

The *Anabasis* of Chaereas And Callirhoe

STEPHEN M. TRZASKOMA
University of New Hampshire

I. Introduction

Scholars have long acknowledged that there is an intertextual relationship between Chariton's *Callirhoe* and the works of Xenophon, including the *Anabasis*.¹ The journey of the novel's heroine to Babylon (begun in 4,7,5) has even occasionally been referred to as her 'anabasis',² and the hero's military adventures and their outcome in Books 7 and 8 bear a rather obvious general resemblance to the action of the *Anabasis*.³ Scholars have also identified a few verbal reminiscences of the *Anabasis* in the last four books of

¹ Already in D'Orville 1750 there are numerous parallels noted between the language of *Callirhoe* and Xenophon's works, and acknowledgment of the relationship runs through much modern scholarship concerned with Chariton's literary antecedents. Cobet 1859, 234: *Neminem ex omnibus Chariton frequentius imitatur quam Xenophontem, praesertim Anabasin et Cyropaediam*. Zimmermann 1961, 329: 'Er kennt seinen Thukydides und von Xenophon besonders die Kyrupaideia sowie die Anabasis.' Schmeling 1974, 24: 'Few pages go by without Chariton imitating the three great Greek historians, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon.'

² Mostly in passing. It is her 'erotic *anabasis*' in Alvares 1997, 620 and her "'anabasis" towards Babylon' in Schmidt 2002, 61. Compare the title of Chapter 2 of Anderson 1982: 'New Comic Melodrama, *Anabasis Erotos*: Chariton.' Holzberg 1996, 20–21: '[T]he motifs he uses and his narrative technique are a deliberate allusion to [Xenophon's] works. However, when Chariton too writes about an *anabasis*, it is here no more a political and military operation, but instead an expedition of a more delicate nature: its end is a courtroom hearing to decide who shall be the lawful husband of the story's beautiful female protagonist.' The subtitle at Schwartz 2003, 380, 'Chariton's Persia: The *Anabasis* to the Capital', refers to the general idea of a Greek's going up to the king (she analyzes Chariton in light of the career of Themistocles) without any special connection to Xenophon.

³ Perry 1930, 100 n. 11: 'At the same time, however, the military career of Chaereas is full of echoes from Xenophon's *Anabasis*.' Most recently, see Smith 2007, 172.

Callirhoe.⁴ Considering how widely recognized a connection between the two works has become, it is surprising that there are no detailed studies of it and most of the evidence for it has never been identified or systematically laid out.⁵

My aim here is to identify the various ways in which Chariton engages with the *Anabasis* and give an initial sustained reading of *Callirhoe* against the backdrop of the earlier work. I will not claim that every link between Chariton's novel and Xenophon's military memoir can be fit neatly into a straightforward or monolithic scheme of significance—quite the opposite, in fact—but that several larger patterns emerge that are fundamental to the narrative strategy of *Callirhoe* from beginning to end. In demonstrating these points I will frequently introduce evidence that has not been adduced before for the *Anabasis* as a hypotext in *Callirhoe*, but the sheer bulk of it⁶ has not always allowed me space to argue as closely as possible each individual point or to detail their ramifications exhaustively. In my view the volume of this material and the consistency of its deployment argue for intentionality on the part of the author and bolster the chances that some of the marginal or less striking instances are, in fact, likely to have recalled the *Anabasis* for an ancient audience. Two further introductory points to stress: first, these are not disjointed and unrelated allusions but together often create an awareness on the part of (at least some members of) the audience that conditions and enriches their experience of large sections and even the whole of the novel; second, the novel's intertextuality with the *Anabasis* must ultimately be read in combination with its intertextuality with the many other works with which *Callirhoe* is in dialogue. In the limited space available to me I have tried to

⁴ Papanikolaou 1973, 13–24 is the standard starting point for Chariton's verbal borrowings. If we begin with the imitations agreed upon in the notes in Goold 1995 and the *apparatus fontium* in Reardon 2004, we have only four, pointing back to only two features/passages of the *An.*: 5,1,1 = recapitulations before *An.* 2–5 and 7; 6,7,7 = *An.* 3,1,29; 7,4,8 = *An.* 3,1,29; 8,1,1 = recapitulations in *An.*

⁵ There are, of course, frequent assertions of the relationship and even more frequent explorations of the relationship of Chariton's narrative to history and historiography more generally. The whole bibliography on the topic need not be rehashed here. Those interested will find the earlier literature richly cited in such recent studies as Smith 2007, Alvares 1997, Laplace 1997, and Hunter 1994. The only detailed investigations of the specific relationship between the *Anabasis* and *Callirhoe* are to be found in Laplace 1997, 51–53 and Smith 2007, 172–176, both of which, aside from mentioning some broad connections, concentrate on a few speeches.

⁶ I do not claim to have identified in this paper every unnoticed connection between *Callirhoe* and the *Anabasis* that Chariton intended or a reader might have experienced (with or without authorial intention). No doubt more will be uncovered in future investigations.

acknowledge the first of these as I could, but there simply has not been room to address the second to any degree.

First, an overview. Callirhoe's journey is portrayed as a kind of *anabasis*, which proceeds in stages in which she is moved unwillingly ever closer to her goal, which will ultimately be revealed by degrees to be Babylon. This journey is analogous to that of Ten Thousand Greeks in a variety of ways. When we come to the later books, and particularly to the waging of war between the Egyptian rebel king and the Persian king in Book 7, it is Chaereas' exploits rather than Callirhoe's situation that are modeled on elements of the *Anabasis*.⁷ These two separate strands of *Anabasis*-inspired narrative then come together with the lovers' reunion on Arados, and Chaereas and Callirhoe jointly enact a subversive, miniaturized version of the trip of the Cyreans back to Greece. In retrospect, it becomes clear that at one level the overall structure of the novel reflects a proportional inversion of Xenophon's narrative: the *Anabasis* gives us a brief and relatively easy *anabasis* occupying a single book followed by a grueling *katabasis* of six books, with the battle of Cunaxa acting as a hinge between the two unequal parts;⁸ *Callirhoe*, by contrast, presents its readers with a grueling *anabasis* that comprises most of the narrative followed by a brief and easy return journey, with the culminating battle between the Persian king on one side and the Egyptian king and Chaereas on the other joining the two parts. Schematically:

Anabasis: *anabasis* (Book 1) — battle against king — *katabasis* (Books 2–7)
Callirhoe: *anabasis* (Books 1–7) — battle against king — *katabasis* (Book 8)

II. Opening Stages

Although the *Anabasis* is normally thought of as a source text for elements of Chariton only once Chaereas and Callirhoe head inland on their separate

⁷ Much ingenuity has been applied to the question of which historical rebellion or rebellions inspired the Egyptian revolt in *Callirhoe*. Regardless, every reader of the *Anabasis*—however ignorant otherwise of Persian-Egyptian relations—knows that Egypt was a particular thorn in the king's side (*An.* 2,1,14 and 2,5,13). This is not to deny that there could be a specific model behind the rebellion. See Salmon 1961 and, outlining the various proposals, Luginbill 2000, 2 n. 5.

⁸ This is a simplification. Scholars of the *Anabasis* frequently conceive of a tripartite division, the *anabasis*, the *katabasis* to the sea, and the *parabasis*. Chariton, however, telescopes the latter two parts into one, a point to which I will return in my conclusion below.

journeys from Miletus at the end of Book 4,⁹ its presence can actually be detected quite early on. We may start with what has been seen as an inconsequential detail in Book 1, where the mention of a traitorous criminal named Menon (1,7,2) has been identified as a nod to the treacherous general in the *Anabasis* of the same name.¹⁰ An overly literal equation of one Menon with the other means that we miss the deeper significance of the name: the robber Menon merely puts us on alert so that we—if we are readers deeply familiar with the *Anabasis*—will catch the real Menon in the novel, the villain Theron. Just now he is considering possible accomplices for robbing Callirhoe's tomb and thinks of Menon: 'Menon the Messenian? Gutsy, but a double-crosser.'¹¹ Rejected on this basis, Menon never materializes in the novel, but his name and character flaw prepare us to note an increasing resemblance of Theron himself to the general of the *Anabasis*. Theron, after all, is the one who betrays his fellows (stealing water from them so they die of thirst in 3,3,12), a fitting counterpart to Xenophon's Menon, who is willing to betray his fellow Greeks to satisfy his own ambition. More generally, Xenophon's obituary of Menon (*An.* 2,6,21–27) reads like a sketch of Theron's character and actions in *Callirhoe*: greed, deception, ridiculing companions (compare Theron's mockery of his fellow robber at the tomb in 1,9,4) and betraying them at first opportunity, looking for unguarded wealth, taking advantage of friendship (Theron tricks Leonas on this basis in the last portion of Book 1), despising piety, thinking morality weakness.

The vocabulary of immorality is conventional in both works, but the world views of the two characters match quite closely, and both are presented by their respective authors as precise inversions of proper morality. So, for example, the general Menon, as Xenophon tells us, 'always thought that any man who wasn't a villain (*πανούργον*) was one of the ignorant (*ἀπαιδεύτων*)' (*An.* 2,6,26). He would have recognized Theron as one of his own kind. He is introduced in Chariton with the word *πανούργος* (1,7,1; it is also used of him at 1,13,2, 3,3,12, and 3,3,17) and believes that grave-

⁹ Holzberg 1995, 35: 'I shall draw the reader's attention to only one other point: the racy parallel between the march of the Ten Thousand against Artaxerxes II described at the beginning of the *Anabasis*, and the journey undertaken by Callirhoe's rivalling infatuates to the court of the same Persian king.'

¹⁰ Perry (1930, 100 n. 11) includes Chariton's Menon in his list of 'other characters suggested by history,' but without analysis.

¹¹ All translations are my own. Those of Chariton are normally taken from Trzaskoma 2010, although they are sometimes modified to show features of the original important to my argument. I rely upon the text of Reardon 2004 for Chariton and that of Marchant 1961 for Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

robbing is a discreditable activity only to the ‘people who do not get it’ (1,7,5 τοῖς ἀνοήτοις ἀνθρώποις). In Theron’s world, in other words, the wicked are wise (φρονίμοις) and profit by their wickedness, a sentiment perfectly in accord with Menon’s thoughts on the matter. This combination of greed and lack of morality also gives both characters a role in moving the journey along. Menon balances risk versus profit (*An.* 1,4,14–17) and is the first Greek to cross the Euphrates in the belief that he has found a way to guarantee the latter without the former. One might compare Theron’s calculation at 1,10,8, where he too believes that he has hit upon a plan that will allow him and his fellow robbers to profit without danger by taking Callirhoe away from Syracuse. Finally, unlike his fellow robbers Theron is saved for a special, lengthy form of torturous death (3,3,12 and 3,4,10) despite his lying assertion that he was saved when the others died because he had never done any wrong in his life (3,4,9 διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἐν τῷ βίῳ δεδρακέναι πονηρόν). Menon is likewise singled out in the manner of his death when he is not beheaded quickly alongside his fellow generals but tortured to death over the course of a year ‘for being a wicked man’ (*An.* 2,6,29 ὡς πονηρός).¹²

Theron’s gang of thugs provides a second reminder of the *Anabasis*. When they discover Callirhoe alive in her tomb, they hold a formal debate over what to do with her. The first to speak suggests returning her and supports his argument by closing with an appeal to conventional morality: ‘And at the same time, we’ll be acting in a way that is moral to men and pious to the gods’ (1,10,3 ἅμα δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ πρὸς θεοὺς ὅσα ταῦτα ποιήσομεν). This manifestly plays off Tissaphernes’ speech in the second book of the *Anabasis*, where the Persian noble asks Clearchus, ‘Why...would we choose the one way [of making war on the Greeks] that is impious to the gods and shameful to men?’ (*An.* 2,5,20 πῶς ἂν...τὸν τρόπον ἐξελοίμεθα ὃς μόνος μὲν πρὸς θεῶν ἀσεβής, μόνος δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων αἰσχρός;). Tissaphernes goes on to remark that only the most desperate of men—in fact, the ‘wicked’ (πονηρῶν)—would act in that way, and he goes on to repeat with a different formulation the contrast for good measure: ‘through false oaths to the gods and faithlessness to men’ (*An.* 2,5,21 δι’ ἐπιρκίας τε πρὸς θεοὺς καὶ ἀπιστίας πρὸς ἀνθρώπους).¹³

¹² Since Photius’ summary of Ctesias’ description of the death of the generals indicates that Menon was not executed in that account, we can be reasonably certain that Theron’s character and death are meant to recall the *Anabasis* rather than the tradition more generally. For the various accounts of Menon see Brown 1986.

¹³ Compare also *An.* 1,6,6 ὅ τι δίκαιόν ἐστι καὶ πρὸς θεῶν καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων... But the wording in Chariton makes it clear he is thinking primarily of Tissaphernes’ speech in

This effect is intensified by what happens in Chariton after the first robber's plea for virtue. The next robber to speak in the debate dismisses the suggestion of following conventional morality. 'Is it robbing a tomb that's made us into upstanding citizens?' he demands to know. Although his own suggestion of killing Callirhoe immediately is not followed, the robbers do reject the virtuous approach of the first speaker, proving in the end that they are, as Theron calls them later, the most wicked men he knows (1,12,3 *πονηροτάτους*).

As early as Book 1, then, through his characterization of Theron and his fellow gang members Chariton establishes an affiliation between his narrative and the *Anabasis* that is deeper than has been appreciated. At the same time, we can already see that Chariton's deployment of his source text is more complex than establishing a series of simple correspondences. In a deft comic touch, the echo of Tissaphernes' impiety and oath-breaking, for instance, comes from the mouth of a robber who argues in earnest for acting piously but who, it turns out, is not so committed to morality that he refuses to go along with the impious decision ultimately made. Compare Tissaphernes, whose pious protestations are simply cover for the treachery of breaking his oaths in *An.* 3,4,6.¹⁴ Thus while we might see a character in the novel represent a reworking of a character from Xenophon's narrative (Theron, for instance, as a reasonably consistent reimagining of Menon), we are not required to be unduly restrictive in aligning characters and events between the two works. Chariton is engaging with, not merely imitating, the *Anabasis*.

As we move forward in the text, Chariton begins to connect Callirhoe and her journey eastward with the Greek mercenaries in Xenophon's account, sometimes with the group as a whole, sometimes with Xenophon himself, sometimes in convergent ways, sometimes in divergent ways. On the most general level, just as the Greek mercenaries in Xenophon's account are mustered through the machinations of Cyrus and Clearchus in Asia Minor with no clear sense of their ultimate destination—Babylon, where the king is—Callirhoe is brought to Ionia, unaware that she too will eventually face the king in Babylon. An alert reader familiar with the *Anabasis* can, however, catch foreshadowing of this parallel well before Callirhoe herself does.

Book 2, rather than the earlier example (or any other similar pithy pairing of gods and mortals that can be found in classical literature, e.g. *Hdt.* 2,139 and *Thuc.* 1,71).

¹⁴ On this episode in the *Anabasis*, see Dillery 1995, 108–109 and 184 and Danzig 2007, with additional bibliography.

When she is sold into slavery in Ionia, her new master falls in love with her and remains trapped in his countryside villa by that love. He cannot return to the city without her because he cannot tear himself away. On the other hand, he fears that to take her to Miletus would risk the danger that ‘her beauty would subjugate all of Ionia and rumor would advance inland (ἀναβήσεσθαι), all the way to the Great King’ (2,7,1). The military vocabulary, particularly the use of the verb ἀναβαίνω, and the mention of the Great King seem clear enough pointers back to Xenophon. We will also remember that the first stage of Cyrus’ rebellion before the *anabasis* against his brother is to attempt to wrest control of the Ionian cities from Tissaphernes and that Miletus plays an especially prominent part in those events (*An.* 1,1,6–8).¹⁵

If this seems overly subtle, the following incident clarifies and reinforces the intertextual relationship. In 2,7,2–7 Plangon, the slave who has been charged with winning Callirhoe’s love for Dionysius, engages in a bit of deception, the result of which will be Dionysius’ first kiss with Callirhoe. This episode is a reworking of Clearchus’ subterfuge in *An.* 1,3,1–21. The occasion there is the first refusal of the Greek mercenaries to continue on Cyrus’ march east, suspicious that he is leading them against the king. Clearchus plays a dangerous game. Aware that he cannot force the soldiers under his command to go further, he pretends to break with Cyrus and support their desire to return home, all the while working secretly to advance the aims of Cyrus (who, like Dionysius in the novel—to add another parallel between the two situations—is not responsible for conceiving or initiating the subterfuge and has no advance knowledge of it). The Greeks are in an unresolved state, able neither to advance (since they are no longer mercenaries in the pay of Cyrus) nor retreat (since Cyrus’ control of supplies makes this impossible). Likewise, Cyrus cannot move on without the Greek portion of his army. Clearchus hits upon the following scheme: he exaggerates the danger presented by Cyrus and stresses his personal vulnerability to Cyrus’ anger and the possibility that he will be punished for his supposed offense. By deceiving the soldiers into thinking that his first loyalty is to them and that his life is under threat, he elicits their sympathies and engineers their agreement to continue on to the Euphrates.

Plangon’s trick is in broad outlines very similar. She is firmly loyal to Dionysius and, in fact, working as his agent to deliver the unwilling Callirhoe to his bed, just as Clearchus was from the very first aiding Cyrus’ plan to attack the king by bringing an unwilling mercenary force east. By pretend-

¹⁵ For a fuller exploration of the connections between Miletus’ place in Chariton’s narrative and the *Anabasis*, see my discussion in Trzaskoma (Forthcoming a).

ing that Dionysius is enraged and ready to kill her and her husband for an offense, Plangon orchestrates a meeting between Callirhoe and Dionysius. The false crisis is averted, Plangon is ‘saved’, Dionysius snatches a kiss, and Callirhoe remains unaware that she has been manipulated the whole while. There is, moreover, a delicious irony in all of this—Dionysius is not really Cyrus. He has no intention of going east, and he certainly does not want report of Callirhoe’s beauty to head upcountry to the king. That this will happen anyway causes him later to recognize that he has been complicit in causing his own loss of the woman he loves (5,10,3–4).

In both the *Anabasis* and *Callirhoe*, the narratives at these junctures have come to a geographic halt. Just as neither Cyrus nor the Greek mercenaries can move without the other, Callirhoe is unable to go anywhere since she is a slave (but at the same time not a slave—her registration papers have not been made out, and Dionysius has made every effort not to treat her as a slave), while Dionysius is explicitly said to be unable to move since he does not want to leave without her. He is unwilling to take her away with him without first binding her closely to him by affection (2,7,1). A false go-between in apparently mortal danger is able to resolve each crisis, at least temporarily.

The parallels here rely on general similarity of situation and action, but there is one further detail that indicates that we are meant to read these episodes together. In Clearchus’ speech, he lays stress on one particularly relevant feature of Cyrus’ character: ‘The man is valuable to someone who is his friend, but a most dangerous enemy to someone who is his foe’ (*An.* 1,3,12 ὁ δ’ ἀνὴρ πολλοῦ μὲν ἄξιός ᾧ ἂν φίλος ᾦ, χαλεπώτατος δ’ ἐχθρὸς ᾧ ἂν πολέμιος ᾦ). In Plangon’s speech to Callirhoe, she asserts that Dionysius has a similarly double-sided personality: ‘It’s the way he is—he can be as harsh as he is compassionate’ (2,7,3 φύσει δὲ ἐστὶ βαρύθυμος, ὥσπερ καὶ φιλόανθρωπος). Here we are less concerned with how the characters speak—there is no close verbal imitation of Clearchus’ speech in Plangon’s words—than with the specific paradox of personality they present to their listeners. In both cases a successful outcome to the trick depends upon the bold distinction and delicate balance between kindness and harshness in a single individual. Dionysius and Cyrus must be seen as kind so that Callirhoe will see her new master as a possible love interest and the mercenaries will continue to be willing to serve Cyrus; but the victims of the deception must believe that the two men can actually be cruel enough to take the lives of Plangon and Clearchus so that an intervention by the object of the subterfuge is necessary to save them.

Despite Plangon's maneuvering, Dionysius is really no closer to achieving his goal of Callirhoe's love. What overcomes Callirhoe's resistance is her pregnancy, and this is the work, as Chariton has it, of Tyche. As he often does, the novelist resorts to military terminology, telling the reader that 'Callirhoe was outgeneraled by Tyche' (2,8,3 κατεστρατηγήθη... ὑπὸ τῆς Τύχης). The power of Fortune in the novel has been compared to its role in Hellenistic historiography,¹⁶ but the specific and striking image of Tyche personified as a general derives from *An.* 2,2,13, where similar figurative language appears at the beginning of the Greeks' retreat: 'Tyche was a better general [sc. than the Greeks]' (ἡ δὲ τύχη ἐστρατήγησε κάλλιον). The Greeks had hoped to sneak or run away without further encounters with the king. Callirhoe had hoped to remain faithful to Chaereas. In both situations Fortune has other plans.

There are further signposts that Chariton is assimilating Callirhoe's situation to that of the Greeks in the *Anabasis* in the early parts of the novel. Tyche's stratagem to overcome Callirhoe's fidelity is explicitly compared through another verbal echo to the disastrous situation of the mercenaries after the death of Cyrus, the pivotal event that separates the *anabasis* of the Ten Thousand from their lengthy *katabasis*. When the king's heralds arrive in *An.* 2,1,7–9 and deliver a demand for the surrender of the Greeks' arms, the Greeks 'listen grievously' to the message (*An.* 2,1,9 οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες βαρέως μὲν ἤκουσαν), a phrase that finds an echo in Callirhoe's reaction at 2,10,2 (βαρέως ἤκουσεν ἡ Καλλιρόη).¹⁷ The news that hits Callirhoe so hard is Plangon's assertion that it will be quite impossible for her to raise another man's child in Dionysius' household and that the better choice is abortion. In both cases the Greeks and Callirhoe know they are in difficult straits but have made a decision about how to proceed that must now be reconsidered. As a result, Callirhoe will decide at Plangon's prompting to pass the child off as Dionysius'; the Greeks will decide to attempt a retreat in concert with Cyrus' Persian allies.

¹⁶ See Bartsch 1934, 8–9, Zimmermann 1961, 333–336, and Hunter 1994, 1062–1063. Luginbill 2000, 4, by contrast, sees Chariton's use of Tyche, at least in 6,8,1 (and 6,8,6), as distinctly Thucydidean.

¹⁷ To my knowledge its only other appearance with the same sense is at Isocrates, *Antidosis* (*Or.* 15) 150 (οἷτινες βαρέως ἂν ἀκούοιεν εἰ...). The collocation of βαρέως and ἀκούω appears also in the Septuagint in *Is.* 6,10 and is picked up from there in the New Testament and in later Christian commentators, but in these instances the phrase refers to being hard of hearing.

Language from the *Anabasis* is used in similar fashion by Chariton at two other turning points in the first half of his narrative. In both he uses simple transitional formulae from Xenophon to highlight Callirhoe's evolving situation. The first comes soon after the previous verbal echo. At 2,11,4 Callirhoe has just finished the imaginary family council in which her unborn child and Chaereas have voted against her in favor of preserving the child at all costs. The transitional language is somewhat bland at first sight: 'She spent that day and night with such thoughts...' (ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἐν τούτοις ἦν τοῖς λογισμοῖς). But bland or not, it echoes *An.* 4,3,8: 'They remained that day and night in great bewilderment' (ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα ἔμειναν ἐν πολλῇ ἀπορίᾳ ὄντες). The key uniting the parallel situations—the Greeks are trapped between the Carduchians and a river they cannot cross—is a matter of context, in this case, a dream. In the *Anabasis*, Xenophon has a dream that signals a happy outcome immediately after these words. In Chariton's novel, Callirhoe has had a dream just before in 2,9,6 in which Chaereas has entrusted their child to her care. It is that dream that provides the tie-breaking vote in the family council. In both contexts, the protagonists are trapped between two alternatives that are impossible to reconcile in the absence of the dream: enemies and a river for the Greeks, preserving her child and her fidelity for Callirhoe. The order of events differs, but an overall resemblance can be discerned.

Chariton also chooses to mimic the closing sentence of the first book of the *Anabasis* in the first sentence of his own fourth book.¹⁸ At this point in the *Anabasis*, the Greek mercenaries, unlike the reader, are as yet unaware of Cyrus' death. Now trapped deep in Persia, they have lost their supplies, including their emergency rations, and have received no communications from their allies. They return to their pillaged camp, where they spend a hungry night. The book concludes with a simple declaration: 'So that is how they passed this night' (*An.* 1,10, 19 ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν νύκτα οὕτω διεγέροντο).

Although the vocabulary is not rare nor the idea uncommon in military narratives, the sentence carries a heavy load of ominous suspense, one that draws its power from the unequal knowledge of narrator, audience, and characters, and serves the structural purpose of starkly dividing the *Anabasis* into two very unequal pieces. Book 1 is properly only the narrative of the *anabasis* of the Greeks; the other six books describe their retreat homeward, their *katabasis*. It serves a similar but not identical structural and emotional purpose in Chariton, who begins his fourth book with a close echo: 'So Cal-

¹⁸ The book divisions are not Xenophon's but were in place by the time of Chariton. Book divisions in *Callirhoe*, by contrast, are Chariton's own (cf. Hägg 1971, 252).

lirhoe passed this night in lamentation' (4,1,1 ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν νύκτα Καλλιρόη διήγευεν ἐν θρήνοις).¹⁹ We have the same simple vocabulary,²⁰ a similar positioning at the boundary between books—this time beginning a book rather than ending one—and a similarly distinct break in narrative. But even as he imitates, Chariton reconfigures by reversing the dramatic irony one finds in the *Anabasis*—his readers know that Chaereas is actually quite alive (rather than dead as Cyrus is), although Callirhoe and the other characters in Miletus think he is dead (rather than the Greeks' believing Cyrus is alive).

We have seen above that the news of Cyrus' death and its impact on the Greek mercenaries vis-à-vis the king (*An.* 2,1,9) are picked up by Chariton and woven into Callirhoe's reaction to the news that she is pregnant and the difficulties this raises for her status in Dionysius' household (2,10,2). The pregnancy sets off a series of events in Books 2 and 3 in which Callirhoe establishes a principled position in the midst of her impossible circumstances, is moved by necessity (or apparent necessity) from that position, establishes a next-best position, is moved by necessity from it, and so on. In the end she is left with only one option: marry Dionysius and pass Chaereas' child off as his. Once she has done so, however, the news arrives in 3,10,2 that Chaereas is dead. By her own reckoning, this renders Callirhoe's suffering and second marriage utterly pointless and her child an unwanted and superfluous burden (3,10,5). The imitation of the close of Xenophon's first book comes immediately after this bitter lament of Callirhoe, which stretches from 3,10,4–8.

¹⁹ For the verb in Chariton, compare the similar transition at *An.* 6,5,1 τὴν μὲν νύκτα οὕτω διήγαγον.

²⁰ There is no certainty that comes from the fact that the first five words of the passage being treated here—ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν νύκτα—recur nowhere else in Greek literature in that precise form until Procopius, who imitates the same transition of Xenophon three times in *De Bellis* (most closely at 5,18: ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν νύκτα οὕτως ἑκάτεροι διευκτέρευσαν), but it is at least suggestive. My argument about this passage and the previous transitional passage relies upon the notion that these words would have been distinctly memorable in Xenophon's narrative by their positioning and that the contexts are similar enough for imitation to spark memory. Chariton happily imitates distinctly memorable phrases and transitions from other classical authors that are equally colorless in vocabulary and phrasing. For that matter, it is not always the quantifiably distinct utterance or written line that is picked up by others. Note, for instance, Chariton's imitation of the famous ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, ἦκε δὲ ἀγγέλλων τις... from Demosthenes, *De Corona* 169 at 1,3,1 and (only the first clause) 8,1,5, which was widely copied elsewhere in Greek literature.

In both texts, then, these moments are marked as divisions: divisions between knowledge and its lack, between the knowledge of the characters and the readers, and divisions of plot between one kind of motion and another. In *Callirhoe* the news of Chaereas' death leads to a funeral, the event at which Mithridates will fall in love with Callirhoe and which will occasion her journey to Babylon and subsequent trial.²¹

The funeral of Chaereas is not a foregone conclusion, however. The plan for it arises as a consequence of another dream that Callirhoe has (in 4,1,1 in the sentence following the imitated transition from Xenophon), in which she sees herself trying to help Chaereas as his ship burns. Her distress causes Dionysius to suggest that they build a cenotaph and have a funeral for her first husband, and she agrees. There is perhaps another verbal reminiscence here of Xenophon's second major dream in the *Anabasis* (recounted at *An.* 3,1,11). Chariton was thoroughly familiar with this part of the *Anabasis* and clearly alludes elsewhere to moments a little before and after it.²² The similarity occurs in the words that introduce the two dreams. Both Callirhoe and Xenophon are awake with dismay through the night, but sleep for a short time, time enough to dream: 'Catching a bit of sleep, he saw a dream' (*An.* 3,1,11 μικρὸν δ' ὕπνου λαχὼν εἶδεν ὄναρ) versus 'Nodding off a bit, she saw a dream' (4,1,1 μικρὸν δὲ καταδαρθοῦσα ὄναρ ἑώρα). In the *Anabasis*, the dream comes just after Xenophon has introduced himself as a character in his own narrative at a critical moment.²³ The Greek generals have been treacherously seized and put to death, the Greeks have been abandoned by all their native allies, and all hope is lost. They are unable to sleep and believe that they will never see their countries or families again (*An.* 3,1,3).

My contention here is that just as the beginning of Book 4 in Chariton is consciously constructed to recollect the transition from Book 1 to 2 of the *Anabasis*, it also simultaneously calls to mind the transition from Book 2 to 3 of the same work. The death of Cyrus, which dashes the hopes of the

²¹ It may not be simple coincidence that Chariton's plot will hinge on treacherous letters sent by a Persian noble that are intercepted and end up with the target of the plot. In *An.* 1,6,1–10 there is a brief intrigue in which the Persian Orontas plots against Cyrus, sends a letter to the king that he entrusts to a friend, and is discovered when the letter is given to Cyrus instead. The resemblance is admittedly slight, but the subsequent scene of a Persian trial, in which Cyrus consults with his closest advisors, may also have been in Chariton's mind when he composed his own trial scene at the king's court.

²² In 5,2,1 he imitates *An.* 3,1,5 (in Xenophon's back story, on which imitation see Cobet 1859, 235). In 6,7,7 and 7,4,8, he imitates *An.* 3,1,29 (Xenophon's speech as he rouses the Greeks to action).

²³ For the dream's importance as a pivotal point in the narrative, one may note that it is explicitly referenced as such later in *An.* 6,1,22.

Greeks and signals a complete change in narrative direction from *anabasis* to *katabasis*, and the death of the Greek generals, which will change the nature of the Greek retreat and alter fundamentally Xenophon's own role in his memoir, are effectively consolidated through the double allusion and focus our attention on the utter desolation and brutally difficult circumstances of Chariton's heroine. But just as the dream in Xenophon encourages him to organize the army to continue resistance against the Persians so that the Greeks can reach home safely, the dream in *Callirhoe* leads to a basic shift, both in motivation—Dionysius' suggestion of a funeral will lessen Callirhoe's grief and allow her to survive, and the presence of Chaereas' cenotaph provides her consolation²⁴—and in narrative focus—most of Book 4 of *Callirhoe* will not concern the heroine directly but show the merging of the subplots of Chaereas and Polycharmus, Dionysius, Mithridates, and the Persian king. Xenophon comes to fore in his narrative; Callirhoe fades back in hers. There is only a single short passage of direct speech or thought from her in the whole of Book 4 (4,1,11–12).

III. *Callirhoe's anabasis from Miletus*

As we have seen, Chariton is particularly fond of alluding to key moments of narrative transition in the *Anabasis* at places where his own story changes direction. The most clearly marked and frequently analyzed example occurs in the recapitulation in 5,1,1–2, where its position alone, precisely at the start of the second half of the novel,²⁵ is reason enough to pay close attention, but its clear imitation of the recapitulations that head most of the books of the *Anabasis* demands that we do so.²⁶ Earlier analyses of this passage,²⁷ while

²⁴ This is a bit of sleight-of-hand on Chariton's part. Callirhoe has veered toward suicidal thoughts before, and with Chaereas now reportedly dead, our author needs some way to forestall his narrative from getting bogged down in continual lamentation and threats of suicide.

²⁵ See Whitmarsh 2009, 40–41 for the role of the recapitulation in demarcating the second from the first half of the novel, as well as for its essentially literary role, and Nimis 2003, 264.

²⁶ It matters not in the least for the present discussion whether these are originally by Xenophon or were inserted by a later editor; they were certainly there by the time Chariton wrote since the closing wording of the recapitulations in Chariton (ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ δεδήλωται) clearly derives from the final words of all of the summaries in Xenophon, as many have noted (see, e.g. Zimmermann 1961, 330–331 and Perry 1967, 358 n. 16). Chariton must have taken them for Xenophon's and assumed that his readers would recognize the technique and wording as the historian's.

they have suggested various practical and literary reasons for the recapitulation and its placement, have generally avoided analyzing it in detail in intertextual terms. What I mean is this: only a few have asked what seems to me the most interesting question of all, not ‘Why is there a recapitulation at the midpoint of the novel?’ but ‘Why does Chariton at the midpoint of his novel imitate the recapitulations from Xenophon’s *Anabasis*?’

To be sure, the former question is one well worth asking, and responses to it must condition our answer to the latter. On the functional level, various suggestions have been put forward. Müller (1976, 120 n. 25) emphasized its presence as a purely structural device to divide the novel in half and found it tempting to think that the recapitulation would have headed the second of two papyrus rolls between which a copy of the novel would have been divided.²⁸ At the same time Müller insisted on a principle that still makes good sense: we must strive to explain the recapitulation as a totality in its placement, its practical function, and its literary purpose. The major problem with his analysis was that he assumed that recognition of the recapitulation as an imitation of Xenophon was in and of itself sufficient exposition of its literary purpose. Hägg (1971, 332 and 1994, 129–130) has argued that the recapitulation is part of a narrative strategy to help ‘inexperienced’ readers (or people listening to someone else reading the text aloud) navigate the novel as well as part of a novelistic rhetoric that Chariton uses to ‘engrave on the reader’s mind the accumulated mass of experiences which his hero or heroine has had to endure’ (Hägg 1971, 331), but it was to be Bowie (1996, 97–99) who first elaborated an explanation that truly combined the practical and literary: it may be for inexperienced readers, as Hägg suggested, and it may be a response to a division between papyrus rolls, as Müller thought, but at the same time it also may ‘corroborate Chariton’s historiographic pose’ and ‘reinforce the sense of closure with which Chariton clearly seeks to mark the ends of his books.’²⁹ I have very serious doubts about the idea that Chariton seeks to pose as a historian to any extent,³⁰ but here for the first

²⁷ Most important are Hägg 1971 and 1994, Müller 1976, Hunter 1994, Bowie 1996, Nimis 2003, and Whitmarsh 2009.

²⁸ In fact, he was tempted further to put forward the notion that the novel had originally been published in two instalments, where the practical functionality of the recapitulation would have been even more pronounced.

²⁹ On the notion of closure and book divisions in Chariton see Hunter 1994, 1064 with n. 43.

³⁰ See Müller 1976, 123–124 (on the historiographical form of the opening sentence and its immediate dispelling of any notion that one is reading history), Schmeling 1974, 56, Plepelits 1976, 16, and Hägg 1994, 85–90 on this point.

time we have at least an attempt to explain why Xenophon is imitated, and in both parts of his formulation Bowie has put forward a hypothesis, however vague, that Chariton's recapitulation has a stylistic and literary aim.

More recently, Whitmarsh (2009) has provided a very different reading of the recapitulation. Unlike Bowie, Whitmarsh does not see closure as Chariton's aim, but book structure plays a major role in his thinking too. He emphasizes strongly the recapitulation's role in Chariton's overall narrative strategy and the experience of a reader moving through the text. In his view, the summary is positioned at the balance point of the narrative for a reader between two halves of the novel with different textures. For Whitmarsh, the first four books are more complex in their action and less neat in their organization (in the sense that their beginnings and endings do not coincide as tidily with major plot divisions as those of the last four books do). In other words, what has preceded the summary is, on the whole, likely to appear to a reader complex and somewhat disorganized, whereas what follows will reveal a trend of an increasingly linear and resolved plot.³¹ To my mind this rather overplays the complexity of the first half of the novel and the nature of the breaks at book divisions,³² but as the novel unfolds there certainly are various movements toward resolution and revelatory moments that provide momentum and a patterning. The interplay with the *Anabasis*, I argue, is one structural element that conditions a reader's reaction to this forward progress through the plot.

'That Chariton invokes the *Anabasis* at a point of transition to central Asia is,' Whitmarsh (2009, 41) notes, 'of course, significant.' But about what that significance may be he is silent. My own answer to that question need not invalidate the other analyses of the recapitulation, particularly if we allow for a multifarious audience. For example, I certainly would not wish to deny the recapitulation a practical function. Although its primary purpose seems unlikely to be as an aid to oral appreciation of the novel—unless, that is, we are meant to imagine that the summaries in the *Anabasis* have an analogous function—if someone were to listen to a reading of the novel, I suppose the recapitulation might help them pause and recollect where the story has got to before launching into the second half.³³ On the matter of papyrus

³¹ Whitmarsh 2009, 39: '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.'

³² Compare Hägg 1994, 130: '...a normal (modern) reader would find [Chariton's narrative] extremely straightforward and clear' and it 'abounds with reminders and summaries.'

³³ See Bowie 1996, 99 on the ambiguity of the recapitulations as markers of an expectation of 'inexperienced' readers or oral delivery. Hunter 1994, 1066: '...the plot summaries

rolls, the relative isolation of the recapitulation in Book 5 calls for some explanation. Most of the books of the *Anabasis* are prefaced by a summary, and they would obviously have aided a reader in scanning for a particular place in the narrative when juggling multiple papyrus rolls. Chariton's single recapitulation in Book 5, by contrast, is less useful in this regard, since the divisions of the text are rather larger than individual books of the *Anabasis*, and the one at the beginning of Book 8 is more than mere recapitulation, since it looks forward, and would not have been at a roll-break in any case.³⁴ But the recapitulations could certainly have helped readers in the way imagined.

As we have seen, other analyses have suggested that the purpose behind the explicit recollection of Xenophon is too obvious to require an explanation, is merely a nod to Xenophon as a literary forebear, or a ploy to establish a momentary authorial pose. These possibilities leave us with a Chariton for whom allusion is merely ornament and whose use of the *Anabasis* is trivial. This view seems untenable to me. Whitmarsh's basic insight that the recapitulation is a marker of the plot's developing resolution is attractive, but I prefer to think that rather than simply implying the taming of complexity through recapitulation, Chariton imitated the *Anabasis* here to achieve very specific effects directly related to the larger correspondences between the novel and Xenophon's work.

So, why the *Anabasis*? Perhaps one answer is that the recapitulation is designed specifically to recall Xenophon so that a reader knows that the second, 'historical' half of *Callirhoe* will be modeled in the broadest sense on the *Anabasis*.³⁵ When viewed, however, against the several evocations of the *Anabasis* I laid out above from the first half of the novel, we should be

which head Books 5 and 8 may be seen as borrowed from the techniques of oral narration, or as a specifically literary imitation of Xenophon's 'Anabasis,' depending upon which aspect of the work one wishes to stress.' In another vein, as a simple aide-memoire for the 'inexperienced reader,' the summary in Book 5 adequately hits the highlights of the first half of the novel. On the other hand we have to imagine a very forgetful reader indeed if we suppose that he or she needed to be reminded of such basic facts as the beauty of Callirhoe and her marriage (first item of the recapitulation) or the most recent events, such as the summons to trial (final item).

³⁴ Bowie 1996, 98–99.

³⁵ For the notion of the second half of the novel as 'historical' as opposed to 'private' see Zimmermann 1961, 339 ('...in dem zweiten, historisch gehaltenen Teil unseres Romans...'). Hägg 1994, 88, by contrast, does not see the division as taking place at the midpoint ('The mainly private first part of the novel is thus (6,8) followed by a shorter part—about one-fourth of the whole—in which public affairs come to the fore'), but surely the trial is a public rather than private matter.

precise: the recapitulation must be an open declaration that the *whole* of the novel is meant to be read in dialogue with Xenophon's memoir—after all, the recapitulation is inherently backward-looking at the same time it indicates that there is more narrative ahead. It is perfectly reasonable to imagine that an ancient reader of both the *Anabasis* and *Callirhoe* can have reached the middle of the narrative without noticing either the commonality of plot (Greeks moving eastward into the Persian empire to face the king) or specific allusions. For this sort of reader the recapitulation will be a revelation, one designed to spark simultaneously a retrospective realization of where the story had been headed all along, including recognition of some of the several hints and various echoes of the *Anabasis* that have been missed, and a prospective sense of anticipation and suspense about how closely the novel will track with its heretofore distant model. Will military conflict come into play? Will Callirhoe and Chaereas become trapped behind enemy lines? How will they get home? For a reader more thoroughly familiar with the *Anabasis*—as familiar as Chariton himself clearly was—the recapitulation will have much the same impact with regards to the imminent events, but will bring with it also a satisfying sense of having successfully recognized the clues along the way.³⁶

In either case, all those readers,³⁷ now fully *au courant*, can see how Callirhoe's geographic progress in the first half comes in stages and is achieved by the machinations of people who act for their own gain and through deception. As Cyrus, Clearchus, and Menon start the Greeks on their

³⁶ Goldhill 1991, 289, though not addressing the topic of the Greek novel, puts this notion a different way in paraphrasing Compagnon on allusion: 'the process of recognition also invites a self-recognition as a knowing reader, a sharer of knowledge.' Manuwald 2000 refers with some frequency to the pleasure derived by Chariton's readers from spotting a citation, e.g., 'den Reiz des Wiedererkennens' (101) and 'der Reiz des Auffindens' (106). Reardon 1996, 332 sees the entire historical setting as designed 'to titillate the reader, who will feel pleasure at recognizing it.' I am more interested in advancing the notion of a higher sort of intertextual response in which at least some readers will not only recognize individual echoes and a 'historical' details but go on to construct from them larger frameworks of interpretation as the novel unfolds, providing themselves a deeper satisfaction in the process.

³⁷ These are not the only two kinds of reader we might imagine, of course. At the other extreme, for instance, we might imagine readers who missed all of the clues and are not helped by the striking recapitulation because they do not know the *Anabasis* at all. For the notion of Chariton's multiple audiences see Hägg 1994, 117–119. One of the most important points to be found in Hägg's treatment is that a reader who does not catch all or even any of Chariton's various citations and allusions would not be denied basic understanding or prevented from enjoying the novel, but would merely do so in a different way than a reader who catches every single one and recognizes all of the source texts.

journey and take them further and further eastward, moving them by various means after interruptions in their journey, so too Callirhoe is taken by Theron and Dionysius and Plangon. And just as the Greeks variously are ignorant and aware of the purposes and schemes of those leading them against the king, so too Callirhoe is sometimes half-aware of what is happening to her (as when she sees through Theron's lies) and sometimes not at all (as when she fails to recognize Plangon's intrigues). It is thus perfectly appropriate that Chariton has emphasized her ignorance again in 4,7,8,³⁸ just before the recapitulation in 5,1,1. There, as Callirhoe begins the final leg of her *anabasis*, which, like the Cyreans', will lead to Babylon and the king, Dionysius deceives her about the reason for their trip, claiming that the king has sent for him to give some policy advice. It is difficult not to think of all the lies and tricks that have brought Callirhoe to this point and conclude that they have at least some connection with Cyrus' initial lie (*An.* 1,2,1) that he is taking the Greek mercenaries east to fight the Pisidians, as well as all the subsequent fabrications and examples of subterfuge with which he brings them ultimately to Babylon.

For both the expeditions of Cyrus and of Dionysius,³⁹ the point of no return is the Euphrates.⁴⁰ In a neat parallel, Callirhoe reaches the river by being taken on a southerly route leading to Cilicia and Syria (5,1,3) just as the Greek mercenaries in the *Anabasis* are (they reach Cilicia in *An.* 1,2,21 and the Cilician gates to Syria in *An.* 1,4,4). Both journeys inland also have in common a leisurely pace,⁴¹ the most important consequences of which for Callirhoe are that her fame spreads and that she is received by the various officials and communities along the way. Her beauty brings her hospitality and gifts, but another factor at play is the expectation on the part of her hosts that her eastward march toward the king will ultimately result in their being

³⁸ Her ignorance is stressed again in 5,4,13.

³⁹ Both groups that set out with Mithridates and Dionysius in *Callirhoe* are described as *στόλοι*, a word applied also to Cyrus' expedition by Xenophon (e.g., τὸν Κύρου στόλον at *An.* 1,2,5 and 1,3,16). Although so common a word cannot be said to be 'taken from' the earlier author, Chariton is purposefully evoking the notion of a march upland and a situation parallel to the *Anabasis*. See Laplace 1980, 96 and, following her, Alvares 1997, 620 n. 29.

⁴⁰ Compare Whitmarsh's (2009, 42) neat formulation—although he is interested in the book divisions of Herodotus as a comparandum, not Xenophon's narrative—of Chariton's placement of the crossing of the Euphrates at the beginning of Book 5, '...the geophysical frontier serves as a spatial analogue for the book division...' See Briant 2006, 837 on the Euphrates in Chariton as an example of the river's status in Greek thought as a 'cultural boundary beyond which deepest Asia, both mysterious and unsettling, commenced.'

⁴¹ Cyrus picks up speed considerably after crossing the Euphrates.

recompensed in the future when she gains great power (5,1,8). Read against the *Anabasis*, it is hard not to see this reflecting the motivations of a host of characters in their dealings with Cyrus in the first book; they curry favor with him in the explicit expectation that he will pay them back once he becomes king.

Cobet long ago saw another verbal imitation of the *Anabasis* soon after the recapitulation in 5,1,1. In 5,2,1 Chariton describes Mithridates' departure and his decision to take a route more northerly than Dionysius', remarking that, 'More than anything else he was concerned that the king would also find fault with him for following in the woman's footsteps, but he was also eager to get there first...' The opening of this sentence (μάλιστα μὲν δεδουκῶς μὴ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπαίτιον αὐτῷ γένηται πρὸς βασιλέως, ὅτι...) recalls Socrates' worry in *An.* 3,1,5 that participation in Cyrus' expedition would cause trouble for Xenophon back home in Athens (καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης ὑποπεύσας μὴ τι πρὸς τῆς πόλεως ὑπαίτιον εἶη Κύρῳ φίλον γενέσθαι, ὅτι...).⁴²

It has been convenient until now for me to refer explicitly to Babylon as the endpoint of all of these journeys, but in fact in another parallel development this knowledge is denied to readers of both the *Anabasis* and *Callirhoe* for some time. In the *Anabasis*, although readers know from the opening paragraphs of the work that the king is the target of Cyrus' expedition, revelation of the precise location of the king is delayed, and Xenophon discloses it to be Babylon only in 1,4,11, when the army is already in Syria and the journey inland essentially completed. Chariton coyly denies his readers knowledge of the king's location until Mithridates is already in the city and Dionysius well on his way. I say 'coyly' because the delay is neither inci-

⁴² The resemblance is even closer when we remember that ἐπαίτιον in Chariton is Cobet's emendation for the manuscript's αἴτιον, which he made on the basis of the passage in Xenophon. But although we find ἐπαίτιον in our modern editions of Chariton, following Cobet (who was following standard editions of the *Anabasis* in his own day), more modern editions of Xenophon normally print the MS variant ὑπαίτιον, not ἐπαίτιον. Since the argument at Cobet 1859, 235 is that this is a *locus Xenophontis quem [sc. Charito] imitatur*, we probably ought to print ὑπαίτιον in Chariton as well (since it is impossible to know which variant Chariton had in front of him, it seems reasonable to print what current texts of Xenophon have). Papanikolaou 1973, 16–22—which has too long been trusted as a thorough compilation of imitations of Xenophon and other classical authors by Chariton (see Trzaskoma Forthcoming b)—does not list this instance, and it was subsequently demoted from an imitation to a mere parallel for usage. Once we have our text of Chariton using the same word as our current texts of Xenophon, the echo is quite clear: δεδουκῶς μὴ...ὑπαίτιον...γένηται πρὸς βασιλέως and ὑποπεύσας μὴ τι πρὸς τῆς πόλεως ὑπαίτιον εἶη.

dental or accidental. Just before the revelation two important cities in the empire are mentioned by Callirhoe as her imagined destinations once she crosses the Euphrates (Susa and Bactra in 5,1,7), a bit of misdirection from our author. Long before this, the reader has been reminded or informed that the Persian kings were often on the move when we are told in 1,13,1 that Dionysius' house is magnificent because it was built to receive the king (ἦν γὰρ εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως παρεσκευασμένη). In 4,6,3 Pharnaces writes a letter to the king, but there is no mention of where the king is either here or when the letter is delivered a short time later in 4,6,5. The king's reply in 4,6,8 summons the litigants but does not specify where they are to proceed. And when Mithridates considers revolt instead of going to the king for judgment (and it seems hard to imagine that Mithridates' consideration of armed rebellion on its own would not bring to mind the *Anabasis*), the destination is simply 'inland' (4,7,1 ἄνω).⁴³ Likewise, the moment in *Callirhoe* of departure of the two parties on their journey to the king provides an opportunity to mention the location of their destination, but this does not happen. So too on all other occasions in which the location of the king could naturally have been revealed there is either silence or vagueness.⁴⁴

The revelation of the name Babylon, when it does come, is then another moment at which Chariton's readers can have varied but satisfying reactions. Readers with no familiarity with the *Anabasis* will not be hindered in their basic understanding and merely acknowledge another piece of the puzzle has fallen into its place. Those readers who have either recognized the influence of the *Anabasis* all along or have had it brought home by the recapitulation in 5,1,1 will have the pleasure of having their expectations fulfilled in another 'aha!' moment. At the same time they will realize that the plot of *Callirhoe* tracks the narrative of the *Anabasis* somewhat loosely. This leaves the essential questions still unanswered: Will there be a disaster to match the death of Cyrus? Will there be military conflict? Will the Greeks in *Callirhoe* become trapped in Persia? If so, how will they escape?

The potential disaster that looms most seriously is that Callirhoe will become the object of the king's love. Callirhoe herself worries about this openly, as do Dionysius and Chaereas, and this fear is contextualized by further reminders of the *Anabasis* in Babylon itself. Some of these can be

⁴³ Goold 1995 gives the game away in his translation: 'he thought about not going to Babylon.'

⁴⁴ I have already mentioned that in 2,7,1 we have ἀναβήσεσθαι...μέχρι τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως. In 4,8,1 we also have ἀνέβαινεν ἤδη μέχρι τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως.

rather less obvious than many of the other parallels and imitations, and one can see in some of them more an attempt to establish verisimilitude for the audience with regard to the Persian setting than to achieve any special effect. As such, in many cases another text about Persia—whether Herodotus, Ctesias, or Xenophon’s own *Cyropaedia*—may be seen as the source rather than the *Anabasis*.⁴⁵ Nevertheless it is worth drawing out some specific implications vis à vis the *Anabasis* as opposed to these other works, not because no readers would have been familiar with the alternatives but because a very great number of them would certainly have known Xenophon’s *Anabasis*. For instance, there is almost certainly a bit of Persian coloring from Ctesias in the introduction of the eunuch Artaxates, who is described by Chariton in 5,2,3 as the ‘most important and powerful man in the king’s court’ (μέγιστος ἦν παρὰ βασιλεῖ καὶ δυνατώτατος). Both the name and description are related to the eunuch Artoxares in Ctesias,⁴⁶ but these two eunuchs differ in one very important way: Ctesias’ Artoxares is notoriously faithless and plots against his king, while Artaxates in *Callirhoe* is the king’s most trusted man (6,3,1 δὲ ἦν αὐτῷ πιστότατος ἀπάντων). Here we can perhaps detect the additional influence of the *Anabasis*.

Specifically, I would suggest that in addition to Ctesias’ Artoxares a reader would be reminded of Artapates from the *Anabasis*, whose name is equally close to the novel’s eunuch.⁴⁷ Artapates is designated as πιστότατος in *An.* 1,6,11 and this characteristic is emphasized strongly in *An.* 1,8,28, the scene of Cyrus’ death, when Artapates kills himself or allows himself to be killed after throwing himself over the body of his master: Ἀρταπάτης δ’ ὁ πιστότατος αὐτῷ τῶν σκηπτούχων θεραπέων λέγεται. These *skeptouchoi* were probably assumed to be eunuchs by Chariton and other ancient readers.⁴⁸ In Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, of which Chariton was as assiduous a reader as he was of the *Anabasis*, the eunuchs in *Cyr.* 7,3,15 are plainly labeled as *skeptouchoi*,⁴⁹ and Gadatas, who is said to be a eunuch (*Cyr.* 5,3,18), is later re-

⁴⁵ On the point generally see Baslez 1992, who surveys the Persian coloring of *Callirhoe*.

⁴⁶ Ctes. *FGrH* 688 F15: Ἀρτοξάρης ὁ εὐνοῦχος, δὲ μέγα ἡδύνατο παρὰ βασιλεῖ... Note, too, Chariton’s repetition of similar language at 6,2,2 δὲ ἦν <παρ’> αὐτῷ μέγιστος. Baslez 1992, 200–201, discusses the characterization of the eunuch and Chariton’s inspiration for it (Ctesias combined with imperial Roman views).

⁴⁷ For the importance that Xenophon places on Artapates see Bassett 1999, 478–480.

⁴⁸ A century or two after Chariton Aelian certainly believed that Artapates was a eunuch and explicitly says so when he references what must have been the well-known anecdote of his death (*NA* 6,25).

⁴⁹ The passage has been suspected of being spurious, but as with the recapitulations in the *Anabasis*, we are more concerned with what Chariton had before him when he read Xenophon, not what Xenophon actually wrote.

ferred to as Cyrus the Elder's chief *skeptouchos* (*Cyr.* 8,4,2).⁵⁰ So when Chariton was imagining an especially loyal eunuch, he would easily have been influenced by Xenophon in these various passages.⁵¹

Xenophon's Artapates may provide another reminiscence for events that take place in Babylon in the novel. This comes in the form of a verbal imitation at 5,3,7, where Dionysius leaps off his horse to greet Rhodogoune. The Greek here (*καταπηδήσας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου*) was first identified as an imitation of *Cyr.* 7,1,38 (*καταπηδήσας δέ τις ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου*) by Papanikolaou (1973, 20), but he has not been subsequently followed in this.⁵² It may be that it comes instead from the *Anabasis*; at *An.* 1,8,28 we find Artapates leaping from his horse to cover Cyrus (*καταπηδήσας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου*).⁵³ This is a far more dramatic context than that in the *Cyropaedia*, and there is a chance that a reader might have recollected Artapates' leap or that Chariton might have had it in mind when he wrote. Dionysius' leap in this reading becomes as futile a gesture as Artapates'. The latter cannot defend his master; the former cannot protect his wife from Persian eyes.

Other Persian elements that may have been seen by some readers as coming from the *Anabasis* are the bracelets and necklace that Queen Stateira donates to Rhodogoune's costume in 5,3,4. I am not making a claim that Chariton imported these items of Persian costume from the *Anabasis* in particular. They can be found in Herodotus and Ctesias (e.g., *Hdt.* 3,20 and 9,80 and *Ctes. FGrH* 688 F 26), for instance, and in the *Cyropaedia* (e.g., *Cyr.* 1,3,2–3 and 2,4,6), and if any single passage lies behind these gifts in Chariton (although it seems highly unlikely that this can be so) it may well be *Cyr.* 8,2,8, where the giving of these particular gifts is said to be restricted as a royal prerogative. But they are especially prominent in the first book of the *Anabasis*, where they occur three times (*An.* 1,2,27, 1,5,8, and 1,8,29), and readers may have made this connection. In the first of these passages, the necklaces and bracelets are said to be gifts conferring honor at court, and the

⁵⁰ On *skeptouchoi* and eunuchs see Tuplin 2004, 159 with n. 15, but note that 'Cyr. 3.15' and 'Ael. *VH* 6.25' there should be corrected to 'Cyr. 7.3.15' (printed correctly just before in the same note) and 'Ael. *NA* 6.25.'

⁵¹ To which we might add, in a general way, Xenophon's presentation of Cyrus' view of the advantages of employing eunuchs in *Cyr.* 7,5,60–65, where their fidelity to their masters is the main point.

⁵² There is good reason to be skeptical, not least because the wording is so very common in imperial Greek authors, including Chariton himself, who has *ἀποπηδήσας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵππου* at 2,3,5. The contexts in the hypertext and novel are also difficult to align.

⁵³ It also occurs in another dramatic moment of the same work in the same words, at *An.* 3,4,48, where Xenophon himself leaps from his horse in the race for the top of the mountain.

third is once again the scene of Artapates' death, where his adornment shows how highly Cyrus esteemed him. Chariton does not use the usual words for the Persian items (στρεπτοί and ψέλια) but less marked synonyms (περιβραχιόνια καὶ ὄρμον), but their conjunction and their royal source make a connection possible. The substitution of the vocabulary probably stresses that in the novel these are items of female adornment,⁵⁴ and so the scene becomes a feminine version of a typically Persian scene, with royal gifts, imbued with symbolic power, being granted, only with the queen substituting for the king and the ladies of the court standing in for male nobles and warriors.⁵⁵ In this sense Rhodogoune really is the champion of Persia, and the language of a war of beauty takes on added significance. The point here is not that these details of political custom and material culture, along with others elsewhere in Chariton, such as a distinctly Persian dagger and a golden horse bridle (ἀκινάκης and χρύσεον...χαλινόν, both at 6,4,2),⁵⁶ must come from the *Anabasis*, but that readers of that work would have recognized their function and considered them authentically Persian because of their familiarity with that text.

There is one element that might have made a reader connect Rhodogoune's 'arming' scene quite specifically with the *Anabasis* and not other Greek literary texts about Persia. In *An.* 3,2,25 Xenophon praises Persian women, joking with the Cyreans that if they get used to spending time with 'the tall and beautiful women and girls of the Medes and Persians' they will, like Odysseus' men who consumed the lotus, forget the way home. In the novel Rhodogoune is armed as a result of a delegation of women coming to the queen out of worry that Callirhoe represents a threat to them in the matter of beauty in which they have long been universally admired, which looks very much like a glance back at Xenophon.⁵⁷ The queen dismisses their worries and introduces an interesting comparison, noting that the Greeks are impoverished ('beggars', she calls them, πτωχοί) and that this makes them

⁵⁴ The word περιβραχιόνια is used in combination with ψέλια at *Cyr.* 6,4,2, where the items in question belong to Panthea (compare also *Cyr.* 6,1,51).

⁵⁵ For the role within the empire of gifts given to and by the Persian king see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1989 and Briant 2006, 302–315. For Greek views of the practice (earlier than Chariton) see Miller 1997, 127–130.

⁵⁶ These items belong to the king in Chariton and are not gifts, but both can be found alongside a necklace and bracelets as typical royal gifts in *An.* 1,2,27, and when Artapates dies in 1,8,29 he has an ἀκινάκης in addition to his bracelets and necklace (for the combination of necklace, bracelets and golden-bridled horse together as royal gifts, see *Cyr.* 8,2,8).

⁵⁷ The text of 5,3,1 is corrupt in the sentence in question, but the basic sense is clear enough, especially because it is restated later in the same sentence.

exaggerate (for instance, by thinking that Dionysius is wealthy when in Persian terms he is not). This intertwining of the themes of beauty, wealth/poverty, and Greek threat to Persian power occurs also in the *Anabasis* in the relevant passage. Xenophon urges his men not to forget their homcoming but return home to remind their fellow Greeks ‘that they are poor by choice’ (*An.* 3,2,26 ὅτι ἐκόντες πένονται) and let them know that they could invade, conquer, and settle Persian territory, and so enjoy riches.

Some verbal reminiscences strengthen my argument for the influence of the *Anabasis* on Callirhoe’s sojourn in Babylon. The eunuch Artaxates soon attempts to coerce Callirhoe into becoming the king’s lover. He insinuates that her refusal to submit will make her an enemy, and as for the king’s enemies, ‘for them alone is it not possible to die, even when they want to’ (6,7,7 μόνοις γὰρ τούτοις οὐδὲ ἀποθανεῖν θέλουσιν ἕξεισι). This has long been recognized as an allusion to *An.* 3,1,29,⁵⁸ a passage in which Xenophon describes the imagined situation of the captured Greek generals: ‘Are they not now...not even able to die, those wretched men, even though I imagine they very much long for it?’ (οὐ νῦν ἐκεῖνοι...οὐδὲ ἀποθανεῖν οἱ τλήμονες δύνανται, καὶ μάλ’ οἶμαι ἐρῶντες τούτου;). Chariton here again assimilates Callirhoe’s experiences to a model with which he presumes at least a portion of his audience will be familiar. In this case the cruelty displayed by the historical Artaxerxes in the *Anabasis* toward the treacherously captured Greek generals becomes for the audience a benchmark to measure the novelistic Artaxerxes’ capacity for cruelty toward the uncooperative Callirhoe.

IV. Chaereas’ *anabasis*

Chaereas too, it will be remembered, is part of a *stolos* sent to Babylon by Eros, but to this point in the novel he has generally been passive and often suicidal. He has also not been involved directly in any of the allusions to the *Anabasis*. But with the coming of the war at the end of Book 6, Chariton introduces the narrative redirection that will change not only Chaereas’ character and pattern of action but do so partly by following a strategy of finally beginning to assimilate the novel’s hero and the narrative around him strong-

⁵⁸ The allusion is secure enough on its own, but another verbal imitation of a different part of the very same sentence elsewhere (in 7,4,8, to be discussed in the next section) makes it absolutely certain. Papanikolaou 1973, 20 lists the later imitation, but not the earlier. Both were noted first by Cobet 1859, 234. Although Chariton’s sketch of Persian cruelty resonates generally with widespread Greek traditions of Persian cruelty, the verbal connections make it clear that the *Anabasis* is being specifically invoked.

ly to the *Anabasis* as he earlier did with his heroine.⁵⁹ This shift is perhaps signaled in advance by the redirection of the eunuch's threat from Callirhoe to Chaereas (6,7,13).

Relatively few of the specific instances of Chariton's assimilation of Chaereas and his adventures to the *Anabasis* have been analyzed by critics, I suspect in some cases because they have been thought so obvious, but in others because they have simply been missed. Although there is much to say about Chaereas' military career and the way it hearkens back to earlier history and literature (from Homer to the Alexander historians), here I limit my discussion of such matters of general import and concentrate on isolating the elements of the *Anabasis* in *Callirhoe* in order to expand our identification and appreciation of them where possible, not to preclude the possibility of a more comprehensive interpretation. Obviously, the interpretation of the whole novel would need to take into account how the various intertextual dimensions of Chariton's aesthetic operate together as a complex and variable system in individual portions of the narrative and as a whole.

In the broadest sense, Chaereas' adventures can be matched up with several features of the narrative of the *Anabasis*.⁶⁰ Even at these points of convergence, on the other hand, Chariton continues to avoid the slavish imitation of Xenophon. One reason for this is obviously that the novelist has other literary models to accommodate, but this cannot be the only factor at play. There are many opportunities for Chariton to make his narrative track the *Anabasis* more closely, and the fact that he does not exploit these indicates that he does not have the goal in the second half of his novel of producing just a second *Anabasis*, a shoddy rewrite of Xenophon or unimaginative imitation. As in *Callirhoe's anabasis*, Chariton is more interested in establishing for Chaereas' military activities a wide-angle resemblance that evokes the familiar classical narrative, an evocation that is reinforced through the introduction of select details of closer imitation.

Just as his portrayal of Callirhoe earlier in the novel is informed by comparisons that vary in their referent (Callirhoe is now the Greek mercenaries generally, now Xenophon specifically) and he sometimes strives for unex-

⁵⁹ The change is not, however, instantaneous. In a nice bit of irony, Chaereas will find heroism by pursuing his death wish but succeed only in accomplishing supposedly impossible deeds and not in finding his death. See Plepelits 1976, 20 and particularly his fine phrase 'eine Art Todeskommando.'

⁶⁰ Perry 1930, 104: 'If one examines the description of Chaereas' career as soldier (VII, 3 ff.; VII, 2), he will find that the imitation of Xenophon, though somewhat naive in its general conception, is nevertheless broad and not confined to mere words.' Perry does not provide any details.

pected conjunctions (e.g., Mithridates' concern for himself echoing Socrates' worry for Xenophon and Plangon's trick mimicking Clearchus'), so also in the military phase of the novel he does not stick to a simple set of correlations or signal his deployment of such intertextual effects uniformly.

Although this is the portion of the narrative that is widely acknowledged to be the site of intertextuality between *Callirhoe* and the *Anabasis*, since most of the potential resemblances are based not on verbal similarities but on situational parallelism, and since some of these have been discussed by earlier scholars, it is perhaps more economical to sketch them roughly. Chaereas is a young man who, like Xenophon, joins a rebellion against Artaxerxes at a friend's urging (Polycharmus' and Proxenus', respectively). He becomes one of several Greek mercenaries involved in the campaign,⁶¹ though he (again like Xenophon) is not precisely a mercenary himself but merely a private individual, a friend (7,2,4; cf. *An.* 3,1,4). Chaereas becomes a *symoulos* of the leader of the revolt (7,2,5), just as in the *Anabasis* Clearchus, the leader of the mercenaries, does (*An.* 1,6,5).⁶² When there seems no way to continue the fight, it is Chaereas whose speech inspires confidence (7,2,4–5), just as Xenophon singlehandedly convinces the Greeks to continue fighting by a series of speeches (beginning in *An.* 3,1,15).⁶³ Chaereas selects Peloponnesians to serve in his own elite unit (7,3,7, along with a few Dorian Sicilians), in the same way that Cyrus collects Peloponnesian mercenaries for his expedition (*An.* 1,1,6). In the speech that Chaereas gives his men at this juncture he stresses that he need not be their commander and that

⁶¹ Hunter 1994 1058: 'It is...Xenophon's "Anabasis" which provided the model for Chariton's narrative of Greek mercenaries engaged in a revolt against Artaxerxes II.'

⁶² Chariton also specifies in the same passage that Chaereas first becomes a *homotrapezos* of the Egyptian king, which does not parallel any Greek figure in the *Anabasis*. But the detail is important nonetheless and, although the title can be found elsewhere in authors Chariton read (see Baslez 1992, 199 with n. 2), there is perhaps reason to believe that the *Anabasis* is being evoked. The *homotrapezoi* of Cyrus are almost the only ones who remain with him at his death (*An.* 1,8,25–26). Chaereas, we ought to remember, is looking to die fighting against the Persian king, a fact that Chariton has him stress repeatedly and clearly. Chaereas' designation as a *homotrapezos* is one of several ways by which his actions gain the resonance of fatalistic, suicidal heroism, the most obvious of which are Chaereas' citation of Hector's speech before the final battle with Achilles (*Il.* 22,304–5 at 7,2,4), his allusions to Thermopylae (at 7,3,9 and 7,3,11, which I will discuss below), and his possible mention of Othryades (at 7,3,11, although this depends upon emendation; Othryades' actual suicide lends additional support to D'Orville's widely accepted conjecture, even if Reardon does not accept it in his recent edition, preferring D'Orville's other suggestion of Miltiades. See Smith 2007, 175 n. 45).

⁶³ On Chaereas' speeches and their parallels to those of Xenophon, see Laplace 1997, 51–52 and Smith 2007, 173–176.

he will be obedient if the army chooses another leader (7,3,10), a claim that appears several times in the *Anabasis*, both from Clearchus (*An.* 1,3,15) and Xenophon himself (twice, in *An.* 3,1,25 and 6,1,29).⁶⁴ He inspires his men by stressing the gods' favor,⁶⁵ the general superiority of Greeks over barbarians,⁶⁶ and the unimportance of numbers, particularly by hearkening back to the victory at Thermopylae (7,3,9 and 7,3,11). These are the very tactics Xenophon employs in his speech to the mercenaries when he recalls the victories at Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea (*An.* 3,2,13).⁶⁷ When he takes Tyre by subterfuge, Chaereas pretends (7,3,5) the Greek mercenaries have not been paid—a complaint always on the lips of the Cyreans—and that the Persian king is plotting to betray and kill them—surely, the most famous plot by a monarch of Persia to kill Greek mercenaries is that from the *Anabasis*. Moreover, the whole motif of mercenaries deserting from one side to the other is easy enough to parallel from several instances in Xenophon's narrative (e.g., *An.* 1,4,3).

I would like to explore in a bit more detail the long-known verbal reminiscence of the *Anabasis* in the Tyrian section of *Callirhoe* in order to show that more can be gained than general coloring from such moments. In the description of the Tyrians' slaughter at the hands of Chaereas and his men (7,4,8 παϊόμενοι καὶ κεντούμενοι) Chariton uses language he takes from Xenophon (*An.* 3,1,29 παϊόμενοι, κεντούμενοι), the same sentence about the

⁶⁴ Laplace 1997, 51 n. 35 and Smith 2007, 173.

⁶⁵ For the importance of the favor of the gods in Xenophon's thought generally, see Dillery 1995, 183–194. For the recollection in Chariton see Laplace 1997, 51 and Smith 2007, 174.

⁶⁶ See Laplace 1997, 51 and Smith 2007, 173 on the connections here between Chariton and Xenophon. More generally, this is a *topos* in both works and, to some degree, basic to their worldviews (for Chariton see Kuch 1996, 216–218). In the *Anabasis* even Cyrus himself stresses the advantages the Greeks have over Persians (*An.* 1,7,3–4), and the Persian prince's singling out of freedom as the most enviable possession of the Greeks in the *Anabasis* perhaps resounds in Chariton's description of Chaereas as the 'only free man' in Babylon (7,1,1).

⁶⁷ Unless we accept D'Orville's emendation of Miltiades at Chariton 7,3,11, Chaereas, as a Dorian, omits mention of any Athenian victories before his Dorian audience. See Smith 2007, 175–176 on this and on Xenophon's omission of Thermopylae. I would add to Smith's discussion that Xenophon is trying to give examples of successful actions by small numbers of Greeks against large numbers of Persians, and Thermopylae does not fit that category. Chariton, by contrast, is careful to give us a Chaereas with a devil-may-care attitude (although it is a bit surprising, at least to me, that none of Chaereas' chosen mercenaries seems to have any hesitation about following a leader who is bent on dying a glorious death).

torture of the Greek generals he had the eunuch imitate in 6,7,7.⁶⁸ The Tyrians do not represent the Greek generals, of course. Rather, a reader who can recognize the allusions can connect the eunuch's threat and the capture of Tyre in a direct and sophisticated way. The danger of torture and death at the hands of the Persians is raised by the allusion in the eunuch's speech, but the capture of Tyre and the second allusion emphasizes how hollow that threat is. It is not Chaereas (or Callirhoe or any other Greek) who in the end suffers, but the allies of the Persians.

Again, the allusion comes at a significant point in the narrative, the very first display of Chaereas' military heroism, a moment when the basis of his character and the nature of the narrative shifts. As we have seen, Chariton is particularly fond of citing the *Anabasis* at such junctures. Also in keeping with Chariton's narrative technique, a reader who fails to recognize the source of the allusion is not disadvantaged in any basic way in understanding; a reader who recognizes it but fails to read it with the earlier echo of the same sentence will feel their separate impact (threat of awful torture and horrible physical suffering, respectively); but Chariton expects that at least some of his readers will be able to recognize the relationship of these two separated allusions to a single passage of the *Anabasis* and interpret them with an additional layer of subtlety because of that relationship.⁶⁹

To return to the survey of parallels, in the final battle of the rebels against the Persian king, Chaereas and his Greeks fight separately from the Egyptian king. Those opposite the Greeks put up no resistance and turn to disordered flight (7,6,1), just as at Cunaxa the Persian forces ranged against the Greek phalanx are routed before a blow is struck (*An.* 1,8,19). And while the Greeks in both works are victorious, their barbarian leaders are defeated elsewhere in the action (7,5,12 and *An.* 1,8,27). Chaereas and his men (7,5,2) remain unaware for some time that the Egyptian has been defeated, as the Ten Thousand are ignorant of Cyrus' demise until the day after the battle (*An.* 2,1,3).⁷⁰ Likewise, Artaxerxes initially believes he has been completely victorious in both battles in both works (7,6,2 and *An.* 1,10,4) but learns the truth before the Greeks do (8,2,3 and *An.* 1,10,5). And although the Egyptian king in *Callirhoe* does not die in battle as Cyrus does (*An.* 1,8,27), he does kill himself soon enough (7,5,14), and both rebel leaders lose their heads

⁶⁸ For the identification see Cobet 1859, 234.

⁶⁹ Moreover, this second allusion to *An.* 3,1,29 does not stand in splendid isolation, but is embedded into a context full of reminiscences of the *Cyropaedia*, the deeds of Alexander the Great, Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, Homer, and so forth.

⁷⁰ Laplace 1997, 51.

posthumously (7,5,14 and *An.* 1,10,1).⁷¹ The Egyptian king's flight, meanwhile, provides an opportunity for Dionysius to distinguish himself further through success in a narrative suggested by Tissaphernes' actions after Cunaxa in the *Anabasis*. While the historical satrap asks for picked troops from the king to prevent the retreat of the king's enemies, he cannot achieve this end; Dionysius, by contrast, is able to take a small contingent of the army and catch the Egyptian king (7,5,14).⁷²

V. Aftermath and katabasis

Book 8 begins with another recapitulation modeled on those from the *Anabasis*. This recapitulation is followed immediately by Chariton's announcement of another major transition: Aphrodite has given up her anger against Chaereas and will reunite the pair. A happy ending for the eighth book is explicitly promised (8,1,4), and, perhaps more surprisingly, Chariton in the same passage excludes even the possibility of any more real travails for the couple, including any more military conflict (μάχη...πόλεμος...ἄλωσις...). But the thread of the *Anabasis* that Chariton has woven into his entire narrative continues in the last part of the novel. There is, of course, the simple fact that despite their victory the lovers and the other Greeks are still trapped behind enemy lines in Persian territory because of the death of the leader of the rebellion, which could hardly fail to recall the situation of the Ten Thousand after Cunaxa. But the combination of recapitulation and signaling of a happy outcome emphasizes in the strongest terms the ultimate divergence between the two stories, a point to which I will return below.

Before the battles against the king, Chariton clearly divided his recollections of the *Anabasis* in large blocks between Callirhoe's narrative (those portions from Book 1 through the outbreak of the rebellion that treat her storyline) and Chaereas' (the military narrative in Book 7 until the capture of Arados). After Arados is taken, however, the scheme is altered again. As Callirhoe and the Persian women experience their first night of captivity on

⁷¹ Laplace 1997, 51 notes the twin decapitations. The Egyptian does not lose his hand as Cyrus does, but this reflects a difference in how the battles play out. Cyrus' hand is cut off because he strikes the king (so Ctes. *FGrH* 688 F 16), whereas the Egyptian does not.

⁷² And Dionysius thereby gets clear credit for finishing off the king's enemy despite the Egyptian's suicide. Responsibility for the death of Cyrus, on the other hand, was much disputed (to the detriment of those who disputed with the king himself for it) and the accounts are very muddled. Xenophon is silent on the issue of direct responsibility. See Bassett 1999 for the many versions of Cyrus' death in ancient sources.

the island, they ‘neither lit a fire nor tasted food’ (7,6,4 οὔτε πῦρ ἀνήψαν οὔτε τροφῆς ἐγεύσαντο) since they believe all as lost, a reminder of the despairing night the Greek mercenaries spent after the seizure and execution of their generals, when ‘few of them...tasted food, and few lit a fire’ (*An.* 3,1,3 ὀλίγοι μὲν αὐτῶν...σίτου ἐγεύσαντο, ὀλίγοι δὲ πῦρ ἀνέκασσαν). One effect of this allusion is to create sympathy for the Persian queen and her ladies as the denouement of the novel approaches—as well as once more to emphasize how divergent the narratives are. The Persian women, after all, will be returned to their families shortly through Callirhoe’s good offices. It is better, in other words, to be a Persian woman who falls into the hands of Greeks in novels than a Greek who is at the mercy of Persians in a more or less historical account.⁷³

Chariton has begun to include Callirhoe once more in his allusions to the *Anabasis* as we approach reunion and the resolution of the plot. The recapitulation at 8,1,1 and the ensuing discussion of what will follow involve both lovers, and they are reunited immediately afterward (8,1,7). But one goal still eludes them: they are not home. Instead, as Polycharmus reminds them and as many scholars have noted, they are trapped in enemy territory (8,1,9), just as the Greeks in the *Anabasis* are. When Chaereas later reveals to the whole army that they are ‘cut off, surrounded by the enemy’ (8,2,10 ἀπειλήμμεθα ἐν μέσοις τοῖς πολεμίοις) it is difficult not to think of the *Anabasis*.⁷⁴ This is especially true because Chaereas’ short speech in 8,2,10–11 contains several other reminiscences of themes from the *Anabasis* (for example, the stress on the army as a new community, the value of experience, and the rejection of asking for mercy from the king). Of vital importance here is that Chaereas’ decisions in this portion of the narrative are informed by Callirhoe’s advice (8,2,4 and 8,3,1) as the question becomes how to escape back to Greece. His success, therefore, is dependent upon their joint planning and their joint return to Syracuse. Chaereas and Callirhoe, in other words, although their *anabases* have until now been kept strictly separate,

⁷³ As one of the journal’s referees notes, this is clearly related also to narratives about Alexander that emphasize his humane treatment of the captured Persian royal family. I am happy to acknowledge the point, especially as it is one that plays a prominent part in a paper I have written (and which I hope to publish soon) on the characterization of Chaereas in light of the Alexander historians (especially the school represented Diodorus Siculus’ Book 17). As with other such potential connections, however, space precludes me from elaborating upon it here.

⁷⁴ At the same time, this is an echo of the description of the fate of Cyrus in Isocrates’ *Phillipus*: ἐν μέσοις γεινόμενον τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀποθανεῖν (*Or.* 5,90). For Chariton’s knowledge of this oration, see Laplace 1997, though she does not note this allusion.

will share a single *katabasis*. And through their cooperative planning and combined intelligences, they will ensure that the entire army will share it with them.⁷⁵

Before their return, however, there are details to wrap up, and Chaereas' actions frequently recall elements of the *Anabasis* here as well. Cyrus promises to make his mercenaries a 'source of envy' to people back home and suspects that many of them will prefer to remain with him rather than return to be with those they left at home (*An.* 1,7,4). This remains in the world of what might have been in the *Anabasis*, but in *Callirhoe* we see it come to pass for Chaereas: all his men would prefer to remain with him rather than return to their countries and children (8,3,11),⁷⁶ but not everyone can accompany him, so he ensures that the men he sends back will be 'more honored' among those at home (8,3,12). And while Cyrus satisfies every single one of Greeks with promises of the rewards he will grant them after his victory (*An.* 1,7,8), Chaereas actually is victorious and does more than promise rewards; he delivers them. Chariton takes pains to assure us that 'No one who asked for something from Chaereas failed to get it' (8,3,12).⁷⁷

The return of Chaereas and Callirhoe to Syracuse will not be effected with wretched toil and suffering, or by long marches and tough fights, but with ease. Because of Callirhoe's advice, Chaereas will not face the obstinate opposition Xenophon often does as general.⁷⁸ Instead of more than a year of marching, Chaereas and Callirhoe will have a swift and trouble-free sea voyage home. Most importantly, although both the *Anabasis* and *Callirhoe* end up precisely where they began, in Asia Minor and Syracuse, respectively, a happily-ever-after ending awaits Chaereas and Callirhoe while for the Ten Thousand there is 'no real escape, but only a starting over again.'⁷⁹ Both narratives describe the displacement of Greeks geographically, cultu-

⁷⁵ As the success of the Ten Thousand is related to their development of a communal purpose and a decision-making processes that involve multiple opinions. See Dillery 1995, 63–95 with pointers to earlier bibliography.

⁷⁶ On the various facets of the success of Chaereas in light of the *Anabasis*, see Alvares 1997, 624, where, however, there is no explicit comparison to the specifics in Xenophon's narrative or to the model of Cyrus.

⁷⁷ Householder 1978, 266: 'The remark. . . is obviously patterned on the praise of Cyrus near the end of the first book of the *Anabasis*.'

⁷⁸ Alvares 1997, 624: 'Like Xenophon in the *Anabasis*, Chaereas must get his men home... But, unlike Xenophon, Chaereas does not have to deal with constant dissension among his officers and men; quite the reverse.'

⁷⁹ The phrase is from Ma 2004, 335 and his entire discussion has influenced my thinking here and below.

rally, and as individuals, but Chaereas and Callirhoe end with an assured reintegration into their original roles and community.

Throughout his narrative Chariton allows his readers to read the adventures of Chaereas and Callirhoe against the background of the *Anabasis*. At one moment he draws similarities between the action, characters, or themes of the novel and the military memoir, but at the next he might pointedly highlight a stark difference between them. In the end, the action of the novel, if it is right to view it as a combination of *anabasis* and *katabasis*, forms in its proportions a major inversion of the *Anabasis*. Xenophon's history comprises an *anabasis*, which fills only its first book and contains only minor obstacles easily overcome, and a *katabasis*, which takes up the bulk of the work—six books worth of narrative—and is filled with impediment after impediment. The linchpin between the two parts is the battle at Cunaxa. This ratio is reversed in Chariton's novel, where the *anabasis* of Callirhoe and Chaereas occupies Books 1,1.1–7,5,9 before the final battle, and the *katabasis* essentially occupies only the eighth and final book. The distribution of obstacles is also inverted; in *Callirhoe* they are serious only in the earlier phase, the *anabasis*, while the *katabasis* is accomplished with speed and ease.

Moreover, while the return of the Ten Thousand comprises both a difficult journey to the sea (*katabasis*) and then further difficulties as they travel along the coast (*parabasis*), Chaereas and Callirhoe are not in the heart of the empire but already on the sea—on an island, in fact. There is no 'Thalatta! Thalatta!' moment here. Ships are not hard to come by, as they are for Xenophon and the Cyreans, because the lovers have a whole fleet of them at their disposal. And while the novel's hero and heroine do have a sort of intermediate step, a *parabasis* to Cyprus, as I suppose one might think of it, the real dangers are all past. The actual journey from Cyprus to Syracuse is limited to a single extended sentence at 8,6,1.

In their return Chaereas and Callirhoe enact a resolution of all the tremendous tensions that run through the world and narrative of the *Anabasis*.⁸⁰ Exiles and mercenaries are given new homes and new communities,⁸¹ families are reunited, the king's satraps are all satisfied, the Egyptian rebels are

⁸⁰ Compare Alvares 1997, 624.

⁸¹ The Lacedaemonian exile in 8,2,11–13 seems to me to stand in for all the Ten Thousand in the novel, but especially for Clearchus, himself an exiled Spartan who dies in a foreign land because of a love of war and his inability to reintegrate into peacetime Sparta. At the end of the novel Syracuse can incorporate such men properly, while in the *Anabasis* they continue their rootless lives. Regarding the Spartan exile, Laplace 1997, 52 compares him and his speech to that of Cheirisophus in *An.* 3,2,1–3.

peacefully reconciled with the king, and the Persians and Greeks learn to coexist. This détente between Greeks and barbarians is explicit: Chaereas has gained the king's friendship for the Syracusans (8,8,10), Callirhoe and Stateira have become pen pals (8,4,8), and Chaereas even brings some of the Egyptians to settle in Syracuse (8,8,14).⁸²

VI. Conclusion

On the level of individual allusions to and recollections of the *Anabasis* there is frequently a particular emotional, ethical, thematic, or narrative texture introduced into a reading of *Callirhoe* by their recognition. More importantly, these connections cumulatively form a network of intertextuality that allows readers familiar with the hypotext to create a set of expectations and hypotheses based on their familiarity with the *Anabasis* and then test these against the novel's plot as it actually unfolds. The importance of this web of intertextuality, however, is not done justice when put in these terms. In fact, the *Anabasis* is integral to the very conception of the novel. I do not mean that *Callirhoe* is a rewritten version of Xenophon's memoir—or, at least, I do not mean that this is all it is. Chariton dexterously manages a complex set of allusions that show both convergence with and divergence from the *Anabasis*, but any total reading of the novel will have to take into account not only deeper analysis and further details of how the *Anabasis* is deployed, but how Chariton orchestrates an intricate arrangement of multiple model texts aside from Xenophon's. If I have not offered such a complete reading, nonetheless I hope it is now clear that Chariton's use of the *Anabasis* shows at every step an authorial self-awareness and impressive sense of control, not to mention remarkable creativity in actively reshaping the literary tradition.⁸³

⁸² In a nice twist, we might also note that Chaereas brings a small measure of freedom to the barbarian world, ensuring that his non-Greek allies have the opportunity to choose whether they wish to accompany him or not. On the other hand, this only goes so far; they do not receive full citizenship, as Alvares 1997, 624 notes. For a broader, and too strongly put, reading of this point without reference to the *Anabasis*, see Doody 1996, 36: "Sicily" comes to represent an escape from tyranny. At the end, some of the bravest among Persia's subjugated peoples (Greeks, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Cypriots) choose to join Chaereas in his return to a free land. A concept of political freedom, even political revolt, hovers behind [the novel].⁷

⁸³ I would like to express my gratitude to the Loeb Classical Library Foundation, which supported my initial research on this topic.

Bibliography

- Alvares, J. 1997. 'Chariton's Erotic History', *AJPh* 118.4, 613–629.
- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.
- Bartsch, W. 1934. *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*, diss. Leipzig.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1992. 'De l'histoire au roman: la Perse de Chariton', in: M.-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, M. Trédé (eds.). *Le monde du roman grec: actes du colloque international tenu à l'École normale supérieure (Paris 17-19 décembre 1987)*, Paris: Presses de l'École normale supérieure, 199–212.
- Bassett, S. R. 1999. 'The Death of Cyrus the Younger', *CQ* 49.2, 473–483.
- Bowie, E. 1996. 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels', in: Schmeling 1996, 87–106.
- Briant P. 2006. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbraun's.
- Brown, T. S. 1986. 'Menon of Thessaly', *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 35.4, 387–404.
- Cobet, C. G. 1859. 'Annotationes Criticae ad Charitonem', *Mnemosyne* 8, 229–303.
- D'Orville, J. P. (ed.) 1750. Χαρίτωνος Ἀφροδισιέως τῶν περὶ Χαίρειαν καὶ Καλλιρρόην Ἐρωτικῶν Διηγημάτων Λόγοι η', Amsterdam: Peter Mortier.
- Danzig, G. 2007. 'Xenophon's Wicked Persian, or, What's Wrong with Tissaphernes? Xenophon's Views on Lying and Breaking Oaths', in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian Responses: Political and cultural interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*, Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 27–50.
- Dillery, J. 1995. *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Doody, M. A. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goold, G. P. (ed. and trans.), 1995. *Chariton: Callirhoe*, Cambridge, Mass.: Loeb Classical Library/Harvard University Press.
- Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- Hägg, T. 1994. *Parthenope: Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969–2004)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Holzberg, N. 1995. *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Holzberg, N. 1996. 'The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe', in: Schmeling 1996, 11–28.
- Householder, F. W. 1978. Review of G. Schmeling, *Chariton*, in: *CJ* 73.3, 265–267.
- Hunter, R. 1994. 'History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton', *ANRW* II.34.2, 1055–1086. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Jakob, J. 1903. *Studien zu Chariton dem Erotiker. Erster Teil*, Aschaffenburg: Programm des K. Humanistischen Gymnasiums Aschaffenburg.
- Kuch, H. 1996. 'A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: "Barbarians" and Others', in: Schmeling 1996, 209–220.
- Lane Fox, R. (ed.). 2004. *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Laplace, M. 1980. 'Les légendes troyennes dans le roman de Chariton, *Chairéas et Callirhoé*', *REG* 93, 83–125.
- Laplace, M. 1997. 'Le Roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence', *RhM* 140, 38–71.
- Luginbill, R. D. 2000. 'Chariton's use of Thucydides' *History* in Introducing the Egyptian Revolt', *Mnemosyne* 53, 1–11.

- Ma, J. 2004. 'You Can't Go Home Again: Displacement and Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in: R. Lane Fox (ed.), 330–345.
- Manuwald, G. 2000. 'Zitate als Mittel des Erzählens – Zur Darstellungstechnik Charitons in seinem Roman Kallirhoe', *WJA* 24, 97–122.
- Marchant, E. C. 1961 (repr.). *Xenophontis opera omnia*, Vol. 3, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miller, M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Müller, C. W. 1976. 'Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike', *A&A* 22, 115–136.
- Nimis, S. 2003. 'In mediis rebus: Beginning Again in the Ancient Novel', in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden: Brill, 255–269.
- Papanikolaou, A. D. 1973. *Chariton-Studien*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Perry, B. E. 1930. 'Chariton and his Romance from the Literary-Historical Point of View', *AJPh* 51, 93–134.
- Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley – Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Plepelits, K. 1976. *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe*, Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Reardon, B. P. 1996. 'Chariton', in: G. L. Schmeling (ed.), 309–335.
- Reardon, B. P. (ed.), 2004. *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*, Munich – Leipzig: K. G. Saur.
- Salmon, P. 1961. 'Chariton d'Aphrodisias et la révolte égyptienne de 360 avant J.-C.', *CE* 36, 365–376.
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. 1989. 'Gifts in the Persian Empire', in P. Briant, C. Herrenschmidt (eds.), *Le Tribut dans l'Empire Perse*, Paris: Peeters, 129–146.
- Schmeling, G. L. 1974. *Chariton*, New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc.
- Schmeling, G. L. (ed.) 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill.
- Schmidt, T. S. 2002. 'Plutarch's Timeless Barbarians and the Age of Trajan', in: P. Stadter, L. Van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 57–71.
- Schwartz, S. 2003. 'Rome in the Greek Novel? Images and Ideas of Empire in Chariton's Persia', *Arethusa* 36, 375–394.
- Smith, S. D. 2007. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton*, *AN Suppl.* 9, Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.
- Trzaskoma, S. M. 2010. *Two Novels from Ancient Greece: Chariton's Callirhoe and Xenophon of Ephesos' An Ephesian Story*, Indianapolis – Cambridge: Hackett Publishing.
- Trzaskoma, S. M. Forthcoming a. 'Why Miletus? Chariton's Choice of Setting and Xenophon's *Anabasis*', *Mnemosyne* 64.
- Trzaskoma, S. M. Forthcoming b. 'Citations of Xenophon in Chariton', in: K. Chew, J. R. Morgan (eds.), *The Greek Novel and the Second Sophistic*.
- Tuplin, C. 2004. 'The Persian Empire', in: R. Lane Fox (ed.), 154–183.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2009. 'Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works', in: M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis, G. Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel*, *AN Suppl.* 12, Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 36–50.
- Zimmermann, F. 1961. 'Chariton und die Geschichte', in: R. Günther and G. Schrot (eds.), *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse im alten Orient und im klassischen Altertum*, Berlin: Deutsche Historiker-Gesellschaft, 329–345.