimis, S. 2003. "In mediis rebus: Beginning Again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen 2003, 255–270.

Oakley, J.H. and Sinos, R.H. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Ogilvie, R.M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oldfather, C.H. 1950. *Diodorus of Sicily V*. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd.

— 1956. *Diodorus of Sicily IV*. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd.

Oliver, J.H. 1950. *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Omitowoju, R. 2002. *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Oudot, E. 1992. "Images d'Athènes dans les Romans Grecs", in: Baslez, Hoffman, and Trédé 1992, 101–111.

— 1996. "L'Ombre d'Athènes. L'Image de la cité et de son peuple chez les géographes, les historiens, et les biographes grecs du haut-empire", Diss., University of Paris.

Palmer, M. 1982. "Alcibiades and the Question of Tyranny in Thucydides", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 15, 103–124.

Panayotakis, S.; Zimmerman, M.; and Keulen, W., edd. 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Papanikolaou, A.D. 1963. "Zur Sprache des Chariton", Diss., Köln.

— 1973. *Chariton-Studien. Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane*. *Hypomnemata* 37, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pelling, C. 2000. *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*, London and New York: Routledge.

Pernot, L. 2005. *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Perrin, B. 1986. *Plutarch's Lives in Eleven Volumes. IV. Alcibiades and Coriolanus. Lysander and Sulla*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. Originally published in 1916.

Perry, B.E. 1930. "Chariton and His Romance from a Literary-Historical Point of View", *AJPh* 51, 93–134.

— 1967. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*. Sather Classical Lectures 37, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Petri, R. 1963. *Über den Roman des Chariton*. *Erlangen Beitrage Zur klassischen Philologie*. Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain.

Phillips, A.A. and Willcock, M.M. 1999. *Xenophon and Arrian on Hunting with Hounds*, Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, ltd.

Picone, M. and Zimmermann, B., edd. 1997. *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*, Basel, Boston, and Berlin: Birkhäuser.

Pimentel, M.C. 1977. "O romance de Cáriton. Quéreas e Calirroe", *Classica* 1, 53–71.

Plepelits, K. 1976. *Chariton von Aphrodisias, Kallirhoe: eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert*, Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

— 1983. *Im Reiche des Eros: sämtliche Liebes- und Abenteuerromane der Antike*, Munich: Winkler.

Porter, J.R. 2003. "Chariton and Lysias I: Further considerations", *Hermes* 131, 433–440.

Pouderon, B.; Hunzinger, C.; and Kasprzyk, D., edd. 2001. *Les Personnages du Roman Grec. Actes du colloque de Tours, 18–20 novembre 1999.* Collection de la Maison l'Orient Méditerranéen. 29. Série littéraire et philosophique 7, Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, Jean Pouilloux; Paris: de Boccard.

Puccini-Delbey, G. 2001. "Figures du narrateur et du narrataire dans les oeuvres romanesques de Chariton d'Aphrodisias, Achille Tatius et Apulée", in: Pouderon, Hunzinger, and Kasprzyk 2001, 87–100.

Raaflaub, K.A. 1990. "Contemporary Perceptions of Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens", in: W.R. Connor (ed.), *Aspects of Athenian Democracy. Classica et Mediaevalia dissertationes* 11, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press and the University of Copenhagen, 33–70.

Rademaker, A. 2005. *Sophrosyne and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint: Polysemy and Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 259, Leiden: Brill.

Ramelli, I. 2000. "Caritone e la storiografia greca. Il *Romanzo di Calliroe* come romanzo storico antico", *Acme* 53, 43–62.

Reardon, B.P. 1969. "The Greek Novel", *Phoenix* 23, 291–309.

— 1971. *Courants Littéraires Grecs des Iie et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles lettres.

— 1979. Review of K. Plepelits, *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe*, *CR* 29, 145.

— 1982. "Une nouvelle édition de Chariton", *REG* 95, 157–173.

— 1988. "The Form of the Ancient Greek Romance", in: Beaton (ed.), *The Greek Novel A.D. 1–1985*, London, New York, and Sydney: Croom Helm, 205–217.

— ed. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.

— 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 1996. "Chariton", in: Schmeling 1996, 309–335.

— 1999. "Theme, Structure, and Narrative in Chariton", in: Swain 1999: 163–188. Originally printed in *YCIS* 27 (1982), 1–27.

— 2000. "Les malheurs de *Callirhoé*", in: Billault 2000, 59–71.

— 2001. "Callirhoé et ses soeurs", in: Pouderon, Hunzinger, and Kasprzyk 2001, 21–27.

— ed. 2004. *Chariton. De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

Reeve, M.D. 1971. "Hiatus in the Greek Novelists", *CQ* 21, 514–539.

Reynolds, J.M. 1980. "The origins and beginning of imperial cult at Aphrodisias", *PCPhS* 206, 70–84.

— 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

— 1986. "Imperial Cult at Aphrodisias", *StudClas* 24, 109–117.

Richter, G.M.A. 1958. "Was Roman Art of the First Centuries B.C. and A.D. Classicizing?", *JRS* 48, 10–15.

Rijksbaron, A. 1984. "Chariton 8,1,4 und Aristot. Poet. 1449b28", *Philologus* 128, 306–307.

Roberts, J.T. 1994. *Athens on Trial. The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Robiano, P. 1984. "La notion de tychè chez Chariton et chez Héliodore", *REG* 97, 543–549.

— 2000. "La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec", *Revue des Études Anciennes* 102, 509–529.

— 2006. "La main et la voix: la lettre intime chez Chariton", in: V. Rimmell (ed.), *Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*. *Ancient Narrative* Supplement 5, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and the Groningen University Library.

Robinson, H.S. 1943. "The Tower of the Winds and the Roman Market Place", *AJA* 47, 291–305.

Rohde, E. 1960. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Fourth edition, Hildesheim: Georg Olms. Originally published 1876.

Rojas Álvarez, L. 1998. "Caritón de Afrodisias : la huella de su oficio", *Nova Tellus* 16.1, 15–26.

Roncali, R. 1991. "Zelotypia/daimon in Caritone", *QS* 17, 183–186.

— 1996. *Caritone di Afrodisia: Il romanzo di Calliroe*. Milano, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.

Rose, H.J. 1939. "Some lacunae in Chariton", *CQ* 33.1, 30.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fiction: the Letter in Greek Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosivach, V.J. 1998. *When a Young Man Falls in Love. The Sexual Exploitation of Women in Comedy*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1980. "Una observación para la cronologia de Caritón de Afrodisias", *REC* 24, 63–69.

— 1989. "Caritón de Afrodisias y el mundo real", in: P. Liviabella and A.M. Scarcella (edd.), *Piccolo mondo antico*. Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 107–149.

— 1991. "Aspects of the vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias", *CQ* 61, 484–489.

— 1994. "Chariton von Aphrodisias: Ein Überblick", *ANRW* II.34.2, 1006–1054.

Sacks, K.S. 1990. *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sage, P.W. 1991. "Tradition, Genre, and Character Portrayal: *Cyropaedia* 8.7 and *Anabasis* 1.9", *GRBS* 32.1, 61–79.

— 1995. "Dying in Style: Xenophon's Ideal Leader and the End of the *Cyropaedia*", *CJ* 90.2, 161–174.

Saïd, S. 1999. "Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or The Country Seen from the Town", in: Swain 1999, 83–107.

Salmon, P. 1961. "Chariton d'Aphrodisias et la révolte égyptienne de 360 av. J. C.", *Chronique d'Egypt* 36, 365–376.

Sandy, G.N. 1975. Review of G. Schmeling, *Chariton*, *CW* 69, 79–80.

Sanz Morales, Manuel. 2002. "Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Chariton-Text auf Papyrus", *ZPE* 141, 111–115.

Scafuro, A.C. 1997. *The Forensic Stage. Settling Disputes in Graeco-Roman New Comedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scarcella, A.M. 1981. "Metastasi narratologica del dato storico nel romanzo erotico Greco", in: *Atti del convegno internazionale 'Letteratura classiche e narratologia'*. Materiali e

Contributi per la Storia della Narrativa Greco-Latina 3, Perugia: Istituto di filologia latina dell'Università di Perugia, 341–367.

— 1988. "Il mare (le fonti, i fiumi): l'altra faccia della geografia ideale dei romanzi erotici greci", *Euphrosyne* 16, 257–270.

Schenkeveld, D.M. 1993. "The lexicon of the narrator and his characters: some aspects of syntax and choice of words in Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe", *Groningen colloquia on the novel* 4: 17–30.

Schmeling, G.L. 1974. *Chariton*. Twayne's World Authors Series 295. New York: Twayne Publishers.

— ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill.

— 2003. "Myths of Person and Place: the Search for a Model for the Ancient Greek Novel" in Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen 2003, 425–442.

— 2005. "Callirhoe: God-like Beauty and the Making of a Celebrity", in: Harrison, Paschalis, and Frangoulidis 2005, 36–49.

Schmitz, T. 1997. *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, München: Beck.

Schwartz, S. 1999. "Callirhoe's Choice: Biological vs. Legal Paternity", *GRBS* 40, 23–52.

— 2003. "Rome in the Greek Novel? Images and Ideas of Empire in Chariton's Persia", *Arethusa* 36.3, 375–394.

Scobie, A. 1969. *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage. Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek romances. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 30, Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.

Scourfield, J.H. David. 2003. "Anger and gender in Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe", in: S. Braund and G.W. Most (edd.), *Ancient anger. Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163–184.

Selden, D.L. 1994. "Genre of Genre", in Tatum 1994, 39–64.

Shipley, F.W. 1979. *Velleius Paterculus and Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Sinko, T. 1940. "De ordine quo erotici scriptores sibi successisse videantur", *Eos* 41, 23–45.

Smith, R.R.R. 1987. "Imperial Reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias", *JRS* 77, 88–138.

— 1988. "*Simulacra Gentium*: The *Ethne* from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias", *JRS* 78, 50–77.

Smith, S.D. 2003. "Discourses of Identity and Freedom: Representations of Athens in Chariton." Diss., Boston University, 2003.

— 2005. "Bakhtin and Chariton: A Revisionist Reading", in Branham 2005, 164–192.

Spawforth, A. 1994. "Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire", in: S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 233–247.

Stadter, P.A. and van der Stockt, L., edd. 2002. *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98–117 A.D.)*, Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Stahl, H.-P. 1966. *Thukydides. Die Stellung des Menschen im geschichtlichen Prozeß*, Munich: C. H. Beck

Stanford, W.B. 1938. "Notes on a new edition of Chariton", *Hermathena* 51, 135–139.

Steiner, D. 2005. "For Want of a Horse: Thucydides 6.302 and Reversals in the Athenian Civic Ideal", *CQ* 55.2, 407–422.

Steiner, G. 1969. "The graphic analogue from myth in Greek romance", in: *Classical Studies Presented to B.E. Perry by his Students and Colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924 – 1960*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 123–137.

Stephens, A. 1990. "The Popularity of the Ancient Novel", in: Tatum and Vernazza 1990, 148–149.

Stevens, G.P. 1946. "Architectural Studies concerning the Acropolis of Athens", *Hesperia* 15.2, 73–106.

Strassler, R.B., ed. 1998. *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Stylianou, P.J. 2002. Review of K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, *BMCRev* 02.06.19.

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

— 1997. "Plutarch, Plato, Athens, and Rome", in: J. Barnes and M. Griffin (edd.), *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

Syme, R. 1984. *Roman Papers* 3, Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Tatum, J. 1989. *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On* The Education of Cyrus, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

— ed. 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tatum, J. and Vernazza, G.M., edd. 1990. *The Ancient Novel. Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives, International Conference on the Ancient Novel 2*, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Taylor, M.W. 1981. *The Tyrant Slayers: The Heroic Image in Fifth Century BC Athenian Art and Politics*, New York: Arno Press.

Thiolier, J.C. 1985. *Plutarque. De Gloria Atheniensium*, Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Thompson, H.A. and Wycherley, R.E. 1972. *The Athenian Agora, XIV. The Agora of Athens*, Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Toohey, P. 1999. "Dangerous Ways to Fall in Love: Chariton 1.1.5–10 and 6.9.4", *Maia* 51, 259–275.

— 2004. *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Travlos, J. 1993. *Πολεοδομικὴ ἐξέλιξις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἀπὸ τῶν προϊστορικῶν χρόνων μέχρι τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ 19ου αἰῶνος*. Second edition, Athens: Ekdoseis Kapon.

Trenkner, S. 1958. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van der Horst, P.G. 1983. "Chariton and the New Testament. A Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum", *NT* 25, 348–355.

van Opstall, E. 1995. "Chariton van Aphrodisias: 'Chaireas en Callirhoe' 1.1.7–16 & 1.7.1–8.4", *Hermeneus* 67.2, 68–70.

van Steen, G. 1998. "Destined to be ? : Tyche in Chariton's « Chaereas and Callirhoe » and in the Byzantine romance of « Kallimachos and Chrysorroi »", *AC* 67, 203–211.

Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
Walker, H.J. 1995. *Theseus and Athens*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Weissenberger, M. 1997. "Der 'Götterapparat' im Roman des Chariton", in: Picone and Zimmermann 1997, 49–73.
Wesseling, B. 1988. "The Audience of the Ancient Novels", in H. Hoffmann (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel I*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 67–79.
West, S.R. 2003. "Kerkidos Paramythia? For whom did Chariton write? For Reinhold Merkelbach on his 85th birthday", *ZPE* 143, 63–69.
Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
— 2004. *Ancient Greek Literature*, Cambridge, United Kingdom; Malden, Massachusetts: Polity Press.
— 2005a. "Dialogues in love: Bakhtin and his critics on the Greek novel", in: Branham 2005, 107–129.
— 2005b. "The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre", *AJPh* 126, 587–611.
Wiedemann, T. 1994. *Greek and Roman Slavery*, London and New York: Routledge.
Williams, C.A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality. Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Winkler, J.J. 1994. "The Invention of Romance", in: Tatum 1994, 23–38.
— 1999. "The Mendacity of Kalasiris in the *Aithiopika*", in: Swain 1999, 286–350.
Wohl, V. 1999. "The Eros of Alcibiades", *CQ* 18.2, 349–385.
— 2002. *Love Among the Ruins: The Erotics of Democracy in Classical Athens*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Wooton, C. 1975. "Le développement du style asiatique pendant l'époque hellénestique", *REG* 88, 94–104.
Wycherley, R.E. 1957. *The Athenian Agora. Volume III. Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, Princeton, New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
Yildirim, B. 2004. "Identities and empire: Local mythology and the self-representation of Aphrodisias", in Borg 2004, 23–52.
Zanetto, G. 1990. "La lingua dei romanzieri greci", *GIF* 42, 233 – 42.
Zeitlin, F.I. 2003. "Living Portraits and Sculpted Bodies in Chariton's Theater of Romance", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen 2003, 71–84.
Zimmermann, F. 1922. *De Charitonis codice Thebano*. Diss., Leipzig, Tübingen = *Philologus* 78 (1923), 330–381.
— 1924. "Supplementa Charitonea", *Aegyptus* 5.3, 202–204.
— 1925a. "Zu Chariton 2.2.1", *Philologus* 80, 222.
— 1925b. "Drei Konjekturen zum Chariton-Roman", *Philologus* 80, 472–474.
— 1927. "Zu Chariton 1 14, 7", *Philologische Wochenschrift* 47, 766–768.
— 1928a. "Ein korrupter Medizinerausdruck bei Chariton", *Philologus* 83, 218–220.
— 1928b. "Zur Überlieferung des Chariton-Romanes", *Hermes* 63, 193–224.
— 1930. "Ein verkanntes Wortspiel bei Chariton I, 1, 2", *Philologus* 85, 482–484.
— 1953–1954. "Eine alte Crux im Codex Florentinus des Chariton-Romans", in: *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschriften der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig* 3, *Gesellschaftliche & Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 4, 437–438.
— 1957a. "Kallirhoes Verkauf durch Theron. Eine juristichphilologische Betrachtung zu Chariton", in: J. Irmscher (ed.), *Aus der byzantinische Arbeit der Deutsche Demokratische Republik*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 72–81.

— 1957b. “Chariton-Interpretationen”, *Studi Calderini-Paribeni* 2, 137–145.
— 1961. “Chariton und die Geschichte”, in: R. Günther und G. Schrot (edd.), *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse im alten Orient & klassischen Altertum*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 329–345.

Indices

Index locorum

General Index

.