Introduction

GARETH SCHMELING
University of Florida

The theme of this volume, 'The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel,' allows the contributors the freedom (intended by the organizers) to use their skills to examine the real and the ideal within the works of the genre. Contributors to the volume were of course encouraged to interpret the parameters of the theme.

Despite the lively and long-standing discussion of the fantasmatic role that Egypt played in the Greek and Roman novel, scholars have paid much less attention to the ways in which prose fiction figured within the field of Egyptian cultural production. Accordingly, Daniel Selden's essay on 'The Political Economy of Romance in Late Period Egypt' discusses four texts written in Egypt or widely read there from the Persian occupation through the Islamic conquest (565 BC – AD 643): the Old Aramaic *Life of Aḥīqar*, penned during the first Persian regime; the Bentresh Stele, carved in Late Middle Egyptian hieroglyphs and erected at Karnak, either during Egypt's last period of independence or under the early Ptolemaic kings; Chariton of Aphrodisias' Greek novel *Callirhoe*, a product of the early Roman Empire; and finally, the Coptic *Kambyses Romance*, whose single manuscript can be dated on palaeographical grounds to the late sixth or even seventh century AD. The paper offer three principal findings: the language of novelistic production in Egypt varies with the language of political administration; each of the novels, from an indigenous point of view, constitutes a political allegory of Egypt's increasing marginalization within the Leventine-Mediterranean world system, as it evolved from the Persian Empire through the Roman and Byzantine periods; and finally, together the novels form a coherent set of texts in which each tale both stands on its own and yet remains related to the other members of the corpus. Selden's omission of the Demotic novel from the discussion is, therefore, to be regretted, though it is not difficult to see how the tales about Setne

Khamwas, for example, 'who spent his time in the study of ancient monuments and books,' would fit into this general literary-historical picture.

In his essay ' "But there is a difference in the ends …": Brigands and Teleology in the Ancient Novel,' Ken Dowden tackles the thorny problem of robbers and murderers in ideal fiction. After defining brigands and reviewing Greek and Latin words for the various kinds, he looks at the individual brigands, groups them, and considers whole towns of them. Novel evidence comes from Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, and Apuleius. The novelists found descriptions of brigands in earlier history, but also added new characteristics to give them a role and function in the novel: brigands exist so that heroes might destroy them and so entertain the reader. Dowden, however, is also concerned with the brigand community as a subject of interest in itself, and he readily acknowledges the difficulty of discussing their reality because they have been fictionalized. In Chariton, Apuleius, and Achilles Tatius he observes that the brigands have a structural position in the narrative: they tend to occupy an early or middle position in the text. Not so in Xenophon of Ephesus who scatters brigands and pirates throughout his novel: 'Whatever Xenophon's novel has been about, it requires a constant presence of brigands to contextualize the trajectory of the hero and heroine.' While many critics in the past have found Xenophon's novel the least well written, Dowden points out the curious novelistic innovations in the characters Hippothoos (from good to bad to good) and Habrocomes the ideal hero who for a short time travels with the brigand Hippothoos, and together they do a bit of roistering – not something ideal heroes should do. Since brigands and ideal characters interact with each other at many levels, Dowden observes that '… any novel that finds much room for brigand society … must necessarily constitute at some level a discourse on civilized or ideal society.'

Froma Zeitlin in 'Landscapes and Portraits: Signs of the Uncanny and Illusions of the Real' focuses in general on ecphrasis and visual arts, and then more specifically on Achilles Tatius and the series of garden descriptions (landscape) and on the Andromeda 'episode' (portrait) in Heliodorus. The levels of interaction between viewer and object – 'the illusion of breaking the frame: that is, of the viewer entering the picture or a figure in the painting (or indeed the painting itself) passing into the zone of reality,' – are explored in depth, also in texts other than those of novels. In Achilles Tatius the love life of garden plants is confused with that of Clitophon and Leucippe, just as imitator and imitated and real and unreal are confused. Clitophon produces landscape paintings that seem to resemble 'the sometimes fantastic impressions of Roman wall frescoes, with the detailed representations, especially of plants,

flowers, and birds' (cf. the various 'styles' in Pompeii). Zeitlin singles out the peacock for Achilles Tatius' talents in word/images, rhetoric/art, real/ideal. The peacock in the flowering garden becomes Clitophon and Leucippe, who are more beautiful than nature. The novel of Heliodorus begins at the end with the birth of Charicleia, who emerges white from her mother's womb, a phenomenon caused by Persinna's gaze on the totally naked Andromeda during sex with Hydaspes (male gods and mortal women realize immediately that good sex for the gods equals pregnancy). The portrait of Andromeda has the power to walk through the painting and join reality, the reverse of what she had done when she became the portrait in the painting.

In 'The Loves of the Gods: Literature as Construction of a Space of Pleasure' Gianpiero Rosati first looks at Achilles Tatius 1.5.6 and then Petronius 83.1-4 and notes in both the legitimization of desire by a mythical model. Then he asks the basic question whether the loves of the gods might be seen as historical precedents for human loves, or as abstract/mythical paradigms. For the sake of comparison Rosati moves away from the novel proper to the novelistic character Hero (Ovid *Her*. 19) who presents a middle-class reality and who is an avid reader of divine love stories which seem to give character to her emotions. Rosati observes that 'stories about the gods' loves hold a particular attraction for women, both … in the world of myth and … of the novel.' The story of divine loves, popular in literature and painting, are interpolated in other love stories, as ecphrasis or story-within-story, e.g., and via these love stories the 'novel creates a free space inside itself … the *mythoi* of the divine loves create a space of pleasure …' Reading episodes of divine loves is probably akin to looking at paintings of people making love, but these pictorial scenes of love acts were probably not merely illustrations of sexual practices but in truth offered 'an upper-class fantasy for the lower-class viewer.' The loves of the gods legitimize the fantasies of mortals, and comments in the ancient novel on erotic literature and art are important in the 'history of the discourse of desire.'

In 'Comedy in Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*' Margaret Doody traces comical *elements* in Heliodorus' novel. She is not concerned with citations from or allusions to comic plays, as were previous scholars of comedy on Heliodorus, but with the novel's comicality, identified in the dissonance between the register which characters use to describe themselves (often tragic) and the author's laughter at their self-presentation. In this section her analysis follows along lines laid down by Thomas Paulsen, *Inszenierung des Schicksals* (Trier 1992). Another aspect of Heliodoran comicality is in another dissonance: between the chronological setting and the comic/tragic plays cited or referred to,

which are later than that setting, and therefore could not possibly have been used by the characters. The effect of putting into their mouths plots they could not know is comical because characters lose their 'reality', the illusion of being real, and come out as fictional. Doody calls this practice anachronism. She spots more elements of comicality in the discrepancy between the reference to an epic subtext (Achilles claiming Briseis as Thyamis claims Chariclea; Odysseus killing a ram for dinner as does Cnemon) and the non-epical situation/behavior of the characters involved. Finally she detects comicality in two features that distance Heliodorus from his models: the presence of processions and of gory scenes.

In 'Mythological Paradigms in the Greek Novels' Françoise Létoublon looks at the ways in which myths serve as paradigms for the young, inexperienced lovers who will need guidance as they become more mature and in need of help. The actions of the protagonists of the Greek novels, if analysed against a background of actions in myths, that is myths involving metamorphoses, often illustrate that art imitates nature and vice versa. Létoublon points out that, especially in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the Greek novels can be shown to reflect or refract themes and motifs in Greek mythology. As the protagonists grow, mature, find their way in the world, and evolve from unsophisticated to more sophisticated, the narrative of the novels becomes similar to life experiences, a *rite de passage*. Even Pan and Eros seem to be transformed in nature: their wild and uncontrolled behavior becomes almost mellow and certainly helpful and protective of young lovers. The maturing process in the young lovers is apparent in their radiant facial beauty which is reflective of their souls.

Starting from the well recognized influences of the *Odyssey* on the Greek novels, Silvia Montiglio in her essay ' "His eyes stood as though of horn or steel:" Odysseus' Fortitude and Moral Ideals in the Greek Novels,' compares moral ideals in the two sets of texts, drawing not only on the *Odyssey* of Homer but also on the moralizing interpretations of it that run roughly contemporary to the novel. The main question asked in the article is: do novelists espouse similar moral ideals as those contemporary moralists saw embodied in Odysseus? The answer given is both yes and no: yes, insofar as Odysseus' endurance, self-control, steadfastness, in short what moralists called his *arete*, is a noble aspiration in the novels; but also no, because that aspiration conflicts with the equally idealized demands of emotionality. Novelistic characters imitate Odysseus by trying to hide their emotions, but, if they are noble characters, in the end they fail because displaying emotions is the right thing to do.

Michael Paschalis in his essay 'The Basic Plot of *Callirhoe*: History, Myth, and Aristotelian *Poetics*,' considers a basic issue of the critics' examination of the materials which Chariton used to build his novel: is the novel both ideal and non-ideal? Using Aristotle's *Poetics* as a guide, can we with confidence always separate and distinguish the basic plot from the story? Was Ben Edwin Perry (1930, 1967) correct when he claimed that behind the narrative of *Callirhoe* lay the historical truth of a real-life Hermocrates (Syracusan official greatly responsible for the defeat of the Athenian invasion of 413 BC), whose daughter (Chariton names her Callirhoe) married Dionysius I, ruler of Syracuse 405-367 BC? Callirhoe's son was raised by a Dionysius of Miletus, who would later become ruler of Syracuse as Dionysius II? There are other interesting points of comparison between the extended family of Callirhoe and that of Dionysius I and II. The plot thickens, or the search behind the plot thickens. Because Chariton refers to and quotes from Homer so often, there is some scholarly opinion that behind Chaereas-Callirhoe-Dionysius lies Menelaus-Helen-Paris. Then, too, a powerful motif in *Callirhoe* is the anger of Chaereas, which sets the plot in motion by causing the *Scheintod* of Callirhoe. In the end it seems likely that Chariton used historical characters and real events to serve as antecedents of the actors in his novel.

Ewen Bowie in 'Caging Grasshoppers: Longus' Materials for Weaving "Reality" ' provides precise definitions for ideal and real: ideal characters and actions possess praiseworthy qualities, and they are better than the people and actions in our world; real describes situations which the reader will recognize as the kind he encounters in his own life. Thus the novels of Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus are ideal by reason of the characters' behavior, but their settings are as real as those of ancient historians. Longus' novel, however, is different: its general features and details do not come from personal observation or historical/political books, but from literary texts 'that are themselves presenting fiction,' i.e. Sappho and Theocritus. As Longus creatively borrows material from Theocritus 1 (Chloe 1.10.2 weaves a grasshopper cage, Theocritus 1.52-54 a boy does), he narrates a story 'four steps [removed] from the real world.' Bowie compares episodes in Longus 2.32, where Philetas with his son Tityrus plays a role in the action, with Theocritus 1 and similar actions; Longus 1.17 (Daphnis' hair, eyes, complexion whiter than goats' milk) with Theocritus 11 and with Sappho; Longus 3.32-34 and Daphnis' acquisition for Chloe of the fairest apple previously unattainable because it was at the top of the tree, with Sappho's *epithalamia* and Theocritus 28.7. Bowie's title of 'weaving "reality" ' reflects his view that Longus, while knowing that his, like other novelists', world is fictional, still

tries at times to create a world that might have existed (Chariton's world). The stress is on the fictionality rather than on the poetic status of the texts from which Longus borrows.

Mario Labate in his essay '*Tarde, immo iam sero intellexi*: the Real as a Puzzle in Petronius' *Satyrica*' looks back to the work of Ciaffi (1955) who identified 'the mechanics of the trap as the main narrative structure [of the *Satyrica*],' from which one or more of the trio of protagonists cannot extricate himself until an external force (similar to a *deus ex machina*) appears and frees him. Such a narrative *deus ex machina* appears in Cicero *Pro Caelio* 65, Horace *C.* 1.9, *Serm.* 1.8.46-50, 1.2.127-133, 1.9.72-78, 2.6.110-115. Labate notes that all verifiable endings of episodes in the *Satyrica* are abrupt: 15.7, 78.7-8, 115.1-5, fr. 1, and that a subtitle of the *Satyrica* thus could be 'Men on the Run' or 'Men in a Trap'. But what elements lead the trio into a trap: 'their insufficient ability to understand "reality" …', which becomes a dominant theme of the *Cena*. Labate shows that in 6.2-7.4 Petronius makes an episode out of Encolpius' inability to look around and comprehend what he sees. The episode on board Lichas' ship (100-115) shows how Encolpius unwittingly enters the trap which is Lichas' ship: there is no escape (though many plans are put forward), and Encolpius is caught like a rat and whipped; the storm and shipwreck serve as the *deus ex machina*. Lichas had met Encolpius earlier in a section no longer extant, and the episode at 100-115 might just represent a re-entrapment of the protagonists.

Jason König in 'Landscape and Reality in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*' divides his discussion into three parts: Fantasy Landscapes (Books 1-10), Landscape and the Body (Books 1-10) = physical presence of landscape, and Books 10-11 = Book 11 Changes Everything. Fantasy landscapes are rhetorical conceptions of landscapes, which stress their allusive and literary character. The first example adduced by König is from *Met.* 1.2.2: it begins with a literary landscape only to end with a sweaty horse. A succession of examples fills out the section in support of his approach. The memorable description of the bandits' mountain hideout (4.6.1-4) is carefully analyzed to show literary qualities which include inconsistency and absurdity and give rise to the *locus amoenus* and *locus horridus*. The second section which focuses on the physicality of landscapes with emphasis on rocks, cliffs, and their ability to kill is highlighted by the episode in 7.17.3-4 (the body and landscape) where the ass describes how the boy-tormentor is able to beat him with a stick, hitting the same spot again and again on his right hip until the hide is worn away and a wound opens up, making a hole or a pit or a window. But even the dirty reality of the scene is couched in fine rhetoric. Section three: Book 11 changes everything.

For the most part rhetorical and physical landscapes (which are really stageprops) are banished from here and replaced by higher realities – and by images of water and the sea. Isis sweeps away the threatening mountains landscapes of Books 1-10.

In 'Between Photis and Isis: Fiction, Reality, and the Ideal in *The Golden Ass* of Apuleius' Robert H.F. Carver begins his investigations by pointing out that Gustave Flaubert was dazzled by *The Golden Ass* and remarks on its high/low elements, i.e., bestial/celestial union. Carver returns to the motif of bestiality at the end of his paper. Two women appear to mark out two possible courses in the novel; they come sequentially and Lucius does not choose one over the other (magic/Photis/sex, and religion/Isis/no sex) but enjoys (?) both of them. Carver also compares Meroe and Charite, both have major roles in the novel (are their stories told because they prefigure what will happen to Lucius?), but neither has a long-term impact on Lucius – he gets to hear stories about them. On the road to Cenchreae Lucius (still an ass with an enormous member) copulates with a Corinthian *matrona* (10.21-22) who is compared with Pasiphae. His success here wins for him an appointment to copulate with a condemned woman before a crowd in the amphitheater (10.34). His escape from this appointment leads to Cenchreae. The *matrona* from Corinth, the Pasiphae look-alike, is compared with Photis, and Carver notes that in every respect except the socio-economic Photis is superior to the *matrona*. Some scholars claim that Photis is the *serviles ... voluptates* who leads to Lucius' downfall, but on closer examination she is probably a woman of real heart who is maligned. In Book 11 Lucius follows Isis, but perhaps not with whole heart or mind. Apuleius could easily have worked Photis back into the story and left Isis in Egypt, but he did not. We will have to agree, however, with a conclusion of Carver: 'The gap between Isis and Photis is not nearly so great as critics have made out.'

In 'The Erotics of *mimesis*: Gendered Aesthetics in Greek Theory and Fiction' Tim Whitmarsh begins with two references in Achilles Tatius, one to Selene on a bull (1.4.3), and then to Europa on a bull (1.1.2-13), and accompanying ecphrasis, and observes that 'Leucippe has become a portmanteau, a woman-text: an irreducibly physical being who has a physical effect on Clitophon, but also an imaginary cipher for the power of textual representation. Put in the simplest of terms, women in the Greek novels should be understood *both* as passive objects of the gaze *and* as positive embodiments of the genre's creative power.' A central part of his paper is developed from statements in *On Imitation* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who is concerned with two different types of mimesis, the first is natural, the second is cultural and proceeds

from technical rules. The natural is superior but the cultural is often too closely connected to it, so that the two cannot always be separated: mimetic literature both artificial and capable of naturalistic representation. The production of artefacts is a form of physical reproduction, and mimesis is thus closely linked to sexual reproduction. Since it takes two correspondents to create something sexually, the roles of man and woman should be the same, but in antiquity mimesis remains androcentric: women are reduced to dismembered objects of the male gaze, and the perfect woman is one constructed of the best parts of many women. Whitmarsh concludes with an analysis of the story of the birth of Charicleia, born white to two black parents.