

# Callisthenes in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe And Cleitophon*: Double Jeopardy?

IAN REPATH  
Swansea University

## *Introduction*

In his novel *Leucippe and Cleitophon* Achilles Tatius has two characters with the name Callisthenes. This is remarkable, not to say downright peculiar, yet it is a fact which has received remarkably little attention.<sup>1</sup> No other extant Greek novel contains two characters with the same name. Moreover, the cast list of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is not especially large – there is a total of 29 named characters (excluding divinities, mythical characters, and Lacaena, Leucippe’s pseudonym).<sup>2</sup> Nor is it the case that Achilles Tatius is slapdash or lazy in the construction of his novel; recent studies have focused on how carefully he builds a sophisticated and playful narrative, with intratextuality, often involving the linking of two or more particular passages, an essential feature of his writing.<sup>3</sup> Finally, an author who uses the name

---

<sup>1</sup> Vilborg 1962, Hägg 1971a, Winkler 1989, Yatromanolakis 1990, and Morales 2004 are silent on the matter. O’Sullivan 1980, 204, notes the existence of the two, one being ‘the kidnapper of Calligone’, the other ‘a slave-trader’, as does Gaselee 1969, 459, in his index. Plepelits 1980, in his index at 259, says that the second Callisthenes is a ‘Kaufmann desselben Namens’. Whitmarsh 2001, 158, in a note to his translation, says that the Callisthenes we find at 5,17 is ‘no doubt a different Callisthenes from the one who attempts to abduct Leucippe’. Whether or not this matter is so straightforward is one of the things I wish to address.

<sup>2</sup> Chariton has 24 (see Hunter 1994 and Goold 1995), Heliodorus 38 (see Morgan 1982, 247, Bowie 1995, and Jones 2006), Longus 25 (see Hunter 1983 and Morgan 2004a), and Xenophon of Ephesus 33 (see Hägg 1971b).

<sup>3</sup> For care of construction, see Hägg 1971a, Most 1989, Reardon 1994, Nakatani 2003, and Repath 2005; for sophistication and intratextuality, see also Bartsch 1989, Goldhill 1995, Whitmarsh 2003, and Morales 2004. I cannot agree with Nimis 1998 (cf. 1994, 1999, and 2003) that this novel in particular is not carefully and deliberately planned and constructed. For arguments in favour of a relatively well-educated readership of the Greek

Menelaus, for instance, for a man who prefers boys to women and who comes from Egypt, is fully aware of the potential significance of names and of the games that can be played with them; indeed, many of the others he uses point to networks of allusion and/or are etymologically significant and so were obviously chosen with care.<sup>4</sup> In this piece I am not going to focus on the potential allusivity of the name Callisthenes or on any etymological relevance and impact, although that is not to say that these are not areas of interest.<sup>5</sup> What I am going to do is look at each Callisthenes and the passages in which they occur or are mentioned, compare them, and then see where these comparisons lead.

### *The First Callisthenes*

The first Callisthenes is introduced at 2,13.<sup>6</sup> His characterisation is brief and to the point: ‘There was a young man of Byzantium called Callisthenes, a wealthy orphan, but prodigal and extravagant.’ (2,13,1).<sup>7</sup> He hears that Sostratus, also of Byzantium, has a beautiful daughter (Leucippe), and wants to marry her, despite never having seen her. He asks Sostratus for his daughter, but he refuses. Callisthenes then ‘plots’ (ἐπιβουλεύει 2,13,3) to obtain his desire, supposedly following a law of the Byzantines that if a man abducts a virgin and makes her his wife, the punishment is the marriage itself (2,13). Although Leucippe is sent to Tyre when a war breaks out between Byzantium and Thrace, Callisthenes continues his ‘plotting’ (ἐπιβουλῆς 2,14,1) and finds an opportunity to mount an abduction when appointed to an embassy to Tyre (2,15,1). At the embassy’s sacrifice he sees Calligone with Leucippe’s mother and assumes she is Leucippe (Calligone’s mother is ill; Leucippe is pretending to be unwell so that she can meet Cleitophon) (2,16,1–2). He tells his trusty servant Zeno ‘to gather some robbers’ (ληιστὰς

---

novel, and so one which it is reasonable to suggest would have been attentive and alert, see, e.g., Wesseling 1988, Stephens 1994, Bowie 1994 and 1996, and Morgan 1995.

<sup>4</sup> See Whitmarsh and Morales 2001, 163–164, Bowie 2003, 60–61, and Morales 2004, 56.

<sup>5</sup> Although I do not think it affects my argument, it should be noted that Callisthenes is a fairly common name: there is a total of 190 in the volumes so far published of Fraser and Matthews (eds.) *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, which do not yet cover Asia Minor – 57 in I, 51 in II, 35 in III.A, 6 in III.B, and 41 in IV.

<sup>6</sup> See Morales 2004, 88–94, for an analysis of his characterisation.

<sup>7</sup> Translations of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* are taken, and occasionally adapted, from Whitmarsh and Morales 2001. Greek is cited from Garnaud 1991. I shall generally only cite the Greek in order to highlight parallels or repetitions, and sometimes differences, in vocabulary and phrasing.

... συγκροτῆσαι 2,16,2), 'instructing him on the manner of the abduction' (ibid.). When he has completed his part of the embassy Callisthenes departs in his own ship (2,17,1) and in the village of Sarapta acquires a small boat which he entrusts to Zeno. Zeno, we are told, 'had a doughty constitution and the nature of a brigand (φύσει πειρατικός)' (2,17,3); he quickly recruits some 'fishermen as bandits' (ληστὰς ἀλιεῖς ibid.), and they go back to Tyre. At the night sacrifice the next day, they approach the assembled company, among which are a further eight men who are 'wearing women's clothes and with their beards shaved from their chins' (2,18,3). When the pyre has been raised, they:

suddenly rushed upon us with a shout (ἐξαίφνης βοῶντες συντρέχουσι) and put out our torches. We were terrified and fled in panic, whereupon they bared their swords, snatched my sister (τὰ ξίφη γυμνώσαντες ἀπράζουσι τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμὴν), and put her on board the boat (ἐνθέμενοι τῷ σκάφει); then, embarking themselves, they took wing like a bird. (2,18,4).

They then escape towards Sarapta, where Callisthenes meets them and takes Calligone on board his ship. Cleitophon knows all this, and also what happened next, from what Leucippe's father tells them over dinner after the couple have been finally reunited in Ephesus (8,17–18), and I shall come to that later, but before that I want to look at the second Callisthenes.

### *The Second Callisthenes*

The second Callisthenes (hereafter Callisthenes#) is mentioned by Sosthenes, who will become Thersander's henchman, at 5,17,9, when quizzed by Melite about a female slave:

"My lady" he replied, "I only know that some dealer called Callisthenes sold her to me, saying that he had bought her from some bandits (ἀπὸ ληστῶν), and that she was freeborn. The name the dealer gave her was Lacaena."

As Ewen Bowie has noted: 'Names can evoke a vast range of associations. Dropped into the calm flow of a narrative they set up ripples which persist

long after they have first splashed into the readers' awareness.<sup>8</sup> He goes on to write primarily about instances of allusion to other texts, but there is no reason why this comment should not apply equally to intratextuality. The dropping of the name 'Callisthenes' into the narrative at this point must surely make the reader think of the Callisthenes who abducted Calligone.<sup>9</sup> This is especially true since there is no particular need for this dealer to have a name at all, and so for him to have the name 'Callisthenes' must be significant. The splash made here will cause ripples whose interference pattern will produce a tidal wave of questions and doubt at the end of the novel, but there are associations and similarities which have already occurred by this point and which the mention of Callisthenes# brings into sharper focus.

### *Two Abductions*

The Lacaena whom Sosthenes bought is, of course, Leucippe, and it is worth examining how she ended up in this predicament. A certain Chaereas is one of those unfortunate souls who vainly fall in love with a novelistic heroine. At the beginning of book five the protagonists and Menelaus are in Alexandria, and this Chaereas begins to make his move:

Realising that consent would not be forthcoming, he arranged a plot (συντίθησιν ἐπιβουλήν): assembling a band of robbers who shared his trade (ληστῶν ὁμοτέχνων ὄχλον συγκροτήσας) (he being a man of the sea), he arranged what they had to do; then he invited us to Pharos to share his hospitality, under the pretext (σκηψάμενος) of celebrating his birthday. (5,3,2)

Plotting (the idea is repeated at 5,6,1: 'this was how we escaped from the plot (τὴν ἐπιβουλήν)'; cf. 2,13,3), gathering a band of robbers, and giving instructions on abducting a maiden (cf. 2,16,2 for both) parallel very closely what we saw in the build-up to Callisthenes' kidnapping of Calligone, and the lack of consent, not even solicited in this case, recalls Sostratus' rejection

<sup>8</sup> Bowie 1995, 269.

<sup>9</sup> For the effect the mention of names can have, see Cleitophon's reactions to hearing the names Thersander and Melite in the false story of the planted prisoner at 7,3,6 and his sister's name at 8,17,2 – see below for the latter. It is interesting, given the evident care of construction in the novel, that the mention of Callisthenes# at 5,17,9 is almost equidistant textually between the report of the abduction of Calligone by Callisthenes (2,13–18) and its sequel when Sostratus tells us what happened next (8,17–18).

of Callisthenes (2,13,2). This is the first set of similarities at the beginning of an episode in which earlier events are consistently mirrored.

Another set occurs immediately: Cleitophon describes how on their way to dinner 'we encountered a bad omen' (οἰωνός ἡμῖν γίνεται πονηρός 5,3,3) when Leucippe was clipped by a hawk chasing a swallow. He appeals to Zeus, asking what the 'portent' (τέρας) is and asks for 'a clearer omen (οἰωνόν)' (ibid.). This recalls the omen, which is described as 'not good' (οὐκ ἀγαθόν 2,12,2), of the eagle which snatches the pre-wedding sacrifice from the altar, with the result that 'they postponed (ἐπέσχον) the wedding (sc. of Cleitophon and Calligone) for that day (ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν)' (2,12,2). Cleitophon's father then 'summoned prophets and soothsayers (τερατοσκόπους) and recounted the omen (τὸν οἰωνόν)<sup>10</sup> to them' (2,12,2). They say that he should go 'to the shore' (ἐπὶ θάλατταν) and sacrifice to Zeus at midnight (2,12,3). It is at this sacrifice that Calligone is abducted (2,18), and her abduction is brought forward by the opportunity afforded by the arrangements of the sacrifice (2,18,1). Immediately after Cleitophon's appeal to Zeus (5,3,3), they see a picture showing the myth of Tereus, Philomela, and Procne. Cleitophon himself will go on to explain the picture in detail, including the previously unmentioned fact that the characters in it are transformed into birds (5,5). Menelaus interprets the omen and the painting as 'not good' (οὐκ ἀγαθὰ) and says that interpreters of signs claim that one should consider the contents of paintings and 'conclude that the outcome (τὸ ἀποβησόμενον) for us will be comparable to the story they tell' (5,4,1). At 2,12,3, after the eagle had snatched the victims, Cleitophon comments that 'the fulfilment of the portent (τοῦ τέρατος)<sup>11</sup> was not long in coming (ἀπέβη).' This is picked up at 2,18,4 when Cleitophon says that the abductors 'took wing like a bird (ὄρνιθος δίκην)'. At 5,4,2 Menelaus recommends that they do not go to Chaereas: 'For this reason, I advise you to postpone (ἐπισχεῖν) the expedition', and Cleitophon puts him off 'for that day' (ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν). Thus the two omens in book five, of the birds and of the painting which contains birds, affect the timing of the snatching of the girl: they lead to its postponement rather than bringing it forward, but in so doing they parallel the initial effect of the omen of the eagle in postponing Cleitophon's wedding for one day.

The next day, when pressed, our hero and heroine are shamed into accepting Chaereas' invitation. Menelaus does not go, saying he is unwell (5,6,1). Similarly, when they have reached Chaereas' house, the host leaves

<sup>10</sup> οἰωνός occurs only at 2,12,2 and twice at 5,3,3.

<sup>11</sup> τέρας occurs only at 2,12,3 and 5,3,3.

the scene, making his stomach his excuse, which may or may not imply illness (5,7,1). Back to book two, and Cleitophon tells us the reason Callisthenes falls for the wrong girl at the sacrifice for which he has come as a Byzantine ambassador: ‘as it chanced, my mother was unwell at that time. Leucippe, under the pretext (σκηψαμένη) of also being ill, remained in the house’ (2,16,1). The absences through illness, real in the one case and feigned in the other, of Cleitophon’s mother and Leucippe entail that it is Calligone who is abducted and not Leucippe; the absences through illness, presumably real in the one case and feigned in the other, of Menelaus and Chaereas facilitate the abduction of Leucippe because the former cannot help the couple resist and the latter is presumably preparing for his getaway.<sup>12</sup> In addition to the theme of illness and how it affects the abductions, and also the recurrent idea of pretence (cf. Chaereas at 5,3,2), there are three other similarities in the circumstances of the two abductions: they both involve festive gatherings, they take place right on the coast, and occur in the evening. Callisthenes had heard that ‘there was to be a festival (πανήγυρις) during which ... all the maidens [were] accustomed to meet on the shore (ἐπὶ θάλατταν)’ (2,16,2). This is the occasion on which he plans to have Calligone abducted, but the nocturnal sacrifice to Zeus comes first and Zeno takes advantage of it. At 2,18,1–2 Cleitophon relates that, after the preparations for this sacrifice had been made: ‘When it was late into the evening (βαθείας ἑσπέρας), we set out and he (sc. Zeno) pursued. Just as we arrived at the lip of the sea (ἐπὶ τῷ χεῖλει τῆς θαλάσσης) ...’ At this point Calligone is abducted. The festive gathering in the case of Leucippe’s abduction is the pretext of celebrating his birthday which Chaereas uses to invite the protagonists for dinner (5,3,2). We know that he lives on the island of Pharos (ibid.), and we later find out that his house ‘lay on the far side of the island, right on the sea (ἐπ’ αὐτῇ τῇ θαλάσσει).’ (5,6,3) The next thing we are given is an indication of when Leucippe’s abduction took place: ‘When evening (ἑσπέρας) came around ...’ (5,7,1).

When we look at Leucippe’s abduction itself, we can see that it is almost a carbon copy of the abduction of Calligone:

After a while there was a sudden shout (βοή τις ἑξαίφνης) at the doors, and a large group of well-built men immediately rushed in (εἰστρέχουσιν), daggers drawn (μαχαίρας ἑσπασμένοι), and they all made a dash for the girl. (5,7,1)

<sup>12</sup> This is not specified, but we find out from Leucippe at 8,16,4 that he was on board the ship on which she was taken away from Egypt.

The sudden shouting, running, drawn daggers, and going for the girl are extremely similar to the details we find at 2,18,4 (quoted above), and these bandits also 'put the girl in the boat (ἐνθήμενοι τῷ σκάφει) and made their escape' (5,7,2). Two other factors to include are that when Cleitophon and the general of the island give chase by sea, the bandits catch sight of another ship which they call to their aid; it is manned by 'piratical fishermen' (πορφυρεῖς ... πειρατικοί 5,7,6). These two boats are paralleled by those used by Callisthenes in his abduction of Calligone – his own private ship (2,17,1) and the additional boat he buys for Zeno to use (2,17,2); the piratical fishermen recall the fishermen who were also bandits whom Zeno gathered to make the raid (2,17,3).

There are, then, extensive and close parallels, both in terms of detail and language, which should encourage us to link the abductions of Calligone by Callisthenes and of Leucippe by Chaereas. They are further and even more closely linked when we come across the name 'Callisthenes' at 5,17,9, but there are yet more factors to consider before making an initial assessment about where all this leads us. At 5,17,3 Cleitophon and Melite come across a female slave on the latter's estate near Ephesus. When encouraged to explain what has happened to her, the woman says that she is called Lacaena and is from Thessaly, and that if she is saved from her present misfortune, she will pay two thousand gold pieces, since this was the amount for which Melite's steward Sosthenes had bought her 'from the bandits' (ἀπὸ τῶν ληστῶν 5,17,5). Cleitophon is greatly affected by her story, not least because she reminds him of Leucippe: 'I for my part was extremely upset, since she seemed to have something of Leucippe about her' (5,17,7). This is hardly surprising, because she is Leucippe: the reason he does not recognise her fully is that she has had her head shaved (5,17,3). This is emphasised shortly afterwards when half-way through dinner Satyrus gives Cleitophon a letter from his beloved Leucippe. Cleitophon asks if she is alive, and his slave replies that she is:

She is the woman you saw on the estate. At that point, no one else who saw her would have recognised her, given her transformation into an ephēbe: the metamorphosis is due entirely to her haircut (ἡ τῶν τριχῶν ἀπὸ τῆς κουρᾶ). (5,19,2)

Shaved hair and a perceived sex change, potential or otherwise, bring us back to some of the bandits Zeno had gathered, the ones on the shore:

wearing women's clothes and with their beards (τὰς τρίχας) shaved from their chins, each carrying a sword in the fold of his clothes. They themselves also joined in the sacrifice, so as to provoke as little suspicion as possible: we thought that they were women. (2,18,3)<sup>13</sup>

Not only are the details interesting here, in that they further enhance the links between the two episodes, but there are general themes of identity, disguise, deception, and (mis)identification which are important throughout this novel, and particularly for looking at the episodes involving Callisthenes. Callisthenes does, after all, abduct a woman who 'has something of Leucippe about her' in that he misidentifies Calligone as Sostratus' daughter, and the possibility of identification and deception will be important when we look at certain things we are told in the narrations in the novel's final book.

Leucippe is freed by Melite, who summons Sosthenes to explain himself. It is at this point that we find Callisthenes# named:<sup>14</sup> 'My lady' he replied, 'I only know that some dealer called Callisthenes sold her to me, saying that he had bought her from some bandits, and that she was freeborn. The name the dealer gave her was Lacaena.' (5,17,9) Given the similarities and parallels between Calligone being abducted and Leucippe being abducted, and given the involvement of a Callisthenes in both narrative strands, it is worthwhile seeing what mileage can be gained at this point, before moving on to look at the narration of these and connected events in the final book. Callisthenes wants to have Leucippe and receives a woman he thinks is Leucippe from Zeno and some bandits, for whose work it is fair to assume he paid: Callisthenes# buys Leucippe from some bandits. Callisthenes gets the wrong woman and ends up with Calligone: Callisthenes# gets the real Leucippe, although he thinks she is called Lacaena (5,17,9; cf. 6,16,5 where Leucippe says her name was stolen by the pirates), but sells her on.

There is, therefore, if nothing else, considerable irony in having Callisthenes# succeed with great ease where his namesake failed, and this irony is amplified when he voluntarily gives up possession of Leucippe. The irony would be immeasurably greater if we were dealing with not two characters called Callisthenes, but one; that is, if it were actually the same Callisthenes who wanted Leucippe and did not obtain her, but then unknowingly obtained her and let her go. In spite of commentators', and readers', assumptions to

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Cleitophon dressed in Melite's clothes at 6,1 so that he will escape detection.

<sup>14</sup> This is the only point at which he is named, although he is mentioned later, by Leucippe – see below.



the contrary,<sup>15</sup> there is nothing at this point in the novel to indicate that Callisthenes and Callisthenes# are not identical, and although Cleitophon does not make the identification in his narration, the fact that we are dealing with one name might encourage the reader to think that only one person is involved.<sup>16</sup> In any case, to have his narrator make it clear one way or the other would spoil the fun, and Achilles Tatius wants to pose more questions than he provides answers, an attitude he maintains right up until the very end of his novel, as we shall see.

Leucippe's adventures between being abducted by Chaereas and freed by Melite and also the story of Callisthenes and Calligone are related in the final book, but before that we find a hint that we are to investigate aspects of what happened to Leucippe. In his desperate, self-condemnatory court speech in book seven, Cleitophon describes how he fell in love with Leucippe, believed her dead after her abduction by bandits in Egypt, met Melite, and how they came to Ephesus. He then says:

Then we found Leucippe enslaved in the service of Sosthenes, a manager of Thersander's property. How Sosthenes had ended up with a free woman as his slave, and what was the deal he struck with the bandits (τοῖς λησταῖς), I leave to you to consider. (7,7,3–4)

This is a relatively inconsequential aside in his speech – his pained self-accusation is the main focus – but it does operate as a trigger to the reader to add up the details surrounding the sale of Leucippe, and the last thing we were told was that Sosthenes bought her from a dealer called Callisthenes#. We receive a similar prompt from Cleinias towards the end of his speech which rebuts Cleitophon's: 'Here is Sosthenes – he will tell you the source from which he acquired Leucippe as a slave' (7,9,14). Although Sosthenes is eventually brought into court, by that stage all that matters is that he implicates Thersander (8,15,1); how he acquired Leucippe is not important as far as the trial is concerned. However, the fact that the question is thereby left hanging allows the reader the chance to attempt to answer it and acts as an encouragement to do so. Leucippe will do this herself to some extent (8,16 –

<sup>15</sup> See n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> Whether or not Cleitophon might have been in a position to make this identification will be considered later. For Cleitophon as an unideal reader of his own story, and for different levels of narration and knowledge, see Whitmarsh 2003. For the idea that a narrator might not be aware of something that the (implied) author conveys and the (implied) reader realises, see Conte 1996 and Morgan 2004a, and also Morgan 1997, 179–186, and 2004b for some comments on Cleitophon.

see below), but not without simultaneously raising other interesting and important questions.

*Callisthenes in the Final Book*

In the final book, in between court appearances and trials for the two principal female characters, gaps in the narrative are, seemingly, filled in by the characters, for the benefit of both other characters and also the reader. In the penultimate two chapters of the novel (8,17–18) Cleitophon gives us a summary of Sostratus' report of the events which we have seen Cleitophon recount earlier about Callisthenes and Calligone (2,13–18); Cleitophon then provides us with the rest of Sostratus' speech concerning what occurred next. Before looking at this speech, however, there is the matter of Leucippe's account of how she survived having her head apparently cut off by the bandits (5,7). It was, of course, some other woman who met such a grisly end, and what followed is what we should expect of baddies in Greek novels – they got into an argument and killed each other,<sup>17</sup> Chaereas getting his just deserts in having his own head chopped off too. Leucippe says that next: 'The bandits (οἱ ... λησταί) sailed for two days, then took me somewhere or other and sold me to their regular slave-dealer (ἐμπόρῳ συνήθει), and he sold me to Sosthenes.' (8,16,7) Leucippe does not give us the name of this 'regular slave-dealer', and it is perfectly plausible that she does not, since how could she think it significant?<sup>18</sup> However, the attentive reader will remember that he was Callisthenes#.

This becomes significant when we look at what comes immediately afterwards, since Sostratus elaborates at some length the story of Cleitophon's half-sister Calligone and her abduction by none other than Callisthenes. Morgan has referred to a parallel made between the main narrative of Cleitophon and Leucippe and the subordinate(d) story of Callisthenes and his abduction of, and subsequent relationship with, Calligone, and suggested that the latter acts as a commentary on the former: Callisthenes undergoes a character transformation, and the reader is thereby invited to reflect on whether Cleitophon himself shows similar development, with the most likely

<sup>17</sup> Cf. especially Hld. 5,32.

<sup>18</sup> She was present when Sosthenes named him (5,17,9). She did not in fact mention a dealer in her earlier account (5,17,5), saying only that Sosthenes bought her from bandits; this might further emphasise her mention of a dealer in the final book.

conclusion that he does not.<sup>19</sup> This is certainly one way in which this secondary narrative can be read, but, while not wanting necessarily to disagree with this, I do want to look at Callisthenes a bit more closely, especially in light of Callisthenes#. How reliable, for instance, is Sostratus' account of Callisthenes and his transformation, and what effect does Leucippe's mention of Callisthenes# just before it have?

Sostratus introduces his contribution to proceedings by saying:

Now that you have recounted your own adventures (μύθους), my children, you must hear from me what happened at home concerning Calligone, your sister, Cleitophon: I do not want to turn up at the banquet of story-telling altogether empty-handed (ἵνα μὴ ἀσύμβολος ᾶ μυθολογίας)! (8,17,1)

The terms employed here, while by no means simple in this novel or elsewhere, do at least bring into question the truth-content and reliability, not only of what Leucippe has said, but also of what Sostratus will say. Although μῦθος occurs with a good degree of frequency in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, the doubt its use creates here is perhaps shown best by recalling the opening conversation between the anonymous narrator and Cleitophon, where the latter says: 'My tale is like a fictional adventure (μύθοις)' (1,2,2), and the former encourages him by saying: 'It will give me all the more pleasure if your tale is indeed like fiction (μύθοις).' (ibid.) Furthermore, it is Sostratus himself who is made to highlight the potentially dubious nature of what he has to say.<sup>20</sup> Cleitophon's reaction to Sostratus' introduction is:

<sup>19</sup> Morgan 1997, 185–186; the piece by Fiona Templar to which he refers was never published. Hägg 1971a, 208, comments that the 'subplot centred on Callisthenes ... is the nearest approach to a description of character development in the romance.' See also Reardon 1971, 363, and 1994, 91.

<sup>20</sup> Other than at 8,17,1, μυθολογία is used twice by Achilles Tatius: at 2,37,5 it means more or less what we would by 'mythology', and at 1,19,3 it refers to the erotic phenomena from the natural world by discoursing on which Cleitophon has been trying to make Leucippe erotically inclined towards him. More interesting in terms of the question of fictionality is the cognate verb, μυθολογέω, which occurs four times: at 2,11,4 it is used of a Tyrian legend and at 8,15,3 it describes the discussions which we hear in 8,16–18, but at 6,13,3 it conveys Leucippe's sceptical attitude to what Sosthenes has to say about Thersander, and at 7,11,1 Thersander uses it to denigrate Cleinias' speech as fiction. The compound διαμυθολογέω is used by Cleitophon at 8,18,5, its only occurrence in the novel, to describe what is said in 8,16–18.

‘When I heard my sister’s name, I gave him my full attention.’ (8,17,2)<sup>21</sup> The dropping of Calligone’s name into what Sostratus says arouses Cleitophon’s interest, and I would argue that, coupled with this, the mention of Callisthenes# at 8,16,7 should have a similar effect on the reader. We already know from 2,13–18 that Callisthenes was responsible for what happened to Calligone, and also his name is mentioned very soon afterwards when Cleitophon summarises what we were told there: ‘He (sc. Sostratus) began by telling everything that I have already related: Callisthenes, the oracle, the sacred embassy, the boat, the abduction.’ (8,17,2) The juxtaposition at this point of two narrative strands which are linked by the name Callisthenes and a host of other details invites us to consider their relationship to each other. Why does Achilles Tatius ensure that they are brought together like this almost at the very end of the novel?

Sostratus continues by saying that Callisthenes, although he had got the wrong girl, fell madly (and conveniently!), in love with her anyway and said:

Lady mistress, do not think of me as some bandit (ληστήν), some criminal! I was, after all, born into the nobility: my family is from Byzantium, and I am second to none in rank (εἰμι τῶν εἰς γεγονότων, γένει Βυζάντιος δεύτερος οὐδενός). Eros scripted my role as bandit (ληστείας ὑποκρίτην); Eros made me weave these artful wiles to get you. (8,17,3)

The first thing to note here is that in recognising that his behaviour has the hallmarks of banditry, Callisthenes emphasises the association between himself and bandits; this is an association that, as we have just been reminded at the end of Leucippe’s speech, also applies to Callisthenes#. The second thing is that Callisthenes does not let on that he was after someone else! In saying to Calligone: ‘Eros made me weave these artful wiles to get you’, Callisthenes is being economical with the truth at best; he had plotted to abduct Leucippe and got Calligone by mistake. One could argue that Callisthenes is saying that it was Eros’ plan that this should happen, but that in turn could be interpreted as a pragmatic rather than romantic opinion. There is, thirdly, also the self-reflexivity of this comment: if we substituted ‘Achilles Tatius’

<sup>21</sup> I should like to think that the implication that Cleitophon has not been paying full attention to Leucippe’s words, and/or that he would not pay full attention to what Sostratus has to say if it did not concern his sister, is a deliberate device to add to his characterisation as self-absorbed. Cf. 1,15,1, where he hurries off to see Leucippe after Charicles’ funeral, and 2,18,6, where he mentions his joy at having his marriage prevented before expressing his concern for his abducted sister.

for 'Eros',<sup>22</sup> ('Achilles Tattius scripted my role as bandit; Achilles Tattius made me weave these artful wiles to get you') we would get a neat encapsulation of how clever the author has been in setting up this parallel story which intersects with that of the protagonists at crucial points. The reader's attention, I would argue, is being drawn to how and why the author has constructed these narratives and their relation to each other as he has. The final thing, connected with the idea of deceit, is the mention of role-playing: Callisthenes claims he was forced to act in a way contrary to his station, saying: 'I was, after all, born into the nobility: my family is from Byzantium, and I am second to none in rank.' A character who becomes a bandit in spite of his high birth is a figure known from other Greek novels, for instance Xenophon of Ephesus' Hippothous and Heliodorus' Thyamis, so the argument that someone well-born could not be a bandit is not especially cogent.

But we do not need to look beyond *Leucippe and Cleitophon* for a character whose status and behaviour undermine Callisthenes' argument. At 6,12,2 Sosthenes, attempting to make Leucippe susceptible to Thersander, says that his master:

is the highest-born (γένει ... πρώτος) of all the Ionians. His wealth (πλοῦτος) exceeds his ancestry, and his integrity his wealth. As for his age, well, you have seen that he is young (νέος) and handsome (καλός) (which is what most delights women).<sup>23</sup>

Sosthenes is not reliable, of course, as his emphasis on Thersander's integrity testifies, but there must be some truth in the rest of what he says, and in any case there is little reason to lend much more credence to Callisthenes' claim to nobility.<sup>24</sup> Thersander, then, is an example of a man whose behaviour (especially at 6.18–21) belies his birth. Not only that, but he too is compared to a pirate or bandit at several points: soon afterwards, at 6,13,1, Leu-

<sup>22</sup> Just as we could easily do for 'Fortune' when it has a part to play in the plot: see Whitmarsh 2003, 197; cf. Bowie 1985, 688, on Chariton.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Leucippe's comment during her soliloquy that: 'I am the daughter of a general of Byzantium, wife of the foremost man of Tyre (πρώτου Τυρίων γυνή).' (6,16,5) Even allowing for some exaggeration here, the intended significance of this is undercut not only by the fact that we have seen Cleitophon succumb to Melite (5,27), but also by Leucippe's recently expressed conviction that he has been faithful (6,16,3–4). He may be from an important family, but that does not by itself make him a gentleman.

<sup>24</sup> Further links between Callisthenes and Thersander can be seen in the fact that the former is also 'wealthy' (πλούσιος 2,13,1), 'a young man' (νεανίσκος), and 'handsome to behold' (ὀφθῆναι καλὸς 8,17,4). They share another similarity in that both fall in love with Leucippe as a result of what they have heard: compare 6,4,4 with 2,13,2.

Leucippe says to Sosthenes: ‘I know that this is some pirates’ den (πειρατηρίῳ) that I am in’; in her speech which forms the climax of the same book, after Thersander has reacted incredulously to her assertion that she is a virgin with sarcastic comments about pirates and bandits (6,21,3), she reasserts the fact that she has remained a virgin, despite Sosthenes’ attention: ‘He acted like a real bandit (ληστής) towards me: the others were more temperate than you lot, and none of them attempted such outrage. If you act in such a way, then this is the real pirates’ den (πειρατήριον). Are you not ashamed to do what the bandits (οἱ ληστές) shied away from?’ (6,22,1–2); and finally she imagines what will be said of her, that, having remained a virgin after the herdsmen, Chaereas, and Sosthenes, she was ‘a virgin even after Thersander, who was even more lecherous than the bandits (ληστῶν): because he could not commit his outrage upon her, he even killed her.’ (6,22,3)<sup>25</sup> If someone of Thersander’s class could act so abominably, then why should we, or Calligone, or Sostratus, believe that Callisthenes’ birth precludes his behaving like, or actually being, a bandit? Thersander is characterised as worse than bandits, largely because it is Leucippe’s sexual value rather than her monetary value that interests him, and he is persistent in the extreme in pursuing her, using violence, deception, and trumped-up charges. Callisthenes’ interest too is confessedly sexual (‘Eros scripted my role as bandit; Eros made me weave these artful wiles to get you.’ 8,17,3), and the question we are invited to ask and attempt to answer is to what extent his abduction of Calligone was an aberration of youthful exuberance and whether his conversion into the perfect gentleman is genuine. Besides, the reader should also ask whether, if Callisthenes was forced to play the role of bandit, other aspects of his subsequent behaviour were forced upon him or contrived to cope with a certain situation.

According to Sostratus, Callisthenes promised himself and a good part of his wealth, and vowed to respect Calligone’s virginity as long as she saw fit (8,17,3).<sup>26</sup> This is something that is paralleled in the case of the central couple: at 4,1 Cleitophon agreed to respect Leucippe’s virginity as long as she saw fit. However, he only did so under divine duress and in a sharp change from his previous attitude, and this might make the reader question the purity of Callisthenes’ motives.<sup>27</sup> There are other fruitful comparisons which can be

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Cleitophon’s comment at 8,5,6: ‘in the midst of bandits (λησταις) she retained her virginity, and she even overcame the chief bandit (ληστήν) – I mean Thersander, that shameless rapist.’

<sup>26</sup> Sostratus reports his claim to have done this at 8,18,2.

<sup>27</sup> We have already seen (6,22,1–2; 6,22,3) Leucippe emphasising that she has remained a virgin, in spite of everything, but see Morales 2004, 206–220, on the potential undermin-

made between Callisthenes and Cleitophon, and as well as potentially affecting our reading of Cleitophon and his story, they might operate in the other direction and also affect our reading of the former and his supposed conversion. Such comparisons are invited particularly because the narrative strands involving the two are brought back together by the connectedness of the tales, by their deliberately juxtaposed and interconnected narration in the final book, and by the fact that they share the same ending, in more than one sense.<sup>28</sup> One set of comments which connects and demands comparison between the two characters can be found after the end of the speech of Callisthenes which Sostratus reports:

With these words and many more besides he made the girl more amenable to his advances. He was, moreover, handsome to behold,<sup>29</sup> eloquent, and extremely persuasive. (8,17,4)

καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλείονα εὐαγωγότεραν τὴν κόρην αὐτῷ γενέσθαι παρεσκεύασεν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ὀφθῆναι καλὸς καὶ στωμύλος, πιθανώτατος·

At this point I have sided with every editor other than Garnaud and followed Jacob's reading; Garnaud follows the manuscript tradition and reads *ἐπαγωγότερα* ('With these words, and many more that were even more alluring ...'). In my opinion *εὐαγωγότεραν* is the better reading for two reasons: first, it avoids a rather strained construction in the rest of the sentence, which I cannot find used or paralleled elsewhere in this novel,<sup>30</sup> second, *εὐάγωγος* is used elsewhere in two very similar contexts. One is part of Cleinias' advice to Cleitophon on how to woo Leucippe: 'If, though, you have more success via the other approach, by making her amenable (*εὐάγωγον αὐτὴν κατασκευάσας*), then maintain for the most part the silence of a mystery-cult,

---

ing of this. Less ambiguous is the irony of Leucippe resolutely defending her virginity at 2,25,1; 2,25,2; and 2,28,2, when she would not have been for long had her mother not interrupted her and Cleitophon! Cleitophon is also concerned with virginity: his own. See his letter at 5,20,5, and his response to Leucippe's claim in her own letter to have remained a virgin (5,18,6): 'you learn that I have imitated your virginity, if there be a male equivalent of virginity'; and especially his words to Sostratus earlier in the final book: 'If there be such a thing as virginity in a man, I have retained it up to the present day, as far as Leucippe is concerned' (8,5,7). The qualification is necessary in the light of his infidelity with Melite, and brings further doubt on such assertions.

<sup>28</sup> See below.

<sup>29</sup> A nice twist on the fact that Callisthenes became a 'lover by hearsay' (2,13,1).

<sup>30</sup> Whitmarsh in Whitmarsh and Morales 2001, 143, follows Garnaud and has: 'he won the girl over to his side'.

approach her gently, and kiss her.’ (1,10,5) The second is even better, and occurs at 1,16,1 where we find Cleitophon, ‘keen to make the girl (sc. Leucippe) amenable to desire (εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι)’. As well as being preferable on linguistic and stylistic grounds, reading εὐάγωγοτέραν also affords the benefit of allowing a more direct comparison between Callisthenes and Cleitophon, since not only would the phrase at 8,17,4 more closely pick up the earlier, parallel, situation, but it encourages us to investigate other similarities. Callisthenes is ‘handsome to behold’ and ‘eloquent’ (στωμύλος): Cleitophon attracts both Leucippe and Melite, and at 5,13,3–5, when Melite is gazing at him, even praises his own looks, albeit in generalising and indirect terms. Cleitophon could certainly be called στωμύλος, since the term has connotations of talkativeness or garrulity as much as anything, and he is now nearing the end of the eighth book of his narration. Callisthenes is also described as ‘extremely persuasive’, but this might also mean ‘extremely plausible’. In fact, between them the adjective *πιθανός* and the adverb *πιθανῶς* are used a total of 12 times in this novel, and the vast majority refer to someone lying or moulding facts to suit their own purposes.<sup>31</sup> Whether he is persuasive, or plausible, or indeed both, there is at least the hint here that Callisthenes is saying what suits him and the situation rather than necessarily confessing his undying love in the style of a genuine romantic hero. Plausibility and saying what suits the situation are factors that are also relevant to Cleitophon, as we shall see below.

A further, important, thing to consider about what Sostratus says is how he knows what he has not witnessed himself. The question of accounting for knowledge is flagged up for the reader when Cleitophon says: ‘He (sc. Sostratus) began by telling everything that I have already related: Callisthenes, the oracle, the sacred embassy, the boat, the abduction.’ (8,17,2) This is

---

<sup>31</sup> 2,4,4: Cleitophon says that Satyrus is a plausible trainer, but he is not confident he will be able to accomplish his desires – a neutral use; 3,10,3: Cleitophon on how being more persuasive than the Sirens would not help him with bandits who do not speak Greek – a relatively neutral use, but not without undertones of deception and danger; 4,7,6: Menelaus concocts something plausible when lying to Charmides that Leucippe is having her period; 6,3,4: Sosthenes lies plausibly to Thersander about Leucippe and his reasons for buying her; 6,10,2: Melite’s lies of 6,9 are described as plausible; 6,10,4: Slander is more plausible than the Sirens – Melite claiming that what Thersander has heard is not true; 6,11,1: Melite’s web of lies and her generalisations about rumour and slander seem reassuringly plausible to Thersander; 6,15,2: Sosthenes lies plausibly that Leucippe is reluctant to submit to Thersander, rather than telling him the truth that she never would; 7,10,1: Cleinias’ speech seems plausible to the majority, but this is reversed by Thersander who uses the adverb twice at 7,11,1 to berate the jury for being taken in by the plausibility of Cleinias’ acting and weeping.



how Cleitophon is able to describe Callisthenes' actions when he could not possibly have known much of what happened at the time.<sup>32</sup> This point is made at exactly the same time as Sostratus is beginning his account of what happened to Calligone, and Cleitophon's answering of one question requires us to ask the same thing of Sostratus. We are soon given the answer. At 8,18,1 Sostratus says that: 'Callisthenes took me by the hand and recounted for the first time what he had done concerning Calligone.' This means that Sostratus hears about the abduction, what Callisthenes said to Calligone on the voyage to Byzantium, and the alleged fact that 'he won the girl over to his side' from the perpetrator himself. However, not only should the fact that Callisthenes is Sostratus' source give us pause for thought, but there is also the question of time. Callisthenes tells Sostratus what happened as they are both about to set off, the one to Tyre, the other to Ephesus, to thank Heracles and Artemis respectively for their victory over the Thracians. Sostratus has only reached Ephesus four days ago (7,12,3–4; cf. 8,7,6; 8,11,4; and 8,15,1), and Callisthenes has not yet reached Tyre (8,19,2 – the protagonists stay for a further three days in Ephesus; 8,19,3 – they arrive in Tyre two days after Callisthenes). The events which he relates to Sostratus thus occurred a considerable amount of time earlier, not least because at 5,8,2 we find that a period of six months has elapsed. Given that Callisthenes might well have good reason not to be entirely truthful in the first place, the temporal gap casts further doubt on the accuracy and possible veracity of what he told Sostratus.<sup>33</sup> This gap also raises some rather worrying questions: where has Callisthenes been keeping Calligone all these months? Has Hippias not been making the same effort to find her as he did to find Cleitophon (see 5,10)? Or is that what he was doing in Palestine shortly after her abduction (2,30,2; cf. 5,10,3)? Do we believe Callisthenes' assertion that: 'I have respected the girl's virginity to this very day' (8,18,2)? The parts in Sostratus' tale of Callisthenes' conversion which concern Calligone all, as far as we know, depend on what her abductor says, and there is a lot of information which we are not given: this is not the most reassuring situation if, like Sostratus, we want to believe the tale.

Sostratus proceeds by describing what Callisthenes did and by outlining the changes that he underwent, or seemed to undergo: 'In other ways, too, he

<sup>32</sup> The importance of this is increased since, as Hägg 1971a, 131, observes, 2,13 marks the first point at which Cleitophon does this, and it is a substantial narrative too. See also Reardon 1994, 82.

<sup>33</sup> Callisthenes' very name might also have connotations of fictionalising, if Achilles Tattius was aware of the so-called *Alexander Romance* and of its, no doubt false, attribution to Callisthenes, the court historian of Alexander the Great.

showed (παρεῖχεν) himself extremely decent, proper, and moderate: there was a sudden, miraculous transformation (ἐξαίφνης ... θαυμαστή μεταβολή) in the young man.' (8,17,5) However, was Callisthenes suddenly and miraculously transformed by the love of a good woman, or, in showing himself 'extremely decent, proper, and moderate', was he trying to secure a marriage with the daughter of one of the foremost men in Tyre?<sup>34</sup> Perhaps this is an overly cynical suggestion, but pretending you have changed by giving up your seat, greeting people, being financially prudent, and giving to charity (8,17,5) is surely not that difficult, and so doing such things is not necessarily indicative of a fundamental shift in personality. It does, however, have the desired effect: 'As a result, all marvelled (θαυμάζειν) at this sudden (τὸ αἰφνίδιον) metamorphosis (μετελθόν) from the rather bad to the very good.' (8,17,5) The suddenness of the transformation and the wonderment it inspires are emphasised again, and may prompt the reader to wonder whether it is too sudden and too marvellous to be true. In any case, Sostratus admits that 'It was me, however, that he won over most of all. I was extremely fond of him, and counted his former prodigality as the fantastic excess of his nature, not as an inability to control himself.' (8,17,6) It is not hard to see why Sostratus should be so fond of Callisthenes, since the former says: 'He paid much attention to me, calling me "father" and serving as my bodyguard in public' (8,17,8), and, later, 'They made him joint general with me. For this reason, his devotion to me increased still further, showing (παρέχων) himself obedient to me on every issue.' (8,17,10) Why does Callisthenes make such a fuss of Sostratus? Or, more accurately, why does Callisthenes make such a fuss of Sostratus as far as Sostratus is concerned? Perhaps it is because he wants to amend his opinion of his way of life (cf. 2,13,2), or could it be because he wants to marry into Calligone's family and Sostratus is her father's half-brother?<sup>35</sup> Might it even be because he wants to gain positions of respect and power in Byzantium, such as a generalship, and he has now realised how best to go about it? Because we are only given one point of view, and one which does not seem unbiased, it is not so clear that we should be as understanding towards Callisthenes and forgive him just as Sostratus does. We have no concrete evidence to make us believe that Callisthenes was actually not a bad man all along, or that even if he was, he has now changed. Sostra-

<sup>34</sup> παρέχω is also used of Callisthenes at 8,17,10: see below. Cf. Cleitophon trying to conceal his emotions after the receipt of Leucippe's letter: 'I tried to present (παρέχειν) my expression no different from what it had been before.' (5,21,2)

<sup>35</sup> Callisthenes cannot have recourse to the law of the Byzantines that if a man carries off a virgin and makes her his wife, the penalty is the marriage (2,13,3), since Calligone is from Tyre.

tus, on the other hand, even goes so far as to comment that he 'began to regret having told him to go to hell when we had discussed my daughter's marriage.' (8,17,7; cf. 2,13.2) Lest we forget, he says this in front of Leucippe and her boyfriend! The implication is that Sostratus would have acquiesced in Callisthenes making Leucippe his wife if Callisthenes had been successful in his attempt to abduct her and then behaved in a similar manner; this would have short-circuited the plot as we have it, since Cleitophon, having fallen in love with Leucippe, would have been obliged to marry Calligone at his father's behest, or else somehow mount an expedition to retrieve his beloved. As it happens, Callisthenes and the marriage of Leucippe will be connected at the very end of the novel, and the hint here of an alternative outcome or scenario might stimulate us to look closely at what happens there.

Sostratus says that Callisthenes' conversion reminds him of Themistocles because 'he too had a great reputation for licentiousness in his earliest youth, but later surpassed all the Athenians in wisdom and manly excellence.' (8,17,7) This is fair enough as far as it goes, although it could be pointed out that, at least according to Plutarch in his biography of him, many of Themistocles' successes were the result of cunning and deceit.<sup>36</sup> However, after he had risen from humble origins to become an Athenian general and statesman and after he had led the Greeks to victory over Xerxes' Persians, he angered the Spartans, then Athens' allies, and even his fellow Athenians; he was banished from his home city and charged with treason; and finally he fled to Asia where he became close to the King (which angered the Persian aristocracy) before committing suicide to avoid having to fight at the King's request with the Persians against the Greeks.<sup>37</sup> The reader who remembers the whole of Themistocles' story might wonder whether Callisthenes' career will continue to follow a similar path. We have no way of telling since we are almost at the end of the novel, but this is one of a series of questions which are posed by the author and which muddy the waters of the seemingly happy ending.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> It seems a good bet that Achilles Tattius read Plutarch, not least in light of similarities between the debate at *Leucippe and Cleitophon* 2,35–38 and certain parts of the latter's *Amatorius*.

<sup>37</sup> Plutarch, *Life of Themistocles* 20–31. Thucydides seems to prefer the version that he died of natural causes, 1,138,4.

<sup>38</sup> I shall look at other questions below.

Another factor which might make us think twice about Callisthenes' transformation and Sostratus' account of it can be found towards the climax of the latter, where Sostratus describes how the former became adept at cavalry exercises:

Nor did he neglect his military training (τῶν εἰς πόλεμον γυμνασίων): he distinguished himself with particular (πάνυ) vigour in the equestrian exercises (ἐν ταῖς ἵππασίαις). During the time of his prodigality, too, he had taken pleasure in practising such things, but as a self-indulgent game; even so, his manliness and experience had been nourished, unbeknownst to him. (8,17,8–9)

Callisthenes' character change is symbolised by his ability to control horses in a disciplined manner, at least in Sostratus' opinion.<sup>39</sup> But how impressed should we be? If we make another comparison between Callisthenes and Cleitophon, we can find a remarkably similar passage, with a young man impressing an older general with his control of horses. Having been rescued from the bandits by the general Charmides and his forces, Cleitophon meets the general, explains who he is, and is offered arms. He says that:

I asked him for a horse, as I had been trained into an excellent horseman (σφόδρα γὰρ ἤδειν ἵππεύειν γεγυμνασμένος). When one was produced, I rode a circuit, performing all the military manoeuvres (τὰ τῶν πολεμούντων σχήματα) in a perfect dressage: even the general declared himself extremely impressed. (3,14,2)

Cleitophon, even if he does say so himself, is an expert with horses, and as a result of this Charmides invites him to dinner. Now, given what we know of Cleitophon, his veracity, his fidelity, and so on, we should hardly think that this display is necessarily a sign of good character rather than of an ability to do what any well-educated young man would be trained to do. Should we think any differently about Callisthenes? Is he any better than Cleitophon? If not, what should we make of Sostratus' praise of him? Is – and this is the essential point – is Sostratus' reading the right or only one? Callisthenes has always been keen on horses and good at riding them – what has changed? To be sure, he does go on to distinguish himself on active service, give money to the city, become a general, and seek Hippias' permission to marry Calli-

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the aphorism of Themistocles himself likening his transformation to the turning of a wild colt into a good horse at Plutarch *Life of Themistocles* 2.

gone, but I do not think that we should simply swallow every aspect of Sostratus' account, or at least his interpretation of some of what happened.

Not only is Sostratus particularly fond of Callisthenes, not only does he seem to believe, or even to want to believe, what Callisthenes tells him, and not only does he seem not to hold it against him that he attempted to kidnap his daughter and forcibly make her his wife, but we can see from elsewhere that Sostratus is not necessarily the most sensible of men. At 5,10,3 Cleinias tells Cleitophon that the day after they had fled from Tyre, a letter had come from Sostratus betrothing Leucippe to Cleitophon. There is no hint as to why he might have done this, and we, who as readers have got to know Cleitophon quite well by now, might question Sostratus' judgement in being willing to give his daughter to such a character as our narrator.<sup>40</sup> At 7,14,3 Sostratus reacts violently to hearing the charges that Cleitophon had brought against himself (7,7), and while this is reasonable enough, it takes the level-headed Cleinias to calm him down and to reassure him that the dream he had had in which Artemis told him he would find Leucippe and Cleitophon in Ephesus (7,13,4) was not misleading. Finally, and most significantly, by the time Sostratus describes Callisthenes' transformation and behaviour we have already seen Sostratus, and everyone else except the reader for that matter, taken in by the report of another young man with whom Callisthenes shares many similarities. That man is Cleitophon. At 8,5,1–8 Cleitophon relates the whole of his and Leucippe's story. In his narration to the anonymous narrator he skips quickly over most of what we already know, but focuses on the way in which he dealt with the episode with Melite, for this is the most delicate part. How, Cleitophon's interlocutor and Achilles Tattius' reader wonder, is Cleitophon going to cope with this tricky subject? Will he be forced to lie, or might he come clean? As it happens, and as we would expect from Cleitophon, we get a partial and adapted version of events: 'When I came to the part about Melite, I emphasised my part, reshaping the story into one of chaste self-control, although I told no actual lies.' (8,5,2). He mentions her love, his continence, and her persistence; in fact he seems to be omitting very little: 'Only one of my actions in the course of the drama did I overlook, namely the services I subsequently rendered to Melite.' (8,5,3) There is no way in which any of his listeners at the time could know he was making this omission and so realise his account was not fully reliable, and that is precisely the point I wish to make: what would Sostratus' interpretation of this be? Would he not be impressed by Cleitophon's stout resistance in the

---

<sup>40</sup> Sostratus has met Cleitophon before – he once spent some time in Tyre with the result that he recognises Cleitophon when he comes across him in Ephesus (7,14,1–2).

face of the beautiful Melite's charms and overtures out of love for his daughter?<sup>41</sup> If Cleitophon could get away with this, what might Callisthenes have got away with? Might Callisthenes have emphasised some parts of what he told Sostratus, and overlooked others?

There are, then, several factors which should make us pause to reflect on whether what we are told in Sostratus' account of Callisthenes and Calligone in 8,17–18 is an accurate and/or full picture of events. But if we look back to the end of Leucippe's tale, we find that Callisthenes# was referred to: 'The bandits sailed for two days, then took me somewhere or other and sold me to their regular slave-dealer, and he sold me to Sosthenes.' (8,16,7) A Callisthenes who buys well-born slaves from bandits and kidnappers is not the most fortuitous namesake to be mentioned before a fulsome speech in praise of your character. There is, surely, some point to this juxtaposition, and one reading is that it tarnishes Callisthenes by association.<sup>42</sup> What we think of when we are reminded of Callisthenes#, namely bandits and kidnap, must affect our reading of Sostratus on Callisthenes. Indeed, if one recalls the close parallels, both verbal and situational, between the abductions of Calligone and Leucippe, and also the roles of bandits and men called Callisthenes, Leucippe's concluding remark makes Callisthenes the convert less straightforward for the reader than Sostratus might think he is.<sup>43</sup>

Could we push this further? While it is true that Achilles Tatius likes narrative doublets and complementary narratives,<sup>44</sup> he also likes tying things together, and this is especially clear in the way in which Cleitophon accounts for what he narrated in 2,13–8 by saying that he heard it from Sostratus (8,17,2).<sup>45</sup> Is it possible, therefore, that there is in fact only one Callisthenes?

<sup>41</sup> See Anderson 1982, 120, n.45: 'On the other hand there is something a little suspect about the happy ending of Calligone's adventure ... there is also irony here: while Sostratus accepts this gallant reprobate reformer, over the main love-affair both he and Leucippe remain deceived.'

<sup>42</sup> A similar case can be found in Chariton, and I owe this point to John Morgan – see Morgan 2007, *forthcoming*: at 3,4,8 the pirate Theron claims in court that his name is Demetrius; later in the novel (8,3–4) we find a philosopher whose name is Demetrius. The real Demetrius is thus problematised by the association his name provides with one of the novel's baddies; why Chariton might want to do this is an interesting point, but I think it does fit in with other less than straightforward aspects of his final book; see, e.g., Fusillo 1997, 216–217, and Repath 2005, 264.

<sup>43</sup> Another interpretation is that if we believe Callisthenes has indeed undergone a radical transformation, this juxtaposition enhances it.

<sup>44</sup> See Segal 1984.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Heliodorus' weaving together of all his manifold coincidences and seemingly different characters and plot-lines: the bandit Thyamis, for example, turns out to be Calasiris' son.

There is, after all, a good deal that is similar in the two episodes in which they are involved which promotes a link between them. One might object that according to Sostratus' account Callisthenes has spent a considerable amount of time fighting Thracians (8,17.9–18,4), but I am not sure that this precludes some slave-dealing on the side.<sup>46</sup> At 5,8,2 we are told that six months elapsed between Leucippe's second Scheintod and the surprise arrival of the presumed-dead Cleinias, and we can infer that Leucippe was sold very near the beginning of that period from her account at 8.16. This does, of course, mean that there has been sufficient time for Callisthenes to undergo a radical transformation just as much as for him to play a number of roles. On the other hand, if, for the sake of argument, we did take the line that we had only one Callisthenes, then this would tally with the impression that Sostratus' encomium of him was not necessarily the reading we might wish to follow, especially given the extra information at our disposal. If we did have one Callisthenes, he would have bought and sold Leucippe some time after he had abducted Calligone, which would have meant that his conversion was not total, or immediate, if in fact it had genuinely existed at all.<sup>47</sup> However, one factor of Sostratus' account which makes it very difficult to be able to make a firm argument one way or the other, aside from the aspects already considered, is that he does not give us the kind of detail we would need. He does not, for instance, say that Callisthenes returned to Byzantium with Calligone and has not left since then, which would mean that he could not have been slave-dealing elsewhere. In fact, rather than Sostratus making the conclusive case he seems to, his vagueness, coupled with the narrative structure and the precisely-timed release or mention of detail, raises questions which bring more and more doubt into the equation.

---

<sup>46</sup> Leucippe says that Callisthenes# was the bandits' 'regular' slave-dealer, but there is no evidence to support the idea that she knows, or has any reason to think, this, especially since she did not mention him at 5,17,9. Also, Leucippe does not know where she was sold to Callisthenes# (8,16,7); it therefore could not have been in Byzantium – with the result that Sostratus would be less likely to know about it – and presumably it was not too far from Ephesus, since Sosthenes bought her and had her working on Melite's estate (5,17).

<sup>47</sup> Taking into account only temporal indications given and not any time necessary for some of the action to have taken place if not specified, there are at least five weeks between the two events: see 2,19,1; 2,23,1; 2,27,3 – 2,28,1; 2,30,2; 2,31,6; 3,1,1; 3,9,1; 3,12,1; 3,15,1; 3,24,1; 4,11,2; 4,15,1; 4,17,4; 5,1,1; 5,6,1.

*A Case from Lucian*

Before moving towards the denouement of the novel and my own conclusion, I wish to adduce a comparandum from a more or less contemporary author. Lucian is an author who uses the same names repeatedly, although usually in different works, but there is one example from a collection of dialogues which provides a parallel to Achilles Tatius' use of the name Callisthenes. In the *Dialogues of the Courtesans* (*DMeretr.*) there are two men called Charmides. At *DMeretr.* 2.4 Pamphilus recalls the words of his mother:

'My dear Pamphilus' she said, 'Charmides, that young fellow of the same age as you, the son of neighbour Aristaenetus, is getting married at last and showing some sense (σωφρονεῖ), but how long are you going to continue keeping a mistress?'

This is the only mention of Charmides in this dialogue. The behaviour of Charmides in *DMeretr.* 11, this time one of the interlocutors, is very different. Over the course of the dialogue we find out that he has hired the courtesan Tryphaina to make Philemation, with whom he is in love, jealous; when she has discovered the reason for his unwillingness to take full advantage of her services and who it is he is in love with, Tryphaina tells him that Philemation is 45 years old, mostly bald, greying where she is not bald and suffers from a skin disease; Charmides, who has been hopelessly in love for seven months, immediately goes off Philemation and decides after all to get his money's worth out of Tryphaina. Lucian leaves open the question of whether the Charmides who was a model of good sense in *Dialogue 2* is the same as the Charmides of *Dialogue 11*, and so teases the reader with the possibility and with the implications the identification might entail.

*Conclusion(s)*

As far as *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is concerned, I have to say that I do not think there is a definitive answer to the question of whether we have one Callisthenes or two, just as with Lucian's Charmides; however, rather than regarding this as a problem, I think we should embrace the different possibilities available, since it seems to me that Achilles Tatius is keen on providing avenues for the reader to wander down rather than in necessarily furnish-



ing us with all the answers. Having two men with the same name, and having them so closely connected in terms of theme and narrative structure, automatically raises questions, and I think that they should affect our reading not only of Sostratus' narration towards the end, but of the novel as a whole. Just as we should treat Sostratus' narration with some scepticism, so we should treat anything we are told in this novel with a raised eyebrow. Are we ever told the full truth? Could we ever be told the full truth? Who exactly are the people we are reading about, and how well do we, or can we, get to know them? Cleitophon does not explicitly draw attention to the fact that there are seemingly two men called Callisthenes, let alone ask or comment on whether or not they are identical. How should we react to it? Are they two, or is he one? Identity, disguise, deception, and duality are all important facets of Achilles Tattius' novel, intrinsic to his writing of fiction, and Callisthenes is an essential and illustrative part of this. One Callisthenes, or two? In having this question raised for us, and in not being able to answer it, we are drawn to consider how we can read this novel and what we might hope to get out of it. Fiction is one thing, but fiction told by unreliable and partial narrators is another. When we read what Sostratus says about Callisthenes, at certain points we are dealing with the anonymous narrator's account of what Cleitophon said when he gave an account of what Sostratus said when he gave an account of what Callisthenes said when he gave an account of what he had said to Calligone.<sup>48</sup> The anonymous narrator likes stories, especially if they are like fiction (1,2,2–3), Cleitophon misses bits out of narrations and adapts things to make himself look good (8,5,2–3), Sostratus is not necessarily the best judge of character, and Callisthenes may have undergone a radical conversion or may be a lying, manipulative slave-dealer. When put like that, we cannot know quite what to make of the characters of this novel and what they say, and so we are forced, on reflection, to ask unanswerable questions.

Now, one of the biggest unanswerable questions is what really happens at the end of the novel. We are given the barest bones of travel and marriages (8,19), but it is extremely perfunctory and has consistently troubled readers.<sup>49</sup> What we are told is that the protagonists go to Byzantium, get married, and then they travel to Tyre, where Callisthenes had arrived two

---

<sup>48</sup> Hägg 1971a, 131, says 'it is taken for granted that Callisthenes' inner mental processes etc. have reached Clitophon, in spite of the intermediary links, without being misrepresented', adding in a note that 'In VIII,17,2 Sostratus tells Clitophon what he says, in VIII,18,1, that he has heard from Callisthenes himself.' However, I do not think that we should simply take it for granted, and that there are sufficient indications to prompt us to do the opposite.

<sup>49</sup> See Repath 2005 for a treatment of the problems involved.

days earlier. They join in the sacrifices which they find Cleitophon's and Calligone's father about to make for the wedding of Callisthenes and Calligone the next day (8,19,2–3). They pray that both marriages be protected by good fortune and decide to pass the winter in Tyre before going back to Byzantium (8,19,3). In addition to the end being surprisingly rapid given that it contains what we might think is the climax of the novel – the wedding of the protagonists – Cleitophon is in neither Tyre nor Byzantium as he narrates his story, Leucippe is not with him, and he does not seem particularly happy. Has something gone wrong, and what might it be? There is, of course, no way of knowing. But what we do know is what happened last time Hippias made sacrifices the day before his daughter's wedding: an eagle stole the offering (2,12). This both foreshadowed the abduction of Calligone by Callisthenes and also enabled it, since it was the seers' opinion that a sacrifice needed to be performed at midnight on the seashore (2,12,3), and it was at this sacrifice that Zeno and his bandits kidnapped the girl. Callisthenes was really after Leucippe, and this has been made clear to the protagonists very recently during Sostratus' narration (8,17–18; only a few days earlier). At the very end of the novel, when he is just about to marry Calligone, Callisthenes finally gets to see Leucippe.<sup>50</sup> How did he react? Did he become blind to the beauty of Calligone and have eyes for Leucippe alone, like Cleitophon in the first book?

My father is pressurizing me into this marriage, and his request is not unreasonable: that I should marry a girl who is not a foreigner, nor ugly – nor indeed is he selling me to raise money, as in Charicles' case. In fact, he is giving me to his own daughter, and – O gods! – I thought she was beautiful enough until I saw Leucippe! But as it is, I am blind to her beauty, and have eyes for Leucippe alone. (1,11,2)

It would have been rather awkward and possibly disastrous if he had! Cleitophon, Callisthenes by hearsay, Charmides, Gorgias, Chaereas, Sosthenes, and Thersander are all incapable of resisting Leucippe's beauty, so the precedents are not promising.<sup>51</sup> At the very least, the wedding might have

<sup>50</sup> If there is only one Callisthenes, he saw her when Chaereas' bandits sold her to him, although she was dressed as a prostitute at the time (8,16,1–2).

<sup>51</sup> The only men who do not make an attempt on Leucippe are the herdsmen (3,9–11), although Leucippe has only one night in their clutches – with Cleitophon – and she is soon taken away to be a virgin sacrifice (3,12), and Chaereas' bandits (8,16). Leucippe emphasises the self-restraint of both sets of men, in contrast to Sosthenes' and Thersander's designs, at 6,22,1–3.

been rather tense, since Leucippe would have had good reason to be wary of her would-be abductor. Moreover, if we have only one Callisthenes in this novel, Leucippe would recognise at the very end of it the slave-dealer who bought her from the bandits and sold her to Sosthenes, and Callisthenes would realise that he had let Leucippe slip through his fingers. If Callisthenes is one and the same, and Leucippe revealed him to be so, then all the characters, including Sostratus, would know that his much-celebrated conversion was not quite as straightforward as we have been told.<sup>52</sup> The fallout created by either scenario – whether we had one Callisthenes or two – would be potentially destabilising and dangerous, but we are never told more than the basic facts: at the pivotal coming together of the two main plot-strands of the novel we are finally denied Cleitophon's psychological insights and theorising and given instead the minimum amount of information compatible with having any kind of generic conclusion at all. This lack of detail spurs the reader to re-create the ending, and a comparison with the contents of the opening frame of the novel makes this disturbingly problematic.

To return to the problem with which I started, I do not think it is possible to commit to the idea of one Callisthenes, despite the temptation to do so. I think it is a possibility we are meant to realise and consider, but there is no certainty, and there is designed to be no certainty. Confronted with two characters called Callisthenes, the reader is forced to raise questions and attempt to answer them for him or herself, and this and similar games are played out at every point in the novel. The characterisation and narrative construction that Achilles Tatius employs create gaps, and we are prompted to use our imaginations to fill them in. Achilles Tatius, mostly through Cleitophon, gives us one text, but there are other narratives, opinions, emotions, and facts within the fiction which remain untold and unknowable. The reader, if he or she is aware of what Achilles Tatius is up to, ends up creating and reading their own version of the novel. The alert reader has no choice, and Achilles Tatius positively encourages this: this is interactive fiction, but it is a game in which the author holds most of the trumps and never fully declares his hand.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Of course, in this case Cleitophon would know this when he narrates his story, but it should be pointed out that he is made by the author to withhold other facts for effect, such as Leucippe not actually being killed at 3,14 and 5,7.

<sup>53</sup> A preliminary version of this paper was delivered at the conference 'Greek Prose Friction: Achilles Tatius and Beyond', organised by Tim Whitmarsh for the Exeter Centre for Hellenistic and Roman Greek Studies and KYKNOS, at the University of Exeter, and held on the 10<sup>th</sup> of November, 2006. My thanks to Tim for providing such an excellent, convivial, and stimulating occasion, and also to those who contributed to the discus-

### *Bibliography*

- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico, CA: Scholars' Press.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: the Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton: University Press.
- Bowie, E.L. 1985. 'The Greek Novel', in: P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, I. Greek Literature*, Cambridge: University Press, 683–699, and in: Swain 1999, 39–59.
- 1994. 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in: Tatum 1994, 435–459.
- 1995. 'Names and a Gem: Aspects of Allusion in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in: D. Innes, H. Hine, and C. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric, Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*, Oxford: University Press, 269–280.
- 1996. 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 87–106.
- 2003. 'The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B. E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions', *AN* 2, 47–63.
- Conte, G.B. 1996. *The Hidden Author: an Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fraser, P.M., and Matthews E. (eds.) *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford: University Press, I 1987, II 1994, III.A 1997, III.B 2000, IV 2005.
- Fusillo, M. 1997. 'How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative', in: D.H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton: University Press, 209–227.
- Garnaud, J.-P. 1991. *Achille Tattius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Gaselee, S. 1969. *Achilles Tattius<sup>2</sup>*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Goold, G.P. 1995. *Chariton: Callirhoe*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hägg, T. 1971a. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tattius*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- 1971b. 'The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesius', *Eranos* 69, 25–59.
- Hunter, R.L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge: University Press.
- 1994. 'History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton', *ANRW* II 34.2, 1055–1086.
- Jones, M. 2006. 'Heavenly and Pandemic Names in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *CQ* 56, 548–562.
- Morales, H.L. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tattius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Morgan, J.R. 1982. 'History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros', *CA* 1, 221–265.
- 1995. 'The Greek Novel: Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception', in: A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World*, London: Routledge, 130–152.
- 1997. '*Erotika Mathemata*: Greek Romance as Sentimental Education', in: A.H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction*, Bari: Levante, 163–189.

---

sion after my paper, whose thoughts, ideas, and suggestions I hope I have managed to reflect here.

- 2004a. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris and Phillips.
- 2004b. 'Achilles Tattius', in: I.J.F. De Jong, R. Nünlist, A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden: Brill, 493–506.
- 2007. *Forthcoming*. 'The Representations of Philosophers in Greek Fiction', in: J.R. Morgan and M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Greek Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum*, Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Most, G.W. 1989. 'The Stranger's Stratagem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture', *JHS* 109, 114–133.
- Nakatani, S. 2003. 'A Re-examination of Some Structural problems in Achilles Tattius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *AN* 3, 63–81.
- Nimis, S. 1994. 'The Prosaics of the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 27.3, 387–411.
- 1998. 'Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 31.1, 99–122.
- 1999. 'The Sense of Open-endedness in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 32.2, 215–238.
- 2003. '*In mediis rebus*: Beginning Again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel', in: Panayotakis/Zimmerman/Keulen 2003, 255–269.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. 1980. *A Lexicon to Achilles Tattius*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. (eds.) 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden: Brill.
- Plepelits, K. 1980. *Achilleus Tattios. Leucippe und Kleitophon*, Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Reardon, B.P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- 1994. 'Achilles Tattius and Ego-Narrative', in: J.R. Morgan, and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 80–96, and in: Swain 1999, 243–258.
- Repath, I.D. 2005. 'Achilles Tattius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: What Happened Next?', *CQ* 55, 250–265.
- Segal, C. 1984. 'The Trials at the end of Achilles Tattius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*: doublets and complementaries', *SIFC* 77, 83–91.
- Stephens, S.A. 1994. 'Who Read Ancient Novels?', in: Tatum 1994, 405–418.
- Swain, S. (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford: University Press.
- Tatum, J. (ed.) 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore – London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tattius: Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Göteborg: University Press.
- Wesseling, B. 1988. 'The Audience of the Ancient Novels', *GCN* I, 67–79.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2003. 'Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Eroticism in Achilles Tattius', in: Panayotakis/Zimmerman/Keulen 2003, 191–205.
- Whitmarsh, T., and Morales, H., 2001. *Achilles Tattius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, Oxford: University Press.
- Winkler, J.J. 1989. 'Achilles Tattius: *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 170–284.
- Yatromanolakis, Y. 1990. *Leucippe kai Kleitophon*, Athens: Hidryma Goulandre-Chorn.