Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works

TIM WHITMARSH
Oxford University

Unlike the Homeric poems after which their narratives are patterned, the Greek novels were designed to be circulated primarily in written form.[1] It is quite possible, indeed, that the novel represents the first new literary genre to be born into world in which the book, rather than oral performance, constitutes the primary medium for transmitting large-scale narrative. What evidence we have, indeed, suggests that the books in which the novels were housed were, at least by the second century, high-status affairs, beautifully calligraphed.[2] By this time, the material book was a prestige item, as Lucian's *Uneducated bookbuyer* shows: fetishised not just for their sumptuous visual form (including purple cover and golden knob, 7), but even for their smell (of saffron and cedar oil, 16).

Texts are also a regular feature within the novelistic worlds. Achilles' Clitophon famously wields a book while eyeing up Leucippe (1,6,6). Letters appear everywhere,[3] as do inscriptions.[4] This emphasis upon the materiality of the word has implications for the textuality of the novels themselves. Pseudo-documentarism – the allusion to fictitious textual precedents – abounds, most obviously in the cases of Dictys' *Ephemeris* and Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders beyond Thule*, both of which present themselves as based upon ancient Phoenician texts.[5] *Anthia and Habrocomes* concludes with the dedication of a *graphē* (a painting, or more likely inscription) cover-

[1] This is not to deny the possibility of oral performance as well, whether through public readings (Hägg 2004, 108-140) or mimes.
[2] Stephens 1994; Cavallo 1996.
[3] Rosenmeyer 2001, 133-168; Létoublon 2003; Robiano 2007, specifically on Chariton.
[4] Sironen 2003; also Stoneman 1995.
[5] Hansen 2003, and esp. K. Ni Mheallaigh, 'Pseudo-documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction', forthcoming in *AJP*.

ing 'all that they endured and all that they had done';[6] this strategy is borrowed and enhanced by Longus, whose narrator takes his cue from a (presumably invented) 'painted representation' (εἰκόνος γραφήν, *praef.* 1) covering the events described in the narrative itself.

The dynamic interplay between written and oral discourse in the ancient novel has been well studied in recent years.[7] My focus here is on a rather different, and rather more recondite aspect of the material novel. With the novels' emphasis upon textuality, I shall argue, comes a new facility with paratextuality, or (better) peritextuality. These last two terms derive from Gérard Genette.[8] Paratexts, in his parlance, are the features that mediate between the text proper and the real world: prefaces, interviews, publicity material and so forth. Peritexts are a sub-category that find their place within the book proper: the title, author's name, chapter headings, and the like. Genette describes the relationship between the peritexts principally in spatial terms: they are defined by their position in the book.[9] As we shall see in the course of this paper, that spatiality is manipulated adroitly by Greek authors.

My particular focus will be upon the manipulation of book divisions in the novels.[10] That post-classical authors in general were often aware of these and often composed with them in mind has been well demonstrated by a wide range of studies.[11] Scholars of the Greek novel, indeed, have long noted the use of books and book-clusters in the distribution of thematic units, particularly in Chariton, Achilles and Longus (n.b. τέτταρας βίβλους

---

[6] πάντα ὅσα τε ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσα ἔδρασαν, 5,15,2.

[7] See esp. the essays in Rimell (ed.) 2007; also Bowie 2006, Hunter 2008.

[8] Genette 1997.

[9] Genette 1997, 4-5. He also identifies a temporal aspect to the peritext, in that it appears simultaneously with the book, not in advance (like a publicity flyer) or afterwards (like a catalogue).

[10] On the emergence and development of book divisions, see esp. Birt 1882, 282-341, supplemented by the full bibliography given at Hägg 2004, 182 n. 44. I have discussed novelistic titles at Whitmarsh 2005a. I use the word 'book' here to denote a unit of text as architecturally designed by the author (or perhaps sometimes redactor), like the chapters in a modern novel, and not a physical papyrus scroll: the two could correspond, but did not have to (e.g. Kenyon 1932, 62-63); and in any case a number of our novel fragments come from parchment codices, which could house all the 'books' in a single volume.

[11] See e.g. Hardie 1998, 89-90 on Vergil (with further literature), Holzberg 1998 on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Harrison 1998 on Petronius; Dowden 1993, Harrison 2003 on Apuleius. It has been argued that the creative use of book division goes back to Homer (e.g. Stanley 1993, 249-261), but that remains controversial: see esp. Taplin 1992, 285-293; Jensen 1999; Edwards 2002, 40-47

ἐξεπονησάμην, *praef.* 3).[12] (Xenophon and Heliodorus, probably for different reasons, are more difficult to analyse in these terms.)[13] What interests me principally in this paper, however, is not just inert formal 'structure', but also the readerly process of reception and interpretation, of 'structuration'. Book divisions do not simply create meaning, they also challenge readers to create their own mental maps, to impose cognitive form on narrative. What we are after is what we might call, paraphrasing Don Fowler, the prosaics of segmentation:[14] the set of techniques that an author employs to tease the reader with the possibility that the narrative can be resolved into a pure form – a possibility that is realised only at the end of the text (and even then only incompletely).

I focus primarily upon Chariton, as (probably) the earliest of the extant novelists; *Callirhoe* marks a formative moment in the history of the genre. His manipulation of book divisions, indeed, may well have been influential on the later novelists: my discussion takes a number of detours into later novels (including, for these purposes, Philostratus' *Apollonius*), where I detect Chariton's legacy.

* * *

According to one scholarly *donnée*, *Callirhoe* is thematically segmented not by the eight books but by five acts, in the style of new comedy.[15] This division runs as follows:

---

[12] Among many studies, see esp. Hägg 1971, 251-252, Plepelits 1976, 12-13 on Chariton; Sedelmeier 1959, 113-114, Plepelits 1980, 44-45, and Nakatani 2003, 70-73 on Achilles; MacQueen 1990, Teske 1991, 86-97, Nakatani 2003, 70-73, Morgan 2004, 11 on Longus.

[13] In Xenophon's case, the lack of thematic unity in the books is no doubt related to the overall anomalousness of the text (and of course to the wider questions of epitomisation, orality and so forth). His books also vary wildly in terms of length, from approximately six to twenty Teubner pages: this feature is well discussed by Hägg 2004, 181-3, who also notes however that other novelists also show variation. In Heliodorus, meanwhile, there are some broad links between culture/geography and books (thus, in the most general terms, 1-2 are largely set in Egypt, 3-4 in Greece, 5-6 in Egypt, 7-8 in Persian-dominated Egypt, and 9-10 in Ethiopia), but the multiple complex, overlapping narratives militate against any clear divisions by book. There is, however, more to be said; Heliodorus merits a study in his own right.

[14] Fowler 1995; more on segmentation at 1997, 13-17.

[15] Reitzenstein 1906, 95-6, followed by e.g. Perry 1976, 141-142; Plepelits 1976, 12-13; Weissenberger 1997, 60. Hägg 1971, 139-140 has a different, 3-phase segmentation.

Act I: Chaereas and Callirhoe in Syracuse; Callirhoe's 'death', capture by pirates; her sale to Leonas and marriage to Dionysius (1,1,1-3,2,17).
Act II: Chaereas' pursuit, capture and entanglement with Mithridates, while Callirhoe is transported across Asia (3,3,1-4,7,8).
Act III: events in Babylon (5-6).
Act IV: Chaereas' military exploits (7).
Act V: Reunion and return to Syracuse (8).

Dividing the text like this raises all sorts of questions. What authorises the breaks between 'acts'? The division between I and II is – so we are told – indicated by a switch of focus from Callirhoe to Chaereas; but why not, then, locate a new act every time the action switches?[16] In fact, the five-act division is arbitrary, a fantasy born of the scholarly preoccupation with textual anatomisation. Nevertheless, it does capture two important features of the text. The first is that the desire to segment is actually triggered by various features of the text, chiefly (i) the complexity of the text, which invites the reader to gain mastery of it; (ii) the divisions that begin books 5 and 8, which are (as we shall see in more detail presently) both heavily marked by the narrator's intervention with recapitulations and proleptic reference to the material to come.[17]

This leads to my second point: the thematic unity of books is, as the five-act model indeed acknowledges, much more evident in the second half of the novel: thus book 5 is built around the trial, 6 around its aftermath, 7 around Chaereas' military exploits, and 8 (as the narrator explicitly promises: see below) around reunion and homecoming. In the first half, by contrast, the themes are more complex and interwoven, and overlap the book-endings. One clear sign of this is that, rather than switching between parallel story-lines immediately at the start of a book, Chariton tends to wait a few chapters (cf. 3,3,1; 4,2,1; 5,2,1). This gives the impression of tangled complexity, which is gradually resolved in the course of the narrative, particularly as the plotlines converge in Babylon, in book 5. As the narrative units come to nest more snugly in the individual books, a sense of resolution and harmonisation is generated: the vast, unwieldy plot is tamed into cognitive units.

---

[16] I.e. 4,2,1; 5,2,1, etc.: full analysis of the alternation between story lines see esp. Hägg 1971, 141-154.

[17] The segmentary role of the recapitulations was first noted (to my knowledge) by Reitzenstein 1906, 95-96. See esp. Hagg 1971 246-252, who also notes phraseological parallels between the two passages (246-247). See further below on 5,1,1-2.

This sense that book divisions stimulate in the reader a feeling of gradual mastery over the text will be the central theme of this paper. Before we come to that, however, I wish to clarify that the earlier books do have their own subtle patterning, lending them a provisional shape, even if they are not dominated by single themes as the later ones are. In particular, books 2 and 3 both open with Dionysius grieving over his passion for a woman (λύπης, 2,1,1; λυπῶν, 3,1,3; also ὄναρ καὶ ὕπαρ, 2,1,3; ὕπαρ ἢ ὄναρ, 3,1,4), in both cases (apparently) in his *thalamos* – the difference being that in book 2 he is thinking about his wife, and in book 3 of Callirhoe. In either case, he is interrupted by an urgent message about Callirhoe from one of his servants (Leonas and Plangon respectively).[18] The theme reasserts itself at the start of 4, where Callirhoe dreams of Chaereas, whom she believes dead, just as Dionysius dreamed of his dead wife at the start of 2.[19] This repetition of motifs serves to turn the screw of emotional complexity harder and harder: while Dionysius' sadness (2,1,1-2) turns to joy at the news that Callirhoe will marry him (3,1), that very decision is the cause of her own grieving (πενθοῦσα, 4,1,1; λύπη, 4,1,4).[20]

This much is true; but, as we have said, it is only in the second half that book divisions become significant vehicles for meaning. Much more powerful and evident expressions of the segmentary impulse come at the beginnings of books 5 and 8, the location (we have noted) of the two major recapitulations. I want to focus for now on book 5, marking the beginning of the second half of the novel:

> How (ὡς μέν) Callirhoe was married to Chaereas, the most beautiful woman to the most beautiful man, with Aphrodite machinating the marriage, and how she seemingly died when Chaereas struck her out of lover's jealousy ... [etc] ... all of these events have been shown in the story so far (ταῦτα ἐν τῶι πρόσθεν λόγωι δεδήλωται); as for what hap-

[18] Their similar roles are emphasised phraseologically: [Leonas] σπεύδων εὐαγγελίσασθαι τῶι δεσπότηι τὰ περὶ τῆς νεωνήτου (2,1,1); [Plangon:] ἄπειμι δὲ ἐγὼ τὴν πρεσβείαν κομίζουσα (2,11,6).

[19] The nocturnal book divisions are perhaps a nod to Xenophon's *Anabasis* (cf. 2,1; 4,1); they may even dimly recall the Homeric 'dawn formula' beginning books 2, 8 and 17 of the *Odyssey* (as well as occurring frequently elsewhere); for Heliodorus' use of this motif see Whitmarsh 2005b. Apuleius also uses daybreak as a book-inceptive device in books 3 and 7 (variation in book 11): Harrison 2003, 244, 247, 251-252. 'Day-and-night phases' are, however, common enough in Chariton: Hägg 1971, 32-47.

[20] The beginning of book 6, where Artaxerxes grieves at night over the effects of Callirhoe upon him, reprises this theme.

pened next, I shall now narrate that (τὰ δὲ ἑξῆς νῦν διηγήσομαι). (5,1,1-2)

This passage clearly marks its pivotal role in the text, delineating between the events that 'have been shown' (perfect tense, in the *men* clause) and those that 'I shall narrate' (future tense, in the *de* clause). At one level, the emphatic division of the text into two halves showcases the author's powerful grip over his narrative. Although the language used here suggests oral performance ('I shall narrate', as though the act of narration is temporally concurrent with our reading), this recapitulation is – contrary to what is sometimes claimed[21] – a marker of literate textuality. As has long been noted, the phrasing 'How ... has been shown in the earlier part of the narrative' borrows from the tags that Xenophon (or an editor) positions at the start of books 2-5 and 7 of the *Anabasis* (where exactly the same phrase ἐν τῶι πρόσθεν λόγωι δεδηλώται is used).[22] That Chariton invokes the *Anabasis* at a point of transition to central Asia is, of course, significant. For a specifically pivotal recapitulation (i.e. combining analepsis and prolepsis) we might compare Theophrastus' *Enquiry into plants*. Let us take an example from the start of book 6: 'The previous subject has been trees and bushes; we now proceed to undershrubs and herbaceous plants ...' (περὶ μὲν οὖν δένδρων καὶ κάμνων εἴρηται πρότερον· ἑπόμενον δ' εἰπεῖν περί τε τῶν φρυγανικῶν καὶ ποωδῶν ..., 6,1,1). I cite this passage as evidence not for direct allusion, but for Chariton's borrowing of features from scientific discourse, and thus for his keenness to demonstrate textual mastery, the ordering of (narrative) knowledge.[23]

Narrative repetition, as the oft-quoted Peter Brooks asserts, is a 'major operative principle ... shaping energy, giving it perceptible form, form that the text and the reader can work with in the construction of thematic wholes and narrative orders'.[24] Yet the authorial control on display here has its limits. The first sentence, recapping the story so far, is full (125 words); the second is a mere 5 words long. In contrast to the peritextual beginning of book 8, there is here no prediction of future events. For Steve Nimis, moments like this reveal the narrative to be 'under construction', not yet fully in control of its narrative possibilities.[25] Whether we take the author to be in

[21] E.g. Hägg 1971, 332, and esp. 2004, 128-30.

[22] Perry 1967, 358 n. 16. In Xenophon, ὁ πρόσθεν λόγος means 'the previous book', while in Chariton it means 'the story so far'.

[23] See in general König and Whitmarsh (eds) 2007.

[24] Brooks 1984, 123-124.

[25] Nimis 1997, at 102; also 1994.

search of a narrative plan at this point, or (as I would prefer) to be strategically withholding it, for the reader at any rate a cognitive map of the novel is only at a provisional stage of formation. This passage, then, prompts the reader to look for structure, without fully disclosing it.

The pivotal function of this passage is reinforced, symbolically, by geography. In fact, there is a broad geographical unity to each of the individual books of *Callirhoe*, a unity that (once again) coalesces as the alternative narratives of Chaereas and Callirhoe converge in book 5.[26] This geographical 'zoning' of books is perhaps designed to echo Herodotus (whose own book divisions are usually thought to be Hellenistic, but would no doubt have been read as integral by Chariton). Again as in Herodotus – and this is my central point – the geophysical frontier serves as a spatial analogue for the book division, in the crucial instance of the beginning of book 5, where Callirhoe crosses the Euphrates:[27]

> As far as Syria and Cilicia, then, Callirhoe found her journey easy to bear: she heard Greek spoken; she could see the sea that led to Syracuse. But when she reached the Euphrates, beyond which there is a vast stretch of unending land (μεθ' ὃν ἤπειρός ἐστι μεγάλη) – it is the threshold of the King's great empire (ἀφετήριον εἰς τὴν βασιλέως γῆν τὴν πολλήν) – then longing for her country and family welled up in her … (5,1,3).

Callirhoe divides the world into the Greek-speaking West, dominated by the sea (the 'Greek sea', as she puts it elsewhere),[28] and Mesopotamia, the land-

[26] Book 1 is set mostly in Syracuse, and also covers Callirhoe's journey to the Ionian coast; in book 2 we shift immediately to Miletus (ἐξῆλθεν [*sc.* Leonas] εἰς τὴν Μίλητον, 2,1,1), where this book and the following two are largely set, as far as Callirhoe is concerned, with her journey east beginning toward the end of 4; in book 3, however, we also rediscover Chaereas, who leaves Syracuse and ends up enslaved in Caria. Book 5 significantly marks the transition to Babylon (main text, above) for both Chaereas and Callirhoe; this and the following books are set there. At the end of book 6 Artaxerxes and his retinue leave Babylon for war (ἐξήλαυνε Βαβυλῶνος, 6,9,1), and at the beginning of book 7 Chaereas and Polycharmus do the same (ἐξορμήσαντες ἐδίωκον βασιλέα, 7,2,1); 8, meanwhile, is the book of homecoming, marking the return of Chaereas and Callirhoe to Syracuse (and of Artaxerxes and Stateira to Babylon, and of Dionysius to Miletus).

[27] Thus Herodotus 1 ends with Cyrus' disastrous crossing of the Araxes, 3 begins with Cambyses' invasion of Egypt, 4 with Darius' entry into Scythia, 5 with Megabazus' march into Thrace. Similarly, the final book of Xenophon's *Anabasis* opens with heavy emphasis upon the crossing (διαβιβάσαι, 7,1,2; διαβαῖεν, 7,1,3; συνδιαβάντα, 7,1,4; διαβῆι, 7,1,5; διαβῆι, 7,1,6; διαβαίνουσι, 7,1,7) of the Bosporus.

[28] θαλάσσης Ἑλληνικῆς, 4,7,8. These words are strictly the narrator's, but they are focalised through Callirhoe.

locked East. The Euphrates marks the 'threshold', the border between the two, and in this capacity receives (along with Fortune) a recriminatory lament from her (5,1,4-8). What is particularly significant for our purposes is that the river symbolises the median point in the text. When she claims that 'I am divided from (διορίζομαι) my country by an entire *kosmos*', the *kosmos* in question is both the physical structure of the world and the author's narrative planning.[29] Chariton's book 5 can thus be seen as a new beginning:[30] Mesopotamia replaces Sicily as Callirhoe's new homeland. As she puts it, with a certain geographical laxity, 'Bactria and Susa will from now on be my home and tomb' (Βάκτρα μοι καὶ Σοῦσα λοιπὸν οἶκος καὶ τάφος, 5,1,7). Like her readers, Callirhoe is forced to rely on guesswork (inaccurate, as it turns out) about her future.

Chariton's creative use of a geographical boundary to mark a book division was perhaps influential (together with its Herodotean and Xenophontic hypotexts) on Philostratus' *Apollonius*. The second book of *Apollonius* begins with the crossing of the Caucasus, explicitly denoted as the border between India and Parthia (ὁ δὲ Καύκασος ὁρίζει μὲν τὴν Ἰνδικὴν τε καὶ Μηδικήν, 2,2,2), the otherness of which is marked by the sweet-smelling soil, references to Dionysus, and the different pigmentation of the inhabitants. Book 2 closes with a decisive marker of 'a bronze *stēlē* ... with the legend "Alexander stopped here"' (στήλην ... χαλκῆν, ᾗ ἐπιγεγράφθαι 'Ἀλέξανδρος ἐνταῦθα ἔστη.'), to mark the 'limit of his empire' (τὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς τέρμα, Philostr. *Ap.* 2,43).[31] Book 3 begins with a description of another boundary, the Hyphasis. Book 4 begins with Apollonius 'entering' (παρελθόντα) into Ephesus, where he has arrived by ship at the end of the previous book. Book 5 begins in Cadiz, most spectacularly, with 'the pillars that Heracles is said to have set up as boundary markers for the world' (τῶν Στηλῶν, ἃς ὅρια τῆς γῆς τὸν Ἡρακλέα φασὶ πήξασθαι, 5,1,1 – *cf.* the *stēlē* for Alexander), 'at the end of Europe' (κατὰ τὸ τῆς Εὐρώπης τέρμα, 5,1,4). In all of these cases, the limits of the book serve as figurative markers of spatial and cultural limits: the words τέρμα and ὅριον are self-referentially peritextual as well as geographical. Both Chariton and Phi-

[29] The role of the Euphrates as the boundary of Babylonian territory is reaffirmed at 7,2,1, where Chaereas and Polycharmus ford it, as the action shifts to Syro-Palestine and Egypt.

[30] Nimis 2003, 264 (briefly).

[31] Cf. Luc. *VH* 1,7: στήλην χαλκοῦ πεποιημένην, Ἑλληνικοῖς γράμμασιν καταγεγραμμένην, ἀμύδροις δὲ καὶ ἐκτετριμμένοις, λέγουσαν "Ἄχρι τούτων Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Διόνυσος ἀφίκοντοι". But both passages derive ultimately from the complex set of traditions surrounding Alexander the Great (Stoneman 1995, 159-160).

lostratus reserve their most powerful segmentary devices for the beginning of book 5 out of 8, i.e. at exactly the half-way point.

It is, however, in Achilles Tatius that we see the most spectacular example of the legacy of Chariton 5, again at the start of the fifth book. As Steve Nimis has noted, 'the arrival of the hero and heroine in Alexandria [i.e. at the beginning of book 5] has the earmarks of a new beginning'.[32] Book 1 began with an unnamed narrator arriving by sea at Sidon; in book 5 Leucippe and Clitophon come to Alexandria by boat. Clitophon's tour of the city (περιάγων ... ἐμαυτόν, 5,1,5) and its spectacles mirrors the narrator's initial tour of Sidon (περιϊών, 1,1,2); both figures drink in the lavish sights before them, describing them in erotic terms. What is more, both visit the temple of and pray to a culturally sylleptic god: Clitophon that of 'the great god, whom the Greeks call Zeus, the Egyptians Sarapis' (τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, ὃν Δία μὲν Ἕλληνες, Σέραπιν δὲ καλοῦσιν Αἰγύπτιοι, 5,2,1); the unnamed narrator that of 'the Phoenicians' goddess; the Sidonians call her Astarte' (τῆι τῶν Φοινίκων θεᾶι· Ἀστάρτην αὐτὴν οἱ Σιδώνιοι καλοῦσιν, 1,1,2).[33] In particular, Clitophon's eroticised[34] description of the city looks back to his first encounters with Leucippe.[35] When he comments that 'the lightning-like beauty of the city immediately confronted me, and weighed down my eyes with pleasure' (συνηντᾶτο εὐθὺς τῆς πόλεως ἀστράπτον τὸ κάλλος, καί μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐγέμισεν ἡδονῆς, 5,1,1),[36] this combines the effect of Leucippe's arrival (she 'struck my eyes like lightning', καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, 1,4,2) with the aftermath of the first symposium: the others (we are told) measured their 'pleasure' (ἡδονήν) with their bellies, but Clitophon was 'weighed down with' (γεμισθείς) the girl's face' (1,6,1).[37] All of these

[32] Nimis 1998, 110. Tomas Hägg also argues for a 'clear borderline between the two halves', but argues that it comes at 5,8,1-2 ('Six months had passed, and the larger part of my grief was beginning to wither...'), and hence 'does not coincide with the end of a *book*; this fact, in the first place, should make us cautious in dealing with the 'book' as a compositional unit in the author's planning of the romance' (1971, 77 n.2). I disagree, for reasons that will be evident.

[33] Diggle 1972, comparing the two passages, proposes to emend 1,1,2 to τῆι τῶν Φοινίκων Ἀφροδίτηι or similar. This would reinforce the parallelism, but I am not convinced that change is necessary.

[34] Morales 2004, 100-6.

[35] Γιατρομανωλάκης 1990, 661-662, although his discussion is rather inaccurate.

[36] 'It is a fine comic touch that Clitophon is dazzled when he walks through the gates of the Sun' (Morales 2004, 104).

[37] Subtler echoes: the gates of Selene (5,1,2) look back to the comparison of Leucippe to a picture of Selene (1,4,3); the 'row of columns' (κιόνων ὄρχατος, 5,1,4) picks up the 'chorus of columns' (χορῶι κιόνων) in Hippias' garden (1,15,1).

echoes serve to cast book 5 as a rerun of book one, with Alexandria replacing Sidon/Tyre.

That the description is of Alexandria, of all cities, is doubly significant. Firstly, Alexandria is (according to the Suda, A 4695) the author's own homeland: it serves as a tag of authorial identity at a point where authorial control is maximally asserted. This perhaps elucidates Clitophon's curious, verbless phrase *endēmos apodēmia*, which in my translation I rendered 'you could be a tourist at home', and which has been nicely taken to convey the 'curious sensation when reading of encountering something familiar that has been defamiliarised'.[38] *endēmos*, 'at home', is a curious word for the Tyrian Clitophon to use: elsewhere his time abroad is referred to as an *apodēmia*, a 'tour abroad' (2,27,2; 33,3; 5,10,3; 8,5,7).[39] *endēmos apodēmia* brings together, in a single, giddyingly metaleptic phrase, both Clitophon's and Achilles' perspectives.

The second point is that Alexandria might be read as a hypostatisation of Alexandrian literary principles, centred on allusivity and self-referentiality. The description of Alexandria also serves as a metatextual allegory of the 'Alexandrian' novel.[40] We might even see in the description of the city as 'greater than a continent' (ἠπείρου μείζων, 5,1,6) a cheeky glance sideways at Chariton, who has his heroine, at the comparable point in his novel, facing a 'great continent' (ἤπειρος ... μεγάλη, Char. 5,1,3). Is Achilles implying that his segmentary device is 'greater' than Chariton's?

It is particularly significant that the city's symmetry and order is praised, at exactly the point where the Alexandrian author is imposing textual order:

> Two opposing rows of columns ran in straight lines (στάθμη μὲν κιόνων ὄρθιος ἑκατέρωθεν) from the gates of the Sun to the gates of the Moon (these two deities are the city's gate-keepers). Between the columns extended the open part (πεδίον) of the city. Many a road criss-crossed this

[38] Morales 2004, 104; also Nimis 1998, 112-13. Cicero provides a parallel for this phrase, albeit an inexact one: *Nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum deduxerunt …* ('For while we were wandering around abroad in our own city, like tourists, your books brought us home, as it were…', *Acad. post.* 1.9).

[39] See however 5,15,1, where Clitophon describes his journey from Alexandria to Ephesus as an ἀποδημία. O'Sullivan 1980, 39 classes this as a solitary case referring to a voyage 'from a place that is not one's homeland'; we might, however, put this down to the subjective assimilation between author and narrator discussed above (i.e. this journey would have been a conventional ἀποδημία for Achilles).

[40] Morales 2004, 105-106.

> part: you could be a tourist at home (ὁδὸς δὲ διὰ τοῦ πεδίου πολλὴ καὶ ἔνδημος ἀποδημία). When I had advanced a few stades into the city, I reached the place named after Alexander, where I saw another city altogether. Its beauty was dissected as follows (σχιζόμενον ταύτηι τὸ κάλλος): a row of columns ran in a straight line, traversed by another of equal length (ὅσος γὰρ κιόνων ὄρχατος εἰς τὴν εὐθυωρίαν, τοσοῦτος ἕτερος εἰς τὰ ἐγκάρσια). (5,1,2-3)

The word for 'row' is *stathmē*, literally a carpenter's rule, and hence an emblem of orderly construction. The image of the *stathmē*, indeed, is a favourite novelistic word, and central to the discourse of structure and its absence from earliest time: the fragmentary *Ninus* romance, for example, refers to the uncertain times ahead using the phrase τὸ ἀστάθμητον, 'that which lacks the *stathmē*' (A,III,28-30); similar phrases are found in Heliodorus and Chariton.[41] Given this metaliterary emphasis upon structure, it is notable how prominent is the idea of division. The 'open part' (πεδίον) of the city, we are told, lies between the two rows of columns, and between the two gates: this powerfully suggests a topographical analogy for the segmentation of the novel at this point. Particularly suggestive is what happens when Clitophon reaches 'the place named after Alexander': here the city begins itself again ('I saw another city altogether'), its beauty 'dissected' (σχιζόμενον) at the point where two rectangular lines of columns meet. This language of bisection again lays itself open to self-referential interpretation: Clitophon and his readership are at the cross-roads of the narrative.

For all this language of control, however, Clitophon chooses to stray (both as actor and as narrator) off these structured roads into the city's many paths. Departing from the trammelling, structuring trajectory of the colonnaded paths, he chooses to immerse himself in aimless errancy, and becomes besotted with what he sees:

> I divided (μερίζων) my eyes between all the streets, an insatiable spectator incapable of taking in such beauty in its entirety. There were sights I saw, sights I aimed to see, sights I ached to see, sights I could not bear to miss... my gaze was over-powered by what I could see before me, but dragged away by what I anticipated. As I was guiding my own tour around all these streets, love-sick with the sight of it, I said to myself wearily: "We are defeated, my eyes!" (5,1,4-5)

[41] Char. 6,4,5; Hld. 5,4,7; 6,7,3; 6,9,3. Bowie 2002, 52 traces the novelistic use of this word to Thucydides 4,62,4.

If the description of the city served as an allegory of authorial control, then this description of ecphrastic overload represents the failure of narratorial power ('we are defeated ...'). Where the city is 'dissected' (σχιζόμενον) in orderly fashion, Clitophon's gaze is 'divided' (cf. μερίζων) by its wild, unconstrained yearning: both images express the idea of segmentation, but in very different ways. What does this tension between order and chaos signify? For Steve Nimis, it represents Achilles' own hesitation in the face of 'the vast narrative possibilities lying before our author at this particular place in the novel'.[42] On this reading, the ecphrasis of Alexandria becomes a parable of the author's improvisatory approach to his narrative. For Helen Morales, however, this eroticised, scopophiliac viewing is characteristic specifically of the erotomaniac *Clitophon*, not Achilles. On this reading, Clitophon's 'unsatisfied spectator' (θεατὴς ἀκόρεστος, 5,1,4) figures the role not of the author but of the *reader*, trying to pick a way through this mazy narrative: 'viewing Alexandria ... reflects the experience of reading Achilles Tatius'.[43] It is impossible to adjudicate between these two interpretations, partly because the episode is allusive rather than exact, and partly because *qua* narrator and protagonist, *auctor* and *actor*, Clitophon combines aspects of both authorial and readerly identity: he is *both* the teller of the story *and* its first receiver. What, ultimately, this passage demonstrates is that the equation of narrative with (architectural) structure is necessarily inexact, at least at the mid-point, for (as Gotthold Lessing famously argues in *Laokoon*) narrative has a dynamic temporality that cannot be captured in static, material form. To reduce narrative to structure, is to kill it.

I return, finally, to Chariton, and to the novel's second major peritextual intervention, at the start of book 8. This lays even more emphasis upon its pivotal function than the first, demarcating the 'gloomy events of the foregoing story' (τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν, 8,1,4; cf. ἐν τῶι πρόσθεν λόγωι, 8,1,1,[44] and σκυθρωπόν, 8,1,2) from what will happen in 'this, the final book' (τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα, 8,1,4), which he promises to be the most pleasant (ἥδιστον) for his readers. The final book, thus, marks a thematic transition from tragic events to the happy ending: 'no more piracy, slavery, law-courts, fighting, endurance, war and capture; instead, legitimate love and legal marriage' (8,1,4). Unlike at the beginning of book 5, here we have a definitive statement of what the future holds. With this thematic transition comes a change in president deity: the becalmed Aphrodite (patron

[42] Nimis 1997, 112.
[43] Morales 2004, 100-106, at 103.
[44] Above, n. 22.

goddess, of course, of Chariton's homeland of Aphrodisias, as well as the Julio-Claudian dynasty under whom he probably wrote) overrules the plans of Tyche, goddess of chaos, to create more misery for the two lovers (8,1,2). The imperial, Olympian deity pulls rank on the post-Homeric personification, figuring the author's assertion of his mastery of the text, as he knowingly restricts the opportunities for narrative amplification.

It is also particularly significant, for our purposes, that it is at this point, where the author flexes his narrative muscles, that Chariton's characteristic oral self-reference (λέξω, 8,1,5) is for the first time admixed with an acknowledgement of the material text, and indeed of the segmented text: the allusion (directed to 'readers') to 'the final book' (τὸ τελευταῖον ... σύγγραμμα, 8,1,4) allies authorial control over narrative with mastery of the written (peri)text. This transition from oral to written is completed in the final line of the novel, another peritextual moment, this time in the form of an authorial *sphragis* that mimics the form of a colophon: 'that is the extent of what I composed about Callirhoe' (τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα, 8,8,16). The final word of the text, *sunegrapsa* ('I composed'), picks up the reference to the 'book' (*sungramma*) at the start of book 8, imposing an elegant, formal unity, and even perhaps retrospectively releasing a pun: 'the final *sungramma*' at 8,1,4 refers, we learn, not only to the final book, but also to the final word of the text. Medium and message are thus harmonised at the end of the narrative, jointly monumentalising it in the physical form of the book. But readers may have been craving it all along, resolution into formal structure, as we have observed, extinguishes all the vitality of narrative. The 'final (*teleutaion*) book' is also the book of death (*teleutē*): all that remains for Callirhoe at the end is to pray for 'a blessed life and a common demise' (βίον μακάριον καὶ θάνατον κοινόν) for herself and her husband (8,8,16).[45] When the narrative finally becomes a book – that is when it ceases to be a narrative.

Bibliography

Birt, T. 1882. *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*, Berlin: W. Hertz.

Bowie, E. 2002. 'The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B.E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2, 47-63.

— 2006. 'Viewing and Listening on the Novelist's Page', in S.N. Byrne *et al.* (eds.), *Authors, Authority and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel*, [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 5] Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 60-82.

[45] Cf. König 2007, 18 on the deathly closure of *Anthia and Habrocomes*.

Brooks, P. 1984. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*, New York: A.A. Knopf.

Cavallo, G. 1996. 'Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere', in O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino*, Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 13-46.

Γιατρομανωλάκης, Γ. 1990. *Ἀχιλλέως Ἀλεξανδρέως Τατίου* ΛΕΥΚΙΠΠΗ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΕΙΤΟΦΩΝ, εἰσαγωγή - μετάφραση - σχόλια, Athens: Goulandris-Horn Foundation.

Diggle, J. 1972. 'A Note on Achilles Tatius', *CR* 22, 7.

Dowden, K. 1993. 'The Unity of Apuleius' Eighth Book and the Danger of Beasts', *GCN* 5, 91-107.

Edwards, M. 2002. *Sound, Sense and Rhythm: Listening to Greek and Latin Poetry*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fowler, D.P. 1995. 'From Epos to Cosmos: Lucretius, Ovid, and the Poetics of Segmentation', in D. Innes *et al.* (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his 70th Birthday*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-18.

— 1997. 'Second Thoughts on Closure', in D.H. Roberts (ed.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3-22.

Genette, G. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, Stockholm [Svenska institutet i Athen] – Lund: P. Aström.

— 2004. *Parthenope: Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press and University of Copenhagen.

Hansen, W. 2003. 'Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature', in Panayotakis *et al.* (eds.), 301-314.

Hardie, P.R. 1998. *Virgil*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, S.J. 1998. 'Dividing the Dinner: Book Divisions in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*', *CQ* 48, 580-585.

— 2003. 'Epic Extremities: the Openings and Closures of Books in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Panayotakis *et al.* (eds.), 239-254.

Holzberg, N. 1998. '*Ter quinque volumina* as *carmen perpetuum*: the Division into Books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 40, 77-98.

Hunter, R. 2008. 'Ancient readers', in Whitmarsh (ed.), 261-271.

Jensen, M. Skafte 1999. 'Dividing Homer: When and How Were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?', *SO* 74, 5-91.

Kenyon, F.G. 1932. *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

König, J. 2007. 'Orality and Authority in Xenophon of Ephesus', in Rimell (ed.), 1-22.

König, J., Whitmarsh, T. (eds.) 2007. *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Létoublon, F. 2003. 'La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses', in Panayotakis *et al*. (eds.), 271-288.

MacQueen, B.D. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: A Reading of Daphnis and Chloe*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris & Phillips.

Nakatani, S. 2004. 'A Re-examination of Some Structural Problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *AN* 3, 63-81.

Nimis, S. 1994. 'The Prosaics of the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 27, 387-411.

— 1997. 'Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 31, 98-122.

— 2003. '*In mediis rebus*: Beginning Again in the Ancient Novel', in Panayotakis *et al.* (eds.), 255- 269.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1980, *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*, Berlin – New York: W. de Gruyter.

Panayotakis, S. *et al.* (eds.) 2003. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* [Mnemosyne Supplementum 241], Leiden: Brill.

Plepelits, K. 1976. *Chariton von Aphrodisias. Kallirhoe*, Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann.

— 1980. *Achilleus Tatios. Leukippe und Kleitophon*, Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann

Reitzenstein, R. 1906. *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig: Teubner.

Rimell, V. (ed.) 2007. *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 7], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.

Robiano, P. 2007. 'La voix et la main: la lettre intime dans *Chéréas et Callirhoé*', in Rimell (ed.), 201-222.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schönberger, O. 1980. *Longos. Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*, 3rd ed, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Sedelmeier, D. 1959. 'Studien zu Achilleus Tatios', *WS* 72, 113-143; repr. in H. Gärtner (ed.), *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*, Hildesheim 1984: Olms, 330-360.

Sironen, E. 2003. 'The Role of Inscriptions in Greco-Roman novels', in Panayotakis *et al.* (eds.), 289-314.

Stephens, S.A. 1994. 'Who Read Ancient Novels?', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 405-418.

Stoneman, R. 1995. 'Riddles in Bronze and Stone: Monuments and their Interpretation in the *Alexander romance*', *GCN* 6, 159-170.

Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric Soundings*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Teske, D. 1991. *Der Roman des Longos als Werk der Kunst*, Münster: Aschendorff.

Weissenberger, M. 1997. 'Der "Götterapparat" im Roman des Chariton', in M. Picone, B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*, Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 49-73.

Whitmarsh, T. 2005a. 'The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre', *AJP* 126, 587-611.

— 2005b. 'Heliodorus Smiles', in S. Harrison *et al.* (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 87-105.

— (ed.) 2008. *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.