

S.M. TRZASKOMA (trans.), *Two Novels from Ancient Greece. Callirhoe and An Ephesian Story*
2010, pp. xxxvii, 195. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
Paper \$13.95
ISBN 9781603841924

Reviewed by Aldo Tagliabue, University of Wales Trinity Saint David,
Lampeter Campus. Email: a.tagliabue@tsd.ac.uk.

“The aim of an edition such as the present one is [...] above all to present the texts themselves - primarily in a way that facilitates a reader’s direct and immediate contact with them and, secondarily, in a way that provides broad context for such contact” (XXXIII). And the intended audience – as we discover later – is composed of “general readers and students” (182). With this presentation, Stephen Trzaskoma (T. from now on), Associate Professor of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at the University of New Hampshire, highlights the originality of his book.

This publication constitutes a new step in the study of ancient fiction. During the last century the Greek novels were so neglected by classicists that editions of them were scarcely produced. However, this attitude has recently changed. Since the publication of *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* in 1989, edited by Reardon,¹ the Greek novel as a genre has become increasingly popular in the study of Classics; and both Chariton’s and Xenophon’s texts have been published in the Teubner series by Reardon and O’Sullivan,² and in the Loeb series by Goold and Henderson.³ Although T. became aware of Henderson’s project only after he was commissioned to produce this publication, the aim of his edition is clearly not to remedy a lack of translations,

¹ Reardon, B.P. (ed.) (1989), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley: University of California Press. In this volume Chariton is translated by Brian Reardon, while Xenophon by Graham Anderson.

² Cf. Reardon, B.P. (2004), *Chariton. De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, München/Leipzig: Saur; O’Sullivan, J.N. (2005), *Xenophon Ephesus. De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, München/Leipzig: Saur.

³ Cf. Goold, G.P. (1995), *Chariton: Callirhoe*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Henderson, J. (2009), *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe. Xenophon of Ephesus: Anthia and Habrocomes*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press. In addition, the *Ephesiaca* has also been translated by Moses Hadas in Hansen, W. (1998), *Ancient Greek Popular Literature*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 3-49.

but to make Xenophon and Chariton accessible to those who are no experts in Classics.

For this reason, T. adopts a non-traditional approach. First, he decides to combine the so-called “pre-sophistic novels”, challenging those scholars who see them as unworthy of consideration. This choice is very appropriate for undergraduate students: *Callirhoe* and the *Ephesiaca* can provide them with an idea of the Greek novel, without requiring them to pick up the intricate threads of Achilles Tatius’ and Heliodorus’ texts or to interpret the sophisticated construction of Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, which are more appropriate to a postgraduate class. The second innovation concerns the translation technique: as the author himself declares, at the beginning he tried to write texts which “were more [...] colloquial and non-literary” (XXXVI); but then he realized that this approach was creating “a growing gap between the content and the language of the stories and the language of the translations” (ibid.). Thus, he decided to “follow a middle way and produced English versions [...] which give a strong sense of how these authors come across in the original Greek” (XXXVI). In other words, the author suggests that his translation is less formal than usual but, at the same time, is not distant from the Greek. Before offering examples of this special style, I will first consider the introduction to the book.

The introduction

This section is conceived as a general survey of the study of ancient novels, as the author addresses issues of genre, audience, plot, style, intertextuality, and informs the readers about dates and titles, and the identities of Chariton and Xenophon.

Although the overall tone of the discussion is general, on more than one occasion T. advances criticism of unsolved scholarly problems. For instance, in the analysis of novelistic readership he includes the novelists; this is certainly an important topic which requires more detailed work, as Tim Whitmarsh shows in his recent book.⁴ In addition, T.’s view of the traditional identification of the “highly educated elite of the empire” (XVIII) as the audience of the Greek novels is most suggestive: “proving that one sort of audience read or could have read the novels is one thing, but such an argument can never prove that another audience did not read them” (XVIII). A

⁴ See Whitmarsh, T. (2011), *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

similar problematizing approach characterizes the discussion of the common structure shared by the novels, in which T. takes into account the loss of other exemplars: “if we had only five Greek tragedies by five different authors instead of thirty-one we actually have [...], how different would our view of Athenian drama be?” (XIX). At the same time, our author does not spare detailed analysis when dealing with specific issues and this is particularly true in relation to *Callirhoe*: his discussion of Persius’ testimony for the date of this novel (XXIV – XXV) is precise, as it includes a review of different scholarly views, and his skeptical conclusion takes issue with the positive assessment of the same source given by Tilg in his book.⁵

Finally, T. suggests a new assessment of both novels, which has a different origin. On the one hand, he highlights the highly literary status of *Callirhoe*. In his opinion, scholars “have significantly underestimated both the amount and the sophistication of Chariton’s purposeful intertextuality” (XXXI). Conversely, his interplay with classical historians and other models shows the clear limit of defining *Callirhoe* as a pre-sophistic novel. On the other hand, T. believes in Xenophon’s “intertextual primitiveness” (XXXI), as this author “refers to famous episodes and plot elements of classical literature only obliquely” (XVI); however, the *Ephesiaca* “as an action story is hardly matched in antiquity” (XXXIII).

In conclusion, “we are dealing with two works that still can and ought to be read and responded to as literature, rather than merely as data” (XXXIII). Thus, the challenge of this book is to offer a version of these novels which can attract young students and, at the same time, preserve and highlight their different literary value.

The translation of the Ephesiaca: the general tone

This double purpose can be well documented in the translation of the *Ephesiaca*, which I shall discuss first. From the beginning, T. adopts an emphatic language, which includes some variations from the original. First, he tries to engage the readers by giving a vivid translation of καὶ γάρ: “it was the custom in that festival, you see” (1.2.3). Then, he adopts a good number of idioms which belong to the spoken language. The pirate Corymbus “thought it impossible to seduce (πεῖσαι) Habrocomes” (1.15.1, Goold), but T. writes: “he didn’t think he had a shot at winning Habrocomes”. Then, in Habro-

⁵ See Tilg, S. (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, New York: Oxford University Press, 69-78.

comes' first monologue, the protagonist refers to his past resistance to Eros with the informal American verb "he bad-mouthed the god" (1.4.1). Finally, a simple sentence such as ὅπου γὰρ Ἄβροκόμης ὀφθείη (1.1.6) becomes "wherever Habrocomes put in an appearance"; here the phrasal verb places an emphasis on the protagonist's attitude, which is not suggested by the Greek text and which Anderson does not include in his "wherever Habrocomes appeared".

Furthermore, in direct speech T. often divides long sentences into smaller ones, as we see in Anthia's lament when captured by Clytos: "Traitorous beauty! Unlucky good looks! Why do you keep tormenting me?" (5.5.5). The original text, instead, contains just commas and not exclamation marks: «ὦ κάλλος ἐπίβουλον» λέγουσα, «ὦ δυστυχῆς εὐμορφία, τί μοι παραμένετε ἐνοχλοῦντα;». This change highlights the heroine's suffering at this stage of her journey, as it makes the tone of her speech more tragic. A similar effect is caused by the use of dashes to highlight the characters' feelings, as when the pirates unwillingly deliver the protagonists to their superior: "Euxeinos and Corymbos relinquished Habrocomes and his party to Apsyrτος – grudgingly, perhaps" (2.2).

Finally, this vivid language becomes more emphatic when T. translates Xenophon's erotic expressions. The rise of Corymbos' love for Habrocomes, which in the Greek text is described with one verb – αὐτὸν ἢ πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον συνήθεια ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξέκαιε (1.14.7) – is amplified by T. in "spending so much time with the young man fanned the flame of his love even more". This idiomatic expression clearly places an emphasis on the power of *eros*. Similarly, the direct declaration of Corymbos' love for Habrocomes becomes "Corymbos had fallen in love – deeply in love", while in the Greek text we find: ἐρᾷ ὁ Κόρυμβος τοῦ Ἄβροκόμου καὶ σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα (1.14.7).

Are these changes to the original text appropriate in the context of T.'s aims? A first positive answer comes from the perspective of his declared audience: with his readable and fluent text "general readers and students" (182) are helped to minimize their distance from classical literature. Furthermore, it is important to investigate how this translation relates to the original and I would argue that with his modern perspective T. does not render Xenophon's exact words, but has the merit of expressing the meaning of the text. The *Ephesiaca* contains many dramatic features, as its high number of monologues proves,⁶ and T.'s listed variations make this evident. The

⁶ See Morgan, J.R. (2004), 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in I. de Jong, R. Nunlist, and A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden:

only limitation, perhaps, is that T. makes the whole story seem comical even when it is not, hiding those few passages where Xenophon gives moral nuances of the protagonists' erotic ideal.⁷ For example, in Habrocomes' reaction to Corymbos' erotic proposal there is not just a frightening and grotesque portrait of the enemy, but also the contrast between his chastity – σωφοροσύνη (2.1.4) – and the pirate's "shameful lust", τὴν αἰσχρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν (2.1.3). However, when this last phrase appears, T. writes the question: "To hand myself to a horny pirate and his shameful lust?". His rendering of ληιστῆι ἐρῶντι with the informal adjective "horny pirate", which differs from Henderson's "amorous pirate", makes it difficult to hear the serious tone of Habrocomes' reaction.

In addition, T.'s choice of introducing American idioms into his text leads us to ask whether his translation can be universally appreciated. In my opinion, the benefits of this work especially concern American English speakers, who are familiar with the spoken language adopted by T. Conversely, it is more difficult for British and international readers to have the same experience, since they might ignore either the exact meaning or the original context of some of the expressions, and this would alter their understanding of them.

While the loss of the moralizing concern appears an inevitable but minor consequence of this translation, the second criticism paradoxically stresses its virtue; our author seems to throw into question the common principle that an English version of a classical text should be readable everywhere, and with this challenge T. might be a translator closer to the original than many others: Greek texts, including the novels, were generally written for a specific audience and, certainly, not for the majority of the inhabitants of the ancient world. But I will return to this at the end of my review.

The translation of the Ephesiaca: detailed analysis

On further examination, T. offers some renderings which show a philological originality.

Brill, 489-493, 491: "in contrast to Chariton, the narrator of our novel is often content to let the characters speak for themselves: roughly two-thirds of the text can be classified as showing rather than telling".

⁷ On the existence of an erotic and moral education in the *Ephesiaca*, see Tagliabue, A., 'The *Ephesiaca* as a *Bildungsroman*', in this volume, 17-46.

A convincing passage is the eighth verse of Apollo's enigmatic oracle, in which T., like Henderson, correctly follows Locella's variant ποταμοῦ ἱεροῦ, against O'Sullivan's ποταμοῦ Νεῖλου. As Morgan argues, "the reference to the Nile is clearly a corruption, since in the next chapter the parents ask which river the oracle meant".⁸ In addition, Trzaskoma deals very well with the verb παραμυθέομαι, which characterizes the reaction of the protagonists' fathers to the oracle: "Ἐδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς [...] παραμυθήσασθαι τὸν χρησμὸν ὡς οἶόν τε καὶ συζεδῆσαι γάμωι τοὺς παῖδας (1.7.2). Although Zimmermann and Griffiths translate the verb with "fulfil",⁹ most scholars choose "appease",¹⁰ because in their understanding the parents' decision would otherwise appear sadistic. Only T. takes the older view: "they [...] felt it best to go along with the oracle as best they could...". In my opinion, the correctness of his translation is proven by the context of this passage, where Xenophon adds the statement: ὡς τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλομένου (1.7.2). This suggests that the parents' choice of marriage is a sincere attempt to obey the god's will. In addition, as Griffiths argues, "it is only by a projection of modern ideas into the past that the reaction to the oracle in this novel becomes ridiculous. To the ancient mind oracles must be respected".¹¹ Thus, in this case T.'s choice seems to pay tribute to the *Ephesiaca's* plot and spirit.

On the other hand, there is a passage in which the translation and the philological explanation are less satisfactory: in the description of Anthia's eyes – ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί, φαιδροὶ μὲν ὡς κόρης, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος (1.2.6) – T. retains the manuscript κόρης and does not follow O'Sullivan's proposal of καλῆς supported by Aristaenetus with φαιδροὶ μὲν ὡς καλοῦ (1.10.7-8). This is T.'s comment: "Aristaenetus would have had to change κόρης in any case because of the change of gender in adaptation, since κούρου would not have been an option for him" (194). Although this point is correct, in my opinion it does not exclude the possibility that Aristaenetus changed καλῆς to καλοῦ, and a careful analysis of the *Ephesiaca's* passage suggests that the presence of καλῆς might make more sense than that of κόρης. To begin with, καλῆς establishes a significant link with σώφρονος:

⁸ Morgan, J.R. (2007), 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in I.J.F. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 453-466, 461.

⁹ Cf. Zimmermann, F.W. (1949-50), 'Die *Ephesiakà* des sogenannten Xenophon von Ephesos. Untersuchungen zur Technik und Komposition', *WJA* 4, 252-286, 262, n. 4 and Griffiths, J.G. (1978), 'Xenophon of Ephesus on Isis and Alexandria', in M.B. Boer and T.A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à M.. J. Vermaseren*, Leiden: Brill, 409-437, 415.

¹⁰ See Ruiz Montero, C. 1994. 'Xenophon von Ephesos: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2, 1088-1138, 1100-1101 for a survey.

¹¹ Griffiths (n. 9) 1978, 415.

the entire phrase has a parallel construction, as the adjective γοργοί is expanded with φαιδροί and φοβεροί, and the existence of two adjectives such as καλῆς and σώφρονος, both used substantively, would conform better to this rhetorical device, which is a key feature of the *Ephesiaca*'s style.¹² Furthermore, as both καλός and σώφρων would respectively refer to Anthia's beauty and chastity, they would mark an opposition between the physical and the spiritual side of the heroine, which perfectly matches what Xenophon writes in Habrocomes' presentation: "the young man was quite egotistic, exulting in his intellectual accomplishments but much more so in his physical beauty" (1.1.4). Thus, following our interpretation, we would be dealing here with another sign of that symmetry which is peculiar to Xenophon's protagonists in the entire novel.¹³

The translation of Callirhoe: the general tone

The main features of the translation of the *Ephesiaca* occur also in T.'s translation of Chariton: informal and idiomatic expressions are widespread in T.'s version of *Callirhoe* and make it appropriate for general readers.

A case in point is Chaereas' description by one of Callirhoe's suitors: "But when the guy who didn't do a bit of work to get the girl is picked instead of us, I won't put up with the insult" (1.2.2). Goold's rendering is certainly more formal: "Since we have been passed over for one who made no effort to win the wife, I cannot bear the insult", while Reardon's one is closer to T.'s: "But we have been passed over for a man who made no effort to win the bride, and I am not putting up with that insult". In addition, as in the *Ephesiaca*, T. tends to emphasize the presence of *eros*. Thus, the love of the members of the gymnasium for Chaereas is expressed with the sentence "for the other young men thought the world of him", a very idiomatic rendering of ἐφίλει, "loved" in Goold. Finally, T. modernizes his text with the adoption of expressions which come from our contemporary society: so the suitors' assembly becomes "a joint planning session" (1.2.1), an unexpected

¹² For two other examples, cf. the position of participles and adjectives in γενοῦ μὴ πικρὸς μόνον ἀντέχοντι, ἀλλ' εὐεργέτης ἡττωμένοι (1.4.5) and the sentence πείθειν οὗτος μὲν Ἄβροκόμην, Κόρυμβος δὲ Ἀνθίαν (1.15.6).

¹³ See Konstan, D. (1994), *Sexual Symmetry. Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 26: "Habrocomes and Anthia are simply the clearest examples of the equivalence of the male and the female amatory roles that is specific to the novel".

rendering of βουλευτήριον κοινόν, which Goold translates as: “they took counsel together”.

Overall, this new approach to the text works very well when Chariton’s style displays theatrical and comic effects. This is particularly evident in the trial in Babylon, in which the main characters of the novel seem truly to appear on stage. Here, very cleverly T. transforms the duel between Chae-reas and Dionysus into a *stichomythia*, as it is suggested by the layout of the page:

“I’m her first husband,” Chaireas said.

“I’m a more steadfast one,” Dionysios replied (5.8.5).

Neither Reardon nor Goold tried anything similar.

Unlike the *Ephesiaca*, however, *Callirhoe* has a great number of passages in which the tone of the narration becomes genuinely serious and the style elevated. In these cases, T. still includes vivid expressions, but, at the same time, looks for a more sophisticated language. This “middle way” (XXXVI), as it is called by T., confirms that his engagement with the text does not only aim to present a readable text, but also to reproduce the meaning of the original. A case in point is the description of Dionysius’ falling in love with Callirhoe: the former fights a battle with his reason to resist Eros, and his words display a philosophical colour which elevates the tone of his speech.¹⁴ For example, in one of his monologues we read: “Dionysius, aren’t you ashamed of yourself? You are the first man in Ionia in virtue and repute (ἀρετῆς τε καὶ δόξης). Satraps and princes and whole cities admire you. And you’re suffering a schoolboy crush (παιδαρίου πράγμα). You’ve fallen in love at first sight” (2.4.4). In this passage, Chariton holds a delicate balance between seriousness and irony, since both the Greek words which designate Dionysius’ virtues have an epic origin, while τὸ παιδάριον is often used by Greek comedians to make their audience laugh.¹⁵ Interestingly, T.’s renderings express the same mismatch: the first three sentences are written in a formal style, as the noun “repute” shows, while the introduction of “schoolboy crush” has a comical effect on the readers.

A similar linguistic mix emerges in the scene of the first encounter between the protagonists: “So by chance they ran into one another at a narrow bend in the road (περὶ τινα καμπήν) and met, the god orchestrating this en-

¹⁴ On the existence of this colour, see Repath, I. (2007), ‘Emotional Conflict and Platonic Psychology in the Greek novel’, in J.R. Morgan and M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, AN suppl. 10. Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 53-84, 64-8.

¹⁵ See for example Ar. *Nub.* 821, Av. 494, and Pl. 823.

counter (τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτευσαμένου) so that each could see the other. Swiftly they aroused in each other a passion of equal intensity, remarkable beauty meeting its match” (1.1). In this passage, whose Greek is difficult to reconstruct, Chariton again seems to associate classical and solemn phrases such as τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτευσαμένου with the more colloquial term καμπή, which is first related to roads by Aristophanes.¹⁶ This juxtaposition is preserved by T., who combines an informal register, which emerges in the phrase “they ran into one another” and in the use of -ing forms, to a formal vocabulary, suggested by “each could see the other”, “swiftly” and “a passion of equal intensity”.

As a result, with Chariton, T. engages his intended audience in a more challenging way: a friction between American idioms and formal language becomes the expedient to preserve a key feature of the original. In this way, our author breaks the silent agreement of classicists that a translation of an ancient text should be as formal as possible. Thus, whether T.’s approach is appreciated or not, its assessment requires patience and openness, since we are not used to it.

The translation of Callirhoe: detailed analysis

The interest of this translation is also enriched by a great number of footnotes, in which T. provides his readers with essential information and introduces many intertextual references. In addition, in the endnotes the philological engagement is quite detailed, as the author enters into dialogue with Reardon’s “excellent critical edition” (XXXI).

Thus, at the very beginning of the novel, T. suggests, against Reardon, that we retain the manuscript reading παρθένου referred to Aphrodite, and he uses Apuleius’ Psyche as an argument, as she is defined as a “second Venus endowed with the flower of virginity” (Apul. *Met.* 4.28.4). In my opinion, this suggestive comparison might be supported by the fact that the beginning of Apuleius’ shares with our novel’s opening the motif of the fame of a woman’s beauty which attracts many suitors.¹⁷ In addition, the worship of Psyche as Aphrodite might recall what happens to Callirhoe in Miletus (Char. 2.3.6). Thus, it is not impossible that Apuleius took his definition of the goddess from Chariton. Further support for this hypothesis comes from

¹⁶ See *Ar. Pax.* 905, where this term designates the “turning-post in a race-course” (*LSJ*, s.v. καμπή). Before Aristophanes, the word usually relates to the bending of rivers.

¹⁷ Cf. Char. 1.1.2 and Apul. 4.28.4.

Stephen Harrison's view that Apuleius drew Isis from Xenophon's novel;¹⁸ if we accept his thesis, the possibility that Apuleius read also Chariton is not difficult to propose.

A second interesting note concerns the description of the wedding night, where, against the scholarly consensus, T. proposes τὸ πλῆθος as the object and not as the subject of ἀπέλιπον (Char. 1.1.15). The difference in the interpretation is substantial: in the first case the translation is "the crowd made some room", while in the second "they left the crowd at the door". In my opinion, to contest the common reading of this passage is a very good idea: as T. declares, ἀπέλιπον taken as "made some room" creates a "slightly strained sense" (190), since this verb is usually transitive. In addition, τὸ πλῆθος has twenty-two other occurrences as a subject in *Callirhoe* and only in one case it is followed by a verb at the third person plural.¹⁹ This makes its role of subject of ἀπέλιπον unlikely. However, in T.'s rendering "the servants" of the previous sentence becomes the subject and one might argue that the attribution of this action to them is also unlikely. T., being aware of this, adds the following comment: "it is possible that Chariton has compressed the description of the wedding beyond the point of clarity or something has fallen out with a resulting gap" (190). While the second option is certainly possible but difficult to prove, the first one is supported by a general mood conveyed by Chariton's text: this novelist likes arousing sexual desire with his writing, as it happens with Callirhoe's bath in Miletus (2.2.1-4).²⁰ Thus, he might be truly inviting his readers to imagine that more took place on the wedding night than what is described. Further support for this idea comes from the description of the same event made by Xenophon of Ephesus, in which a similar sense of mystery is given, as only the protagonists are allowed to see the canopy where Aphrodite's and Ares' love is depicted (see 1.8.2). Similarly, also at the end of Longus' novel the wedding guests and readers are left outside the bedroom door, when the protagonists have their desired sexual consummation (see. 4.40.2-3).

Conversely, a stylistic choice which I do not find completely persuasive is the inclusion of the Homeric quotations in the main corpus of the text. For example, at the end of the protagonists' reunion, we read in sequence: "And

¹⁸ See Harrison, S.J. (2007), 'Parallel Cults? Religion in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Some Greek Novels', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S. Harrison and M. Zimmerman (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel. Parallel Readings, AN Suppl. 8*, Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 204-218, 216.

¹⁹ This is the only other exception: τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ταῖς οἰκίας φθονοῦσαι τὴν ξένην εὐδοκίμησαι συνήχοντο (5.4.2).

²⁰ See Morgan, J.R. (2004), *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris and Philips, 161.

when they had had enough tears and tales, falling into each other's arms, gladly they turned to the rite of their old bed". T. makes this passage special through an unusual poetic style. However, writing the Homeric verses in the middle of the page, as Reardon and Goold do, could have helped the students to identify these important quotations and to become familiar with this inter-textual approach which is typical of Chariton and completely extraneous to Xenophon.

Conclusion

On the whole, this book is a new step in the reception of ancient fiction in the contemporary world. I would recommend it not only to its intended audience, but also to scholars of ancient novels, since, as I have shown, T. subtly suggests new philological interpretations which are worth considering. I also wonder whether this student-oriented and modernized approach to translation might open a new trend in classical scholarship, which could lead to a revision of what is meant by translating an ancient text. While I am curious about the possible outcome of other such attempts, I believe that T.'s technique suits perfectly texts such as *Callirhoe* and the *Ephesiaca*, as their engaging and straightforward narrative encourages overcoming the formal traditional approach to ancient texts.

This consideration leads me to a final speculation. In 2003 Konstantin Doulamis suggested that Chariton's and Xenophon's texts were probably intended not only for *pepaideumenoï*, but also for a less-educated audience.²¹ T. is writing his translation for non classicists. Although his book with its modern style introduces a chronological distance from the original, it might paradoxically take Chariton and Xenophon back to one of the original contexts of their reception. This re-translation is definitely not a simplified version of classical texts, but a literary work which seems to promote "cultural recontextualization".²²

²¹ Cf. Doulamis, K. (2003), *The Rhetoric of Eros in Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton: a Stylistic and Interpretative Study*, diss. Exeter, 122: "Xenophon's novel may indeed have been intended for a larger audience comprising both highly and less well educated readers" and 233: "Chariton seems to have both a readership of *pepaideumenoï* and one of less highly educated people in mind".

²² On the value of this term, see Pagano 2000 (n. 16).