Seeing Gods:
Epiphany and Narrative in the Greek Novels

Robert L. Cioffi
Bard College

The Greek world was full of the divine, and the imagined world of the ancient novels was no different.[1] Divinity and its worship pervade the novels' narratives, helping to unite, drive apart, and then reunite their protagonists. In this paper, I explore the relationship between ancient religion and literature, the transformation of literary tradition, and the place of the marvelous in the novels' narratives by examining the role that one aspect of the human experience of the gods, epiphany, plays in the genre. Although the novelists describe very few scenes of actual epiphany,[2] they make abundant use of the epiphanic metaphor in what I will call "epiphanic situations," when an internal audience reacts to the hero or, most often, the heroine of the novel as if he or she were a god or goddess. These epiphanic situations transform the common metaphor of divine beauty into a reality, at least as experienced by the internal audience,[3] and they offer the novelists an alternative to ekphrasis for expressing ineffable beauty.

---

[1] Zeitlin 2008, 91 writes: "The novels are full of: temples, shrines, altars, priests, rituals and offerings, dreams (or oracles), prophecies, divine epiphanies, aretalogies, mystic language and other metaphors of the sacred (not forgetting, in addition, exotic barbarian rites)."

[2] In the novels, mortals are most frequently visited by divinities during dreams: e.g., Chariton 2,3; X. Eph. 1,12; Longus 1,7-8, 2,23, 2,26-27, 3,27, 4,34; Ach. Tat. 4,1,4; Heliod. 1,18; see further Hägg 2002, 57, Carlisle 2009, and Whitmarsh 2011, 194 n. 98 on dreams. True epiphanies in waking visions are much rarer: Longus 2,4-6 (a vision of Eros reported by Philetas), 2,25-26 (a series of strange phenomena which are understood as the *aretai* of Pan); Ach. Tat. 2,2,3-6 (a mythical tale of the epiphany of Dionysus), 7,12,4, and 8,18,1 (which both describe an epiphany of Artemis during battle); Heliod. 3,11,5-3,12 (Calasiris reports seeing Apollo and Artemis in a night-time waking vision).

[3] Cf. Hägg 2002, 53: "there is a constant oscillation in the novels between metaphor—'divine beauty'—and religious awe."

My argument in this paper charts a course between several widely divergent views of the role of religion in the novels. The first is represented by Tomas Hägg who proposed a "secular-literary interpretation" of epiphany, privileging the literary and aesthetic qualities of the epiphanic metaphor over its power to describe a religious experience.[4] Hägg's highly aestheticizing reading of the genre's epiphanic scenes, which focuses primarily on Chariton, argues against both Karl Kerényi's and Reinhold Merkelbach's very different suggestions that the novels were close reflexes of sacred texts.[5] While Kerényi believed that the novels were purely secular works which drew on the structures of Egyptian religious narratives (specifically those of Isis and Osiris), Merkelbach argued that the novels were in fact encoded sacred mystery texts, whose true meaning could only be understood by initiates.[6] Both theories, which are often conflated, have been strongly resisted by more recent scholars, but in the words of Ken Dowden they remain "strangely influential."[7]

My approach differs from all three. Although I do not follow either Kerényi or Merkelbach, I give fuller weight than Hägg to the novel's treatment of epiphany as part of a wider cultural and religious system. In particular, I advance three specific claims about the role of epiphany and epiphanic situations in the genre: first, the novelists draw upon a literary tradition of describing what is at heart a religious experience by using and adapting a well-established set of epiphanic protocols in Greek literature and culture; second, these epiphanic situations are an integral part of the novels' generic self-definition and, as such, they are remolded and reshaped by different authors to suit their individual narrative strategies; third, epiphany's emphasis on sight and recognition is implicated with other concerns that have been recognized as central to the novelists' projects, namely their interest in visual representation, personal identity, and the narration of the marvelous.[8] I suggest that the novels'

---

[4] Hägg 2002, 59.

[5] Kerényi 1962 (see esp. 95-122 on the relationship between the protagonists and the gods); Merkelbach 1962.

[6] In the afterword to the second edition of his work, Kerényi (1962, 291 n. 2) explicitly distanced himself and his approach from Merkelbach. Henrichs 2006 discusses the differences between the two theories and their critical receptions.

[7] Dowden 2005, 3. Beck 2003 describes the critical backlash against Kerényi and Merkelbach, but does not dismiss either theory entirely, asking (132) "What is it about these novels that seems to resonate so deeply with the mystery cults—and vice versa?"

[8] On visual representation, see Bartsch 1989, Goldhill 2002, Zeitlin 2003, and Morales 2004; on identity, which is especially relevant to Heliodorus' use of the epiphanic metaphor, see most recently Whitmarsh 2011; on the narration of the marvelous, see Morgan 1982, Tilg 2010, 164-197 (on "novelty"), and Scippacercola 2011.

treatment of epiphany and epiphanic situations shows that they are deeply engaged with ancient religious experience, as refracted through the Greek literary tradition. Ultimately, the epiphanic metaphor derives its power from the awesome experience of meeting a god or goddess face-to-face, and I outline a reading of the novels that gives weight to their engagement with Greek religion without suggesting that they themselves are sacred texts.[9]

Greek Epiphanic Conventions and Protocols

The epiphanic experience kindled the Greek literary imagination from the beginning; divine epiphanies appear in a remarkably diverse set of literary and epigraphic texts from Homer to the Roman imperial period. Before I turn to the novels, this section lays out the fundamentals of Greek epiphanic protocols and conventions. I provide a detailed discussion here, because several important studies on epiphany in Greek literature and culture remain unpublished.[10]

    The English term "epiphany" refers to the awe-inspiring moment in which a divinity reveals him- or herself or manifests his or her power to a mortal or group of mortals, whether in a dream or a "waking vision."[11] Al-though the noun ἐπιφάνεια is not used in a religious sense until the Hellenistic period,[12] divine epiphanies could instead be marked by a remarkably consistent vocabulary and set of "epiphanic protocols" for describing a three-step process: the

---

    [9] Several studies have examined the role of the gods either in specific novels (Weißenberg 1997, Bargheer 1999) or across the genre (Alperowitz 1992). Others have focused on religion and religious practice in the novels: Edsall 2000-2001, Beck 2003, Bierl 2007, Zeitlin 2008, and Bowie 2012.

    [10] Platt 2011 offers an extremely sophisticated and subtle treatment of epiphany in literary texts, the visual arts, and Greek religion. Petridou's unpublished dissertation (Petridou 2006), which provides the most systematic collection of epiphanic scenes in Greek literature, is eagerly anticipated in print. In the following discussion, I am grateful to Albert Henrichs for sharing an unpublished paper which examines the language and tripartite protocols of epiphany (φαίνεσθαι-ὁρᾶν/ἰδεῖν-γιγνώσκειν/γνῶναι). For epiphany in the *Homeric Hymns*, see further Richardson 1974, 208-209, 306-307 and 2010, 6, 81-82, 102, 137, 141, 143.

    [11] On the distinction between dreams and waking visions, see further Dodds 1951, 102-34 and Versnel 1987; for a definition of epiphany, see Pfister 1924, Pax 1962, Graf 1997, and Henrichs 2012.

    [12] The first attested usage of ἐπιφάνεια in a religious sense is in an inscription from Cos for the Delphic Soteria festival that thanks Apollo for his epiphany and his protection of Delphi (278 BCE; *SIG*[3] 398,17, Nachtergael 1977, no. 1, *SEG* 45,468); see further Nachtergael 1977, 152-164 and Platt 2011, 154-157.

moment of divine self-revelation (usually expressed by φαίνω in the middle
voice), mortal perception (most typically expressed by the aorist of ὁράω
and/or the noun ὄψις), and, finally, recognition (often expressed by
γιγνώσκω). These epiphanic protocols are already evident in the earliest liter-
ary epiphanies, such as Athena's appearance to Achilles near the beginning of
the *Iliad* (1,197-200):

> στῆ δ' ὄπιθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἕλε Πηλεΐωνα
> οἴῳ φαινομένη· τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὔ τις ὁρᾶτο·
> θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεύς, μετὰ δ' ἐτράπετ', αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω
> Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην· δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν.

> She stood behind him and grabbed the son of Peleus by his golden hair,
> appearing to him alone. None of the others saw her, but Achilles was
> amazed. He turned around and immediately he recognized Pallas Athena.
> Her eyes flashed terribly.

Athena's epiphany to Achilles, which will serve as my paradigmatic example,
is described by a tripartite sequence and vocabulary of appearance
(φαινομένη), sight (ὁρᾶτο), and recognition (ἔγνω). Achilles' perception of
Athena is both visual and tactile: he first notices her when she grabs his hair,
but it is not until he turns and sees her that he recognizes her as a goddess.
This process is repeated with some variation in epiphanic scenes throughout
Greek literature, and by the time of the novels it had become well-estab-
lished.[13] The fact that Athena's epiphany prevents Achilles from slaying Ag-
amemnon illustrates another typical feature of such scenes: gods seldom ap-
pear to mortals without reason. Epiphanic gods can hinder or prevent; they
can provide aid or advice to mortals; and they can establish new rituals.[14] In a

---

[13] Examples include Hom. *Od.* 16,155-177, *h.Bacch. passim*, but esp. 1-18 (with νοέω used
in place of γιγνώσκω, line 15), A.R. 2,674-684 (in which θάμβος ("wonder," line 681)
simultaneously signals both the moment of recognition and the concomitant terror of being
in the presence of Apollo). For more examples, see Richardson 1974, 252 and Petridou
2006.

[14] These categories are not mutually exclusive (a single epiphany could fit in more than one
category), but they aim to suggest the range of epiphany's possible functions. Some exam-
ples from early Greek poetry: hindering: e.g., Hom. *Il.* 1,197-222, in which Athena pre-
vents Achilles from slaying Agamemnon; aid or advice: e.g., Sappho fr. 1, in which Sappho
asks Aphrodite to appear to her and help her, citing past aid she has received; establishment
of new rituals: e.g., Demeter to Metaneira, *h.Cer.* 188-211. In inscriptions, the motif of aid
or advice offered by a divinity is most prominent: e.g., *SIG*³ 398 (278 BCE; Nachtergael
1977, no. 1, *SEG* 45,468; see n. 12 above) and Delph. Inv. 697, 698, 699 (246/5 BCE;

significant subset of epiphanic encounters, the appearance of one or more divinities authorizes certain types of poetic composition.[15] All of these types of epiphany are manifestations of the gods' power.

It is important to stress that these scenes are not rigidly invariable, and that authors work within and against established epiphanic conventions.[16] For instance, apart from visual and tactile epiphanies, human experience of divinity can also be auditory or even olfactory.[17] In some cases, the moment of recognition is replaced or supplemented by a description of mortal surprise, terror, and awe.[18] Further, aretalogy, a narrative of the miraculous deeds of a god or god-like holy person, frequently accompanies a description of epiphany.[19]

Nachtergael 1977, no. 25, *I.Smyrna* 2,1,574, *FD* III,1,483, *SEG* 46,547), which attribute the salvation of Delphi in 279 BCE to an epiphany of one or more gods. See further Pax 1962, 842-844 and Platt 2011, 154-157. Petridou 2006, 265-307 provides a different tripartite categorization of epiphanies, which roughly corresponds with my schema, but she focuses on the outcome for mortals rather than the agency of the divinity: epiphanies that provide an explanation; epiphanies that provide authority, validity, or legitimization; and epiphanies that functioned as a crisis management tool.

[15] The Muses' appearance to Hesiod (Hes. *Th.* 1-34) is the prototype for many such scenes; see most recently Platt 2011, 50-55. The Mnesiepes inscription from the Parian Archilocheion (*SEG* 57,809, ed. pr. Kontoleon 1952) relates the Muses' epiphany to and poetic initiation of Archilochus (lines 27-41). The inscription is from the mid-third century BCE, but the content may be much earlier (see Müller 1985). Unlike the initiation of Hesiod, the Muses provide Archilochus with a lyre, which is a physical token of his inspiration. In addition to these two archaic poets, Callimachus also claims divine intervention as the inspiration for his poetry at *Aetia* 1,21-24. His relationship with the god is more complex, however: Apollo appears in order to stop him from writing epic, and he bids him to turn to a different kind of poetry, which is embodied by the *Aetia*.

[16] Consider, for example, the play on epiphanic conventions at S. *Aj.* 1-37, in which Athena emphasizes that she can see Odysseus (δέδορκα, 1; ὁρῶ, 3) and recognize his plans (ἔγνων, 36), even though he cannot see her (15). For further discussion of this scene, see Pucci 1994, 18-31.

[17] For visual recognition of the gods, see Prier 1989, 56-64; on auditory recognition, see Pucci 1988, 6 with n. 4 and Pucci 1994, esp. 18-31 (discussing the epiphany of Athena in S. *Aj.* 1-133, esp. 14-17). At E. *Ba.* 1082-1083, the words of the god are accompanied by a "light of holy fire" (φῶς σεμνοῦ πυρός, 1083). On cases of olfactory epiphany, see Platt 2011, 1-2, 10, 56, 64 and Petridou 2006, 23 with n. 76, 318-321; examples include: Hes. *fr.* 140, *h.Cer.* 277-278, *h.Merc.* 231-232, Thgn. 1,8-9, [A.] *Pr.* 115-116, Eur. *Hipp.* 1391-1392, Ar. *Av.* 1715, and Mosch. *Eur.* 91-92. Epiphanic encounters frequently combine two or more modes of perception into a multisensory experience of the divinity.

[18] On awe in epiphanies, see further Richardson 1974, 208-209, 306-307, Lane Fox 1987, 109, and Richardson 2010, 6, 81-82, 102, 137, 141, 143. Awe is noted as a feature in the novels by Hägg 2002, 58 and Dickie 2004, 168.

[19] The combination of aretalogy and epiphany occurs, for instance, in Hor. *Carm.* 2,19, a text which engages deeply Greek epiphanic protocols and conventions. Horace says that he "saw" Dionysus (*vidi*, 2,19,2; the precise Latin equivalent of Greek εἶδον) and that his

In this paper, I will be concerned with an equally significant variation on epiphanic conventions: moments in which the appearance of a mortal, not a god or goddess, triggers an epiphanic response. These epiphanic situations depend upon the duality of two intimately related and complementary phenomena in Greek religious thought: a mortal's likeness to a divinity, sometimes termed *Gottähnlichkeit*, on the one hand, and divine anthropomorphism on the other.[20] Mortals' resemblance to divinities could function on many levels, but the novelists single out their protagonists' visual beauty and, less often, their voice (e.g., Chariton 2,3,8) for comparison. Paradoxically, artistic representations of divinities simultaneously depend upon, reinforce, and challenge the similarities between men and gods; gods were imagined and depicted in cult statues as looking like humans, but more beautiful and more outstanding.[21] In their own use of the epiphanic metaphor, the novelists consistently highlight and problematize the relationship between god, mortal, and artistic representation.

These epiphanic situations represent the novels' most prolonged and subtle engagement with epiphany. Although they are not unique to the genre,[22] they are highly typical of it, occurring in all five extant novels and in at least some of the fragments;[23] I am aware of no other prose genre which integrates

---

"mind trembled with fresh terror" (*recenti mens trepidat metu*, 2,19,5). The remainder of the poem describes the wonders of Dionysus in aretalogical terms; see further Henrichs 1978.

[20] The first extant discussion of divine anthropomorphism comes in Xenophanes' critique of it (fr. 11, 14-16, 23 D-K); see further Jaeger 1947, 47-48, Lesher 1992, esp. 85-94, Morgan 2000, 47-53. On *Gottähnlichkeit* or ὁμοίωσις θεῷ, as Plato terms the concept at *Tht.* 176b, see Roloff 1970, 102-142 and Sedley 2000. Henrichs 2010b, 32-35 and Platt 2011, esp. 77-123, 180-211, 322-329 explore how epiphanic narratives and visual representations of the gods depend on and problematize anthropomorphism. Kerényi 1962, 95-122 ("Göttlichkeit und Leiden") discusses the similarities between the protagonists of the novels and gods in order to connect them with Egyptian narrative texts insofar as they are "narratives of the suffering of divine persons" ("Erzählungen von Leiden göttlicher Personen," 95).

[21] See further Burkert 1985, 182-189. Burkert (1997 and 2004, 14-19) collects evidence for a priest or priestess imitating the appearance of the god in ritual contexts (citing, among other examples, X. Eph. 1,2,7, discussed below).

[22] For instance, Hellenistic ruler cult often used epiphany to emphasize the godlikeness of the king. The title ἐπιφανής was first adopted by Ptolemy V, ruler of Egypt, in 197 BCE (*OGIS* 90A,5 (Rosetta stone); see further Koenen 1993, 65, Burkert 2004, 16, and Platt 2011, 142-143). For a comparison between ruler cult and the divine beauty of the protagonists of the novels, see Scott 1938. In the case of ruler cult, rulers wished to emphasize that they were like gods in all ways, not just in their looks.

[23] I have identified three possible epiphanic situations in the fragmentary novels: (1) Chione (?) P. Berol. 10535 col. ii, line 7-9: "They escorted . . . and some were amazed and awestruck" (προύπεμπον δὲ [αὐ]τ- . . . οἱ μ]ὲν ἄλλοι θαυμά[ζον]|τε[ς κ]αὶ ἐκπεπληγμέν[οι . . .]); (2) P.

such scenes so thoroughly into its narratives.[24] In fact, despite the challenges of defining the novels as a genre,[25] these epiphanic situations are so pervasive and are adapted so self-consciously by later novelists that, I argue, they are an important generic feature, which should be counted among other so-called conventions of the novels, such as travel, piracy, and *Scheintod* (apparent death).[26] As such, they represent a significant point of contact between individual authors, who constantly receive, transform, and reinvent them; in so doing, these authors express a relationship to and an affiliation with the novelistic genre as a whole.

Oxy. III 416 (considered "ambiguous" by Stephens and Winkler 1995, 409-415), lines 8-9: "I saw some god advancing with a shadowy figure and a mournful and frightful visage" (ἑώρα θεόν τινα ϲκοτιαίῳ προϊόντα εἴ[δει καὶ] | πενθικὴν καὶ φρικ[ώ]δη ἔχοντα [ὄ]ψιν); (3) Lollianus *Phoenicica*, P. Oxy. XI 1368, lines 6-15, termed a "reverse epiphany" by Henrichs 2010a, 77: "Glaucetes, astonished, as is natural, said nothing in reply to this, but only nodded and kept on riding. The young man disappeared when he nodded, and Glaucetes kept riding quickly, all the while turning around in case he should see him again, but he did not see him anymore." (ὁ δὲ Γλαυκέτηϲ ἐκ|πλαγείϲ, ὥϲπερ εἰκόϲ, ἐφθέγ|ξατο μὲν οὐδὲν πρὸϲ ταῦ|τα, ἐπένευεν δὲ μόνον καὶ | [ἅμ]α ἤλαυνεν. ὁ δὲ νεάνι|[ϲκοϲ] ἠφανίϲθη ἐπινεύϲαν|[τοϲ, ὁ] δὲ Γλαυκέτηϲ κατὰ κρά|[τ]οϲ ἤλαυνεν καὶ ἅμα ἐπε|ϲτρέφετο, εἴ που αὖθιϲ ἴδοι | ἐκεῖνον, ἀλλ' οὐκέτι ἔβλεπεν.)

[24] Pausanias, whose descriptions of epiphanies are prompted by the sites he describes, is the only prose author who comes close, albeit in a very different way. Many of the epiphanies he narrates occurred during battle; see further Pritchett 1979, 11-46 and Platt 2011, 218 with n. 17. Plut. *Arat.* 32,1-2 describes an epiphanic situation similar to the ones I discuss in this paper: the daughter of Epigethes, who happened to be sitting in a sanctuary of Artemis, was mistaken for the goddess herself: "a vision holier than human appeared" (θέαμα ϲεμνότερον ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον ἐφάνη). See further Platt 2011, 12-14 for a discussion of the passage.

[25] Whitmarsh 2013, 39 offers a productive way of thinking about genre, describing it as "a relationship between texts, a relationship invoked for specific, tactical reasons and to shape the reader's literary reception of the work in question." On such a definition, points of contact between novels become especially important for defining genre. The difficulties entailed in setting generic boundaries for the novels are illustrated by Henrichs 2011, who demonstrates how new papyrological finds have challenged traditional generic definitions; see also the discussions of Selden 1994, Holzberg 2003, and Goldhill 2008.

[26] This paper does not consider Roman novels, but both Petronius and Apuleius engage with Greek and Roman epiphanic conventions; examples include: Petr. 16,2-17,3 (the Quartilla episode; see further Schmeling 2011, 45-49), Petr. 127,5 (Chrysis' beauty provokes an epiphanic response; see further Schmeling 2011, 484-485), Apul. *Met.* 4,28,3 (Psyche's beauty provokes an epiphanic response), Apul. *Met.* 11,3-7 (a dream vision of Isis, which combines epiphany and initiation).

First Appearances:
Epiphanic Situations in Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus

Already in Chariton's *Callirhoe*, the earliest of the extant novels,[27] epiphanic situations are tightly interwoven with the novel's narrative and descriptive strategies. Chariton, whose treatment of epiphany has been the most widely recognized and discussed,[28] contributes to the establishment of an epiphanic tradition in the novelistic genre through the reception and transformation of other Greek epiphanic traditions. In his novel, the focus of the epiphanic metaphor is on his heroine Callirhoe, whose godlike beauty inspires supernatural awe in any mortal she encounters. Chariton's narrative of her first appearance in Ionia at the end of Book One offers a striking example of how the text draws on the Greek epiphanic protocols to express divine beauty.[29] When the pirate Theron tries to sell her as a slave in this scene, she appears so beautiful that some of the Ionian onlookers believe they are experiencing an epiphany of Aphrodite herself:

> ἀποκαλύψας τὴν Καλλιρόην καὶ λύσας αὐτῆς τὴν κόμην, διανοίξας τὴν θύραν, πρώτην ἐκέλευσεν εἰσελθεῖν. ὁ δὲ Λεωνᾶς καὶ πάντες οἱ ἔνδον ἐπιστάσης αἰφνίδιον κατεπλάγησαν, οἱ μὲν δοκοῦντες θεὰν ἑωρακέναι, <οἱ δὲ καὶ προσκυνήσαντες>· καὶ γὰρ ἦν τις λόγος ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς Ἀφροδίτην ἐπιφαίνεσθαι (Chariton 1,14,1).

> After removing her veil and loosening her hair, [Theron] opened the door and he told Callirhoe to go in first. Leonas and all the people inside were awestruck when she suddenly appeared—some of them thought they saw

---

[27] P. Fay. 1, a papyrus roll which has been assigned to the first half of the 2nd century by Cavallo 1996, 16, 25 pl. 7, 38, provides a *terminus ante quem* for the novel; see further Henrichs 2011, 311. If Pers. 1,134 ("After lunch, I give you Callirhoe" (*post prandia Calliroen do*)) is a reference to the title of Chariton's novel, it would require a first century CE date at the latest. Tilg 2010 has even argued that Chariton was the inventor of the erotic novel.

[28] Cf. Alperowitz 1992, 43, Edsall 2000-2001, 116-117, Hägg 2002, 52-56, Zeitlin 2003, Dickie 2004, 165-167, and Bierl 2007. On the similarity of Callirhoe to Aphrodite in Chariton's novel, see further Edwards 1991, 191-200, Edwards 1994, and Edwards 1996, esp. 95-100. Edwards argues that there is a political dimension to the comparison; he follows Scott 1938 in connecting Callirhoe's divine beauty with ruler cult. Haynes 2003, 48-49, on the other hand, emphasizes the multiplicity of divinities to which Callirhoe is compared throughout the text.

[29] Cf. Hägg 2002, 54 for the importance of this scene for the plot of the novel; for more on the divine beauty of Callirhoe, see Schmeling 2005.

a goddess, <others worshipped her>—for it was said that Aphrodite made epiphanies in the fields.

In this passage, Chariton employs a compressed set of epiphanic protocols to describe Callirhoe's effect on the Ionians. Their surprise at her arrival collapses the epiphanic process of sight, recognition, and astonishment into a single verb (κατεπλάγησαν), which emphasizes their amazement at the suddenness of her entrance and her striking beauty. By shifting Chariton's description away from her appearance to the internal audience's reaction to her, the epiphanic metaphor functions as an alternative narrative strategy to ekphrasis.[30] The effect of seeing her and being in her presence, therefore, is tantamount to that of experiencing an epiphany of Aphrodite herself, and this scene foreshadows the equivalence and antagonism between Callirhoe and the goddess that is particularly prevalent in the first half of the novel.[31]

In narratological terms, Chariton's emphasis on the crowd's reaction also has the effect of marking a strong distinction between his narrator and the internal audience. For instance, the narrator's comment that they "thought that they saw a goddess (θεὰν ἑωρακέναι)" makes the epiphanic nature of Callirhoe's appearance explicit, but it also undercuts the crowd's narrative authority. Their mistaken identification of her with Aphrodite is further motivated and rationalized by the explanation (γάρ) that there was a rumor (τις λόγος) that the goddess made epiphanies (ἐπιφαίνεσθαι) in the fields. I suggest that Chariton's efforts to distance his narrative voice from the perceptions and beliefs of the internal audience are part of a broader strategy, familiar from the historiographical and paradoxographical traditions, for narrating the marvelous.[32] In fact, this technique, in which the primary narrator expresses doubt

---

[30] Hunter 2008, 759 discusses Chariton's limited description of Callirhoe's beauty; Rohde 1914, 165-166 had already commented on what he perceived to be the novels' lack of specificity in their descriptions of female beauty.

[31] Antagonism: Chariton 2,2,6, 3,2,12, 3,10,6, 5,1,1, 7,5,2. Equivalence: Chariton 2,2,6, 2,3,5-6 (epiphanic), 3,2,14 (epiphanic), 3,6,4 (epiphanic), 3,9,1 (epiphanic, see below), 4,7,5, 8,6,11.

[32] Cf. Morgan 1982 for Heliodorus' efforts to create "a credible ambience" (222) in the *Aethiopica*; I extend his analysis more generally to the efforts of all the novelists to make their fictional narratives more plausible and persuasive, often by acknowledging the strangeness of what they report (see further Schepens and Delcroix 1996 on this technique in paradoxography). Chariton particularly emphasizes the paradoxical in his text; see further Tilg 2010, 164-197, who catalogues and analyzes the uses of the word καινός ("strange") in the extant novelists. I would not, however, go so far as Tilg in taking Char-

about the beliefs of his internal audience, is used in the earliest extant prose account of an epiphanic situation: Herodotus' description of Pisistratus' efforts to regain the tyranny in Athens (Hdt. 1,60).[33] According to Herodotus, Megacles and the would-be tyrant outfitted an exceptionally tall and beautiful woman named Phye with a panoply (πανοπλίη), seated her in a chariot, and drove her into the center of the city:

αὐτίκα δὲ ἔς τε τοὺς δήμους φάτις ἀπίκετο ὡς Ἀθηναίη Πεισίστρατον κατάγει, καὶ <οἱ> ἐν τῷ ἄστεϊ πειθόμενοι τὴν γυναῖκα εἶναι αὐτὴν τὴν θεὸν προσεύχοντό τε τὴν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐδέκοντο Πεισίστρατον (Hdt. 1,60,5).

And immediately the report spread throughout the demes that Athena was bringing Pisistratus back, and the citizens, believing that the woman was the goddess herself, worshipped the human and welcomed Pisistratus.

Herodotus' narrative provides a model for understanding the epiphanic situations in the novels.[34] Like Chariton, Herodotus describes a rogue character, who uses the religious conventions of epiphany to persuade a group of spectators that a physically exceptional woman is a goddess. Both women's divine appearance is partially accomplished by adornment: Callirhoe's makeover revealed her godlike beauty,[35] whereas Phye, bedecked in a panoply, was dressed to resemble cult representations of Athena Promachus.[36] The visual similarities between these young women and their respective divine lookalikes helps to rationalize and explain the internal audience's epiphanic experience.

---

iton's emphasis on novelty as evidence for his invention of the genre; rather, I would suggest that Chariton's is one of several strategies employed by the novelists to narrate the marvelous.

[33] There are earlier poetic examples of mortals mistaking humans for divinities, e.g., Hom. *Od.* 6,149-152, where Odysseus asks Nausicaa whether she is a "god or a mortal" (θεός νύ τις ἦ βροτός ἐσσι; 6,149). It is presumably Nausicaa's beauty to which Odysseus refers; the entrance of Phye in Herodotus is far less erotically charged.

[34] Connor 1987, 44 compares Phye's arrival in Athens to the beginning of Xenophon of Ephesus' novel, where Anthia, its heroine, is likened to Artemis. He offers a highly rationalizing explanation for the treatment of a woman as if she were a goddess: "The populace joins in a shared drama, not foolishly duped by some manipulator, but playfully participating in a cultural pattern they share." The bibliography on this passage is immense; see especially Sinos 1993, Harrison 2000, 90-92, Asheri, Lloyd, and Corcella 2007, 122-123, and Platt 2011, 15-17.

[35] By loosening her hair, Theron made Callirhoe look more like Aphrodite, whose artfully styled hair becomes a *topos* in Hellenistic poetry: see, e.g., Call. *Lav. Pall.* 21-22, A.R. 3,45-48.

[36] Such representations can be seen in *LIMC* "Athena" no. 118-173.

Further, in both scenes the narrator makes a strong distinction between himself and the thoughts of the onlookers.[37] This contrast between the superior knowledge of the authorial persona and the inferior knowledge of the internal audience is explicit in Herodotus' paradoxical expression that the Athenians "worshipped the human (προσεύχοντό τε τὴν ἄνθρωπον)." Herodotus, like Chariton, is concerned to separate the fact of the matter (Phye's "epiphany" was a trick devised by Pisistratus to regain power) from the way in which her appearance was interpreted (Athena had made an epiphany). There is no doubt, however, that both Chariton's and Herodotus' internal audiences react to these exceptional women as if they were Aphrodite and Athena.

What does it mean for the experience of viewing a beautiful woman to be like viewing a divinity? Ancient sources often report that seeing a statue produced the same epiphanic response as seeing a god or goddess, facilitating the threefold identification of woman, statue, and goddess.[38] We might further suggest, then, that Callirhoe's resemblance to Aphrodite is mediated through artistic representations of her.[39] A later case of mistaken identity in Book

---

[37] On Herodotus' scepticism about Phye's epiphany, see Harrison 2000, 90-91. It seems that distance is a key factor that makes epiphany narratives credible. Harrison 2000, 91 writes of Herodotus: "Belief in divine epiphanies depends on their happening in some far-away place, to a friend of a friend or a very long time ago." Divinities often appear in mortal guises; see Richardson 1974, 179-180 for Homeric examples. Euripides' *Bacchae*, in which Dionysus appears on stage dressed as a human, plays with this possibility to brilliant effect: the human actor is playing a god pretending to be a human.

[38] Cf. Gordon 1979, Gladigow 1985-1986, Gladigow 1990, Piettre 2001, and Platt 2011, 77-83; Burkert 1997 argues that anthropomorphic representations of gods in cult statues in fact derived from the experience of epiphany. Zeitlin 2003, 77-78 and Hunter 2008, 759 discuss the relationship of god, human, and representation in Chariton. Heliodorus makes precisely this comparison: when Charicleia is captured and presented to the second group of Egyptian bandits (Βουκόλοι), they assume that she is a "living, breathing statue" (αὐτὸ ἔμπνουν . . . τὸ ἄγαλμα, 1,7,2) plundered from a temple. The identification of a beautiful girl with a cult image can also be found in Satyrus' description of Melite at Ach. Tat. 5,11,5: "Seeing her, you would say she was a cult statue" (ἂν ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἴποις ἄγαλμα). The word ἄγαλμα can simply refer to statuary in general, but the pervasive metaphor of divine beauty suggests that Satyrus' point of comparison is a representation of a goddess.

[39] In fact, Hunter 2008, 759-761 suggests that the narrator's description of Callirhoe after bathing (Chariton 2,2,2) evokes Praxiteles' Aphrodite of Cnidus, the famous statue which represented the goddess just before her bath. At Chariton 3,8,6, the narrator makes a more explicit comparison between Callirhoe, who is holding her new-born son, and a representation of a divinity: "She was a most beautiful sight, such as no painter painted, no sculptor moulded, no poet described before now. For none of them has represented Artemis or Aphrodite holding a babe in her arms." (ὤφθη θέαμα κάλλιστον, οἷον οὔτε ζωγράφος ἔγραψεν οὔτε πλάστης ἔπλασεν οὔτε ποιητὴς ἱστόρησε μέχρι νῦν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν Ἄρτεμιν ἢ Ἀθηνᾶν βρέφος ἐν ἀγκάλαις κομίζουσαν).

Three cleverly probes the relationship between epiphany, anthropomorphism, and cult statue. In this scene, a priestess tries to comfort Callirhoe with the news that some strangers had come and worshipped a statue of her in the temple of Aphrodite:[40]

> ἤδη γὰρ καὶ σὲ ὡς θεὰν οἱ ξένοι προσκυνοῦσι. πρώην ἦλθον ἐνθάδε δύο νεανίσκοι καλοὶ παραπλέοντες· ὁ δὲ ἕτερος αὐτῶν θεασάμενός σου τὴν εἰκόνα, μικροῦ δεῖν ἐξέπνευσεν. οὕτως ἐπιφανῆ σε ἡ Ἀφροδίτη πεποίηκεν (Chariton 3,9,1).

> Now foreigners even worship you as a goddess. The other day two hand-some young men sailed here. One of them nearly fainted when he beheld your image: Aphrodite made you so epiphanic.

The priestess describes an abbreviated version of the epiphanic protocols: sight (θεασάμενος) followed by a single moment of recognition and surprise, all expressed in the phrase "he nearly fainted" (μικροῦ δεῖν ἐξέπνευσεν). In her telling, Callirhoe's appearance is so similar to Aphrodite's that viewing a representation of the goddess or of the mortal produces the same epiphanic experience. The priestess' final sentence, which has often proved difficult to translate,[41] hints at an invented cult title for Callirhoe: Καλλιρόη ἐπιφανής. Modeled on the titles of gods and divine kings,[42] her newly-coined epithet suggests a further blurring between girl and goddess, and it emphasizes the epiphanic power of her appearance.

From the perspective of the reader, however, there is yet another layer to Callirhoe's epiphanic effect. The "foreigners" (ξένοι) were actually her husband Chaereas and his companion Polycharmus. They worshipped her statue not because of its likeness to the goddess, but rather as a representation of

---

[40] The statue was an "offering from Dionysius" (ἀνάθημα Διονυσίου, Chariton 3,6,3), a phrase which suggests the close connections between Aphrodite and Callirhoe. On Chariton's description of the sanctuary of Aphrodite and of her worship at Miletus, see Jones 1992, 163-164 and Trzaskoma 2012, 300-301. In 1989, an Archaic peri-urban sanctuary of Aphrodite was discovered on Zeytintepe Hill, just outside the Archaic city walls of Miletus; see further Senff 2003. Greaves 2004 collects evidence of worship of Aphrodite in both Miletus and its colonies.

[41] Hägg 2002, 55 discusses the possible translations of ἐπιφανής, which can also mean "visible" or "manifest."

[42] The term ἐπιφανής can be used as a title of gods (e.g., *IG* 5,1,1179) or god-like kings (e.g., Ptolemy V, Antiochus IV, Antiochus VI, Seleucus VI); see note 22 above.

Callirhoe herself.[43] The novels abound in recognition scenes, but what makes this moment so striking is that Chaereas' and Polycharmus' response to Callirhoe's image is exactly the response the priestess would expect of foreigners experiencing an epiphany of Aphrodite. In fact, when she first encounters the two awestruck travelers at 3,6,4, she supposes that Aphrodite herself has appeared to them. Froma Zeitlin interprets this earlier epiphanic situation as follows: "Epiphany and statuary seem to amount to the same thing. The text here refuses to distinguish between the full divine presence of one (Aphrodite 'in person' and in image) and mere representation or imitation (Callirhoe)."[44] I submit that the situation at Chariton 3,9,1 is even more subtle: in addition to conflating epiphany with representation, this scene self-consciously plays with the conventions of divine anthropomorphism and epiphanic situations. The priestess' interpretation depends on her understanding Callirhoe's epiphanic effects;[45] the fact that Chaereas and Polycharmus are actually affected by the sight of Callirhoe *qua* human being not *qua* goddess subverts both the reader's and the priestess' expectations for the experience of viewing her.

Callirhoe *epiphanēs* establishes what will become a flexible and adaptable paradigm for equating the experience of viewing a beautiful young woman with the epiphanic presence of a goddess. Xenophon of Ephesus, the closest of the extant novelists to Chariton in date,[46] begins his work with just such a

---

[43] See Montiglio 2013, 35-36 on the "infallibility of Chaereas's eye," which allows him to distinguish Callirhoe from Aphrodite.

[44] Zeitlin 2003, 81. Platt 2011, 77-123 examines the interaction between divinity, cult statue, anthropomorphism, and aniconism; see further Gordon 1979, Gladigow 1985-1986, Gladigow 1990, and Piettre 2001 on the relationship between Greek gods and their representations.

[45] In fact, Chaereas' and Polycharmus' reaction echoes Dionysius' own epiphanic experience of seeing Callirhoe in the same shrine of Aphrodite (Chariton 2,3,6): "Seeing her Dionysius shouted: 'Aphrodite, may you be propitious and may you appear to me benevolently!'" (θεασάμενος οὖν ὁ Διονύσιος ἀνεβόησεν "Ἵλεως εἴης, ὦ Ἀφροδίτη, καὶ ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ μοι φανείης.")

[46] Xenophon's reference to an *eirenarch* (2,13,3; cf. 3,9,5; see Rife 2002) has often been thought to suggest that the novel was written in the early second century CE. The decisive argument for the novel's date may come from Xenophon's reference to sailing to Nuceria rather than Pompeii or Stabiae (5,8,1). On this basis, Coleman 2011 places the composition of the novel in the period "after it became known that the harbours at Pompeii and Stabiae had been destroyed in the eruption of AD 79 and before the rehabilitation of Stabiae became common knowledge" (27), that is at the end of the first century CE or the start of the second century CE.

scene, when at a festival of Artemis the Ephesians worship his heroine Anthia as if she were the goddess herself:[47]

ἐσθὴς χιτὼν ἁλουργής, ζωστὸς εἰς γόνυ, μέχρι βραχιόνων καθειμένος, νεβρὶς περικειμένη, γωρυτὸς ἀνημμένος, τόξα < . . . >, ἄκοντες φερόμενοι, κύνες ἑπόμενοι. πολλάκις αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένους ἰδόντες Ἐφέσιοι προσεκύνησαν ὡς Ἄρτεμιν. καὶ τότ᾽ οὖν ὀφθείσης ἀνεβόησε τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ ἦσαν ποικίλαι παρὰ τῶν θεωμένων φωναί, τῶν μὲν ὑπ᾽ ἐκπλήξεως τὴν θεὸν εἶναι λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ἄλλην τινὰ ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ <παραπλήσιον ἑαυτῇ> πεποιημένην· προσηύχοντο δὲ πάντες καὶ προσεκύνουν καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῆς ἐμακάριζον, ἦν δὲ διαβόητος τοῖς θεωμένοις ἅπασιν Ἀνθία ἡ καλή (X. Eph. 1,2,6-7).

She wore a belted purple tunic, which was knee-length and fell over her shoulders; there was a fawn skin wrapped around it; a quiver was attached to it; arrows . . . she carried javelins; and there were dogs following her. Frequently when they saw her inside the sanctuary, the Ephesians worshipped her as Artemis. And then too, when she was seen, the crowd let out a shout and there were many exclamations among those viewing her. Some in their amazement said that she was the goddess, others that she was a double fashioned by the goddess. They prayed to her; they worshipped her; and they congratulated her parents. There was a cry among all the spectators: "Anthia, the beautiful!"

The crowd's response to Anthia's appearance in a shrine closely follows the epiphanic protocols I have been discussing: she was seen (ὀφθείσης); the crowd shouted (ἀνεβόησε); and some in their amazement (ὑπ᾽ ἐκπλήξεως) proclaimed her a goddess. In fact, her beauty, dress, adornment, and weaponry are all highly suggestive of Artemis the huntress. By setting this scene in a temple, Xenophon's text suggests a triple identification between Anthia, Artemis, and cult images of Artemis, an identification which is further encouraged by the narrator's suggestion that Anthia could be "a double fashioned by the goddess." Unlike the scene involving Callirhoe's statue in the shrine of Aphrodite, however, it is far more difficult simply to equate girl, goddess, and

---

[47] Cf. Hägg 2002, 53-54; both Anthia and Habrocomes are described in epiphanic terms, but as Hägg observes, Xenophon emphasizes that Habrocomes is "a μίμημα, not the real thing."

image. Depictions of Artemis Ephesia were marked by "egg"-shaped protrusions which have usually been identified either as breasts or bulls' testicles.[48] The goddess' legs were wrapped in a garment depicting busts of lions, bulls, and horses, as well as small insects, normally identified as bees.[49] If Xenophon was a native Ephesian (as tradition states, although this might have more to do with the setting of his novel than any facts we know), he ought to have been aware of the difficulty of comparing a beautiful young woman to such a statue.[50]

In different ways from Chariton, Xenophon's expression of Anthia's beauty problematizes the straightforward comparison of a novel's heroine with a female deity, and it raises important questions about the relationship between the *Ephesiaca* and its contemporary context. Nonetheless, the very fact that Xenophon can compare his heroine with the Ephesian Artemis' appearance suggests the extent to which epiphanic situations have become a regular feature of the novels. Such an argument becomes even stronger when one considers the rest of Xenophon's work. This is not the only epiphanic scene

---

[48] Fleischer 1973 catalogues representations of Artemis from Ephesus, Anatolia, and Syria; the vast majority of the images conform to this description. Although the protrusions are well-attested, both their interpretation and their significance remain a puzzle. Burkert 1999, 68-70 rejects the possibility that they are breasts on the basis of their position in the earliest surviving representation (Fleischer 1973, no. E 58, pl. 55). Instead, he supports the explanation proposed by Seiterle 1979 that the protrusions were bulls' testicles, which had been sacrificed to the goddess; compare the illustration in Seiterle 1979, fig. 14. Most recently, Joanna Schmitz has argued in a paper presented to the AIA in 2009 that the protrusions are fresh figs, a visually plausible interpretation.

[49] Cf. Burkert 1999, 69. The identification of the insects has been challenged by Schmitz 2009. She argues that the small insect associated with Ephesus, which appears both on coinage and Artemis' garments, is the fig wasp, not the bee. Such fine entomological distinctions are difficult to establish given the small size of the fig wasp and the varied ancient depictions.

[50] Thomas 1995, 86-98 suggests that Xenophon is participating in a broader Ephesian "reimaging" of the goddess; similarly, Whitmarsh 2011, 29-30 argues that "it is misleading to allow our idea of Ephesian cult to be exclusively dominated by the [protuberant Anatolian hybrid]" (29). Although I agree that local and Panhellenic images of Artemis did coexist, the Ephesian statue still seems to be the most obvious point of reference. Her image was closely associated with the city through statuary and in its coinage. Apart from coins and statues, Minicius Felix (third century CE) described the Ephesian Artemis' "many breasts" (*mammis multis*, *Octavius* 22,5). See further LiDonnici 1992, esp. 395-396, who argues that the image of Ephesian Artemis was particularly important to the city's self-identity, and that her statue was often used as a symbol for the city itself.

in the novel,[51] and the inclusion of multiple epiphanic scenes in such a rapid and unembellished narrative suggests their centrality to the genre.[52]

Epiphany and Interpretation:
Epiphanic Situations in Heliodorus' Aethiopica

Before examining the second-century novelists, Longus and Achilles Tatius, I would like to turn to the latest, longest, and most ambitious of the extant novels, Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Heliodorus has brilliantly reconfigured his narrative, which is oriented around three major religious centers (Delphi, Memphis, and Meroë) and their corresponding cultures. As with so many of the novels' generic conventions, he has also reimagined and transformed the roles that epiphany and epiphanic situations play in his work. In this sophisticated text, the epiphanic metaphor becomes more deeply intertwined with the fundamental themes of the novel, such as personal and ethnic identity, the relationship between humans and the divine, and the process of recognition and interpretation. At the same time, it can also be applied to a broader range of phenomena. One of the *Aethiopica*'s most striking epiphanic moments comes in its arresting and enigmatic opening, when a band of Egyptian outlaws, gathered at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile, peep over a ridge at a young girl who was "persuading [them] that she was goddess" (θεὸς εἶναι ἀναπείθουσα, Heliod. 1,2,1). She tends a young man in the midst of slaughtered corpses:

> καὶ ἅμα λέγουσα ἡ μὲν τῆς πέτρας ἀνέθορεν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους ὑπὸ θαύματος ἅμα καὶ ἐκπλήξεως ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πρηστῆρος τῆς ὄψεως βληθέντες ἄλλος ἄλλον ὑπεδύετο θάμνον· μεῖζον γάρ τι καὶ θειότερον αὐτοῖς ὀρθωθεῖσα ἔδοξε, τῶν μὲν βελῶν τῇ ἀθρόᾳ κινήσει κλαγξάντων,

---

[51] Later in the novel, there is an even more elaborate epiphanic scene involving both Anthia and Habrocomes, when the couple arrives in Rhodes: "All the Rhodians gathered, amazed at the beauty of the youths. No one who saw them walked by in silence. Some said that it was a visit from the gods; others worshipped and prayed to them. Swiftly the name of Habrocomes and Anthia spread through the whole city." (συνῄεσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Ῥόδιοι, τὸ κάλλος τῶν παίδων καταπεπληγότες, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις τῶν ἰδόντων παρῆλθε σιωπῶν, ἀλλ᾽ οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον ἐπιδημίαν ἐκ τῶν θεῶν, οἱ δὲ προσεκύνουν καὶ προσηύχοντο. ταχὺ δὲ δι᾽ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διεπεφοιτήκει τὸ ὄνομα Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας, X. Eph. 1,12,1; see also Hägg 2002, 57).

[52] The novel has often been thought be an epitome; see further Hägg 1966, who argues that the case for epitome has not been proven, but suggests that the text may have suffered through its medieval transmission. In his introduction to the Loeb edition of the text, Henderson 2009, 200-211 persuasively rejects the possibility that the text is an abridgment.

χρυσοϋφοῦς δὲ τῆς ἐσθῆτος πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀνταυγαζούσης, καὶ τῆς κόμης ὑπὸ τῷ στεφάνῳ βακχεῖον σοβουμένης καὶ τοῖς νώτοις πλεῖστον ὅσον ἐπιτρεχούσης. τοὺς μὲν ταῦτα ἐξεδειμάτου καὶ πλέον τῶν ὁρωμένων ἡ τῶν γινομένων ἄγνοια· οἱ μὲν γὰρ θεόν τινα ἔλεγον, καὶ θεὸν Ἄρτεμιν ἢ τὴν ἐγχώριον Ἶσιν, οἱ δὲ ἱέρειαν ὑπό του θεῶν ἐκμεμηνυῖαν καὶ τὸν ὁρώμενον πολὺν φόνον ἐργασαμένην. καὶ οἱ μὲν ταῦτα ἐγίνωσκον, τὰ ὄντα δὲ οὔπω ἐγίνωσκον (Heliod. 1,2,5-6).

And as soon as she spoke, she leapt from the rock, and [the bandits] on the hillside, struck simultaneously by wonder and surprise at the sight—just as if by a lightning storm—scattered and went for cover in the bushes. When she stood up she seemed to them larger and more godlike, her arrows rattling because of her sudden motion, her gold clothing glistening in the sun, her hair shaking like a Bacchant's under her crown as it ran down the length of her back. They were terrified by these things, but their incomprehension of the events was even more terrifying than seeing them. Some said that she was a goddess—Artemis or the native Isis—others that she was a priestess possessed by one of the gods and that she had worked the great carnage which they were seeing. They recognized these things, but in no way did they recognize the truth.

Heliodorus revels in ekphrastic word images and multiple descriptive strategies in this beautiful and puzzling scene.[53] Although his description is focalized through an Egyptian perspective, the details of Charicleia's appearance, particularly her long flowing hair and the arrows rattling on her back, suggest to a reader familiar with the Greek literary tradition that she is a goddess.[54] The Egyptian bandits themselves believe they are witnessing the appearance of a divinity (either Artemis or their native Isis[55]) or, the closest thing to a divinity, a priestess possessed by the goddess,[56] and their response to Charicleia is articulated in language highly typical of epiphany: at the sight (ὄψεως)

---

[53] Cf. Bartsch 1989, 77, who describes it as "badly in need of interpretation."

[54] Compare the description of Apollo at Hom. *Il.* 1,46-47: "His arrows clanged on his shoulders as he rushed down in his anger. He came like night" (ἔκλαγξαν δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὀϊστοὶ ἐπ᾽ ὤμων χωομένοιο, | αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος· ὃ δ᾽ ἤϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς). Long flowing hair is also typical of divinities; see note 35 above on Aphrodite's beautiful tresses.

[55] For the identification of Artemis and Isis during the Roman imperial period, see Witt 1971, Dunand 1973, and LiDonnici 1992, 406.

[56] Priests and other cult personnel often took on the dress and attributes of the god or goddess that they served; see further Burkert 1985, 97-98, Burkert 1997, Burkert 2004, 14-19, and Platt 2011, 16 n. 58.

of her, they are "struck simultaneously by wonder (θαύματος) and surprise (ἐκπλήξεως)."[57] In fact, the narrator informs us, they are mistaken and their lack of understanding (ἄγνοια) causes them greater terror than the sight of the carnage itself.[58] Their incomprehension is reiterated in an ominous *gnomē*, which emphasizes the distinction between the internal audience's incomplete understanding of the littoral scene and the narrator's position of greater knowledge: "They recognized these things (ἐγίνωσκον), but in no way did they recognize the truth (ἐγίνωσκον)." The verb γιγνώσκω often figures in the epiphanic moment of recognition, but, here, the narrator uses it to highlight the inaccuracy of the internal audience's thoughts and the deceptiveness of appearances, a theme that will reappear throughout the *Aethiopica*. The opening sequence therefore shifts seamlessly between perspectives;[59] in so doing, it captures the terrifying and awesome experience of beholding a divinity while also distancing Heliodorus' narrator from the internal audience.[60]

　　If we read the opening scene as being programmatic for the entire novel, the epiphanic metaphor underscores the paramount importance that the process of decoding and interpretation will have in the novel at large.[61] For instance, although it is only through a gradual series of revelations that the reader learns the name of the girl (Charicleia), then of the boy (Theagenes), and finally the fact that the two will be the novel's protagonists, the Egyptian bandits' epiphanic reaction to Charicleia adumbrates her role in the novel even before that position is made explicit.[62] Nonetheless, as Heliodorus' narrator

---

[57] Cf. Edsall 2000-2001, 121-123, Hägg 2002, 56, and Whitmarsh 2002, 118: "The awe of the bandits, moreover, hints at the epiphany of a deity." Whitmarsh 2002, 119 suggests that this scene "alludes intertextually to *Odyssey* 6.150f." While not excluding such an allusion, I would like to emphasize how this scene works within and transforms the novelistic use of epiphanic scenes, and how central the epiphanic nature of Charicleia's appearance is to the themes of the novel as a whole.

[58] A major theme of the *Aethiopica* is the difficulty of recognition and interpretation, cf. Winkler 1982, esp. 114-137 and Bartsch 1989. Recognition in the moment of an epiphanic encounter is always challenging; see further Platt 2011, 58.

[59] In the terminology of Don Fowler, this would be an example of "deviant focalization," that is a change in focalizer that is not explicitly signaled by the text (Fowler 1990).

[60] Morgan 1991, 86-90 discusses the shifting and unstable distinction between the perspectives of the reader, the bandits, and the author in this scene.

[61] See also Whitmarsh 2002, 116-119 and Haynes 2003, 67-70 on the difficulty of identifying Charicleia.

[62] Novels often open with their female protagonists being mistaken for divinities, as in Chariton 1,1,16, X. Eph. 1,2,7, and Ach. Tat. 1,4,2-5 (discussed below). In both Chariton and Xenophon, the female protagonist is explicitly compared to Artemis; this is particularly striking in Chariton given the close relationship between Callirhoe and Aphrodite throughout the novel.

stresses, their identification of Charicleia is incomplete, and this is the first of several times that her identity will be misinterpreted throughout this text. She looks like many things she is not (a goddess, a Greek), and throughout the novel she lives with an ever-shifting tripartite identity: Greek and Egyptian from her two foster fathers, Ethiopian from her biological father.[63] Further, the epiphanic metaphor emphasizes her close connection with the divine. Her particularly godlike appearance—she had, in fact, donned a crown of laurel and her golden sacred robes from Delphi (5,31,2)—will be explained later (5,28-33) as part of Calasiris' narrative of the events leading up to the opening scene.[64] At the very end of the *Aethiopica*, the connection becomes even closer, when Charicleia, who will eventually be revealed to be part of the Ethiopian royal line, is made a priestess by her mother (Heliod. 10,41,2). Finally, the bandits' uncanny ability to intuit the meaning of a scene, without being able to understand it entirely, looks forward to the crowd of Ethiopians gathered at Meroë, who are suddenly able to understand or guess at the meaning of the Greek being spoken among the Ethiopian royals, even though they themselves do not know Greek (Heliod. 10,38,3).[65]

In a sprawling act of ring composition that encompasses almost the entirety of Heliodorus' narrative, Charicleia's epiphanic presence in the novel's opening pages is connected to another equally striking epiphanic scene at its end. As the novel draws to a conclusion, the action has moved to the Ethiopian capital Meroë (located in modern Sudan). Here, on the edges of the earth, Theagenes faces the prospect of being sacrificed in an ancestral rite by Hydaspes, the king of the Ethiopians and his father-in-law-to-be, when a giraffe suddenly appears, the culmination of the tribute and gifts presented to the king. After a detailed description of the giraffe, an improbable hybrid creature possessing some features of a camel, some of a leopard, and some entirely its own, Heliodorus describes the audience's reaction to its arrival in terms which evoke the epiphanic moment:

> τοῦτο φανὲν τὸ ζῷον τὸ μὲν πλῆθος ἅπαν ἐξέπληξε, καὶ ὄνομα τὸ εἶδος ἐλάμβανεν ἐκ τῶν ἐπικρατεστέρων τοῦ σώματος, αὐτοσχεδίως πρὸς τοῦ δήμου καμηλοπάρδαλις κατηγορηθέν· ταράχου γε μὴν τὴν πανήγυριν ἐνέπλησεν (Heliod. 10,27,4).

---

[63] On Charicleia's tripartite identity in the *Aethiopica*, see further Whitmarsh 1998, Whitmarsh 1999, Elmer 2008, and Whitmarsh 2011, 108-135.
[64] See further Edsall 2000-2001, 123-124.
[65] See further Morgan 1991, 90-94 on the Ethiopian audience in Book Ten of the *Aethiopica*.

> This animal, once it had made its appearance, struck wonder into the whole crowd and its form took its name from the most prominent features of its body: it was spontaneously called a "camelopard" [i.e., giraffe] by the Ethiopian audience. It threw the assembly into confusion.

The giraffe's arrival is described with precisely the same tripartite vocabulary and protocols as other epiphanic scenes I have discussed.[66] In this case, however, the epiphanic metaphor has been applied not to a remarkably beautiful human being, but to a natural marvel. Although there is no explicit comparison between the giraffe and a god or goddess (the giraffe is quite literally incomparable), the tripartite vocabulary of appearance (φανέν), wonderment (ἐξέπληξε), and confusion (τάραχος) suggests an epiphanic situation. Like epiphanic situations elsewhere in the genre, the giraffe appears in front of a large internal audience, which as a group simultaneously experiences an identical reaction. Unlike the bandits' reaction to Charicleia, however, the giraffe is recognized for what it is; upon seeing it, the crowd spontaneously invents its Greek name on the basis of its appearance: καμηλοπάρδαλις. The Ethiopian crowd's Hellenizing onomastic suggests that their perspective has shifted to become a hybrid one, which is now colored by Greek language and culture. Their act of naming has replaced the moment of recognition, the third element of the tripartite structure of epi-phany, and, like the epiphanic situation with which the novel began, it emphasizes the important role that recognition and identification play in the *Aethiopica*.

Heliodorus' application of the epiphanic metaphor to the giraffe not only highlights its unusual and hybrid nature;[67] it also signals its importance for the narrative. The giraffe, which throws the assembly into confusion and startles one of the sacrificial bulls, sets in motion a chain of events that results in Theagenes' salvation and the abolition of human sacrifice in Ethiopia. Later in the book, Sisimithres, the head of the gymnosophists, will interpret this series of events as a sign that the planned rites are not acceptable to the gods:

---

[66] Henrichs 2010a, 66-67 discusses the application of the epiphanic metaphor to the giraffe's appearance. Another epiphanic situation involving an animal occurs at Luc. *Zeux.* 9-10. Antiochus I suddenly unveiled sixteen elephants, which caused the opposing Galatians and their horses, who had never seen an elephant before, to be "thrown into confusion by the surprising sight (πρὸς τὸ παράδοξον τῆς ὄψεως ἐταράχθησαν)."

[67] Apart from Charicleia and the giraffe, Heliodorus describes in detail how the Nile is revealed to be a hybrid entity at Meroë, the fusion of the Astaborrhas and the Asasobas (10,5,1). On the importance of hybridity in the novel; see Whitmarsh 1998, Whitmarsh 1999, and Elmer 2008.

σὲ γοῦν καὶ πάλαι συμβάλλειν ἐχρῆν ὅτι μὴ προσίενται οἱ θεοὶ τὴν εὐτρεπιζομένην θυσίαν, νῦν μὲν τὴν πανόλβιον Χαρίκλειαν ἐξ αὐτῶν σοι τῶν βωμῶν θυγατέρα ἀναδείξαντες καὶ τὸν ταύτης τροφέα, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς, ἐκ μέσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐνταῦθα ἀναπέμψαντες, αὖθις τὴν πτοίαν καὶ τὸν τάραχον τοῖς προσβωμίοις ἵπποις τε καὶ βουσὶν ἐπιβαλόντες καὶ τὸ διακοπήσεσθαι τὰ τελεώτερα νομιζόμενα τῶν ἱερείων συμβάλλειν παρέχοντες· νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφήναντες (Heliod. 10,39,2).

You ought to have understood long ago that the gods do not accept the sacrifice that is being prepared: just now they revealed blessed Charicleia to you on the very [sacrificial] altars and they have transported her foster father here from the heart of Greece, as if through a stage device; next they struck the horses and oxen at the altar with fright and confusion, thus allowing you to understand that those sacrifices thought to be superior would be cut short; and now, as the finale of these happy events, as if the climax of a drama, they have revealed this foreign young man to be the girl's bridegroom!

Sisimithres provides a synopsis of the novel's tenth book, and he divides the *Aethiopica*'s dramatic conclusion into three distinct phases, indicated by three temporal adverbs, which only roughly correspond to the order in which they unfold in the narrative: first (νῦν μέν), the recognition of Charicleia's identity (which comes before the giraffe) and the arrival of her foster father (which comes afterwards), second (αὖθις), the divinely sent fear and confusion among the sacrificial animals (which is caused by the giraffe), and, finally (νῦν), the recognition of Theagenes as Charicleia's bridegroom. He makes the arrival of the giraffe—the cause of the confusion among the sacrificial animals—a critical link in a chain of divinely inspired events that leads to the salvation of Theagenes and the abolishment of human sacrifice. Few commentators, however, have given the giraffe due weight as a catalyst for the novel's surprising end.[68] In narratological terms, its arrival plays the same role as Dionysophanes' appearance at the end of *Daphnis and Chloe*, which I discuss below; both epiphanic appearances set in motion a series of events by means of which the protagonists are allowed to marry and the novel concludes happily. Insofar as

---

[68] Morgan 1978, 463 emphasizes the giraffe's "structural function" in the narrative; cf. also Winkler 1982, 102 and Bartsch 1989, 149, who cites the giraffe as an example of descriptions which "function within the narrative as movers of the plot" (148).

the epiphanic giraffe is a crucial element in the events that lead to the salvation of the novel's hero, it matches a well-known pattern of divinities providing aid to mortals.[69] In this sense, describing the giraffe's arrival in epiphanic terms is appropriate not only because of its startling appearance, but also because it can be interpreted as an instrument of divine will.

Epiphanic Transformations: Achilles Tatius and Longus

From the perspective of tradition, Heliodorus' treatment of epiphany and epiphanic situations represents a return to and transformation of many of the paradigms established by Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus. Achilles Tatius and Longus, whose innovative second-century novels share several points of contact,[70] reinvent the epiphanic metaphor in very different ways from Heliodorus.[71] For instance, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* contains one of the most explicit scenes of actual epiphany in any of the novels.[72] In an exceptional scene at the end of Book Two, Pan's *aretai* are manifest through an entire night and into the following day: he causes great commotion for the Methymnaean soldiers (Longus 2,25,3-26), and his instrument, the syrinx, rings out (Longus 2,26,3). Finally, Pan himself appears and speaks to Bryaxis in a dream vision (Longus 2,27). Earlier in Book Two, Philetas, a retired shepherd-singer reminiscent of the Hellenistic poet of the same name, narrates an

---

[69] This pattern is attested in both literary texts and inscriptions. For instance, divine assistance is already common in the Homeric poems. Epigraphic examples are particularly abundant starting in the Hellenistic period (*SIG*[3] 398 and Delph. Inv. 697, 698, 699 are perhaps the most famous; see further n. 12 and 14 above). The battle epiphanies described by Pausanias also fit this pattern; see further Pritchett 1979, 11-46 and Platt 2011, 218 with n. 17.

[70] Cf. Whitmarsh 2011, 93: "The two works have much in common (it is more than likely that one author read the other, although it is hard to be confident which is the prior)." Both novelists have been dated to the second century CE, but with different degrees of confidence. The relatively secure second-century date for Achilles Tatius depends on P. Oxy. LVI 3836, edited by Parsons. Longus, on the other hand, has not yet been found on papyrus, although he is generally assumed to have been active in the second century CE. On the dating of Longus (and its challenges), see further Henrichs 2011, 312.

[71] Whitmarsh 2011, 69-107 highlights other ways in which these two novels "self-consciously revise the paradigms established by Chariton and Xenophon" (106).

[72] In Ach. Tat. 7,12,4 (repeated in 8,18,1), Sostratus cites an epiphany of Artemis as the reason for his visit to Ephesus, but the scene of epiphany is not described. In a narrative of the origins of the Tyrian wine-harvest festival, Clitophon recounts how Dionysus appeared to a Tyrian shepherd and taught him to make wine (Ach. Tat. 2,2,2-6). The god's epiphany, however, is set in the distant past, outside the novel's timeframe.

epiphany of Eros in his garden (Longus 2,4-6).[73] He tells Daphnis and Chloe that Eros appeared to him, taunted him, and told him his genealogy, before sprouting wings and fleeing. Longus reports that the young couple treat his narrative "as a story rather than fact" (ὥσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον, Longus 2,7,1), thereby shifting skepticism about epiphany from the external narrator to the internal audience.[74]

Apart from these two explicit scenes of epiphany, *Daphnis and Chloe* also hints at the kind of epiphanic situations that occur elsewhere in the genre. For instance, in a passage near the end of Book One, Daphnis looks at Chloe and thinks that he is seeing a nymph. This is one of the first steps in a gradual process by which the couple, who have spent their entire lives together, fall in love:

> ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν ἐν νεβρίδι καὶ στεφάνῳ πίτυος ὀρέγουσαν τὸν γαυλὸν μίαν ᾤετο τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄντρου Νυμφῶν ὁρᾶν (Longus 1,24,1).

> Seeing her in the fawn-skin and with the crown of pine leaves, as she was holding out the wine bowl, he thought that he saw one of the nymphs from the cave.

This scene shares its emphasis on sight and visual perception (ὁρᾶν) with other epiphanic moments in the novels, but Daphnis does not experience the recognition and accompanying wonderment so typical of epiphany. This may be because he is not so much recognizing Chloe, whom he already knows very well, as seeing her in a new light,[75] but there are several details that suggest that Daphnis' restricted epiphanic experience is also connected to his narrow cultural education. For instance, although nymphs are appropriate in the

---

[73] Cf. Hägg 2002, 57-58 and Nickau 2002. Nickau 2002 emphasizes how the epiphany of Eros interacts with other literary accounts of epiphany, chiefly Homeric ones.

[74] Hägg 2002: 58 suggests that "not even the naive children of Longus' creation believe in epiphany!" This goes too far; it seems more likely that they can sense the difference between the artifice of singer-shepherd and "reality," a distinction that is constantly highlighted, explored, and, ultimately, blurred throughout the novel, starting with the preface.

[75] This is certainly true for Chloe, for whom the perception of Daphnis' beauty represents a kind of de-familiarization (Longus 1,13,2): "Daphnis seemed beautiful to Chloe as she watched him; because he seemed beautiful to her for the first time then, she thought that the bath was the cause of his beauty" (ἐδόκει δὲ τῇ Χλόῃ θεωμένῃ καλὸς ὁ Δάφνις, ὅτι δὲ τότε πρῶτον αὐτῇ καλὸς ἐδόκει, τὸ λουτρὸν ἐνόμιζε τοῦ κάλλους αἴτιον).

novel's pastoral world,[76] it is puzzling that Daphnis identifies Chloe as one. Dressed in a fawn-skin and crowned with pine leaves, she looks much more like a Maenad than a nymph.[77] In a novel obsessed with the relation between nature and culture and between reality and image, it seems that Daphnis' perceptions of Chloe are mediated through his extremely limited familiarity with artistic representations of the gods.[78] The nymphs, as experienced through their statues (1,4), are his only point of reference for understanding his response to Chloe's divine beauty, regardless of whether they resemble what he sees. In the same way that the protagonists do not understand that they have fallen in love until they meet Philetas (2,3-7), Daphnis' limited education and lack of cultural knowledge preclude him from fully understanding and expressing his epiphanic experience of female beauty.

Longus also makes use of epiphany in new ways. At the end of the novel, the epiphanic experience is the result of a person's identity rather than his or her divinely beautiful appearance. Dionysophanes, the biological father of Daphnis, evokes the experience of epiphany both through his name, which literally means "Dionysus epiphanic,"[79] and through his sudden appearance at 4,13,1, which causes the commotion (θόρυβος) of herds, servants, men, and women. Like the giraffe, his arrival leads to the recognition of the protagonists' true identities (as nobles rather than as a poor rustic and a slave), and it precipitates a series of events which lead to Daphnis' and Chloe's marriage at the novel's conclusion. In a sense, he and his sudden arrival in the pasture stand in for an epiphany of Dionysus, whose presence can be felt throughout

---

[76] Larson 2001, 56-8 discusses Longus' nymphs and their importance for the narrative. Throughout Greek myth and art, nymphs were associated with herdsmen and the bucolic; see further Larson 2001, 78-87.

[77] She wears the "Bacchic fawn-skin" (νεβρὶς βακχική) that Dorcon gave her (Longus 1,15,2). Compare Morgan 2004b, 170: "Fawn-skins and pine-crowns have not previously been linked with the Nymphs; D[aphnis] reaches for the only divinity in his experience." The fawn-skin is typical of and, indeed, a "sacred garment (ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν, E. *Bach.* 138)" of Maenads; see also E. *Bacch.* 24, 111, 176, 249, 696, 835. In E. *Bach.* 866 the chorus of Maenads compare themselves to dancing fawns, an apt metaphor both for their choral dancing and their dramatic personae. In addition, vases often depict Maenads wearing fawn-skins; see further Edwards 1960, esp. 80-81 n. 17-18.

[78] Although Daphnis knows the names of Zeus, Pan, Dionysus, and the Satyrs (1,16,3-4) and uses them in his argument with Dorcon, he evidently cannot recognize a Maenad.

[79] Cf. Schönberger 1980, 204: "Beim Namen Dionysophanes soll man wohl an die Epiphanie eines Gottes denken."

the novel's pastoral world, even though he never makes an appearance himself.[80]

Longus' transformation of the novels' tendency towards epiphanic situations can be paralleled in his treatment of other common novelistic features: the hero and heroine of the novel do not fall in love at first sight; instead, their relationship gradually grows over the course of nearly two years (seven seasons); the novel takes place in an extremely geographically restricted setting and lacks the wide-ranging travel typical of the rest of the genre; the motif of *Scheintod* seems to be absent; and the sex scene between Daphnis and Lycaenion is far more explicit than in any other novel.[81] Longus' treatment of these novelistic conventions represents a kind of oblique commentary on the genre, in that many of its norms have been reinvented to fit his pastoral love story. Similarly, his use of the epiphanic metaphor also differs from the other novelists', but the fact that he reimagines these epiphanic scenes suggests their centrality to his view of what constitutes a novel.

If Longus challenges his readers' generic expectations, Achilles Tatius innovates by utilizing a radically different narrative structure.[82] His novel employs its male protagonist, Clitophon, as a first-person homodiegetic narrator,

---

[80] Morgan 2004b, 8-9 summarizes many of the Dionysiac references in the novel: e.g., nymphs, Maenads, the seasons, the vintage, and, finally, the garden of Dionysophanes, which contains paintings on Dionysiac themes.

[81] Cf. MacQueen 1990, 124-137 on the relation of *Daphnis and Chloe* to the other novels; MacQueen argues that Longus does not violate these norms, but rather that he has "transformed them" (136).

[82] It seems that *Leucippe and Clitophon* is part of a trend of narratological exploration in the novels and, indeed, in Greek prose fiction of the second century CE. The earliest extant work of prose fiction narrated in the first person is probably Petronius' *Satyrica*, although the fragmentary nature of the text makes it impossible to be certain about its overall narrative structure. The first-person narrative of the Lucianic *Onos* is likely to have been composed in the second century CE (on its transmission and authorship, see further van Thiel 1971, Mason 1994, and Zanetto 2010). P. Oxy. LXX 4762, which preserves another ass novel, is probably a third-person narration (see Obbink's commentary on lines 5-8). It is therefore possible that the first-person narration was a Lucianic innovation (if indeed the novel was written by Lucian); if so, the first-person version of the ass novel in Greek would be roughly contemporary with the date of Achilles Tatius. Lucian's *Verae Historiae* (second century CE) also cleverly plays with the relationship between first-person narrative and fiction; its first-person narrator adopts the rhetoric of eyewitness historiography all the while proclaiming to narrate falsehoods (see further Whitmarsh 2011, 85-89). During the same time period, Apuleius wrote the *Metamorphoses* in Latin, a novel which exploits the possibilities of first-person narration to their fullest extent (see further Winkler 1985 and May 2006). In addition to first-person narrative, authors of prose fiction in the second century also experimented with a variety of other narrative forms. Lollianus' *Phoenicica*, which has often been connected to the *Metamorphoses* (Jones 1980 and Winkler 1980),

that is a first-person narrator narrating his own life. Clitophon exploits his nar-
ratological position to great effect: by withholding information which he has
learned later he is able to heighten the suspense of his narrative and can, for a
while, deceive his readers.[83] The epiphanic situations I have discussed thus far
have been marked by a strong distinction between the external narrator and
the (potentially) fallible beliefs of the internal audience. In *Leucippe and
Clitophon*, this distinction collapses; Clitophon simultaneously acts as narra-
tor (*auctor*) and as internal audience, focalizer, and character in the novel (*ac-
tor*).[84] As a result of his narratological position, some scholars have been too
quick to downplay the role epiphany plays in this text. Tomas Hägg writes:
"Akhilleus Tatius does not weave the motif of epiphany into the plot or de-
velop its potentials."[85] I suggest that the epiphanic motif is not underdeveloped
in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, but rather that it is treated differently because the
novel is narrated differently.

When Clitophon describes the first time he saw Leucippe, his cousin and
the heroine of the novel, he narrates an epiphanic situation very similar to
those in the rest of the genre, but one that is expressed from a first-person point
of view:

ἐν μέσοις δὲ ἦν γυνὴ μεγάλη καὶ πλουσία τῇ στολῇ. ὡς δὲ ἐνέτεινα τοὺς
ὀφθαλμοὺς κατ᾽ αὐτήν, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ παρθένος ἐκφαίνεταί μοι καὶ
καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ. τοιαύτην εἶδον ἐγώ ποτε
ἐπὶ ταύρῳ γεγραμμένην Σελήνην· ὄμμα γοργὸν ἐν ἡδονῇ· κόμη ξανθή, τὸ
ξανθὸν οὖλον· ὀφρὺς μέλαινα, τὸ μέλαν ἄκρατον· λευκὴ παρειά, τὸ
λευκὸν εἰς μέσον ἐφοινίσσετο καὶ ἐμιμεῖτο πορφύραν, οἵαν εἰς τὸν

---

seems to have had a complex third-person narrative with multiple embedded first-person
narrators (see further Stephens and Winkler 1995, 321 and Henrichs 2010a, 74; the newest
fragment, P. Oxy. LXXIII 4945, is consistent with this assessment). Antonius Diogenes'
The Incredible Things Beyond Thule, likely from the second century CE (Stephens and
Winkler 1995, 118-119), takes the penchant for narrative complexity and experimentation
even further. According to Photius, his work had at least seven layers of embedded narra-
tion (Photius codex 166, p. 109a6-112a12 Bekker; see further Stephens and Winkler 1995,
114-118).

[83] Cf. Hägg 1971, 112-137; see further Fusillo 1989, 165-178 and Morgan 2004a on Clito-
phon as narrator. The most striking example of this technique occurs in the gruesome scene
at Ach. Tat. 3,15-18, where it appears that Leucippe, the novel's heroine, has become the
sacrificial victim of a group of Egyptian bandits. In fact, as Clitophon learns later, his friend
Menelaus and his slave Satyrus have constructed an elaborate trick to save Leucippe.

[84] I have adopted the terminology of Winkler 1985, esp. 135-179 for this narratological dis-
tinction.

[85] Hägg 2002, 56, who recognizes only the reported epiphany of Artemis to the Byzantines
(Ach. Tat. 7,12,4, repeated in 8,18,1).

ἐλέφαντα Λυδία βάπτει γυνή· τὸ στόμα ῥόδων ἄνθος ἦν, ὅταν ἄρχηται τὸ
ῥόδον ἀνοίγειν τῶν φύλλων τὰ χείλη. ὡς δὲ εἶδον, εὐθὺς ἀπωλώλειν·
κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν
ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ· ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῷ τραύματι. πάντα δέ με εἶχεν
ὁμοῦ, ἔπαινος, ἔκπληξις, τρόμος, αἰδώς, ἀναίδεια. ἐπῄνουν τὸ μέγεθος,
ἐκπεπλήγμην τὸ κάλλος, ἔτρεμον τὴν καρδίαν, ἔβλεπον ἀναιδῶς, ᾐδούμην
ἁλῶναι (Ach. Tat. 1,4,2-5).

In their midst, there was a tall women, richly dressed. As I directed my
gaze at her, on the left a maiden appeared in my view. Her face flashed
over my eyes like lightning. I saw such a maiden once: a painting of Selene
on a bull. Her eyes were pleasurably fierce. Her hair was blonde, curly
yellow. Her brows were black, pure black. Her cheeks were white; the
white became rosy toward the middle and the blush mimicked the purple
into which a Lydian woman dips ivory. Her mouth was the flower of a
rose, when the rose begins to open the lips of its petals. As soon as I saw
her, I was immediately lost. Beauty wounds more sharply than a dart and
it flows through the eyes straight to the soul; for the eye is the pathway for
the wound of love. Everything seized me at the same time: admiration,
awe, terror, shame, shamelessness. I admired her stature; I was awestruck
by her beauty; my heart trembled; I looked shamelessly; I felt shame to
have been conquered.

Clitophon's first-person narrative unites an account of the epiphanic moment
with an ekphrastic description of Leucippe's beauty. In so doing, he uses the
language and imagery of epiphany differently from other novelists, making
his description of the epiphanic experience simultaneously more intense and
less authoritative. The large group scenes typical of Chariton, Xenophon of
Ephesus, and Heliodorus have been replaced by a single individual's percep-
tions. Leucippe appears (ἐκφαίνεται) and her face flashes like lightning
(καταστράπτει).[86] As soon as Clitophon sees her (εἶδον), he is "lost"

---

[86] In fact, it is possible that Heliodorus' description of the Egyptian bandits as being struck
"as if by a lightning storm" (ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πρηστῆρος, Heliod. 1,2,5; discussed above) is
meant to recall and embellish Clitophon's own meteorological metaphors in his epiphanic
description. Weather patterns, especially lightning, could count as a form of aniconic
epiphany; see further Petridou 2006, 207, who notes that both Semele and Danae were
visited by Zeus in the form of weather (lightning and rain). At Hdt. 8,65, a cloud of dust is
taken to be an epiphany of Iacchus (Petridou 2006, 109-110). The association of Leucippe
with lightning recalls the Greek poetic tradition (beginning with Alcman 1) of comparing
women with astrological phenomena.

(ἀπωλώλειν). He concludes with a catalog of emotions: admiration, awe, terror, shamelessness, and shame. Awe, terror, and admiration are typical of epiphanies; only the last two, shame (αἰδώς) and shamelessness (ἀναίδεια), a paradoxical pair of emotional opposites, belong more firmly in the world of the erotic than of religious experience.[87] His description mixes the epiphanic metaphor with a first-person erotic pathology; both express his helplessness as a spectator of Leucippe's overwhelming beauty and visual power.[88]

In addition to his narrative of the epiphanic moment, Clitophon also lavishes descriptive attention on Leucippe herself, comparing her to a painted image of Selene riding a bull.[89] Famous for her beauty,[90] the moon goddess is

---

[87] Clitophon's description is reminiscent of Sappho fr. 31 (Voigt), a poem which cleverly plays with epiphanic language and the erotic experience; see further Nagy 1990, 7§2n3 and Nagy 2007, 29. If Achilles Tatius were alluding to Sappho's poem, he would likely have received it via Hellenistic *incipit*-lists of lyric poems (on which see further Yatromanolakis 1999), which in the case of Sappho fr. 31 would have given the impression that the poem described an epiphanic situation: φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν . . . ("that man equal to the gods appears to me . . .").

[88] See further Morales 2004, 158-159 on Leucippe's visual power over Clitophon in this passage.

[89] The manuscripts at this point divide between Σελήνην (WMD; 12th, 13th, 15th century, respectively) and Εὐρώπην (VGE; 13th, 15th, and 15th/16th century, respectively). I think that Selene, which was printed by Vilborg 1955 and Garnaud 2002, is the better reading; see also Morales 2004, 38-48 and Cueva 2006, who both argue for Σελήνην. The variant Εὐρώπην would be an explicit reference to the painting with which the novel began. It has some attraction since the depiction of Selene riding on a bull is rare: I have found only one possible parallel in visual art, Roscher 1884-1937 II,2 3140, fig. 11, which depicts a winged Selene on a bull; cf. Schwen in *RE* s.v. "Selene," col. 1138 and *LIMC* "Selene, Luna" no. 46. (A winged Selene may be attested by the epithet τανυσίπτερος at *h.Hom.* 32,1.) Despite the rarity of depictions of Selene on a bull, several other considerations suggest that Σελήνην is the more likely reading. She is often depicted riding other animals, such as rams, making the bull only a moderate stretch. Further, as Vilborg 1962, 21-22 observes in his textual commentary on the passage, the use of ποτε "would be inapt if the picture just described is meant (we should expect ἄρτι or the like)." Finally, Σελήνην is the *lectio difficilior*: it is much easier to imagine how Σελήνην could have been corrupted to Εὐρώπην (a scribe remembered the scene with which the novel began) than the other way around. Billault 2007, 349 raises the possibility that the two variant readings may be the result of textual fluidity in antiquity and that they represent two different, ancient versions of the novel, but in this case, at least, a copying error seems more likely.

[90] In the *Homeric Hymn to Helios*, for instance, she is listed among his "beautiful daughters" (κάλλιμα τέκνα, *h.Hym.* 31,5-6).

a fitting divine model for Leucippe's pale complexion; she could also be identified with Artemis,[91] to whom Chariton,[92] Xenophon of Ephesus, and Heliodorus liken their heroines. As his narrating gaze moves down her face, lingering particularly on her eyes, her hair, her brow, her cheeks, and her lips, his description hovers between the woman and the image; it could apply equally to both. Such a comparison marks a departure from epiphanic scenes in the rest of the genre, in which statuary was the primary point of comparison. Both plastic and painted arts privilege the role of sight, but this novel's world is dominated by paintings (e.g., 1,1,2-13; 3,6,3-3,8,7; 5,3,4-8),[93] on whose two-dimensional canvasses Clitophon sees, experiences, and describes detailed narratives. For him, visual experience—whether of exotic animals, Leucippe, or art—is a vibrant ekphrastic process, and his narrative of Leucippe's divinely beautiful appearance is no different. Like the internal audiences in other epiphanic situations, Clitophon is overwhelmed by Leucippe's beauty, which leaves him powerless to distinguish between woman, goddess, and art. Unlike other epiphanic situations, however, there is no external narrator to explain and rationalize his experience. His restricted narrative, in which the perspective of the *auctor* is tied to that of *actor*, swoons over Leucippe's beauty and the epiphanic experience of viewing her.

Clitophon continues to exploit his first-person restricted perspective in another, very different epiphanic scene in Book Three, when it appears that native Egyptian bandits have killed Leucippe in a gruesome ritual of human sacrifice (3,15,4-5). Just as Clitophon is about to commit suicide in despair, his friend Menelaus promises that "Leucippe will be resurrected" (Λευκίππη δέ σοι νῦν ἀναβιώσεται, Ach. Tat. 3,17,4).[94] After a few raps on her coffin, Leucippe rises from the dead, her stomach gashed open and emptied of entrails.

---

[91] The identification of the two goddesses is attested as early as A. fr. 170 (Radt); see further Allan 2004, esp. 116 n. 17.

[92] Callirhoe is compared to Artemis in the epiphanic situation at the opening of the novel: "When she appeared in public, amazement seized the whole crowd, just as when Artemis appears to hunters in solitude." (ἐπεὶ δὲ προῆλθεν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον, θάμβος ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος κατέλαβεν, ὥσπερ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν ἐρημίᾳ κυνηγέταις ἐπιστάσης, Chariton 1,1,16).

[93] In addition, at several points in the novel paintings are used as points of reference: at Ach. Tat. 3,25,6 the identity of the phoenix is verified by comparing it to a γραφή, which could be either a text or a painting, and at 6,1,3, Clitophon, dressed in woman's clothing, is likened to a γραφή of Achilles on Scyros. See further Harlan 1965 and Garson 1978.

[94] Bowersock 1994, 99-119 notes the prevalence of the motif of resurrection in both the novels and the broader context of Roman imperial writing. He does not go so far as to posit a direct link between this passage (or any other) and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, but he does suggest that "it would be wise . . . to consider the possibility that the Gospel stories themselves provided the impetus" (119) for this aspect of imperial fiction.

Her apparent revival and macabre appearance can only suggest that she is a reanimated corpse or a ghost,[95] but Menelaus promises Clitophon that he will show him Leucippe unwounded. He warns him to close his eyes because he is summoning Hecate:

> ὁ δὲ ἄρχεται τερατεύεσθαι καὶ λόγον τινὰ καταλέγειν· ἅμα λέγων περιαιρεῖ τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς Λευκίππης μαγγανεύματα καὶ ἀπο-κατέστησεν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον. λέγει δέ μοι· "Ἀποκάλυψαι." καὶ ἐγὼ μόλις μὲν καὶ φοβούμενος (ἀληθῶς γὰρ ὤμην τὴν Ἑκάτην παρεῖναι), ὅμως δ᾽ οὖν ἀπέστησα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ὁλόκληρον τὴν Λευκίππην ὁρῶ. ἔτι μᾶλλον οὖν ἐκπλαγεὶς ἐδεόμην Μενελάου, λέγων· "ὦ φίλτατε Μενέλαε, εἰ διάκονός τις εἶ, δέομαί σου, ποῖ γῆς εἰμι καὶ τί ποτε ταῦτα ὁρῶ;" (Ach. Tat. 3,18,3-5)

> He began to speak hocus-pocus and to recite some formula. As he was speaking, he removed the device from Leucippe's stomach and he restored her to her former state. He said to me, "Uncover your eyes." And carefully and fearfully—for I truly believed that Hecate was present—I removed my hands from my eyes and I saw Leucippe perfectly intact. Still more shocked I asked Menelaus, "O dearest Menelaus, if you are some divine servant, I ask you, where in the world am I and what are these things I am seeing?"

This scene combines three important themes in the novels—Egyptian exoticism, epiphany, and *Scheintod*—with a first-person restricted narrator. Leucippe appears not in a shrine, but in the wilds of the Nile Delta, apparently under the spell of Egyptian magic.[96] As with other epiphanic scenes, the setting plays a role in conditioning the expectations of the internal audience.

---

[95] Ghosts sometimes retain the appearance of the deceased at the moment of death, especially when their death was particularly violent or gruesome. Thus Hector appears to Aeneas still dripping with gore (Verg. *Aen.* 2,270-279), as does the ghost of Tlepolemus at Apul. *Met.* 8,8; see further Felton 1999, 14-18.

[96] This scene seems to draw on the close associations of Egypt with magic and the occult, which become particularly prominent from the first century CE and appear in descriptions of individuals such as the doctor Thessalus, who narrates his travels to Egypt in search of magical remedies (*De virtutibus herbarum*, on which see further Moyer 2011, 208-273, 287-292), the magician Pancrates (Luc. *Philops.* 34-36), and the sorcerer Zatchlas (Apul. *Met.* 2,28-30). Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* takes this association even further. Cnemon, a Greek, wonders: "How it is only among the Egyptians that the dead come back to life?" (ὅπως παρὰ μόνοις Αἰγυπτίοις οἱ τεθνεῶτες ἀναβιοῦσιν; Heliod. 5,2,4). Later in the novel, Charicleia and Calasiris witness the reanimation of a corpse just outside the Egyptian city

When Clitophon finally opens his eyes, he is "still more surprised" (ἔτι μᾶλλον οὖν ἐκπλαγείς) to see (ὁρῶ) Leucippe unharmed. I take this description of visual perception followed by surprise to be an evocation of the epiphanic moment. His vision of Leucippe's healthy body seems even more supernatural than that of her ghost or of Hecate incarnate, and it leads Clitophon to suspect that Menelaus is "some divine servant" (διάκονός τις). This scene in the Nile Delta subverts our expectations; the world has been turned upside down, and what is normal (Leucippe alive) becomes amazing. The epiphanic metaphor no longer marks out Leucippe's supernatural beauty, but rather the surprise at seeing her alive and well. She becomes epiphanic on her own terms, rather than because of her similarity to a divinity.

How can a first-person narrator describe such an amazing and improbable experience without losing credibility with his readers? Clitophon's response, I suggest, is to separate his role as *auctor* from that of *actor*. In fact, several details of this passage belong exclusively to his auctorial persona. For instance, he narrates what Menelaus did while his eyes were closed,[97] even though neither the reader nor Clitophon as *actor* understand the significance of removing the "device" (τὰ . . . μαγγανεύματα) from Leucippe's stomach. Its role as a gory bit of costuming will only be revealed later (3,19-22). Finally, when Clitophon explains his reluctance to open his eyes, saying "I truly (ἀληθῶς) thought that Hecate was present," the adverb ἀληθῶς suggests that his belief might now, after the fact, be implausible. I would suggest that Clitophon's efforts as *auctor* to retrospectively rationalize the experience of Clitophon as *actor* are part of a strategy for narrating the marvelous that appears throughout the genre,[98] whereby the narrator distances himself from the thoughts and perceptions of the internal audience in order to describe the most amazing events.

I conclude my discussion of *Leucippe and Clitophon* with two closely related scenes that further extend the scope of epiphanic language to the experience of seeing a text written by Leucippe. Both occur in Ephesus, during Clitophon's brief marriage to the Ephesian widow Melite. In the first scene, Clitophon has just discovered a letter from Leucippe and recognizes her handwriting immediately. The letter's epiphanic effect derives its power both from her textual presence and from her surprising announcement that she is alive.

Bessa (Heliod. 6,14,2-7). As an Egyptian priest, however, Calasiris is very careful throughout the *Aethiopica* to distinguish his Egyptian religion from baser forms of magic.

[97] Cf. Hägg 1971, 132.

[98] Cf. Morgan 2004a, 497. This is part of a larger narratological strategy with regard to the divine, in which Clitophon as narrator rarely ascribes events unambiguously to divine agency.

In the second, Melite discovers the letter and confronts Clitophon with it. I suggest that in these scenes the epiphanic metaphor illustrates the textualization of the heroine,[99] in which the process of reading Leucippe's texts produces the same reaction as seeing her in person:

(1) καὶ ἐπεὶ προσῆλθον, λέγει μὲν οὐδέν, ἐπιστολὴν δὲ ὀρέγει. λαβὼν δέ, πρὶν ἀναγνῶναί με, κατεπλάγην εὐθύς· ἐγνώρισα γὰρ Λευκίππης τὰ γράμματα (Ach. Tat. 5,18,1-2).

And when I approached, he said nothing, but handed me the letter. I took it and, before I read it, I was immediately stunned. For I recognized the writing of Leucippe.

(2) καὶ ἅμα τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῆς Λευκίππης μοι προσέρριψεν. ἰδὼν οὖν καὶ γνωρίσας ἔφριξα καὶ ἔβλεπον εἰς γῆν ὡς ἐληλεγμένος (Ach. Tat. 5,25,4).

And she threw Leucippe's letter at me. Seeing and recognizing it, I shuddered and looked towards the ground as if I had been caught red-handed.

Without explicitly mentioning a god or a goddess, both scenes use language evocative of epiphany to describe the moment Clitophon sees and identifies Leucippe's handwriting. In the first passage (5,18,1-2), the moment of visual perception is expressed through a reference to reading (πρὶν ἀναγνῶναί με). This pun on two etymologically related verbs, ἀναγιγνώσκειν (to read) and γνωρίζειν (to recognize), suggests a connection between reading as a process of seeing, decoding, and recognizing and the very similar process encapsulated by the epiphanic moment. In the second passage (5,25,4), Clitophon's reaction is described using the full epiphanic protocol of revelation, sight, and recognition.

Insofar as reading a text is equivalent to viewing its subject, the effect of Leucippe's letter in both scenes represents a novel kind of ekphrasis. When Clitophon scrutinizes the letter more carefully, the ekphrastic effect is even more explicit. He describes himself as "reading every word of it letter by letter, as if seeing Leucippe through them" (ὡς ἐκείνην δι᾽ αὐτῶν βλέπων, καὶ ἀναγινώσκων καθ᾽ ἕν, 5,19,5). The process of "reading" Leucippe, therefore,

---

[99] See Morales 2004, 202-205 for a discussion of the ways in which the letter represents Leucippe and gives her a voice in the narrative. In a sense, the letter becomes a proxy for her.

is equivalent to seeing and experiencing her presence; texts written by her become a substitute for the real person.[100] Clitophon's response to Leucippe's letter might therefore be compared to Chaereas' reaction to Callirhoe's statue (Chariton 3,6,1 and 3,9,1). In both cases the male protagonist reacts to a representation of his beloved in a way that is suggestive of an epiphany. In Chariton's novel, the representation is a statue. Achilles Tatius gives the written word the same status as the plastic arts. This is related to the novel's broader project of expressing visual beauty in textual form, and these passages in *Leucippe and Clitophon* illustrate the power of writing to represent Leucippe's corporeal presence as well as the nexus of written representation, sight, and epiphany.[101]

Conclusion

Clitophon's epiphanic reaction to a written document is a fitting place to think more generally about the scope and significance of epiphany in the novels. I hope to have shown how integral epiphanic situations are to the novelists' conception of their genre and to have outlined how the novels have received and reshaped a complex set of epiphanic traditions in Greek literature and culture. Epiphanic situations, in which a novel's heroine is compared to a prominent female deity (Aphrodite, Artemis, Isis, the nymphs, Selene, and Hecate), frequently emphasize female beauty and desirability, and they appear in all five of the extant novels and at least some fragmentary novels. In each case, they have been adapted to fit the broader contexts and concerns of the novels in which they appear, but they retain as a recognizable core the tripartite epiphanic protocol of appearing, seeing, and recognizing that is attested throughout Greek literature. In this way, they resemble other generic conventions of the novels, which are manipulated by individual authors in strikingly different ways. Throughout this paper, I have emphasized how epiphany and epiphanic situations relate to the novels' interest in visual perception, the gaze, and the narration of miraculous events. In particular, epiphanic situations, which are

---

[100] For more on the role of ekphrastic description in the novel, see Morales 2004; Elsner 1995 and Elsner 2007 discuss ekphrasis more broadly in the Roman imperial period.

[101] The power of the written word to stand as a substitute for the female protagonist is not unique to *Leucippe and Clitophon*. When Dionysius receives Callirhoe's letter at the end of Chariton's novel, he recognizes her handwriting and kisses the document (8,5,13). Although his reaction to her letter is not epiphanic, he does regard Callirhoe's writing as a substitute for her presence.

often mediated through the visual arts and have a strong tendency to be focalized through the perceptions and experiences of an internal audience, can serve as an alternative or supplement to ekphrasis. By shifting attention away from the object of perception to the experience of viewing, they offer the novelists one strategy for describing the indescribable.

To conclude, I would like to return to Hägg's "secular-literary interpretation" of epiphany in the novels.[102] The argument of this paper suggests that it is indeed possible to give weight to the religious nature of epiphany and of the epiphanic metaphor without reading the novels as encoded religious texts. The genre's preference for epiphanic situations over "genuine" epiphany does not mean that the novelists or their characters did not "believe in" epiphany. To the contrary, they go to great lengths to draw upon, to allude to, and occasionally to subvert the religious, cultural, and literary traditions of epiphanic experience.[103] Further, "genuine" epiphanies do occur in the novels, but, crucially, they occur outside the main narrative: the gods appear in dreams,[104] in the mythical past,[105] or in settings otherwise out of the narrator's view.[106] This distancing technique, which appears in both literary and epigraphic narratives of epiphanies,[107] is familiar from the historiographical and paradoxographical

---

[102] Hägg 2002, esp. 59.

[103] Epiphanic scenes are not the only religious phenomena that are re-appropriated by the novels as literary motifs. Whitmarsh 1999, for instance, offers a sophisticated interpretation of Heliodorus' metaphorical engagement with the narrative patterns of "an adolescent *rite de passage*" (19) in order to comment on cultural identity in the *Aethiopica.*

[104] Clitophon's description of a dream epiphany made by Aphrodite illustrates the importance of "genuine" epiphanies occurring at a different time and/or place from the main narrative. When Leucippe reports that she had a dream vision of Artemis (Ach. Tat. 4,1,4-5), she reminds Clitophon that he had seen Aphrodite in a dream (Ach. Tat. 4,1,5-8). Both narrate their dreams from the comfort of hindsight; on dreams in the novels, see further Carlisle 2009.

[105] E.g., when Dionysus appears to a shepherd at Ach. Tat. 2,2,3-6.

[106] E.g., as Eros is said to do at Longus 2,4-6. Apart from the appearance of Pan and his *aretai* at Longus 2,25-27, the epiphany of Artemis at Ach. Tat. 7,12,4 is the closest that a novel's narrator comes to endorsing the occurrence of an epiphany in recent memory: "Artemis made an epiphany in the war against the Thracians, and the Byzantines, since they won, thought it necessary to send a sacrifice to her as a victory offering for her support" (οἱ γὰρ Βυζάντιοι, τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐπιφανείσης ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Θρᾷκας, νικήσαντες ἐλογίσαντο δεῖν αὐτῇ θυσίαν ἀποστέλλειν τῆς συμμαχίας ἐπινίκιον). Clitophon does not describe seeing the goddess in person, but only relates the Byzantines' report. Cf. Whitmarsh 2011, 193-195, who emphasizes the novelists' preference for setting epiphany at one remove from their narratives

[107] Cf. Graf 2004, esp. 122 for a similar tendency in the epigraphic conventions of recording epiphanies; Graf argues that Greeks were more ready to record epiphanies that occurred at

traditions: by expressing their own doubts, authors lend plausibility to their fictional accounts.[108]

Yet, the novelists' frequent comparison of their protagonists with divinities need not imply, as Reinhold Merkelbach interpreted it, that mortals were substitutes (*Doppelgänger*) for the gods in the novels' narratives.[109] Al-though they provoke the same epiphanic response as gods, paradoxically, the comparison of the protagonists with divinities only emphasizes their mortality. In the novels, mortals resemble divinities strictly in terms of their appearance: they are so exceptional to behold that they can be mistaken for gods, but these mortals, who are tossed across the Mediterranean and face death time and time again, poignantly lack the gods' power and immortality. In this way, the novels do not describe their heroes and heroines as literal, but as literary, *Doppelgänger* of the gods.[110]

Bibliography

Allan, W. 2004. "Religious Syncretism: The New Gods of Greek Tragedy," *HSCP* 102, 113-155.

Alperowitz, M. 1992. *Das Wirken und Walten der Götter im griechischen Roman*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

ANRW = H. Temporini (ed.) 1972- . *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A., and Corcella, A. 2007. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, edited by Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Bargheer, R. 1999. *Die Gottesvorstellung Heliodors in den* Aithiopika, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

---

some distance (either temporal or spatial) from the site of the inscription. Harrison 2000, 90-91 observes a similar phenomenon in Herodotus.

[108] Morgan 1982, 227-232 discusses the way authorial uncertainty contributes to the "realism" of Heliodorus' narrative. He comments (231): "Uncertainty is characteristic of any writer writing honestly about things that really happened; or, more importantly for our present purposes, of any writer who wishes to give the impression that he is writing honestly about things that really happened." Heliodorus, who is writing fiction, has no reason to be uncertain, but his expressions of uncertainty lend plausibility to what he narrates. I suggest that the reluctance to narrate "genuine" epiphany is a related phenomenon.

[109] Merkelbach 1962, esp. 92 on Xenophon of Ephesus.

[110] This paper was first delivered at the Corhali Colloquium on epiphany at Princeton University; it was subsequently presented at the University of Amsterdam; and it was read in written form by Lauren Curtis, Albert Henrichs, Christopher Jones, and the editor and referees of *Ancient Narrative*. It is a distinct pleasure to thank each of these audiences for their astute suggestions and generous encouragement.

Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Beck, R. 2003. "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy, and the Ancient Novel," in: Schmeling 2003, 131-150.

Bierl, A. 2007. "Mysterien der Liebe und die Initiation Jugendlicher: Literatur und Religion im griechischen Roman," in: A. Bierl, R. Lämmle, and K. Wesselmann (eds.), *Literatur und Religion: Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen*, volume 1, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 239-334.

Billault, A. 2007. "Image, légende et récit: remarques sur Achille Tatius I, 1-2 et I, 4, 3," in: S. David and E. Geny (eds.), *Troika Parcours Antiques: Mélanges offerts à M. Woronoff*, volume 1, Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 341-350.

Bowersock, G. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley: University California Press.

Bowie, E. 2012. "Socrates' Cock and Daphnis' Goats: The Rarity of Vows in the Religious Practice of the Greek Novels," *Trends in Classics* 4, 225-273.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, translated by John Raffan, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burkert, W. 1997. "From Epiphany to Cult Statue," in: A. B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*, Swansea: Duckworth in association with the Classical Press of Wales, 15-34. [Reprinted in Burkert 2011, 139-155.]

Burkert, W. 1999. "Die Artemis der Epheser: Wirkungsmacht und Gestalt einer grossen Göttin," in: H. Friesinger and F. Krinzinger (eds.), *100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos: Akten des Symposions Wien 1995*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. [Reprinted in Burkert 2011, 56-73.]

Burkert, W. 2004. "Epiphanies and Signs of Power: Minoan Suggestions and Comparative Evidence," *ICS* 29, 1-23. [Reprinted in Burkert 2011, 156-176.]

Burkert, W. 2011. *Kleine Schriften VI: Mythica, ritualia, religiosa 3: Kulte und Feste*, edited by E. Krummen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Carlisle, D.P.C. 2009. *Καὶ ὄναρ καὶ ὕπαρ: Dreaming in the Ancient Novel*, Chapel Hill: Diss. University of North Carolina.

Cavallo, G. 1996. "Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere," in: O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14-17 settembre 1994*, Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 13-46.

Coleman, K.M. 2011. "Sailing to Nuceria: Evidence for the Date of Xenophon of Ephesus," *AClass* 54, 27-42.

Connor, W.R. 1987. "Tribes, Festivals and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece," *JHS* 107, 40-50.

Cueva, E.P. 2006. "Who's the Woman on the Bull? Achilles Tatius 1,4,3," in: S.N. Byrne, E.P. Cueva, and J. Alvares (eds.), *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel*, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, 131-146.

D-K = H. Diels and W. Kranz (eds.) 1951. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und deutsch*, 6th ed., Berlin: Weidmann.

Dickie, M. 2004. "Divine Epiphany in Lucian's Account of the Oracle of Alexander of Abonuteichos," *ICS* 29, 159-182.

Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley – Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dowden, K. 2005. "The Greek Novel and the Ritual of Life," in: S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, 23-35.

Dunand, F. 1973. *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, 3 volumes, Leiden: Brill.

Edsall, M. 2000-2001. "Religious Narratives and Religious Themes in the Novels of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus," *Ancient Narrative* 1, 114-132.

Edwards, D.R. 1991. "Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus, and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*," in: L. Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 179-201.

Edwards, D.R. 1994. "Defining the Web of Power in Asia Minor: The Novelist Chariton and his City Aphrodisias," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62, 699-718.

Edwards, D.R. 1996. *Religion & Power: Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greek East*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, M.W. 1960. "Representation of Maenads on Archaic Red-Figure Vases," *JHS* 80, 78-87.

Elmer, D.F. 2008. "Heliodoros's 'Sources': Intertextuality, Paternity, and the Nile River in the *Aithiopika*," *TAPA* 138,2, 411-50.

Elsner, J. 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, J. 2007. *Roman Eyes*: *Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

FD = 1902 - . *Fouilles de Delphes*, Paris: Boccard.

Felton, D. 1999. *Haunted Greece and Rome: Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fleischer, R. 1973. *Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien*, Leiden: Brill.

Fowler, D.P. 1990. "Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*," *PCPS* 216, 42-63.

Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed eros*, Venice: Marsilio Editori.

Garnaud, J.-P. 2002. *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie: Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Garson, R.W. 1978. "Works of Art in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*," *AClass* 21, 83-86.

Gladigow, B. 1985-1986. "Präsenz der Bilder—Präsenz der Götter: Kultbilder und Bilder der Götter in der griechischen Religion," *Visible Religion* 4-5, 114-133.

Gladigow, B. 1990. "Epiphanie, Statuette, Kultbild: Griechische Gottesvorstellungen im Wechsel von Kontext und Medium," *Visible Religion* 7, 98-121.

Goldhill, S. 2002. "The Erotic Experience of Looking: Cultural Conflict and the Gaze in Imperial Culture," in: M.C. Nussbaum and J. Sihvola (eds.), *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 374-399.

Goldhill, S. 2008. "Genre," in: Whitmarsh 2008, 185-200.

Gordon, R. 1979. "The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Greco-Roman World," *Art History* 2,1, 5-34.

Graf, F. 1997. "Epiphanie," in: H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Der neue Pauly*, volume 3, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1150-1152.

Graf, F. 2004. "Trick or Treat? On Collectives Epiphanies in Antiquity," *ICS* 29, 111-130.

Greaves, A. 2004. "The Cult of Aphrodite in Miletos and its Colonies," *Anatolian Studies* 54, 27-33.

Hägg, T. 1966. "Die *Ephesiaka* des Xenophon Ephesios—Original oder Epitome," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27, 118-161. [Translated and reprinted in Hägg 2004, 198-259; English title: "The *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon Ephesius—Original or Epitome?"]

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in the Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm: Svenska institutet i Athen.

Hägg, T. 2002. "Epiphany in the Greek Novels: The Emplotment of a Metaphor," *Eranos* 100, 51-61. [Reprinted in Hägg 2004, 141-155.]

Hägg, T. 2004, *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969-2004)*, edited by L. Boje Mortensen and T. Eide, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Harlan, E.C. 1965. *The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and its Application in Achilles Tatius*, New York: Diss. Columbia University.

Harrison, T. 2000. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London – New York: Routledge.

Henderson, J. 2009. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe. Xenophon of Ephesus: Anthia and Habrocomes*, Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press.

Henrichs, A. 1978. "Horaz als Aretaloge des Dionysos: *Credite Posteri*," *HSCP* 82, 203-211.

Henrichs, A. 2006. "Der antike Roman: Kerényi und die Folgen," in: R. Schlesier and R. Sanchiño Martínez (eds.), *Neuhumanismus und Anthropologie des griechischen Mythos. Karl Kerényi im europäischen Kontext des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Locarno: Rezzonico Editore, 57-70.

Henrichs, A. 2010a. "Fractured Communications: Narrators, Narratives and Discourse in Greek Novels on Papyrus," in: G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri del romanzo antico: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 11–12 giugno 2009*, Florence: Istituto papirologico "G. Vitelli," 65-80.

Henrichs, A. 2010b. "What is a Greek God?" in: J. Bremmer and A. Erskine (eds.), *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 19-39.

Henrichs, A. 2011. "Missing Pages: Papyrology, Genre, and the Greek Novel," in: D. Obbink and R. Rutherford (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 302-322.

Henrichs, A. 2012. "Epiphany," in: S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, and E. Eidinow (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edition, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 526-527.

Holzberg, N. 2003. "The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe," in: Schmeling 2003, 11-28.

Hunter, R. 2008. "History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton," in: *On Coming After, Part 2: Comedy and Performance, Greek Poetry of the Roman Empire, the Ancient Novel*, Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 737-774. [Reprinted with addenda from *ANRW* II 34,2, 1055-1086.]

IG = 1873- . *Inscriptiones graecae*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

I. Smyrna = G. Petzl (ed.) 1982-1987. *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, Bonn: Habelt.

Jaeger, W. 1947. *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*, translated by E.S. Robinson, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, C.P. 1980. "Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Lollianus' *Phoinikika*," *Phoenix* 34, 243-254.

Jones, C.P. 1992. "La personnalité de Chariton," in: M.-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and 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, 161-172.

Kerényi, K. 1962. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung: Ein Versuch mit Nachbetrachtungen*, 2nd edition, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Koenen, L. 1993. "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure," in: A.W. Bulloch, E.S. Gruen, A.A. Long, and A. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 25-115.

Kontoleon, N.M. 1952, "Νέαι ἐπιγραφαὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἐκ Πάρου," Ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἐφημερίς 91, 32-95.

Lane Fox, R. 1987. *Pagans and Christians*, New York: Knopf.

Larson, J. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Lesher, J. 1992. *Xenophanes of Colophon: Fragments. A Text and Translation with a Commentary*, Toronto – Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

LiDonnici, L.R. 1992. "The Images of Artemis Ephesia and Greco-Roman Worship: A Reconsideration," *The Harvard Theological Review* 85,4, 389-415.

LIMC = J. Boardman (ed.) 1981-2009. *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zurich: Artemis.

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

Mason, H.J. 1994. "Greek and Latin Versions of the Ass-Story," in: *ANRW* II 34,2, 1665-1707.

May, R. 2006. *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Merkelbach, R. 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*, Munich: Beck.

Montiglio, S. 2013. *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Morgan, J.R. 1978. *A Commentary on the Ninth and Tenth Books of the* Aithiopica *of Heliodoros*, Oxford: Diss. University of Oxford.

Morgan, J.R. 1982. "History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros," *ClAnt* 1, 221-265.

Morgan, J.R. 1991. "Reader and Audiences in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros," *GCN* 4, 85-103.

Morgan, J.R. 2004a. "Achilles Tatius," in: I. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Leiden – Boston: E.J. Brill, 493-506.

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

Morgan, K.A. 2000. *Myth and Philosophy from the Pre-Socratics to Plato*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moyer, I. 2011. *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Müller, C.W. 1985. "Die Archilochoslegende," *RhM* 128,2, 99-151.

Nachtergael, G. 1977. *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes: Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*, Brussels: Palais des Académies.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of the Epic Past*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nagy, G. 2007. "Lyric and Greek Myth," in R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press, 19-51.

Nickau, K. 2002. "Zur Epiphanie des Eros im Hirtenroman des Longos," *Hermes* 130,2, 176-191.

OGIS = W. Dittenberger (ed.) 1903-1905. *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 2 volumes, Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius de Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V,* Munich – Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

Pax, E. 1962. "Epiphanie," in: F.J. Dolger, T. Klauser, H. Kruse, H. Lietzmann, and J.H. Waszink (eds.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, volume 5, Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 832-909.

Petridou, G. 2006. *On Divine Epiphanies: Contextualising and Conceptualising Epiphanic Narratives in Greek Literature and Culture*, Exeter: Diss. University of Exeter.

Pfister, F. 1924. "Epiphanie," in: G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband IV, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 277-323.

Piettre, R. 2001. "Images et perception de la présence divine en Grèce ancienne," *MÉFRA* 113,1, 211-224.

Platt, V. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prier, R.A. 1989. *Thauma Idesthai: The Phenomenology of Sight and Appearance in Archaic Greek*, Gainesville, FL: Florida State University Press.

Pritchett, W.K. 1979. *The Greek State at War: Part III. Religion*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pucci, P. 1988. "Strategia epifanica e intertestualità nel secondo libro dell'*Iliade*," *SIFC*[3] 6,1, 5-24.

Pucci, P. 1994. "Gods' Intervention and Epiphany in Sophocles," *AJPh* 115,1, 15-46.

RE = G. Wissowa (ed.) 1894-1980. *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

Richardson, N.J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Richardson, N. 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rife, J.L. 2002. "Officials of the Roman Provinces in Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*," *ZPE* 138, 93-108.

Rohde, E. 1914. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 3rd edition, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

Roloff, D. 1970. *Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben: Untersuchungen zur Herkunft der platonischen Angleichung an Gott*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Roscher, M.L. 1884-1937. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig: Teubner.

Schepens, G. and Delcroix, K. 1996. "Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception," in O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14-17 settembre 1994*, Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 375-460.

Schmeling, G. (ed.) 2003. *The Novel in the Ancient World*, revised edition, Boston – Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Schmeling, G. 2005. "Callirhoe: God-like Beauty and the Making of a Celebrity," in: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, 36-49.

Schmeling, G. (with the collaboration of Aldo Setaioli) 2011. *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmitz, J.L. 2009. "The 'Breast,' the Bug, and the Babe: Reevaluating the Imagery of Artemis of Ephesus," *AIA 2009 Annual Meeting*, Session 4G, Philadelphia, PA.

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

Scippacercola, N. 2011. *Il lato oscuro del romanzo greco*, Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.

Scott, K. 1938. "Ruler Cult and Related Problems in the Greek Romances," *CP* 33,4, 380-389.

Sedley, D. 2000. "The Ideal of Godlikeness," in G. Fine (ed.), *Plato 2: Ethics Politics, Religion, and the Soul*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 309-328.

Seiterle, G. 1979. "Artemis—die Große Göttin von Ephesos," *AW* 10,3, 3-16.

Selden, D.L. 1994. "Genre of Genre," in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 39-64.

Senff, R. 2003. "Das Aphroditeheiligtum von Milet," in: G. Heedemann and E. Winters (eds.), *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens: Elmar Schwertheim zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet* (=*Asia Minor Studien* 49), Bonn: Habelt, 11-25.

Sinos, R.H. 1993. "Divine Selection: Epiphany and Politics in Archaic Greece," in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73-91.

Stephens, S. and Winkler, J. 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Swain, S. 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

van Thiel, H. 1971. *Der Eselsroman: Teil I. Untersuchungen*, Munich: C.H. Beck.

Thomas, C.M. 1995. "At Home in the City of Artemis. Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period," in: H. Koestler (ed.), *Ephesos. Metropolis of Asia*, Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 81–117.

Tilg, S. 2010. *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Trzaskoma, S.M. 2012. "Why Miletus? Chariton's Choice of Setting and Xenophon's *Anabasis*," *Mnemosyne*[4] 65,2, 300-307.

Versnel, H.S. 1987. "What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany," in: D. van der Plas (ed.), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions*, Leiden – New York: E.J. Brill, 42-55.

Vilborg, E. 1955. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Weißenberg, M. 1997. "Der 'Götterapparat' im Roman des Chariton," in: M. Picone and B. Zimmerman (eds.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*, Basel – Boston: Birkhäuser, 49-73.

Whitmarsh, T. 1998. "The Birth of a Prodigy: Heliodorus and the Genealogy of Hellenism," in: R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, Cambridge: Cambridge Philosophical Society, 93-124.

Whitmarsh, T. 1999. "The Writes of Passage: Cultural Initiation in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," in: R. Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, London – New York: Routledge, 16-40.

Whitmarsh, T. 2002. "Written on the Body: Ekphrasis, Perception and Deception in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *Ramus* 31,1-2, 111-125.

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

Whitmarsh, T. 2011. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. 2013. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winkler, J.J. 1980. "Lollianos and the Desperadoes," *JHS* 100, 155-181.

Winkler, J.J. 1982. "The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*," *YCS* 27, 93-158. [Reprinted in Swain 1999, 286-350.]

Winkler, J.J. 1985. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's* Golden Ass, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Witt, R.E. 1971. "The Great Artemis-Isis," in R.E. Witt (ed.), *Isis in the Greco-Roman World*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 141-151.

Yatromanolakis, D. 1999. "Alexandrian Sappho Revisited," *HSCP* 99, 179-195.

Zanetto, G. 2010. "P. Oxy. LXX 4762 e il romanzo dell'asino," in: G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri del romanzo antico: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 11–12 giugno 2009*, Florence: Istituto papirologico "G. Vitelli," 51-63.

Zeitlin, F. 2003. "Chariton's Theater of Romance," in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Boston: E.J. Brill, 71-83.

Zeitlin, F. 2008. "Religion," in: Whitmarsh 2008, 91-108.