The Boy's Own love story:
The romantic adventures of
Leukippe, Kleitophon, and Kleitophon's friends

ELIZABETH MITCHELL
Harvard University

Introduction

'To fully understand the human image in a Greek romance and the distinctive features of its identity (and consequently the distinctive way its identity is put to the test) we must take into consideration the fact that human beings in such works – as distinct from all classical genres of ancient literature – are *individuals*, *private persons*. This figure corresponds to the *abstract-alien* world of the Greek romance: in such a world, a man can *only* function as an isolated and private individual, deprived of any organic connection with his country, his city, his own social group, his clan, even his own family. He does not feel himself to be a part of the social whole. He is a solitary man, lost in an alien world.'

> Mikhail Bakhtin, 'Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel,' in *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981) p108.

As a generalized statement about Greek romance novels, it is my contention that Bakhtin's statement is wrong. Isolated and private individuality is only of so much use in making sense of Achilles Tatius' 2nd century CE romantic novel *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, and I will argue here that *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, far from being a tale in which one man (or two lovers) are pitched against the world, offers a strong model of group identity based on principles of male friendship and homosociality.[1]

---

[1] It is perhaps unfair to pick on Bakhtin, whose sentiment in the passage above is spoken in relation to the extant (non-fragmentary) Greek romances as a genre, while the topic of this

"Human image" in *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is strongly determined by social relationships. The emotional connection between Leukippe and Kleitophon is continually set against, mediated by, and focalized through an elaborately constructed context of (mostly male) connections and relationships. In many ways, the author shows as much concern to define the protagonist-narrator (Kleitophon) and his romance in relation to these other characters as he does in exploring Kleitophon's relationship to Leukippe.[2]

In arguing for the fundamentality to this novel of (mostly) male-male social relationships, I am adding to a list of social contexts built up by scholars of the novel. While I oppose the model of the romantic hero as an 'isolated and private individual, deprived of any organic connection with his country, his city, his own social group, his clan, even his own family,'[3] it is clear that the Greek novels have many ways of representing and investigating 'the relationship between self and society';[4] male friendship will by no means prove an exhaustive backdrop. On the one hand, I set homosociality against and alongside questions of individual, private identity (as espoused by Bakhtin and others),[5] and also alongside the idea of the *Liebespaar* as the central focus of identity construction.[6] Where for Chariton and Xenophon a key node of identity is the *polis*, in which festivals and public spaces frame the experiences of the lovers, it is immediately obvious that Leukippe and Kleitophon operate within a more private, domestic framework. Tim Whitmarsh has discussed this point, writing that 'Kleitophon's relationship of primary significance is with his family, not his civic community,'[7] and arguing that Achilles Tatius

---

paper is one particular novel, Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe and Kleitophon*. But the idea of individuality so clearly laid out by Bakhtin is one which finds resonance in much of the scholarship on Leukippe and Kleitophon. The model of Kleitophon as 'the individual in the world' (Reardon 1969, 300), is also proposed, among others, by Morales 2001, xxvii: 'Achilles Tatius' focus on the individual ... adrift in the world reflects the isolation of Hellenistic man,' and Morgan 1995, 144: 'Romance is very much the literature of the individual. These stories all have individual heroes and heroines whose experiences are non-social'; 146: 'Romance is an aggressive assertion of selfhood.'

[2] When discussing characters from the novel *Leukippe and Kleitophon* I transliterate names directly from the Greek. However, for characters and authors of other novels I offer inconsistent transliterations, following the Greek or Latin form accordingly as they are most familiar in translations of and secondary literature on these texts. On the same grounds of familiarity, Achilles Tatius keeps his Latinate name. All translations are my own.

[3] Bakhtin 1981, 108.

[4] Whitmarsh 2011, 139.

[5] See n. 1.

[6] The fullest exploration of this idea is in Konstan 1994.

[7] Whitmarsh 2011, 91; see also 73; 149.

constructs a 'patriarchal family romance'.[8] While I accept the importance of the novel's domestic and familial backdrop,[9] I argue that this is by no means an exhaustive, or even the primary, description of the novel's social setting or discursive space.

Ronald F. Hock and Akihiko Watanabe have both written about the importance of friendship in the Greek romances.[10] Hock, focusing on Chariton's *Kallirhoe*, has noted the value of the extant Greek novels as a source for observing the conventions of friendship in a specific historical setting.[11] In a study of Polycharmos, the friend of Chariton's hero Chaereas, he demonstrates the 'visibility and importance' of this particular *phílos*, arguing that 'his importance derives from his role as the *phílosexaíretos*, the one who, to use Lucian's definition of a *phílos*, "obligates himself to share his friend's every blow of fortune" (χρὴ τοῖς φίλοις ἁπάσης τύχης κοινωνεῖν).'[12] Watanabe, whose work focuses mainly on Hippothoos in Xenophon of Ephesos's *Anthia and Habracomes*, has written about the 'alternative masculinity' which a novelistic best friend can offer, and the 'appreciation of [such] other masculinities' evinced by this 'polyphonic and omnivorous genre'.[13] My arguments here will to a certain extent be transferable to the novels of Chariton and Xenophon, but for the most part are specific to Achilles Tatius. I will pick up on Watanabe's 'alternative masculinities', but rather than focusing on a single best friend of/counterpart to the hero as Hock and Watanabe do, I will suggest that friendship in *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is a group activity, and, furthermore, that it constitutes a fundamental part of the narrative framing and construction of the lovestory – perhaps even of love stories more generally.

The story of Leukippe and Kleitophon, related by its hero to a stranger in a garden in the Mediterranean port town of Sidon, is surrounded by second-tier players. Characters such as Kleinias, Satyros, Menelaos, Thersandros, and Sosthenes circle constantly around the perspective offered by Kleitophon on the central love affair, and in the course of this paper I will try to draw out something of their importance. But the social, moral, attitudinal positioning goes beyond the characterizations within Kleitophon's narrative. The opening chapters of the novel's first book add yet another interested party to the novel's community: the unnamed traveler to Sidon, Kleitophon's willing listener. Right from the beginning, by providing a listener whom he brings into

---

[8] Whitmarsh 2011, 257.

[9] 7,12.

[10] Hock 1997; Watanabe 2003.

[11] See e.g. Hock 1997, 162.

[12] Hock 1997, 149, quoting Lucian *Toxaris* 6.

[13] Watanabe 2003, 37.

direct contact and conversation with the protagonist himself, Achilles Tatius is constructing a wider audience for Kleitophon's story. Far from being a world of two, the network of relationships surrounding the romance of Leukippe and Kleitophon extends out into a fictional rendering of a listening audience – and even, one might posit, into the reading community of the novel itself. Kleitophon's love affair, I shall argue, is in every sense a socialized experience.

Framing the love story, writing the reader

Shortly after the novel opens, the narrative voice is transferred from an un-named first narrator, a traveler who has arrived at Sidon after a rough voyage, to Kleitophon, a young man with whom the traveler has fallen into conversa-tion while inspecting a painting of the abduction of Europa. The handling of this narrative transfer frames the circumstances in which the story is – in which such a story ought to be? – told.

The first narrator is in many senses unmarked, nameless, without place of origin, and with no stated purpose for his travels. We do not even know whether Sidon was his intended destination. But we are given circumstances which go some way to characterizing him, at least as regards his relation to Kleitophon and to Kleitophon's tale. He brings with him both the "real" con-text of a recent rough sea journey, and the imaginary, constructed interest aroused by enjoyment of a mythical painting, which has impressed him with its artistry and set him to reflecting on the power of love (its description will also, incidentally, foreshadow some of the themes of the story to come). He is quite ready to hear a love story when Kleitophon appears on the scene with the offer of one, and he leads his new acquaintance to a gentle, Platonic garden where they can sit down in private while Kleitophon tells his tale.

In these ways Achilles Tatius sets Kleitophon in a social relationship to his hearer. The story is shared between two men, near-strangers who have met by chance, one of whom happens to be sympathetic to love stories and in the right mood at the precise moment at which such a story is offered. We can perhaps also make certain assumptions about the social group of the listener – that he is a free man and a citizen, of a social standing close enough to that of Kleitophon to make the sudden friendship a plausible one. It is a personal re-lationship but not an intimate one, and in fact the two men approach the tale with different expectations; where Kleitophon presents his experiences as ones of toil and hardship ('"I should know," he said, "having suffered such

violence from love"' (1,2,1)[14]), the traveler makes it clear in his description of their resting-spot that his own expectations are quite different: 'and so, seating him on a low bench and myself sitting down alongside him, I said, "it seems to me that now is the time for listening to your story. The setting is absolutely lovely, and just right for erotic stories"' (1,2,3).[15] And when Kleitophon warns him that 'my tale is like fiction',[16] his listener is adamant that 'by Zeus and the god of love himself, it'll please me all the more if it's like fiction' (1,2,2):[17] he actively wants to hear a story which will blur the line between the real and the unreal. This question of the self-interested perspective of any given listening audience will also come up again later on in the novel, and also in my discussion.[18] For now it is important to note that the fiction of orality allows for this possibility of push and pull between teller and hearer right from the beginning, giving the impression that this version of the story is told specifically for this occasion (we will find out later that different versions of it have also existed),[19] and also that it is interpreted or experienced specifically on this occasion.

K. Ní Mheallaigh, picking up on the clues of the novel's setting, explores this narrative relationship in Platonic terms. She argues that it is the 'distinctively Phaedran frame' and the absence of a 'present author' for the story which '[shift] the emphasis from author to reader as the site where meaning is realised.[20] Whether we see the Platonic mode as the determining hermeneutic lens or simply as one of many, the author, in creating a relationship between Kleitophon and his hearer, is certainly placing constructions on the reader outside of the text. We are not told that the traveler to Sidon is the "ideal" or "typical" audience for the love story of Leukippe and Kleitophon, but a distinct possibility is offered to us, the reading audience, to set ourselves in his seat and listen to the story as he does.[21] As Géraldine Puccini-Delbey writes, '*le premier narrateur anonyme joue uniquement le rôle d'auditeur bienveil-*

---

[14] 'ἐγὼ ταῦτ' ἂν ἐδείκνυν' ἔφη 'τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών; Garnaud gives εἰδείην instead of ἐδείκνυν.

[15] καθίσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἐπί τινος θώκου χαμαιζήλου καὶ αὐτὸς παρακαθισάμενος 'ὥρα μοι' ἔφην 'τῆς τῶν λόγων ἀκροάσεως· πάντως δ' ὁ τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν.'

[16] τὰ… ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε.

[17] πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Ἔρωτος αὐτοῦ, ταύτῃ μᾶλλον ἥσειν, εἰ καὶ μύθοις ἔοικε.

[18] e.g. 2,35; 7,2-3.

[19] As for example at 8,5, to Leukippe's father Sostratus.

[20] Ní Mheallaigh 2007, 237.

[21] Ní Mheallaigh 2007, 235 argues for an actual apostrophe to an external reader from within the text; this remains however uncertain.

*lant que l'auteur attend de son lecteur modèle. Pour justifier son récit, Klei-
tophon doit trouver quelqu'un qui l'écoutera de manière bienveillante en
créant une solidarité affective.*'[22] There is a case to be made that Achilles Ta-
tius has already written the protagonist of his romance into a companionable
social relationship – with his reader-listener – before the story proper has even
started.[23]

The opening interaction resonates right to the end. For all the teleology of
the love story, our chronological end-point for Kleitophon is not the point
where he tells the "patriarchal family romance" version of the story to
Leukippe's father Sostratos,[24] and not the point where he sails off into the
sunset with Leukippe. The final word will always be the beginning, where he
sits companionably in a garden and tells his already concluded adventures to
a newfound friend.

With a little help from my friends

I will pick up this story of the first narrator later, when I will explore further
the extent to which social and narrative modes implicate and comprise one
another. But first I turn to the cast of characters who underpin these modes,
for whose benefit and in whose mouths they exist: Kleitophon's friends.

The sense of sociability is not lost with the inception of Kleitophon's nar-
rative. Throughout the novel, from Tyre to Alexandria to Ephesos, we will
encounter Kleitophon's companions and helpmates, chief among whom are
his cousin Kleinias and his slave Satyros; for the portion of the book spent in
Egypt, an unhappy lover called Menelaos, met on the voyage to Alexandria,
also joins the circle of companions. All in all, there are very few points in
Leukippe and Kleitophon at which the hero is left entirely to his own devices.

I give a handful of examples here to show the extent to which the success
of Kleitophon's love affair is bound up in non-romantic relationships with

---

[22] Puccini-Delbey 2001, 91.

[23] Whitmarsh 2011, 77-78 suggests that ancient 'readers without the benefit of Genettian
narratological categories would have been more disposed [than modern scholars] to iden-
tify a narrative "I" more or less directly with the author.' He may be right in this, and while
I have implied that a reader/listener other than Achilles may also be intended/interpreted
here, my main point is that there is the sense of an audience (potentially the author) capable
of drawing Kleitophon's embedded narrative out into a wider social context with the po-
tential almost to mimic a "real world" relationship of storyteller to listener.

[24] Whitmarsh 2011, 257.

other males and in the world of male conversation; many other instances might
be drawn from the text.

- When Kleitophon first falls in love, he immediately seeks out his cousin
  Kleinias for advice and consolation, which is given at length (1,9-11).
  Kleinias will be in evidence, with one interlude following the shipwreck
  (3,5-5,8,2), right up to the final chapter of the novel (8,19). It is a
  commmonplace that 'Kleinias's principal role in the plot is to play the
  "restraining friend" role',[25] but while he does indeed play this story-fur-
  thering role, his character is developed and his presence found through the
  novel to such an extent that it would be reductionist to think of him merely
  as a plot device.

- Satyros is also an enduring presence, in the earlier books in particular. He
  is a slave, but he is also a member of the *familia* with whom Kleitophon
  often converses and from whom he often accepts advice; at the close of
  Book 1, for example, they appear as a very self-satisfied master-slave duo:
  'And so both Satyros and I applauded ourselves, I for my mythologizing,
  he because he had provided me with the pretext' (1,19,3).[26] Unlike the
  slaves of Roman comedy, with whom he otherwise has a significant
  amount in common, Satyros is trusted, liked, and tolerated even at times
  when another master/narrator might have presented him as having crossed
  the line. At 2,10,4 Satyros startles the lovers in the garden and Kleitophon
  discovers that he has been under the surveillance of his slave all along –
  an instance of voyeurism which elicits not a word of criticism. Satyros'
  name gives some of his game away, but rather than indulging his own
  satyric appetites, his role is restricted to encouraging and facilitating those
  of his master. His romance with Leukippe's maid, Kleio is granted little
  page-space (2,4; 2,10; 2,19,6); its most obvious narrative functions are to
  facilitate access to Leukippe and also, surely, to provide a sense of paral-
  lelism and companionship in love between master and slave. Even the fic-
  tion of antagonism and revolt is missing.[27] And while he has no vocal part

---

[25] Whitmarsh 2011, 102-3, though Whitmarsh does in fact go on to develop a more complex
account of Kleinias' significance for the narrative, which I discuss further on in my argu-
ment.

[26] ἑαυτοὺς οὖν ἐπῃνοῦμεν ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ Σάτυρος· ἐγὼ μὲν ἐμαυτὸν τῆς μυθολογίας, ὁ δὲ ὅτι
μοι τὰς ἀφορμὰς παρέσχεν.

[27] There is no slave model quite like Satyros in Fitzgerald's book on *Slavery in the Roman
Literary Imagination*; Satyros seems to express himself in a comic mode (like the slaves
of Plautus' plays) but receives none of their beatings and never really answers back to his
master. Besides comedy, there is perhaps something of the model described by Aristotle
in the *Politics* (1255b), in which the slave is 'part of the master – he is, as it were, a part of

to play in the set-piece sex debate on board the ship bound for Alexandria, there are several points, such as Leukippe's first *Scheintod* (3,15-23), and Kleitophon's decision to marry Melite (5,11-12), at which Satyros' actions and ability to participate in decision-making are almost indistinguishable from those of Kleitophon's elite, free friends. In fact, when Kleitophon first sees that Menelaos and Satyros are alive in the wake of Leukippe's first *Scheintod*, he refers to them both as his φίλους (3,17,2).

- After Kleitophon's failed attempt to sleep with Leukippe at his family house in Tyre, it is once again to Kleinias' house that he goes for advice. For two days the cousins, and Satyros, plan the elopement of Leukippe and Kleitophon. The planning is done as a group activity,[28] and when the time of departure arrives, everyone has a role to play: 'A carriage, which Kleinias had arranged, stood ready for us at the gates, and he himself was waiting in it in anticipation of our arrival. When everyone was asleep, at around the first watch of the night, we went out without making a sound, Satyros leading Leukippe by the hand' (2,31).[29]

- Satyros and Kleinias are present on the elopement voyage itself, a voyage on which Kleitophon displays a remarkable lack of interest in Leukippe,[30] and which in fact is presented as something closer to a "holiday with the boys" than a honeymoon, dominated by male bonding when Menelaos becomes a friend to the group and by a debate on the relative merits of male and female sexual partners. A very similar frame to this one is adopted for an eminently comparable (and often compared) debate in the Lucianic *Erotes*,[31] where, tellingly, Lucian is able to explore quite comfortably many of Achilles Tatius' themes without feeling the need to incorporate an "actual" female (or male) love-object.[32] In both texts the conversation

---

the body, alive yet separated from it,' and also of the slave as *contubernalis*, living *familiariter* with his master (Seneca, *Letters* 47). While Satyros clearly retains many features of the literary slave, he remains always at the most placid, companionable, "benevolent" (Thalmann 1997) end of the spectrum.

[28] 2,30: παρεσκευαζόμεθα πρὸς τὴν φυγήν ('we prepared for the escape').

[29] ὄχημα δὲ εὐτρεπὲς ἡμᾶς πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἐξεδέχετο, ὅπερ ὁ Κλεινίας παρεσκεύασε, καὶ ἔφθασεν ἡμᾶς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ περιμένων αὐτός. ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντες ἐκάθευδον, περὶ πρώτας νυκτὸς φυλακὰς προῆμεν ἀψοφητί, Λευκίππην τοῦ Σατύρου χειραγωγοῦντος.

[30] 2,35,1: καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἡ Λευκίππη παρῆν, ἀλλ' ἐν μυχῷ ἐκάθευδε τῆς νεώς.

[31] Now demonstrated by Jope 2011 to be of probable Lucianic, rather than pseudo-Lucianic, authorship, and thus presumably of a later date than the mid 2nd century (early-mid according to Henrichs 2011, 309; third quarter according to Plepelits 1996) *Leukippe and Kleitophon*.

[32] In the *Erotes*, the question of male *vs*. female attractions takes place not actually on board ship, but on a stop-off from a sea voyage in which Lycinus, who will act as intradiegetic

acts as a site of bonding, in Lucian for the reviving of old friendships, and in Achilles Tatius for the formation of a new one. Just as Kleitophon uses his erotic experiences to bond with the unnamed traveler to Sidon, so he and Kleinias can make friends with Menelaos over the course of a single conversation.[33]

- The first *Scheintod* of Leukippe, the attempted human sacrifice, is staged by, and also related by, Satyros and Menelaos. Even what ought to be one of the most emotionally fraught moments of the novel is a shared experience between Kleitophon and his friends, in which the latter play an active, protecting role. The presence of these two allows the event to be presented at least to some section of the audience as farce, ridding it of much of the emotional potential invested in the *Scheintode* of other novelistic heroines and heroes.[34] The way in which Menelaos and Satyros speak of their decision to engineer a fake death is also revealing:

> [Satyros:] "'Saying such things I begged him, calling on Zeus the god of hospitality and reminding him of the table and shipwreck we had shared. And this good fellow replied, "The task is a large one, but for the sake of a friend, even if it should be necessary to die, the danger is beautiful, the death sweet." "In my opinion," I said, "Kleitophon is living. For the girl told me, when I enquired, that she had left him tied up with the captives taken by the pirates, and those of the pirates who escaped to the pirate chief reported that all those taken by them had escaped from the battle to the camp. So there will lie at your disposal

---

narrator and extradiegetic moderator of the debate, is returning from a sightseeing tour of the temple of Bacchus at Rhodes when he accidentally bumps into two of his old friends. The trip itself is presented from the point of view of a would-be tourist, searching for sites even where none exist: "we visited the main towns of Lycia, interesting more for their history than for their monuments, since they have retained none of their former splendour." Rhodes, the "City of the Sun God," is praised for beauty and sightseeing potential rather than any other characteristic, and Lycinus employs "two or three guides," at the rate of a couple of obols, to take him round the portico of the temple. It is just after "having taken my fill of this spectacle" (*Erotes* 9) that he happens across his old friends. The framing of the debate is thus contains elements strongly reminiscent both of *Leukippe and Kleitophon*'s shipboard, dinnertime setting (the debates in the *Erotes* also take place over dinner) and of its opening scene, where Kleitophon meets the unnamed traveller from Sidon among the dedications to the goddess Astarte.

[33] Haynes 2002, 150 points out the speed with which 'the young upper class male in this novel' can bond with others of his type.

[34] See for example Winkler 1980, 167: "The entire episode has been composed not to show us the actual religious life of some particular Egyptians but to shock and titillate the average Greek reader by an extravagant Grand Guignol."

both Kleitophon's gratitude and with it the power to rescue a wretched girl from such great trouble." With these words I persuaded him.' (3,21,6-22,3).[35]

While Leukippe's safety is clearly a concern, the bulk of the discussion here is couched specifically in terms of their friendship with Kleitophon.[36] Had Menelaos and Satyros not believed Kleitophon to be alive, would they have gone to Leukippe's aid with the same determination? Certainly when recounting the rescue to Kleitophon they angle their motives in relation to him.

- After six months of mourning Leukippe's supposed death in Alexandria, the point at which Kleitophon is finally persuaded to move on and accept the advances of the rich and beautiful 'widow' Melite is that at which Kleinias comes back onto the scene and the group of four (Kleitophon, Kleinias, Satyros, Menelaos) is reconvened in its entirety.[37] The authority for a decision which will later become morally problematic rests with the group rather than with Kleitophon as an individual, and its consequences will later become the shared concern of the group. Kleinias actually comes with Kleitophon to Ephesos to settle him into his new life (5,15,2-3), and while Menelaos is eventually left behind at the harbour of Alexandria, a teary farewell and a final commendation from Kleitophon – 'an excellent young man, worthy of the very gods' (5,15,1)[38] – emphasise the continuing bond of affection between the men (5,15,1).

The list goes on. It might be noted that none of these three men at any point poses a threat to Leukippe. Kleinias and Menelaos are both in mourning for lovers of their own, and are besides more interested in boys than in women, while Satyros, for all that he carries the whiff of the satyr about him, is never presented as straying beyond the bounds of his station.

---

[35] ταῦτα λέγων ἐδεόμην Δία Ξένιον καλῶν καὶ κοινῆς ἀναμιμνήσκων τραπέζης καὶ κοινῆς ναυαγίας. ὁ δὲ χρηστὸς οὗτος 'μέγα μὲν' ἔφη 'τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ φίλου, κἂν ἀποθανεῖν δεήσῃ, καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος, γλυκὺς ὁ θάνατος.' 'νομίζω δὲ' ἔφην 'ζῆν καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα. Ἡ γὰρ κόρη πυθομένῳ μοι καταλιπεῖν αὐτὸν εἶπε παρὰ τοῖς ἑαλωκόσι τῶν λῃστῶν δεδεμένον, οἱ δὲ τῶν λῃστῶν πρὸς τὸν λήσταρχον ἐκφυγόντες ἔλεγον πάντας τοὺς ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰλημμένους τὴν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον μάχην ἐκπεφευγέναι· ὥστε ἀποκείσεταί σοι παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ἡ χάρις καὶ ἅμα ἐλεῆσαι κόρην ἀθλίαν ἐκ τοσούτου κακοῦ.' ταῦτα λέγων πείθω.
[36] So also Watanabe 2003, 33.
[37] 5,11.
[38] νεανίσκος πάνυ χρηστὸς καὶ θεῶν ἄξιος.

Just as Satyros edges as close as possible to the status of 'friend' rather than simply 'slave', another character who we would expect to be situated far from Kleitophon's circle of friends is allowed surprisingly personal contact with the hero. The Priest of Artemis at Ephesos entertains the lovers and Sostratos μάλα φιλοφρόνως, 'in a very friendly manner',[39] and is the first to break the awkward silence between father and runaways; such behaviour, when combined with his role in the courtroom trial the next day, does much to blur the boundaries between public and private spheres in this novel.

The model of friendship offered in *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is far from that promoted in contemporary Stoic and Epicurean philosophies, with the emphasis often falling on Kleitophon's reliance on – even neediness towards – his friends rather than on any idea of pure union between self-sufficient, rational individuals. This reliance is seen in many of the examples above, and on one occasion there is a suggestion of something we might almost term desire between Kleitophon and Kleinias. When Kleitophon finds out that Kleinias has been lost at sea, he praises his cousin by calling him τὸν μετὰ Λευκίππην ἐμὸν δεσπότην, "after Leukippe my master" (3,23,4), using a word which not only plays up the relationship of dependency, but which Kleitophon has already endowed with decidedly erotic connotations through his use of it (in the feminine) at 2,6,2 to address Leukippe as "Mistress". The direct comparison with the relationship between Kleitophon and Leukippe plays up the emotional quality of the bond between the two men.

The other canonical Greek novels certainly provide fruitful comparanda: Hippothoos is a friend of Habrocomes in Xenophon of Ephesos' *Anthea and Habrocomes*, Polycharmus of Chaireas in Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Thyamis and Knemon of Theagenes in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Watanabe, discussing novelistic friendships in his article on "The Masculinity of Hippothoos", gives several instances where the friend of the hero rescues the heroine in a manner motivated by friendship towards the hero rather than feelings towards the heroine, just as Menelaos and Satyros do for Kleitophon.[40] Watanabe omits Kleinias from his list of novelistic best friends, presumably on grounds of cousinship, but in many ways Kleinias actually fits better into the role of friend-of-the-hero than can be said of Menelaos, who does appear in Watanabe's list. Where Menelaos, a new friend made in the course of the narrative, useful within a limited geographical sphere (Egypt) and then left behind, might be compared to the temporarily necessary but ultimately dispensible Knemon in Heliodorus, Kleinias is more easily to be assimilated to

---

[39] 8,4,1.
[40] Watanabe 2003, 20-21, 32-33.

Polycharmus in Chariton's novel (although Kleinias has more presence in his novel than Polycharmus does in his, and is more elaborately characterized) and even (in his sexual orientation and reasonably-well developed character) to Hippothoos himself – both characters who endure to the end of their respective novels and are given happy endings of their own.[41]

While male friendship is paralleled in other novels, *Leukippe and Kleitophon* devotes a particularly large amount of space and interest not just to the actions and practical help of Kleitophon's friends, but also to their conversations and sense of community. They provide approbation, a strategic unit on which responsibility for Kleitophon's decisions can rest, an internal audience for the hero's adventures, and a comic and sometimes lewd perspective on what the narrator-hero is doing and ought to be doing. Significantly, they turn the romantic experiences of one member of a group into the concern of every other member.

On the uses of enemies

In defining a social group, it is often important to describe what falls outside that group, or is set in opposition to it. As important as Kleitophon's friends, therefore, are his enemies, and in particular those who threaten Kleitophon's ability to keep hold of his beloved.

Helen Morales, in her book-length study *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius*, gives an account of the different social types surrounding the lovers, picking out Thersandros, Konops and Kallisthenes in particular as negative 'embodiments of social and moral values and as representatives of different ways of viewing the world,' who 'to a certain extent... are constructed to function as regulatory fictions, directing the reader against particular ways of reading'.[42] Where Morales conceptualises this, in line with her larger argument, in visual terms ('stereotypes are constructed... through their ways of viewing the world'),[43] I would rephrase it in social terms, treating the social and moral positioning of characters by the narrator not just in relation to Leukippe or

---

[41] Both Polycharmus and Hippothoos marry at the end of their respective novels; there is no such conclusion for Kleinias, but one might note here that, where Polycharmus is married off to the sister of Chaereas, Kleinias is already part of the hero's family and perhaps requires no further incorporation. Alternatively one might simply cite "Kleitophon's relentlessly egocentric narrative eye" (Whitmarsh 2011, 165) as the crux of the issue.

[42] Morales 2004, 77-95.

[43] Morales 2004, 94-95.

other female objects of the male gaze but also in relation to Kleitophon and his world.

Thersandros offers the prime example of negative social positioning by the narrator. Kleitophon's interactions with Thersandros receive enough page-space to corroborate their importance in the narrator's eyes, and their composition is telling; as well as validating the attractiveness of Kleitophon's love-object, and as well as providing Kleitophon (and the reader) with the frisson of fear evoked by Leukippe's bodily vulnerability,[44] Thersandros is presented in such a way as to emphasize a personal relationship and a personal enmity between the two men. Thus in Book 6, Thersandros, who to all extents and purposes has the upper hand at this point (he has Leukippe secured on one of his out-of-town properties, and Kleitophon has no idea where she is) speaks the words 'by Zeus, I wish I were Kleitophon' (6,17,2):[45] words put into his mouth by the narrator-hero which write Thersandros firmly into a position of jealousy towards Kleitophon. Perhaps even more obvious indicators of personal rivalry are the respective closural sentences of the two chastity tests undergone by Leukippe and Melite towards the end of the final book: rather than celebrating the respective triumphs of two women as we might expect, both are phrased explicitly in terms of (Kleitophon's) victory over Thersandros.[46]

Thersandros shows us Kleitophon's potential as a hero and as one able to best another man. And like Kleitophon's friends, Thersandros shows us what Kleitophon is not. As a character, he is de-socialized and removed from the possibility of inclusion within the novel's community of "correct", right-minded actors and readers by his excessive passions and failures of *sophrosyne*. Kleitophon triumphs over him not only in love and law but also by the measures of right-minded social interaction – or at least, according to the narrating Kleitophon he does.

But more than seeing this as a victory over an outsider and rival, what we see here is also in some way a victory over an equal and equivalent man.[47] Thersandros's life is not entirely removed from the values and structures which govern Kleitophon's own existence. He too has a woman (a wife) to

---

[44] Morales 2004.

[45] ὄφελον, ὦ Ζεῦ, γενέσθαι Κλειτοφῶν.

[46] 8,14,2: 'As Leukippe sprang forth, the whole demos shouted out in pleasure and hurled abuse at Thersander.' Ὡς δὲ ἐξέθορεν ἡ Λευκίππη, πᾶς μὲν ὁ δῆμος ἐξεβόησεν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς καὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐλοιδόρουν; 8,14,4: 'The presiding officer, taking her by the right hand, led her out of the water, Thersander now defeated in two bouts.' τὴν μὲν ὁ πρόεδρος δεξιωσάμενος ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐξάγει, δύο *παλαίσματα* τοῦ Θερσάνδρου νενικημένου.

[47] See Jones 2012, 255; 258.

protect, from whom an unfortunate accident of chance has temporarily separated him, and he too is accompanied by a faithful slave who connives on his behalf, tricking maids and offering romantic advice to help his master achieve his desired ends. At 6,15,1 the respective relationships between Thersandros and Sosthenes, Kleitophon and Satyros, are set in almost direct apposition to one another.[48] Elsewhere in the narrative, Kleitophon shows himself able to engage with the emotions and motives of his rival.[49] Rather than a king of Persia or a bandit chief as in Chariton or Heliodorus, Kleitophon's is a victory over a broadly comparable individual who is close enough in social aspect to Kleitophon that we can go some way to understanding his emotions, and who exists within broadly the same social structures as Kleitophon himself does.[50]

Three other instances in which the author/narrator probes the line between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour deserve brief mention: the separate cases of Chaereas and Charmides, who both start out in friendly relation to Kleitophon, but later break all the rules of group behaviour through their inappropriate approaches to Leukippe; and the case of Kallisthenes, who enters the story as an immoderate rascal, but eventually (by way of a slightly botched though ultimately successful abduction) reappears as a responsible statesman and desirable brother-in-law for Kleitophon.[51]

---

[48] 'As day broke, Sosthenes for his part hurried to Thersander, those around Satyros to me.' ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης ὁ μὲν Σωσθένης ἐπὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἔσπευδεν, οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Σάτυρον ἐπ' ἐμέ.

[49] e.g. 6,19, 7,1.

[50] Dionysius in Chariton's *Callirhoe*, despite his many differences from Thersandros, may be a good comparative example from another Greek romance: different from the hero, but with enough similarities to prevent a simple hero/villain dichotomy. Whitmarsh (2011, 156) discusses the 'possibility of counter-ideological identification' offered by novelistic rivals ('alternative focalisers of desires') and argues that the audience can at times aspire to the role of villain as well as hero (2011, 158): '... even the briefest of reflections on contemporary culture will teach us that audience identification can be complex and multiple: we may aspire to being both Luke Skywalker for his values and Darth Vader for his dark power. "We are in conflict, even confusion, about what it means to affirm ordinary life... We sympathize with both the hero and the anti-hero; and we dream of a world in which one could be in the same act both."' (Quote from Taylor 1989 *Sources of the Self*, 23-4.) I would argue here, however, that Thersandros is simply *too* similar to Kleitophon in every concrete measure to offer an attractive 'alternative focaliser of desire' for the reader; he is presented as a villain because his social behaviour hits the wrong notes – and because of his misfortune in being cuckolded.

[51] 8,17,5: 'And he offered up all these other things, and also himself, the most well-behaved of men, reasonable and self-controlled too, and it was as though some magical transformation had suddenly come upon the young man.' Ὁ δὲ καὶ τἆλλα πάντα παρεῖχεν ἑαυτὸν κοσμιώτατον καὶ ἐπιεικῆ καὶ σώφρονα, καὶ ἦν τις ἐξαίφνης περὶ τὸν νεανίσκον θαυμαστὴ μεταβολή.

Kallisthenes offers a particularly interesting case study of the boundaries between villain and *Mensch*. Whitmarsh, in line with the larger project of his book, sees the story as 'transformative' ('Kallisthenes... starts out as a rogue rapist, but ends up changing his personality entirely').[52] I would also point to the potential of the episode for thinking about the permeability of a group's social boundaries. Chaereas and Charmides were one-time friends who turned out to be villains; by contrast, Kallisthenes is revealed as a decent chap once his youthful impetuousness has been overcome – and once it becomes expedient to marry him into the family. His story also performs a functional role as comparandum for the case of Leukippe and Kleitophon. That the possibility of redemption and romantic maturity is offered to one who had once seemed a criminal beyond hope of recall certainly sheds an attractive light on the central *Liebespaar*, whose own consensual elopement and failed attempts at pre-marital sex pale in comparison – if Kallisthenes can get away with his bride-theft, Kleitophon should certainly be permitted his.[53] Moreover, the timing of Kallisthenes' redemption allows a double marriage between Kallisthenes and Kalligone, and Kleitophon and Leukippe. This event incorporates Kallisthenes fully into Kleitophon's kin group, and also offers him companionship in his move from single to married state. Even marriage becomes something that a man does alongside other men.[54]

Achilles Tatius provides us with boundaries between self and other, friend and enemy, but the differences between the categories are subtle and sometimes permeable, and defined as much in terms of attitude and degree of socialization as of status or geographical origin.

---

[52] Whitmarsh 2011, 106.

[53] One might also note the partial resemblance of Kallisthenes' role to those of Hippothoos in Xenophon of Ephesos and Thyamis in Heliodoros, both of them enemy brigands who later become friends of the hero and abandon their earlier antisocial careers to reenter civil society. Watanabe (2003, 22-23) uses Dio Chrysostom's *Alexandrian Oration* (32,49) to demonstrate that brigandage can in certain circumstances be a desirable feature of masculinity; to this one might add the perhaps even more clear-cut example of Lucian's *Navigium*, in which the uber-successful member of civil society and the brigand king are directly juxtaposed as wish-fulfillment ideals of Greco-Roman manhood.

[54] My reading here is in contrast to that of Reardon 1994, 91, who sees Kallisthenes and Kalligone as "in no way necessary to the plot", and Morales 2004, 88-94, where Kallisthenes is seen as being still unredeemed at the end of the novel, i.e. a wholly negative example. I prefer not to place narrative weight on the appearance of a second Kallisthenes at 5,17,9 (Repath 2007).

A modern man about house and town?

Achilles Tatius uses many strategies in the socialisation of his characters and his reader(s). The story is tied into networks not just of people but also of ideas and places with which the reader (who is not a member of Kleitophon's family) is probably supposed to be able to identify, or at least, with which s/he should be able to identity to a greater degree than is possible for any other of the five "ideal" Greek novels. Urban and domestic space is prominent for most of the novel, with long sections taking place at Tyre, in Kleitophon's family house, and at Ephesos, one of the major cities of the Roman Empire.[55] Extra-urban adventures – Leukippe's repeated near-death experiences, a shipwreck, a battle with Egyptian boukoloi – are confined to Books 3 and 4, and even Egypt is for Kleitophon as much about the impressive colonnaded streets of Alexandria as it is about exotic animals and boukoloi (although he has an interest in these too), an internationally connected city familiarised for protagonist and reader by the presence of the Egyptian Menelaos, who has the local contacts to facilitate Kleitophon's passage and find him lodgings in the city.[56] The novel's climactic showdown between Kleitophon and Thersandros takes place in a civic courtroom under the aegis of the law. Rather than the judgment of a Persian or an Ethiopian king, the fate of these lovers is reliant on the goodwill of a Greco-Roman jury.

The location of the story in time is similarly non-alien. It has been argued that the war between the Thracians and the Byzantines in Book 1 is a conscious periodisation device of Achilles Tatius, and that the setting of the novel

---

[55] See Whitmarsh 2010 on the domestic setting provided by Hippias' house at Tyre.

[56] 5,2. Although I stress the narrator's presentation of Alexandria as a great international urban centre, I see little reason to follow Whitmarsh (and the Suda) in seeing it as "probably" (Whitmarsh 2011, 84) Achilles Tatius' homeland. I would also oppose Whitmarsh 69-70, where he argues for a trajectory away from urban Hellenocentrism in the "second-century novels" of Achilles Tatius and Longus. A large section of the action of this book takes place in fully Greco-Roman Ephesos, while the opening in a civilised domestic residence in Tyre (despite Kleitophon's reference to a story of the local Tyrians at 2,2,2-3) could surely be taken as actually marking the Hellenicity of that port rather than putting it into question.

must therefore be non-contemporary with its time of writing,[57] but most schol-ars are content to locate the action in the present,[58] and historici-zing argu-ments are easily countered, if not disproved: just as historicizing novelists like Chariton felt no need for precision in their invention of the past, it is likely that Achilles Tatius felt little need for precision in the invention a contempo-rary setting. Whether or not the author/narrator had a particular time-period in mind, the text yields up very few clues that we might be dealing with anything other than the non-defined present-day.

Storytelling, self and society:
Situating the first-person voice within the community

We left the unnamed first narrator sitting in a shady spot some pages back, and Kleitophon's story leaves him too, with no return to the "frame" narrative at the end of the book.[59] But the motif of the exchange of stories does not stop in the port-side garden at Sidon, and neither does the concern for audience: for the ways in which listeners relate to their narrators, and the ways in which they don't. Reiterated several times is the idea that the audience of a story – any story – cannot help but compare it with their own lives, and, moreover, may well be listening to other people's tales purely in order to have a chance to deliver their own first-person narratives in return. Thus Kleinias listens to the tale of Menelaos, but cries for his own misfortunes and his own dead

---

[57] Anderson 1997, 2292-93. Plepelits 1996, 408-411, on the basis of the Thracian war and also of the appearance of the Phoenix at 3,24,3, conjectures 'with a certain probability' 'that Achilles Tatius means the year A.D. 47 to be the setting of his novel.'

[58] Perry 1967, 111 sees this as a 'contemporary' romance, arguing that 'Since the protagonist Kleitophon is a young man whom the author meets and talks with personally, we see that the action described within the romance takes place supposedly within the lifetime of the author himself'; a similar argument is made by Hägg 1987.

[59] On the problems and possibilities of the novel's ending see Repath 2005, who gives a bibliography of previous scholarship at 250-51 n.3. Whitmarsh 2011, 107 offers an addi-tional option which would fit in well with my arguments in this section that his love for Leukippe is not the sole concern of Kleitophon's existence: "[The] second century ro-mances are specifically concerned with the problematisation and relativisation of narrative: they dramatise the absence of final meaning, and the difficulty of locating a single cultural vantage on the narrative. But anticlosurality is not just a formal, literary choice: it also has implications for the identity politics of the romance. Marriage, it implies, is neither the absolute end of the story nor the natural destiny of the human subject."

lover,[60] and thus, much later on in the novel, an exchange of stories between two prisoners has the following parenthesis appended: 'for a man who is down on his luck listens with interest to the ills of others, since the companionship in suffering with another acts as a medicine for his own pain' (7,2,3).[61] Judging from the examples within Kleitophon's own narrative, the audience may only be listening to a given story while they meditate on their own troubles or wait for their own turn to speak. But despite the 'relentlessly egocentric narrative eye'[62] of our storyteller-in-chief, storytelling is still a site of male bonding and of the individual's construction of (him)self in relation to larger social groups. The many "action" episodes involving Kleitophon's friends and enemies are set firmly against a backdrop of verbal exchange, and our narrator's construction of the social stages doing and telling as key counterparts of one another.

Indicative of the contemporaneity of this idea – of the exchange of stories as the foundation of a friendship – is the conceit governing a near-contemporary text by Lucian, the *Toxaris*. In this dialogue, a Greek (Mnesippus) and a Scythian (Toxaris) each try to demonstrate, by means of five exemplary stories, that their own countrymen hold friendship in the highest regard. The stories they offer up might almost as easily be recast as mini romances; [63] sex is lacking, but emotions run to fever point. From the off, the dialogue stages the ethnic split as a major bone of contention, and Toxaris and Mnesippus pledge, in case of defeat, their right hand and tongue respectively (forfeits appropriate

---

[60] 2,34-35. Kleinias here refers to *Iliad* 19,302 (Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ᾽ αὐτῶν κήδε᾽ ἑκάστη) where the Trojan women weep for their own sufferings under the pretense of weeping for Patroclus.

[61] The expanded passage (7,2,3-3,1) reads:
'Another of the inmates (for a man who is down on his luck listens with interest to the ills of others, since companionship in suffering with another acts as a medicine for his own pain) said, "What has befallen you at the hands of Fortune? For it is likely that, having done nothing wrong yourself, you met with an evil demon. I've got experience of this in my own affairs." And with that he recounted the domestic troubles on account of which he had been imprisoned. But I paid no attention to any of this. When he'd stopped, he asked for the corresponding tale of misfortunes, saying, "and you should tell me what happened to you as well".'
ἄλλος δέ τις τῶν συνδεδεμένων (περίεργον γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀτυχῶν εἰς ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν ἀκρόασιν, ἐπεὶ φάρμακον αὐτῷ τῆς ὧν ἔπαθε λύπης ἡ πρὸς ἄλλον εἰς τὸ παθεῖν κοινωνία) 'τί δέ σοι συμβέβηκεν' εἶπεν 'ἀπὸ τῆς Τύχης; εἰκὸς γάρ σε μηδὲν ἀδικήσαντα πονηρῷ περιπεσεῖν δαίμονι. Τεκμαίρομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ.' Καὶ ἅμα τὰ οἰκεῖα κατέλεγεν, ἐφ' οἷς ἦν δεδεμένος. Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδενὶ τούτων προσεῖχον. Ὡς δ' ἐπαύσατο, τὴν ἀντίδοσιν ᾔτει τοῦ λόγου τῶν ἀτυχημάτων 'λέγοις ἂν' εἰπὼν 'καὶ σὺ τὰ σαυτοῦ.'

[62] Whitmarsh 2011, 165

[63] So Perry 1967, 234.

to their supposed ethnic traits).[64] But come the end of the contest, and finding that they have no arbitrator to decide between the respective merits of their stories, the differences of the two men fade into the background, and they settle instead on eternal (εἰσαεὶ) friendship.[65] The exchange ends with Toxaris telling Mnesippus to visit him whenever he happens to be passing by Scythia, an offer to which Mnesippus responds, 'Mark my words, I wouldn't hesitate to go even further if I thought I would meet such friends as you, Toxaris, have shown yourself to be through your tales.'[66] In the end, the fact of the exchange and the interaction between the two shows itself to be of more importance than the contents of the stories themselves, which one recent commentator has described as 'sentimental and fabulous'.[67]

Do we believe Kleitophon's story? It may not matter. Mnesippus and Toxaris found each other entirely implausible as narrators, but made friends nonetheless.[68] As Marko Marinčič writes in his acute analysis of Kleitophon's rhetorical pose, 'What Achilles Tatius is striving to authenticate is not the facts of the story but the discourse itself.'[69] The narration gestures constantly to different reader responses within the narrative, and also to the ways in which intradiegetic speakers – most obviously Kleitophon – adapt their stories *in relation to* their projected audiences. We are made aware of the existence of more than one version of the story of Leukippe and Kleitophon. There is the version delivered by Kleitophon in the courtroom (followed by an alternative version delivered by Kleinias),[70] and there is the very different version heard by Sostratos and the Priest of Ephesos – two versions heard by Sostratos in fact, because when he first arrives in Ephesos Leukippe is still nowhere to be found and the bystanders at the courthouse repeat to him the self-accusations

---

[64] Lucian *Toxaris* 10-11.

[65] Lucian *Toxaris* 62.

[66] Lucian *Toxaris* 63. καὶ μήν, εὖ ἴσθι, οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι καὶ ἔτι πορρωτέρω ἐλθεῖν, εἰ μέλλω τοιούτοις φίλοις ἐντεύξεσθαι οἷος σύ, ὦ Τόξαρι, διεφάνης ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων.

[67] Pervo 1997, 163. Pervo is certainly wrong to see the sentimentality of the inserted stories as undercutting the seriousness of the whole as a (semi-)serious discourse on friendship, and is surely also wrong when he says that 'Lucian seems to view the tradition of male friendship as rather out-dated' (179). For all the constructed humour of the overall conceit and the silliness of the hand/ tongue wager, the one earnest thing about the *Toxaris* seems to be its conviction that firm male friendships can be formed (even across an ethnic divide) through the exchange of stories.

[68] E.g. Lucian *Toxaris* 18; 56.

[69] Marinčič 2007, 175. I would argue against the 'hidden author' identified by Morgan (Morgan 2007), an author who 'post[s] signs unintended by Kleitophon himself'. As Marinčič 2007, 196 writes, 'there is no reason whatsoever not to credit a *fictional* character with the intentions of his own discourse'. (M's italics.)

[70] 7,7; 7,9.

which Kleinias has just made in the courtroom.[71] Looking to the other Greek novels, all of these storytelling situations are far removed from the official, sanctioned versions of Chariton's and Xenophon's romances, which are, respectively, delivered by Chaereas to the men of Syracuse in the public theatre, and deposited, possibly by the whole civic body, as a dedication outside the temple of Artemis at Ephesos: situations as specific as those imagined by Achilles Tatius, perhaps, but ones which lay claim to public status, to the creation of a civic master narrative (even if they will always sit in slight tension with the alternative master narrative, the one heard by us).[72]

The version of *Leukippe and Kleitophon* delivered to the reading public has its own quirks. Tellingly, it includes the sub-story of Kleitophon's adventures with Melite, and casts a forgiving and amused light on Kleitophon's actions in that episode. The story of Kleitophon's getaway in drag, in which he casts himself as a feminized adulterer on the run, is taken on wholeheartedly by its protagonist; rather than lowering our opinions of its hero, it sets out to impress us with its playful disregard for the normal proprieties of masculinity. These are the details which Sostratos and Leukippe miss out on, and as such they project a certain character onto their audience: if the unnamed traveler from Sidon, and the readers peering over his shoulder, have been permitted the juicier version of Kleitophon's adventures, we have to assume that this one is specifically for the boys, the locker-room edit.

In fact, the first-person narrative may be in and of itself one of the major markers of sociability within *Leukippe and Kleitophon*. The first person intradiegetic narrator is unparalleled among the extant complete Greek novels, but both extant Latin novels, Petronius' *Satyrica* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* or *Golden Ass*, are first person narratives. In these two novels, individuals on the margins of society, a sexual dissolute and an ass, characters who 'As stand-ins for a Roman elite male... are piteous: lacking in agency over others and in mastery over their own bodies,' tell their own stories in their own voices.[73] And not only do these figures receive a voice, but they (or their authors) both seem to rejoice in the exploration of perspectives unorthodox to a literary world governed by the voices of the elite, using their new identities as spaces

---

[71] 7,14,3; compare the story told by Kleitophon to Sostratos and the Priest of Ephesos at 8,5.

[72] Chariton 8,7,12; he also lists the public benefits which the voyage has brought to Syracuse: the friendship of the Great King, new Greek and Egyptian troops, and a future leader in the form of his and Kallirhoe's son. Xenophon 5,15,2; it is unclear whether it is only Anthea and Habrokomes who make the dedication, or whether the whole city accompanies them.

[73] Bartsch 2008, 255.

for literary play.[74] Achilles Tatius' first person narrator does not take on the voice of a marginalized member of society, but he does go further down the route to rebellion than any of the other novelistic heroes, none of whom is described escaping from the backdoor of a lover's house in female clothes. Whether it is specifically due to the adoption of the first person voice that Achilles/Kleitophon is able to de-idealize the romantic hero is naturally impossible to prove, but it is noteworthy that the most (sexually) exploratory of the novelistic heroes is the one who relates his own story.[75] For my purposes here, it is certainly relevant, if unsurprising, that sexual openness is frequently expressed as a function of male social interaction: the moments which we would be surprised to find in another novel, and which are not repeated to Leukippe and her father, often appear in the context of Kleitophon's conversations with friends.

In addition to the Latin novels – and not forgetting the dialogic, Platonic overtones of the initial garden setting – we might look to a different mode of first-person narration as precursor of Kleitophon's erotic ramble. The relationship between Achilles Tatius' male characters and the lovers of Latin elegy has been explored by Meriel Jones, who describes *Leukippe and Kleitophon* as 'to some degree… a prose version of Latin elegy';[76] even if one does not fully subscribe to this view, Kleitophon's narratival self-consciousness certainly intersects far more fully with the characters of the elegists than those of his fellow (non self-narrating) novelistic protagonists does. Alison Sharrock writes of the impetus to male sociability in the love poems of Propertius, pointing out the number of poems in Propertius' first book (over half of them) which are addressed not to Cynthia but to a third, male party. Sometimes the poet's friend-addressees are even 'invited to join the speaker in looking at Cynthia and in experiencing the pleasure-pain of loving her. In fact, it almost seems that contemplating the beloved is something that is better done together, something that has only limited possibilities for the lover alone.'[77] It is possi-

---

[74] See Fitzgerald 2000, 11, where he says that the role of the slave 'could be the place where the free imagined escaping from the demands of "liberal" comportment and indulging in revolt against their own superiors,' bringing out the aspects of elite play involved in adopting such a low-status voice.

[75] *Daphnis and Chloe* also opens with a first-person narrator, though not one who relates his own story. While his narrative is probably less "rebellious" by any formal marker than that of Achilles Tatius, the opening voice allows us a (rebellious? playful?) perspective of knowing experience on the story of innocence which follows.

[76] Jones 2012, 227-9; quote from 261.

[77] Sharrock 2000, 270.

ble that Propertius and his companions provided one of the models for Achilles Tatius' depiction of a male community whose emotional bonds with one another are forged and strengthened as much by their shared romantic adventures as by shared experience of education or of the public life of the citizen; certainly there is similarity of sentiment. Needless to say, however, even if we do interpret direct links of reception between the two authors, such discursive communities surrounding a love affair arise not just from a literary connection across centuries, but also from the confessional form of first-person narration and from the shared interest of the subject matter itself. As the great incorporator Kleitophon so often reminds us, no voice but his own can be allotted authority over present telling and present community.

The liberal lover: romance in relation to everything else in life

That Kleitophon's web of meaningful relationships does not stop at his love for Leukippe suggests that romance constitutes only one part of the life of this citizen male (even if it will eventually prove to be a privileged and triumphant part). He will make it quite clear in the course of the novel not only that he has both an intellectual and social life going on outside his love affair, but also – and this would no doubt be true for many or most historical males of the 2nd century CE – that he is open to ideas of love and sex which fall outside the standard purview of the novelistic happily-ever-after. The reader is presented with many examples of his open-mindedness and his willingness to embrace contradiction. Most memorably in the seemingly morally unmarked discussion at the end of Book 2 on the relative virtues of boys and women as lovers, but also elsewhere in the novel, the reader is shown that the monogamous male-female relationship is only one of various types of sexual relationship that an urbane young man might reasonably embark on – in fact, the last word in this particular conversation is given to the advocate for the young boy as lover. A double system of sexual values is embedded firmly in the plot, where Kleitophon is permitted by Achilles Tatius both to pursue the trajectory of the traditional love story and to engage in a more casual affair on the way. Melite and Leukippe are ultimately subjected to very different types of chastity test; it turns out that chastity itself is a virtue relative to persons and situation. Near the beginning of the book, meanwhile, an outright contradiction of views is delivered by Kleinias: after denouncing at length the evils of women and matrimony (ὁ δὲ Πηνελόπης γάμος τῆς σώφρονος πόσους νυμφίους ἀπώλεσεν(!) (1,8,6)) in the context of his own lover's imminent marriage, the *praeceptor*

amoris smoothly moves on to an equally lengthy advice session in which – in the context of Kleitophon's own romantic awakenings – male-female relationships receive nothing but praise. There is evident humor in the contradiction, but no authorial judgment.

The sweetshop of sexual possibility is part of a wider social network within which we relativise the hero-narrator himself. The narrator records a selection of more or less acceptable or "normal" sexual and social preferences, of which the classic Greek romance – the prototype of a Chariton or a Xenophon – is merely the one he has happened to choose for himself. The acceptance that other people might choose different paths is firmly embedded in the text.

Freedom to wander is not limited to sex and love. Digression as narrative mode is a major force here, and this tendency to digressiveness is, I would argue, an important factor in the production of a specifically <u>socialized</u> narrative. Every emotion in *Leukippe and Kleitophon* is explored from the perspective of at least three different hermeneutics. Readers of Latin love elegy (like Achilles Tatius?)[78] will be all too familiar with the identity crises of the self-narrating lover, ever unsure whether he's soldier, slave, teacher or captive; Kleinias tops them all with his gender-bending description of the young lover as a birthing mother, labouring under the pains of a first desire for which Eros will play midwife. In a way, the shipboard debate about sexual preference is simply a multiplication, from the point of view of "first-hand" experience, of perspectives on desire which were already theorized from philosophical, mythological, and natural-historical angles back when Kleitophon peered at Leukippe over wine-cup and book in his parents' house in Tyre. Authorial style and diction are as digressive as the varied topics to which they are applied.[79] And Kleitophon will carry on going wildly off topic, with no apparent awareness of the need for plot progression, treating his listener-reader to long descriptions of the hippopotamus (put into the mouth of the Egyptian general Charmides) when what the plot seems to demand is an account of his anxiety over the loss of Leukippe. One school of thought sees a carefully plotted web of inter-referentiality in Kleitophon's digressions,[80] but they are surely more satisfactorily accounted for as expressions of the sheer enjoyment of learning and of digression. Graham Anderson sees in Kleitophon 'a superbly over-educated product of a sophistic academy, turning the curiosity of the *pepaideumenos* at play back and forth from love to learned myth and paradoxography,

----

78 See above; Jones 2012, 227-9.
79 Plepelits 1996, 398-400.
80 Bartsch 1989.

and swimming his way across a sea of rhetoric as he does so'.[81] Whitmarsh, meanwhile, writes that 'This pleasure in artful disorder reflects the culture of the symposium, where individuals might interpose responses without regard for formal structure.'[82] Both of these analyses are alert to the social, dialogic functions of the digressions. Kleitophon's manner is caught somewhere between the sophistic academy and the symposium, both of them key spaces of male group (and individual) formation through dialogic interaction. Jason König writes of 'the obsession with sympotic writing within Imperial Greek works,' and of the intensely dialogic nature of that obsession.[83] '[T]he symposium – and particularly dialogue in the symposium' becomes 'a space for performing Greekness, and for displaying a particularly Hellenic form of philosophical identity and traditional knowledge within conversation'.[84] He focuses on the importance – so visible in Achilles Tatius – of activating knowledge for new contexts: '…the sympotic form in Imperial Greek writing is concerned with *active* treatment of inherited knowledge, which enacts continuity with and inheritance of the past while also reshaping it for its new context. Plutarch and Athenaeus, far from being faceless reorganizers of inherited erudition, dramatize obsessively the *processes* of performing knowledge, inviting us to admire the inventiveness of sympotic speech as we read.'[85]

On the one hand, these digressions provide us with the backdrop of public life and citizen discourse against which the love affair takes place, akin to the Roman elegist's constant references to public life, to the various virtuous activities he ought to be engaged in which don't involve chasing after girls. For Achilles Tatius, of course, performing the discourse of engaged elite masculinity is very different than it was for Propertius; "public life" is not what it used to be in Augustan Rome.[86] But another important function of the digressions is to break up linear plot advancement, allowing the listener-reader constant new access points and changes of tempo within the narrative. The recurrence of the familiar topoi of academy and symposium keep the atmosphere in the discursive male present time, an irrepressible counter to the ultimately

---

[81] Anderson 1997, 2291.
[82] Whitmarsh 2011, 240.
[83] König 2008, 86-87.
[84] König 2008, 87.
[85] König 2008, 88; K's italics.
[86] Though see Jones 2012, 229, where she argues that 'Achilles' men espouse a masculinity much more like that of the elegiac *amator* than that endorsed by Heliodorus or Chariton, or even Longus.'

unstoppable teleological force of the love story.[87] While a political and/or military career for the elegists was billed as the alternative plot (or, even, provided the only potential for plot against the delightful drag of erotic afternoons), in the world of Achilles Tatius it is the love story which provides the forward momentum, male company and *paideia* which keep us from reaching our narrative goal.

The multiplication of male voices and modes provides as the backdrop to the love story a complex group identity, capable of containing many alternative social, sexual and narrative preferences and encoding debate about those preferences within itself. It is an identity which is played out not just in the behaviour of specific characters – friends, enemies, and those in between – but in the fabric of the (inexorably discursive) text itself.[88]

Writing the group:
female exclusions, female inclusions, collective didacticism

In concentrating on the homosocial aspects of *Leukippe and Kleitophon*, I have thus far allotted almost no space to the role of Leukippe in Kleitophon's narrative. Leukippe is of course an emotional as well as narrative keystone of the novel; as Daniel King has demonstrated, her ability to maintain control of her own body and to shape her own physical experiences allows us to imagine alternative narratives for this story, ones in which the action is focalized through something other than the eyes and words of Kleitophon.[89] But in the story as we receive it, our experience of Leukippe is continually mediated and

---

[87] Jones 2012 thinks that Kleitophon fails as a student of sophism: 'Cleitophon may have studied his philosophy, but education alone does not constitute *paideia*, and we will see repeatedly that he is pathologically unable to demonstrate the moral and ethical substance of true *paideia*.' (45) She asks whether Kleitophon was in fact 'questioning the attainability, the maintainability, and the validity, of *paideia*', and whether in doing so he was 're-sisting the hegemonic ideals of masculinity'. While this is certainly one valid way of de-scribing Kleitophon and defining *paideia* I would prefer to express Kleitophon's performance more in terms of an alternative ideal of *paideia*, one which attempts to incor-porate the modes and facts of his education into life without letting them dominate entirely.

[88] Watanabe (2003, 37) has written about the 'alternative masculinity' which a novelistic best friend can offer, and the 'appreciation of [such] other masculinities' evinced by this 'pol-yphonic and omnivorous genre', while Whitmarsh (2011, 162) takes this point into the realm of narratival alternatives, writing that 'Kleitophon's *narratorial*/sexual identity... is constructed dynamically by distinction from his cousin Kleinias' (my emphasis). See also Whitmarsh 2011, 141, where he uses the work of Althusser to theorise more generally such alternative narrative thrusts in the romances.

[89] King 2003.

relativised through male eyes,[90] refocused through male interests, conversations and friendships. While this is largely a function of Kleitophon's first-person narrative (he has no direct access to her inner turmoil and reciprocal love) it is notable, for example, in the encounters which take place between Thersandros and Leukippe, how much more readily the narrator is able to access the (projected) thoughts and feelings of the male Thersandros than those of Leukippe. Morales points out the constant deflection of emphasis away from the heroine and demonstrates strategies of focalisation through which juxtapositions of ideas and objects govern our readings of her,[91] and it is revealing that Leukippe's name disappears entirely in the closing pages of the novel.[92]

In spite of Leukippe's comparative lack of agency, however, the principal segmenting social boundary in Kleitophon's narrative is not necessarily the male-female divide. Melite is on many occasions allowed a measure of agency similar or equal to that of Kleitophon. The narrator feels able to project her thoughts to a far greater degree than he does for Leukippe;[93] she is allowed a knowledge of events which at many points is as full as that of Kleitophon;[94] she jokes;[95] she stares at Kleitophon in the way that Kleitophon once stared at Leukippe;[96] she plans Kleitophon's escape from her house and offers alternative hospitality to Kleitophon, Kleinias and Satyros – thus engaging with Kleitophon's circle of companions.[97] While she too will be relativised as the wife of Thersandros, and (sophistically) reintegrated into chaste society by the test of her marital faithfulness in Book 8, she will nonetheless continue to operate as a private individual with her own legal team and her own competing narrative at the courtcase in Books 7 and 8, and in these many senses she behaves in a manner familiar to the reader from the world of male companionship. In one important emotional and narrative crux of the novel, therefore, it is participation in a social circle or context, rather than gender, which is most active in defining the bounds of individual speech and action within the novel.

---

[90] So Morales 2004.

[91] Morales 2004, 157f: 'Leukippe is assembled through disparate comparisons, with very little direct description.'

[92] Her last namecheck is at 8,15; the novel ends at 8,19.

[93] 5,22.

[94] 5,24.

[95] 5,14. Morales 2004, 224.

[96] 5,13; 1,6. Morales 2004, 222-23.

[97] 6,1f.

Morales sees *Leukippe and Kleitophon* as encoding an explicitly didactic purpose where women are concerned, and argues that the role of its 'sententious statements' is 'to lay down the law about gender and ethnicity, even if those laws are on occasion undercut with irony'.[98] While I would agree with her that the narrative voice is in many ways didactic, I would argue that, as with the case I have just made for the different social roles of Melite and Leukippe, this is not exclusively a gendered and ethnically determined brand of didacticism aimed against the outsider (the ethnic dimension receives particularly little emphasis), and would argue that in its relentless social positioning of characters, the (elite, international, rhetorically trained, philosophically curious, socialized, male) voice of the protagonist-narrator is at least as dictatorial in the behaviour it implicitly prescribes for men as it is for women. With the endless focalisation of "right behaviour" through different characters and viewpoints, the militant tolerance of everything but intolerance, added to the first-person dissemination of his tale to anyone who will listen, we might argue that Achilles Tatius' Kleitophon lays claim to collective relevance just as much as does Xenophon's Habrocomes giving a public account of his love affair in the theatre at Ephesos, or Chariton's Chaereas publicising his in the theatre at Aphrodisias.

Didacticism is also aimed at the reader. The "right" reader must be able to situate himself within the shifting, "moderate", playfully delivered set of viewpoints of the narrator, able to see himself joining the conversations of Kleitophon's social *group*. Those whose morals are not situationally adjustable are written right out of this community of liberal-minded young men, and in writing in his reader at the start of the novel, Achilles Tatius also begins the process of writing *out* his unideal reader.

Finally, it is surely relevant to connect such arguments about the readership presupposed by the narration to wider discussions about the posited "actual" readership of Achilles Tatius. Given the overwhelmingly male discursive and social context set up by the narrator, I am inclined to agree with those who see Achilles' intended reading public as primarily male.[99] However, intention may not correspond to reality – an author of such novels in this period

---

[98] Morales 2004, 229.

[99] Bowie 1994, 134 talks of 'a male orientation which should give pause to theories of a chiefly female readership'; Morgan 1995:143: 'These arguments point to the conclusion that the novel-reading public was not an entity distinct from the reading public, and that novels are better regarded as off-duty amusement for the highly literate than as a product aimed at those with lower grades of taste and education'; 145: 'The Greek novel['s] … implied readers were primarily male'; Morales 2001, x-xi: 'It is significant that both male and female characters in the novels read and write (cf. Leukippe's letter at 5,18). If Achilles

would have had little control over the dissemination of his work – and having argued that gender divisions are sometimes trumped by social divisions I would be ready to see literate Melites in the audience as well.

Conclusion

Taken individually, few of my arguments in this paper have been particularly controversial. It is no surprise to find that we are dealing with an ultimately heteronormative, elite, male narrator who addresses himself in large part to an elite male audience, or that a first person narrative has as one of its concerns the situation of the individual self within society. Moreover, this paper has presented a way of looking at *Leukippe and Kleitophon* which almost entirely evades the major point of the plot: in relegating Leukippe to the status of discussed, seduced, and fought-over object it has ignored not only what agency she does have[100] but also the central position played by the love story in almost any reading of this book. This is not to disparage the romance. My reason for ignoring it is simply that the usual tendency has been to read only the romance, to focus, as Morales does, even as she resists the ideals with which she is presented, on the person or people on whom the narrator tells us to focus (Leukippe; the *Liebespaar*) – or alternately to turn the camera back onto the narrator himself, who "tends to be studied if at all for his technique as a narrator rather than for his attributes as a person".[101] As a counterbalance to such approaches, I have tried here to see Kleitophon's technique as a narrator as something which is inextricable from his attributes as a person/character, and to set both of those against the context of the characterization of a larger community of friends, enemies, lovers and discussants. Kleitophon's performance of identity, masculinity, and love is inextricably bound up with the parallel performances of a whole cast of characters, and it is by bouncing off these performances against each other that a shared discourse of romantic masculinity is created. Friendship, like desire, is needy, inconstant, and dependant on constant verbal exchange. The desiring subject in this novel is diffused not

---

Tatius' internal readership is in any way indicative of his actual readership, then women are likely to be included... On balance, then, it seems likely that the readership of the novel was well-educated and largely, but by no means exclusively, male.' At 2004, 3 Morales also emphasizes the likely presence of women among the novel's reading public. Anderson 1997, 2294 imagines a male readership.

[100] King 2012.

[101] Anderson 1997, 2284.

just across different disciplines, subject areas, and genres, [102] but also through different mouths and different persons.

We don't quite know whether Kleitophon and Leukippe get their happily-ever-after, but we do know that Kleitophon's default mode remains one of constantly reliving and rewriting his romance. And the master version, transmitted to us, is a very specific telling. The trans-Mediterranean love affair of Leukippe and Kleitophon, so far as the reader of the novel is concerned, took place between two blokes on a park bench on a lazy afternoon when neither had anything better to do.[103]

Bibliography

Anderson, G. 1997. 'Perspectives on *Achilles Tatius*', *ANRW* II 34.3, 2278–99.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. 'Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel', in *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin – London: University of Texas Press.

Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bartsch, S. 2008. 'Narrative', in T. Whitmarsh ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 237-257.

Bowie, E. 1994. 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore – London: John Hopkins University Press, 87-106.

Fitzgerald, W. 2000. *Slavery in the Roman Literary Imagination*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garnaud, J-P. 1991. *Achille Tatius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Hägg, T. 1987. '"Callirhoe" and "Parthenope": The Beginnings of the Historical Novel', *Classical Antiquity* 6.2,184-204.

Haynes, K. 2001. 'Power of the Prude: Configurations of the Feminine in the Greek Novel', *Ancient Narrative* 1, 73-92.

Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, Florence, Kentucky, USA: Routledge.

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

Hock, R. F. 1997. 'An extraordinary friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: The Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances', in J. T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 145-162.

---

[102] So Goldhill 1995, 110-111, talking about male desire for males.

[103] My great thanks are due to Albert Henrichs, who first introduced me to the delights of the Greek novels and who has discussed and commented on many aspects of this paper. Thanks also to David Elmer for his comments, and to James Tobias Maclachlan, William Thomas, Abimbola Afolami and John Syfret for invaluable help and inspiration.

Jones, M. 2012. *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Greek Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jope, J. 2011. 'Authenticity of the Lucianic *Erotes*', *Helios* 38.1, 103-120.

King, D. 2003. '"Taking It Like a Man": Gender, Identity and the Body in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon', in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, M. B. Skinner, F. I. Zeitlin (eds.) *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*, Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 127-146.

König, J.P. 2008. 'Sympotic dialogue in the first to fifth centuries CE', in: Goldhill, S. (ed.), *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 85-113.

Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marinčič, M. 2007. 'Advertising One's Own Story. Text and speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in Rimell, V. (ed.), *Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 7, Groningen: Barkhuis, 168-200.

Morales, H. 2001. Introduction to T. Whitmarsh trans. *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, vii-xxxii.

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

Morgan, J. R. 1995. 'The Greek Novel: towards a sociology of production and reception', in A. Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, London – New York: Routledge, 130-152.

Ní Mheallaigh, K. 2007. 'Philosophical Framing: The Phaedran Setting of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', in: J. R. Morgan and M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Greek Novel*. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 10, Groningen: Barkhuis, 231-244.

Nimis, S. 1999 'The Sense of Open-Endedness in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 32.2, 215-238.

Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances, A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Berkeley – Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Pervo, R. J. 1997. 'With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the Toxaris', in J. T. Fitzgerald (ed.) *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, Atlanta, 163-180.

Plepelits, K. 1996. "Achilles Tatius", in G. Schmeling (ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill, 387-416.

Puccini-Delbey, G. 2001. 'Figures du narrateur et du narrataire dans les œuvres romanesques de Chariton d'Aphrodisias, Achille Tatius et Apulée', in B. Pouderon (ed.) *Les personnages du roman grec. In collaboration with Christine Hunzinger and Dimitri Kasprzyk. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient 29, Litt. 7*, Lyons: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux, 87-100.

Reardon, B. P. 1969. 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix* 23, 291-309.

Reardon, B. P. 1994. 'Achilles Tatius and Ego Narrative', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.) *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. London – New York: Routledge, 80-96.

Repath, I. 2005. 'Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: What Happened Next?', *Classical Quarterly* 55, 250-265.

Sharrock, A. 2000. "Constructing Characters in Propertius", *Arethusa* 33.2, 263-284.

Schwartz, S. 2001. '*Cleitophon* the *Moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel', *Ancient Narrative* 1, 93-113.

Thalmann, W. 1997. 'Versions of *Slavery* in the Captivi of Plautus', *Ramus* 25.2, 112-145

Watanabe, A. 2003. 'The Masculinity of Hippothoos', *Ancient Narrative* 3, 1-42.

Whitmarsh, T. 2010. 'Domestic Poetics: Hippias' House in Achilles Tatius', *Classical Antiquity* 29.2, 327-348.

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

Winkler, J. J. 1980. 'Lollianos and the Desperadoes', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100, 155-181.