

Readerly Curiosity:
theorizing narrative experience in the Greek novel

Submitted by Elizabeth Louisa Grace Dollins
to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Classics, September 2012.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

.....

Abstract

This thesis proposes that the ancient Greek novels theorize their readers from within themselves. The novels self-consciously promote and construct a reader who is curious, or *polypragmōn*, and lead this reader towards a recognition of that fact. The reader becomes aware of his or her experience of reading as a process. Drawing on Plutarch's suggestion that the best way to turn curiosity into a force for good is to turn it on oneself, this thesis puts forward the idea that the novels lead a curious reader to engage with his or her encounter with the text, to identify him or herself as curious, and in so doing come to a position of self-analysis.

Attention is drawn to the experience of reading, and the lessons that can be learnt from it, by the embedding of narratives within the novels. Embedded or partial narratives can suggest alternative storylines and encourage the curious reader to pry and collaborate with the narrator. The experience of interior space maps the reader's encounter with the novel, constructing him or her as curious as s/he is encouraged to peep through gaps in doors, follow the narrator through doors, and think about his or her status as voyeur and eavesdropper. Deceptive narratives lead the reader to follow suggested storylines and to interrogate the text to try to discover the 'truth' that may lie behind the narrative. Finally, the presence of female characters incites the curious reader to find out what s/he can about them, pushing the narrative to its limit.

In going through this process of interrogating the text and actively striving to find out more by reading between the lines, the reader becomes aware of reading as a process, and of his or her curiosity, thus becoming able to analyse him or herself. The novels thus promote a theory of how their readers approach them.

Acknowledgements

There are many people I wish to thank for their support, help, and encouragement while I was writing this thesis.

First and foremost I should like to thank my supervisor Karen Ní Mheallaigh who has guided me through this process with a supportive yet critical hand, and with whom I have had many stimulating discussions over the years. I owe much gratitude to Catherine Connors for supervising me during a happy and productive term I spent at the University of Washington, for letting me read several pieces of unpublished work, and for many cups of coffee. I should also like to thank the Leventis Foundation for the funding that enabled me to take up my place as a PhD student.

John Dillon, Rebecca Langlands and Daniel Ogden have all read and commented on sections of this thesis at various stages of its development, as has Paula James who, along with John Morgan and Ian Repath, allowed me access to unpublished work. Matthew Wright has also provided invaluable advice along the way.

I should like to thank the stellar Classics postgraduate community, past and present, at the University of Exeter; in particular Rowan Fraser, Jen Grove, Beth Hartley, Claude Kananack, Steve Kennedy, Sharon Marshall and James Smith. I am also grateful to Morgan Palmer and the graduate community at the University of Washington.

Extremely heartfelt thanks go to Chris Dollins, who proofread the entire project (any errors that remain are my oversight), and to Jenny Winter, who has always been ready with a sympathetic ear.

I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Ceri Davies, and to Siobhan de Souza who first ignited my love for Greek.

Finally, my thanks and love go to Freddie Noble, who is patience personified and has kept me grounded, to Patricia Dollins, who told me long ago that there is no such word as ‘can’t’, and to Ian Dollins, who read me my first stories.

Contents

Introduction	11
<i>Polypragmosunē</i>	15
The reader	21
Methodology	24
The Greek ‘novel’	28
1 Self-commenting narrative	29
Introduction	29
Leading the reader	31
Tales	31
Dreams	35
Counter-tales and subplots	46
Supporting cast in the <i>Ephesiaca</i>	46
The ‘Thelxinoe romance’	49
Thisbe: an unlikely heroine	52
Longus’ inset tales: learning novel lessons	59
Reception anxiety and narrative misfiring	73
Cleitophon’s book	78
Conclusion	81
2 Curious reading and interior space	83
Introduction	83
The lie of the land	84
A new focus	89
“Snooping about”	90

Through the keyhole	91
Spying on the heroine	103
Listening at doors: Thisbe or Charicleia?	106
Opening narrative doors	109
Spatial dynamics: how to create a narrative	111
Discovery and verification	119
‘The doors made a noise’	124
Reading interiors	125
Tombs	126
Women’s quarters	128
(Female) bodies	131
Standing on both sides of the door	135
Hiding behind doors	135
Novelistic wedding nights	137
Access to knowledge	140
Sexual space and the reader(’s <i>sōphrosunē</i>)	149
Suggestive text	151
Lycaenion’s teaching space	154
The ship as a liminal space in the novels	158
Conclusion	162
3 Narrative deceptions	164
Introduction	164
Cleitophon’s narrative	164
Narrative lies in Chariton	168
Persinna and Calasiris	171
Lying speech and feminine wiles: Anthia and Callirhoe	176
Conclusion	181
4 Reading female voices	183
Introduction	183
Reading (as) women: Theocritus <i>Idyll</i> 15	187
Inscribing narrative: Persinna	197

Persinna as narrative catalyst	199
Persinna's voice	200
Persinna's story and Heliodorus' story of authorship	211
Undermining the narrator: Leucippe	214
Cleitophon's ego-narrative	216
The problematic narration of Leucippe	218
Leucippe behind the narrative	228
Controlling the narrative: women in [Pseudo-]Lucian's <i>Onos</i>	232
Palaestra's power and language	235
Powerful female characters	250
Choosing Lucius' narrative	252
Shaping and framing Lucius' narrative	254
Conclusion	257
Conclusion	259
Bibliography	265

Introduction

The Greek novels self-consciously construct and theorize for themselves a reader who is curious, or *polypragmōn*.¹ The texts play to and suggest a reader who wants to explore the different narrative threads and perspectives that the text puts forward (some of which destabilize the main thrust of the text), and who by following his or her curiosity through can supply with his or her imagination the narratives that remain under-narrated or even merely hinted at. The reader that the Greek novels construct is therefore collaborative as well as curious. This kind of collaboration between text and reader is apparent in Hellenistic epigram: readers of that genre were expected to fill in missing details in a process Bing has named *Ergänzungsspiel*.² Reading the novels becomes, in a sense, a hermeneutic game played between text and reader with the aim of making the narrative whole. The reader of the novels is also at times encouraged to engage with his or her experience of reading, and the ways in which this experience is reflected in and constructed by the text. Furthermore, through drawing attention to this experience of reading, the text asks the reader to consider what kind of reader s/he is, and to engage in a self-analysis or self-diagnosis. The reader is given a choice, and the curious reader who will explore the alternative narrative patterns is written into the text:

In the romances. . . we can choose either to follow the teleological thrust of the normative narrative, or choose to explore the microecologies of

¹The second part of Whitmarsh 2011 argues that the novels theorize their own reading strategies, within the framework of narrativity versus closure: the novels allow for the reader to engage with both types of reading.

²Bing 2009, p. 86ff. See also Iser 1980.

desire that are narrated en route.³

A reader who is *polypragmōn* (busy about **many** things) is particularly suitable for texts that provide such multi-faceted narratives.⁴ In playing to and fashioning this curious reader, the novels themselves create a theory of novel-reading which turns the activity of *polypragmosunē* into a legitimate one by which the reader can uncover the narrative and complete the story. The novels court the reader's desire to find out about the narrative: "the movement of narrative itself is driven by desire in the form of 'epistemophilia', a desire to know: we want to discover secrets, to know the end, to find the truth."⁵ The reader's epistemophilia is manifested in his or her *polypragmosunē*.

Each chapter of the thesis will examine a different way in which this curious, inquisitive reader is constructed by exploring ways in which the novels involve the reader in processes of discovery, selection, and interpretation. The first, 'Self-commenting narrative', will demonstrate that novels reflect upon themselves and the processes of reading by encouraging, and in some cases instructing, the reader to read against the text and to take an interest in every aspect or possibility of the narrative. The second chapter, 'Curious reading and interior space', will argue that the novels' representation of access to interior spaces models the reader's access to the narrative, thus creating a model for reading that is explorative. The third chapter, 'Narrative deceptions', will concentrate on how novels often deceive and mislead the reader, making him or her work harder in his or her reading and think about alternative narrative routes. The final chapter, 'Reading female voices', will demonstrate that female characters in the novels have a part to play in constructing the curious reader. They contribute to the shaping of this kind of reader by encouraging him or her to find their narratives, asking more questions of the text, often by reading against the main narrative. This chapter also asks the questions of who is in control of the narrative, and what does it mean for the reader to read from a female perspective. These final two chapters in particular will ask what kinds of narrative can be found once the curious reader has been

³Whitmarsh 2011, p. 168.

⁴I owe this point to Catherine Connors.

⁵Culler 1997, p. 91.

identified: once curious, where can the text take the reader? Overall, my research aims to enrich our ideas about ancient novel-reading, a subject for which we lack any explicit ancient theory.

In suggesting that the reader of the ancient novels is both inquisitive and in dialogue with the text, I take my lead from Hunter,⁶ who argues for a curious reader (and novelist), and from Konstan,⁷ who argues for an active reader: one who fully engages with and questions the text. The reader of the ancient novels “approached them in the same active or dialogical spirit that they did elite literature”⁸ and sustained an “interrogative relationship”⁹ with the text. Part of this interrogative relationship involved a constant searching in the text, leaving no stone unturned. The texts themselves invite this kind of reading; often there are gaps to fill in, or mysteries or riddles to solve.¹⁰ More recently, Whitmarsh — who calls the reader “appetitive”¹¹ — says that (in Chariton) curiosity is a metanarrative force indicative of the “invasive impulse for knowledge” within the novel.¹² Morales shows that Achilles Tatius writes several types of reader into the text in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*,¹³ and one of these readers is Conops, a *polypragmōn* who “actively strives to glimpse what is hidden, and to uncover what should be private”.¹⁴ A reader who based their reading on *polypragmosunē* would “root out hidden meanings and be alert for subtexts, stripping away at the layers of the narrative”.¹⁵ Morales observes that the myth narrated by Conops (2.21.1-4) encourages this kind of reading.¹⁶ The reader who reads in this way, and thus identifies with Conops, is “an irritant”.¹⁷ On the other hand:

⁶Hunter 2009. See especially p. 60 for Homeric scholia and readers who practise *polypragmosunē*.

⁷Konstan 2009.

⁸Ibid., p. 7.

⁹Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 13. See also Hunter 2009, p. 51.

¹¹Whitmarsh 2011, p. 188.

¹²Ibid., p. 190. See also ibid., p. 212: “There is room in romances for resistive reading — for *curiosity*”.

¹³Morales 2004, pp. 77–95.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 86.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 87.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 87.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 87.

he or she is placed in a double-bind, for the strategies of concealment and revelation mobilised by the narrative encourage him or her to be vigilant and curious. The sexualised descriptions of Europa, Andromeda and Leucippe are designed to solicit a voyeuristic engagement from the reader.¹⁸

This implies both that *polypragmosunē* is a negative quality,¹⁹ and that the reader is nevertheless unable to escape from the fact that s/he has to read this way. I shall argue that the Greek novels, *Leucippe and Cleitophon* included, are actually using curiosity in a different way; they are reclaiming it for their own self-referential purposes and reframing it in a way that is less negative. I shall argue that curiosity becomes a tool by which the novels draw attention to their narrative potentiality, and that it encourages the reader to imagine and fantasize, as Morales points out, because this is its purpose. The novels make the reader self-analyse when s/he realizes s/he is creating a fantasy because of his or her readerly curiosity. If the novels make the reader create his or her own fantasy and then draw attention to this fact, then that is the message of the novels: a reader must always be self-aware, just as the text is. *Polypragmosunē*, then, can be useful and positive as long as one is aware of how one is using it. The reader who does not read in the active and interrogative way that the text suggests does not end up as richly rewarded by his or her reading experience as the reader who does follow the path that is theorized for him or her. Conops' brand of *polypragmosunē* — which amounts to sitting with the door open in order to overhear what is going on or catch sight of who is going past rather than going out of his way to spy actively — is the wrong kind: he ultimately fails in his task. The reader needs to be more attentive to detail, to strive actively to discover the narrative, and to take care not to be duped by narrative 'sleeping drugs', administered while s/he is not paying attention, which could result in him or her missing the action. That is, every narrative stone must be turned and every possibility explored in order to experience the novels' full intricacies and delights. This type of *polypragmosunē*, as I shall argue, leads ultimately to readerly self-analysis. Novelistic curiosity thus finds a place amidst the cultural milieu of

¹⁸Morales 2004, p. 87.

¹⁹As indeed it had previously and in other contexts been theorized.

self-awareness and intellectual self-improvement of the Imperial period.

Polypragmosunē

Ehrenberg documents the development of the term *polypragmosunē* as it is evidenced in Greek literature.²⁰ He demonstrates that on the one hand the Athenians traditionally took pride in their *polypragmosunē* and saw it as a positive quality, since for them it carried implications of toiling hard for the good of the expansion of the state: “Athenian imperialism was the main result of Athenian πολυπραγμοσύνη, or to put it the other way round, πολυπραγμοσύνη was the psychological basis of Athenian imperialism.”²¹ However, it was regarded by others as a negative quality; in Herodotus, “the deprecatory implications [of πολυπραγμονέειν] are obvious.”²² The *polypragmōn* later becomes seen as someone who pries into someone else’s affairs, a busybody and meddling, but *polypragmosunē* could also mean research,²³ so the concept was used in contexts ranging “from imperialism to gossiping and from science to intrusive curiosity.”²⁴

Plutarch, in his *Peri Polypragmosunēs*, certainly paints the *polypragmōn* in a less than desirable light. He says that *polypragmosunē* is one of the unhealthy and harmful states of mind (πάθη νοσώδη καὶ βλαβερὰ, 515c), and is a desire to learn about other people’s woes (φιλομάθειά τις ἐστὶν ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν, 515d). A *polypragmōn* will pry into what happens in the mansions of the rich, houses of the poor, royal courts, and bridal chambers of the newly-wedded (οὕτω τοῦ πολυπράγμονος ὁ νοῦς ἅμ’ ἐν πλουσίων οἴκοις ἐστὶν ἐν δωματίοις πενήτων ἐν ἀύλαϊς βασιλέων ἐν θαλάμοις νεογάμων· 517a) and he seeks to know about everything, even prying into the lives of foreigners and leaders (πάντα πράγματα ζητεῖ, τὰ ξένων τὰ ἡγεμόνων, 517a). A *polypragmōn* will also ‘break into private

²⁰Ehrenberg 1947.

²¹Ibid., p. 47.

²²Ibid., p. 46.

²³Van Hoof 2010, p. 179: Although Socrates is derided for being a busybody, educated people “seem to have taken pride in such investigations.”

²⁴Ibid., p. 180.

letters, put their ears to their neighbours' walls, and whisper with their slaves and women' (ἐπιστόλια διορύττουσιν ἀλλότρια καὶ παραβάλλουσι γειτόνων τοίχοις τὰ ὦτα καὶ συμψιθυρίζουσιν οἰκέταις καὶ γυναίκοις, 519f).²⁵

Plutarch prescribes turning one's curiosity towards more intellectual pursuits and towards reading τὰς ἱστορίας (517e) as a remedy for *polypragmosunē*. This is because these texts contain the sort of material that the *polypragmōn* is seeking:

ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἔνεισι
 πεσήματ' ἀνδρῶν κάπολακτισμοὶ βίων,
 φθοραὶ γυναικῶν, ἐπιθέσεις οἰκετῶν, διαβολαὶ φίλων, παρασκευαὶ
 φαρμάκων, φθόνοι, ζηλοτυπία, ναυάγι' οἴκων, ἐκπτώσεις ἡγεμονιῶν·
 For in there you will find 'the falls of men, and violent deaths,' disgraces
 of women, attacks of slaves, treachery of friends, preparing of poisons,
 envy, jealousies, shipwrecks of households, and downfalls of leaders.

517e-f

What kind of texts are these ἱστορίαί? Hunter says that “Plutarch uses ἱστορίαί where we would probably wish to translate (neutrally) as ‘stories’.”²⁶ Novelistic texts also contain the kinds of themes found in τὰς ἱστορίας, as well as the sorts of things that Plutarch says a *polypragmōn* will search for in life.²⁷ According to Plutarch, people who are *polypragmones* ὑπερβάντες τοὺς ἐν μέσῳ λόγους... τὰ κρυπτόμενα καὶ λανθάνοντα κακὰ πάσης οἰκίας ἐκλέγουσι (‘ignoring the narrative in public view... pick out the hidden and concealed evils of the whole house’, 516d). They also τοὺς τοίχους ἀπαμφιέννουσι, τὰς θύρας ἀναπετάννουσι (‘they strip off the walls and throw open the doors’ 516f) of other people, which is what the reader of the novels is encouraged to do.²⁸

²⁵All translations are mine unless stated otherwise.

²⁶Hunter 2009, p. 57.

²⁷See *ibid.*, 57–58: “Plutarch’s list of what you can find in ἱστορίαί could certainly be as well illustrated from those texts which we call ‘ancient novels’ as from the ‘history’ of the ancient world”. Van Hoof suggests that Plutarch may be alluding to his own works when he says one should study nature, the moon, and histories (Van Hoof 2010, p. 207).

²⁸Morales 2004, p. 85 notes the first of these and also φιλοπευστία τῶν ἐν ἀποκρύψει καὶ λανθανόντων, 518c. See also Whitmarsh 2011, p. 187 n. 49.

Plutarch's treatise, then, makes the point that a *polypragmōn* is essentially a bad person, or a person with dubious and questionable morals. However, the evidence from the novels shows that, with three possible exceptions, no *polypragmōn* is essentially bad, and this suggests the novels have a different attitude to curiosity. In Xenophon of Ephesus at 3.9.2 and 4.1.2 it is Habrocomes and Hippothous respectively who are described as engaging in *polypragmosunē*. Habrocomes is making enquiries about Anthia and Hippothous about Habrocomes.²⁹ In Chariton at 1.1.10 and 1.3.3 the people engaging in *polypragmosunē* are crowds, who may be nosy, but are not morally bad.³⁰ Indeed, at 1.1.10 they show concern for Chaereas and urge his father to let him marry Callirhoe. Their curiosity thus becomes a plot driver.³¹ At 1.4.4 Chaereas is accosted by a stranger who tells him he has something important to tell him, and in doing so *μεστὸν ποιήσας ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου καὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης* ('made him full of hope and fear and curiosity'). This is part of the plot the suitors hatch against Chaereas. Interestingly, at 2.4.9, Leonas says *τίς μὲν ἐστι, δέσποτα, μὴ πολυπραγμονῶμεν* ('Master, let us *not* be inquisitive about who she [Callirhoe] is'). He is implying that Dionysius does not really need to know Callirhoe's history to satisfy his lust, but Dionysius says that he is unable to enter into any kind of relationship with Callirhoe without first finding out who she is and where she is from, and even at this stage seems concerned for her welfare.³² Dionysius himself is referred to as *πολυπραγμονῶν* at 2.5.7 and 2.7.2, and at 3.9.4 Plangon only tells Dionysius the bare facts when some strangers have arrived and have been worshipping an image of Callirhoe because she knows that Eros is naturally inquisitive and Dionysius will pry into what has happened of his own accord.³³ Finally, at 3.9.12 Dionysius reprimands Phocas for not personally

²⁹3.9.2: Ὁ δὲ Ἀβροκόμης ἐζήτει καὶ ἐπολυπραγμόνει εἴ τις ἐπίσταιτο κόρην ποθὲν ξένην αἰχμάλωτον μετὰ ληστῶν ἀχθεῖσαν; 4.1.2: ὁ Ἰππόθοος ἐπολυπραγμόνει <εἴ> ποθεν Ἀβροκόμην εὐρεῖν δυνήσεται.

³⁰1.1.10: πολυπραγμονοῦντες δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔμαθον τῆς νόσου, καὶ ἔλεος πάντας εἰσῆει μειρακίου καλοῦ κινδυνεύοντος ἀπολέσθαι διὰ πάθος ψυχῆς εὐφυοῦς; 1.3.3: καὶ πᾶς ὁ παρῶν εἰστήκει κοινῶ τινι πολυπραγμοσύνης πάθει.

³¹Whitmarsh 2011, pp. 186–187.

³²“οὐκ ἂν ποιήσαιμι” φησὶν ὁ Διονύσιος “πρὶν μαθεῖν τίς ἢ γυνὴ καὶ πόθεν. ἔωθεν οὖν πύθμεθα παρ’ αὐτῆς τὴν ἀλήθειαν. μεταπέμψομαι δ’ αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐνθάδε, μὴ καὶ τινος βιαιοτέρου λάβωμεν ὑποψίαν, ἀλλ’ ὅπου πρῶτον αὐτὴν ἑθεασάμην, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης γενέσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι.” 2.4.10.

³³ἠπίστατο γὰρ ὅτι φύσει περίεργός ἐστιν ὁ Ἔρως κάκεῖνος δι’ ἑαυτὸν πολυπραγμονήσει περὶ τῶν γεγονότων.

finding out whether Chaereas is dead or just captured: οὐκ ἐπολυπραγμόνησας πότερον ἐν τοῖς τεθνηκόσι Χαιρέας ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν τοῖς δεδεμένοις. In Achilles Tatius at 2.38.2 women's looks — or rather their false looks from adornment — are described as *polypragmōn*: γυναικὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντα ἐπίπλαστα, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ σχήματα: κἄν εἶναι δόξη καλὴ, τῶν ἀλειμμάτων ἢ πολυπράγμων μηχανή. This in itself is a thought-provoking use of the word. Are the women themselves a source of curiosity? Perhaps it is rather that one has to look hard through a woman's makeup and outward appearance to see the woman beneath, just as one has to look hard through layers of narrative in a novel to find the complete story. At 5.10.7 Cleitophon's father is trying to find out where Cleitophon is: ἐπολυπραγμόνει δὲ παντὶ σθένει, ποῖ κερωρήκατε. In Longus, at 4.17.3, Gnathon defends his choice of love-object (a goatherd!) against Astylus' suggestion that he may be ashamed: οὐδεὶς ταῦτα, δέσποτα, ἐραστῆς πολυπραγμονεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐν οἴῳ ποτὲ ἂν σώματι εὖρη τὸ κάλλος, ἐάλωκε. ('Master, no-one in love is inquisitive about these things but whatever the body he may find beauty in, he is captured'). At this point he has dubious intentions but later redeems himself by rescuing Chloe and is invited to the wedding, and his sentiment seems a positive one. In Heliodorus, at 2.17.4, after Thisbe's corpse has been discovered, Cnemon attempts to send the bandit Thermouthis off to make enquiries about Thyamis, but this is just an excuse to get him out of the way.³⁴ Later, at 2.20.1, πολυπραγμονεῖν refers to Thermouthis and Cnemon who have both gone on this expedition. Thermouthis is waiting for nightfall so that he and Cnemon can go to the village to enquire about Thyamis (however, Cnemon will by now have succeeded in losing Thermouthis by tricking him).³⁵ At 5.2.4 Cnemon says he will not be able to sleep until he has found out under what delusion Nausicles is suffering when he says that he has recaptured Thisbe alive.³⁶ At 7.16.1 Cybele asks Achaemenes what he is being

³⁴ Ἀπολειπτέον οἶν ἡμῖν καὶ φευκτέον ὡς ἄρκυς τινὰς καὶ δεσμοτήριον τὴν νῆσον, ἀποπέμψαντας πρότερον τὸν Θέρμουθιν πρόφασιν ὡς πεισόμενον καὶ πολυπραγμονήσοντα εἶ τι περὶ τοῦ Θυάμιδος ἔχοι μαθάνειν.

³⁵ Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπειδὴ πρὸς ταῖς ἀκρωρείαις ἐγένετο τοῦ ὄρους ἀνέπαυεν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τινος πέτρας ἐσπέραν τε καὶ νύκτα ἀναμένων, καθ' ἣν συνέκειτο αὐτοῖς ἤκουσιν εἰς τὴν κώμην τὰ περὶ τὸν Θυάμιν πολυπραγμονεῖν. . .

³⁶ Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν βιώην εἰ μὴ θάττον ὑπεξεληθὼν τρόπον ὄντινα δὴ πολυπραγμονήσαιμι τίς ποτε πλάνη τὸν Ναυσικλέα κατέληφεν ἢ ὅπως παρὰ μόνοις Αἰγυπτίοις οἱ τεθνεώτες ἀναβιοῦσιν.

curious about when he is spying on Theagenes and Charicleia through a door: Τί πολυπραγμονεῖς. . .; (this will be discussed in chapter 2). Finally at 8.3.5 Thyamis makes inquiries about the protagonists (πολυπραγμονῶν) in an attempt to find out where they are so that he can take care of them as per Calasiris' wishes; this happens after he has been reinstated as a priest.³⁷

The exceptions, which I have not included above, are as follows. Conops in Achilles Tatius I have discussed already. As Pantheia's servant he is part of the system of making sure that her daughter Leucippe remains chaste, which is one of the points on which the events of the novel hang. As I noted above, his type of *polypragmosunē* is misplaced, so, because he is not successful at being *polypragmōn*, he is not a model for the reader, and therefore the fact that he is an unpleasant character does not suggest or comment upon the immorality of the reader. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* at 1.11.6 Theron is concerned that Callirhoe should not be sold in Athens because Athens is a city of busybodies. Through their curiosity, the Athenians would have found out exactly who Callirhoe was, so they would actually have been morally (but not in terms of the narrative) a force for good rather than a negative force, which Theron says they would be.³⁸ Trachinus in Heliodorus is the final exception, since he is a pirate and has evil intent. He says he wants to know when the Phoenician ship will sail from Zacynthus because he is in love with Charicleia. It must be concluded that Trachinus is the only real exception — a *polypragmōn* who is morally bad and interested in the heroine just as the reader is — and he ends up being killed.

Whitmarsh says that in Xenophon of Ephesus, Longus and Heliodorus *polypragmosunē* is “largely deproblematised”,³⁹ but I think that curiosity is an important feature in these novels as well as in Chariton and Achilles Tatius; in this genre it is reframed, or reclaimed, as positive. Even Lucius in the *Onos* is not an essentially wicked person,⁴⁰ and he eventually works out what his problem is when he talks about having escaped the curiosity of an ass at the end of the text: he identifies what it was that put him in that situation in the first place. I do not seek to

³⁷Κἀπειδὴ πολυπραγμονῶν καὶ ἐκπυθάνομενος ἔγνω τοῖς σατραπείοις ἐνφοκισμένους. . .

³⁸But he is the pirate who stole her and has his own motives.

³⁹Whitmarsh 2011, p. 186 n. 47.

⁴⁰Cf. Walsh 1988, p. 75: “There is no suggestion that Lucius has behaved impiously.”

analyse the term *polypragmosunē* as it appears in the novels, but will venture to explore how the novels construct and promote a reader who has the qualities of a *polypragmōn*, that is, one who will investigate the narrative.

Hunter argues that reading or listening to histories or novels is “a way of being healthily *πολυπράγμων*, because it all turns out for the best.”⁴¹ I agree that the novels put a positive spin on *polypragmosunē*; however, the way in which I think the novels encourage healthy *polypragmosunē* is by putting the reader in a position of examining his or her own reading process. It is therefore pertinent for my discussion that Plutarch suggests that curiosity, rather than being directed at other people’s affairs, should be directed towards one’s own affairs: *μετάθες ἔξωθεν καὶ μετὰστρεψον εἴσω τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην* (515d). He also says that if someone turns his curiosity towards his own affairs then he will ask himself questions:

ἐνταῦθ’ ἔχει διατριβὰς οὐκ ἀχρήστους οὐδὲ κακοήθεις ἀλλ’ ὠφελί-
μους καὶ σωτηρίους τὸ φιλοπευθὲς τοῦτο καὶ φιλόπραγμον, ἐκάστου
πρὸς ἑαυτὸν λέγοντος,
πῆ τραπόμην; τί δ’ ἔρεξα; τί μοι δέον οὐκ ἐτελέσθη;

Then this curious and busy disposition has pastimes that are neither useless nor bad in character but useful and a saving grace, with each man saying to himself “where have I gone astray? What have I said? What have I not achieved that it was necessary for me to achieve?”

515f

Plutarch is asking the *polypragmōn* to question his actions. Although he is talking in this context about taking an interest in one’s own household, as opposed to the households of others, this surely implies using one’s curiosity as a means to self-analysis. Furthermore, later on in the text Plutarch suggests “exercises for reflection”⁴² to cure curiosity; yet more self examination.

⁴¹Hunter 2009, p. 60.

⁴²Van Hoof 2010, p. 198.

Curiosity as a tool by which one can analyse oneself is what the novels promote for their reader: they construct the reader as curious, and then, through drawing attention to his or her curiosity, compel him or her to analyse his or her own reading experience. Lieve Van Hoof demonstrates that Plutarch admits that the remedies of turning curiosity on one's own affairs, and reading history, will not work unless one has undergone the "fully fledged, twofold therapy"⁴³ that can be found in the last two paragraphs of the text, which are the exercises for reflection previously mentioned, and practical training to help one gain self-control. The novels offer the reader an easier solution. Read the novels and one's curiosity will be provoked and guided through a process that directs it towards self-reflection: "fiction teaches us the truth about ourselves and the world. Through fiction we learn imaginatively what we cannot learn experientially."⁴⁴ Van Hoof says that Plutarch's aim is not for people to stop enjoying their leisure time, but for people to stop being so concerned about everything and everyone else that they have no time for reading and other such activities.⁴⁵ One lesson we can learn from Plutarch, then, is this: make time in your life for novels; there is much that can be found within them.⁴⁶

The reader

The question of who read these texts in antiquity is a much-asked and variously-answered one, and is not a debate into which I wish or aim to enter with a definitive answer. It should nevertheless be mentioned as part of this study because I do not believe that even a theoretical reader constructed by the text can in reality be completely divorced from the real-life readership unless it is referred to using a completely different term.⁴⁷ Furthermore, without a real-life ancient readership

⁴³Ibid., p. 198.

⁴⁴Morgan 2004, p. 17.

⁴⁵Van Hoof 2010, p. 207.

⁴⁶This is made more pertinent by Hunter's 'idle wondering' about whether Plutarch's use of the phrase *ναυάγ' οἴκων* is an allusion to the novels' shipwrecks, Hunter 2009, p. 58 n. 17.

⁴⁷See Iser 1978, pp. 34–35: "No matter who or what he may be, the real reader is always offered a particular role to play, and it is this role that constitutes the concept of the implied reader."

the novels would not have survived to be read, enjoyed, and debated by the real-life modern readership.

Papyri are not very useful in indicating the numbers of real-life readers, given their paucity,⁴⁸ and are also unable to tell us what sort of person read the novels. Hunter argues that since the novels imply varied audience responses their real-life readers might have been “diverse and complex”.⁴⁹ He also seems to imply that readers within the text reflect the kind of reader one would find outside the text in real life.⁵⁰ Bowie notes that we should “distinguish between actual and intended readers,”⁵¹ and then goes on to issue a caveat about the contentious question of the intended reader. It is of course impossible to be absolutely sure for whom these texts were written and by whom they were read, but since the texts are so highly allusive, presupposing a knowledge of the canon of Greek literature, “it seems reasonably likely that the educated who knew and relished the domestic complications of Menander, the emotionality of a Euripidean tirade, and the courtroom rhetoric of Demosthenes, would be the novel’s optimal readers.”⁵²

Another contentious issue is the possibility of the novels having been written for, or read by, women.⁵³ Taking internal evidence as her starting-point, Egger strongly posits a female readership by arguing that all of the (five extant) novels contain “features that invite female identification”⁵⁴ and function on the basis of “emotional gynocentrism, but factual androcentrism.”⁵⁵ Contemporary female readers would perhaps have been attracted by the female characters’ emotional and erotic power, even though the texts put forward a patriarchal framework of female legal disempowerment.⁵⁶ Hägg suggests that the insistence upon male chastity would

⁴⁸See Bowie 1996, p. 93.

⁴⁹Hunter 2008a, p. 270.

⁵⁰Cf. Morales 2004, p. 77 ff.

⁵¹Bowie 1996, p. 89.

⁵²Lightfoot 2000, p. 276. See also Stephens 1994.

⁵³Or indeed novels having been written by women: Johnes 1996, pp. 163–164, 199–200.

⁵⁴Egger 1994b, p. 264.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 272.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 273. See also Egger 1994a. More plausibly, Haynes suggests that “the archaizing disempowerment of ‘good’ women in the novels can equally well be ascribed to a male need to render them unthreatening.” (Haynes 2003, p. 5.) I shall discuss women in the novels further in chapter 4.

also have appealed to women.⁵⁷ Johne too suggests a female readership is highly likely: “upper and middle-class women could feel writers addressing them. Women found many opportunities for identification”.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the various fantasies created by the text work in reverse as well: strong female characters may appeal to a male readership as much as a female one.⁵⁹ Hunter writes that “there is little positive evidence in favour of the ‘female readership’ hypothesis, and at best the question remains open.”⁶⁰ Here it suffices to say that the original readers of Greek novels are generally agreed to have been the educated elite, and that some women would have fallen into this category.

The question I am addressing is not who actually read (or listened to) these texts in antiquity, or even for whom were these texts intended, but how would a reader of the novels approach the texts? That is, what kind of a reader do the novels themselves invite and promote? I hope to discover a conceptual framework for understanding the ancient novel reader that is laid down by the texts themselves. In order to achieve this it is necessary to concentrate on the reader constructed by the text, rather than an external real-life reader:

If, then, we are to try and understand the effects caused and the responses elicited by literary works, we must allow for the reader’s presence without in any way predetermining his character or his historical situation. We may call him, for want of a better term, the implied reader. He embodies all those predispositions laid down, not by an empirical outside reality, *but by the text itself*.⁶¹

This reader is, according to Iser, “a construct and in no way to be identified with any real reader”,⁶² but the real reader nevertheless must identify with this construct. I shall argue in the course of this thesis that the reader is directed by the

⁵⁷Hägg 1983, p. 96.

⁵⁸Johne 1996, p. 207.

⁵⁹Haynes 2003, p. 5.

⁶⁰Hunter 2008a, p. 266. See also Haynes 2003, pp. 9–10.

⁶¹Iser 1978, p. 34. My emphasis.

⁶²Ibid., p. 34.

text, and shown how to read each particular novel, essentially casting him or her in a role which is that of Iser's 'implied reader'. I am positing that the real-life reader engages with this text-constructed reader in some way, which is why I said above that the real-life reader and implied reader cannot in practice be completely separated.

The reader of the novel is encouraged to imagine to some extent but their imaginings cannot stray outside the believable possibility set up by the narrative's play of concealment and revelation: "What is concealed spurs the reader into action, but this action is also controlled by what is revealed."⁶³ Put another way, the text is not completely proscriptive; it has an open prescriptiveness:

The reader is necessary to the production of meaning. . . but he is constrained by the text, just as hot water is necessary to the production of tea, but a mixture of tea leaves and water will produce only tea, never coffee or chocolate milk.⁶⁴

The Greek novels' blend of tea is, however, a particularly exciting and taste-bud tingling one.

Methodology

The novels are polyphonic in nature;⁶⁵ they put forward various narrative threads and perspectives. We can, as readers, identify "further voices" within the text:⁶⁶

⁶³Iser 1980, p. 111.

⁶⁴Crosman 1980, pp. 154–155. See also Morgan 1991, p. 85: "Works of literature. . . are to some extent in control of their own meanings, and the reader's interaction with the text, while remaining an essential component of the whole, operates within a framework of active direction and guidance from the text." See further Chambers 1984, p. 35 and Eagleton 1983 repr. 1996, p. 73.

⁶⁵Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 259 ff., Fusillo 1989 tr. 1991, Whitmarsh 2008.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 238.

Bakhtin describes the novel as fundamentally polyphonic (multi-voiced) or dialogic rather than monological (single-voiced): the essence of the novel is its staging of different voices or discourses and, thus, of the clash of social perspectives and points of view.⁶⁷

I take as my starting point this background of reading the novels as repositories of varied perspectives and storylines: the reader is urged to take on these differing perspectives, investigating them as s/he goes through the text. In addition to this, novels present the reader with differing narrative threads which constitute the narrative routes down which the curious reader is encouraged to travel, even if the main teleological thrust of the text leads to the homecoming and/or marriage of the protagonists: “there are invariably, for the reader, residual memories of alternative narrative positions.”⁶⁸ The reader has to reconcile the various different perspectives:

We read backwards and forwards simultaneously, predicting and recollecting. . . all of this complicated activity is carried out on many levels at once, for the text has ‘backgrounds’ and ‘foregrounds’, different narrative viewpoints, alternative layers of meaning between which we are constantly moving.⁶⁹

Thus reading is an action that is carried out on various different levels, often concurrently, and the narrative layers that can be found within a text all resonate with each other, both communicating meaning and also challenging the reader to find it.

An overarching reader response approach provides the backdrop to my study. Within this theoretical approach, meaning is created in the interaction between text and reader:

⁶⁷Culler 1997, p. 87.

⁶⁸Whitmarsh 2008, p. 238.

⁶⁹Eagleton 1983 repr. 1996, p. 67.

what modern philologists are concerned with in the study of complex allusion is a relationship between author and reader which can involve indirection as much as direction, concealment as much as revelation.⁷⁰

This is true of reading as a whole: it is a contract, or dialogue, between text and reader. Literature is like a musical score, which “will only be transformed into music when it is performed.”⁷¹ A text does not fully exist until a reader “picks it up and concretizes it in her or his reading.”⁷² Put another way,

[t]he work is full of ‘indeterminacies’, elements which depend for their effect upon the reader’s interpretation, and which can be interpreted in a number of different, perhaps mutually conflicting ways.⁷³

The curious reader is one kind of reader that the novels promote. Other scholars see other ways to interpret the novels, which do not have not to exist in order for the curious reader to exist.

Reading the novels is a process, and in going through it the reader can become more aware of him or herself:

The whole point of reading, for a critic like Iser, is that it brings us into deeper self-consciousness, catalyzes a more critical view of our own identities. It is as though what we have been ‘reading’, in working our way through a book, is ourselves.⁷⁴

The reader of the Greek novels is brought to a position of self-analysis, or self-‘reading’. Reading the novels, then, is a transformation of the kind that Plutarch recommends. The novels as texts are a transformative experience. That is, the novel can be enjoyed both by the semantic, or first-level, reader who “wants to know

⁷⁰Hinds 1998, p. 25.

⁷¹Schmitz 2002, p. 87.

⁷²Ibid., p. 87.

⁷³Eagleton 1983 repr. 1996, p. 66.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 68.

what happens”⁷⁵ and by the critical, or second-level, reader who “asks himself what kind of reader that particular story was asking him to become.”⁷⁶ It is possible to move from one level to another, and to appreciate the work on both levels simultaneously: “The second-level reader is. . . the person who realizes how the work manages to function brilliantly at the first level.”⁷⁷ Not all readers fall into one of these two categories, and the novels present a plurality of possible readers, or reading positions, which can take place concurrently. As such, the meaning of the text is the experience the reader encounters when he or she reads it; meaning is, in other words, what the text does to the reader.⁷⁸

As well as reader response theory, I shall also make use of narratology, as some of the critical terminology will be helpful in determining how characters function within the text, and how the reader is allowed access to different perspectives. The difference in concept between narrator⁷⁹ and focalizer,⁸⁰ and indeed different levels of embedded focalization, are particularly important to novelistic texts because the polyphonic nature of the narrative means that many different perspectives are brought together within one text.⁸¹

The thesis will also deal with some Hellenistic poetry, since this is a genre which is similarly aware of its audience or reader, and constructs it in a way that resonates with the ancient novel. In addition, Hellenistic poetry consists of a shift in themes towards the private just as the novels do, so it is a useful genre with which to make comparisons. It also demonstrates that it is aware of its reading audience and is concerned with the act of reading as part of the experience of the text: “poets writing for the social elite became concerned as never before with the act of reading itself, with the impact of the written word, as artefact and medium, on the

⁷⁵Eco 2002 tr. 2006, p. 223.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 223.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 223.

⁷⁸Fish 1976.

⁷⁹The “[f]unction consisting of the verbal presentation of the story.” (de Jong 1987, p. xiv).

⁸⁰The “[f]unction consisting of the perceptual, emotional and intellectual presentation of the fabula.” (Ibid., p. xiv.) The fabula is “a chronological series of events caused or experienced by characters in a fictional world” and the story is “the elements of the fabula. . . as perceived, ordered and interpreted by a focalizer.” (Ibid., p. xiv).

⁸¹Cf. Whitmarsh 2008, p. 238: “The novels cast themselves as repositories for multiple narrative voices, often partisan and competing.”

reception of their work.”⁸² Poets often draw attention to the theme of writing and the written nature of the texts themselves as well as the act of composing or performing poetry.⁸³ As part of this self-consciousness, Hellenistic poetry constructs its reader from within the text. There are two kinds of reader in the text: a fictive reader and a “response-inviting structure (*Wirkungsstruktur*) which guides and governs its readers.”⁸⁴ It is this second reader in the text, the ‘implied reader’,⁸⁵ and how it is constructed, that I wish to explore. The novels construct a reader who is curious and who pries into the narrative. At certain points in this thesis I shall explore whether a parallel to this curious reader can be found in Hellenistic poetry.

The Greek ‘novel’

It is necessary here to say a few words about the genre of the Greek novel (a contentious issue just as is the real-life reader) and how I conceive of it. Throughout this thesis I shall be discussing the five ‘ideal’ novels, that is, Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus’ *Ephesiaca*, Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, and Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica* as well as the [Pseudo-]Lucianic *Onos*, along with supporting evidence from the Latin novels and less salubrious fragmentary Greek novelistic texts. I have selected these texts as they share a common approach to theorizing their reader as curious.

⁸²Bing 2009, p. 2. See also Meyer 2007, p. 187: “The *GA* itself is an example of the dynamics which grew from the diffusion of a culture of reading. The interaction of authors and readers evolved into a “communication” across the times, a dialogue in which authors and readers played different parts: poets enact themselves as readers and let their own reading experiences be reflected by their epigrams; collectors arrange epigrams for other readers; moreover, the genre of literary commentary develops, reflecting an interest in, and work on, the literary *oeuvre* of other authors.”

⁸³Goldhill 1991, p. 224: Hellenistic poetry has a “self-reflexive concern for the composition of poetry, expressed within poetry.”

⁸⁴Meyer 2007, p. 191.

⁸⁵Iser 1974.

Chapter 1

Self-commenting narrative

Introduction

The aim of this first chapter is to demonstrate that narratives embedded within ancient novels can tell stories about reading those novels, and that these stories in turn guide the reader and suggest how s/he should approach the text. Novels self-consciously construct their reader by showing him or her how reading works. The focus in the present chapter will be on three different stories that are told about novel-reading within the novels; that is, three different functions of embedded narratives that shape and direct reading.

Firstly, novels often represent characters within the text reacting to narratives such as reported stories, pictures, or dreams. Particularly in the case of stories, the exchange between the narrator and the person on the receiving end of that narration dramatizes the communication between the novelist and his reader. These intradiegetic⁸⁶ ‘readers’ both guide the extradiegetic⁸⁷ reader’s response to the particular embedded story, picture, or dream, and suggest how the reader might be alert to the complications of reading and interpreting the novel. The presence of

⁸⁶That is, internal to the text.

⁸⁷That is, external to the text.

‘readers’ within the text thus has the effect of making the external reader analyse the acts of reading and interpretation in which s/he is involved.

Secondly, embedded narratives insinuate meanings that run counter to or parallel to the main thrust of the text and thus enhance the reader’s experience of the narrative. Embedded narratives add to what the reader takes from the main meaning of the text by forming commentaries on the narrative, or through highlighting certain themes. They afford the reader a deeper understanding of the situation than the characters in the narrative, sometimes even hinting at a strand of narrative that has not been completely written into the text. Embedded narratives that function like this are similar to what Alden calls ‘para-narratives’, which are “secondary narratives related by the poet’s characters” or “interludes related in the voice of the poet himself” which are “relevant in some way either to their immediate context, or to that of the main narrative, or to both.”⁸⁸ Para-narratives are elements that shape the way the reader reads and interprets the text by drawing attention to or illuminating various elements in the text, and this is what the embedded narratives’ relation to the reader of the novel is.⁸⁹ In addition, the presence of matrices of different or parallel meanings appeals to an inquisitive reader, adding to the shaping of the reader of the novel as such.

Thirdly, embedded narratives self-consciously create dramas and conflicts about narrative and its reception. The reader is lead to analyse his or her own reading experience and to question whether s/he is reading correctly. The novels invite the reader to approach the text from a perspective of cognitive estrangement and to analyse the actual process of reading and not just the subject matter and plot of what s/he is reading. In this way the novels self-consciously draw attention to the fact that they address themselves to two or more levels of reader.⁹⁰ One of the ways in which the Greek novels shape the reader is through using embedded narratives to encourage him or her to ask him or herself continuously what kind

⁸⁸Alden 2000, p. 1.

⁸⁹Cf. Bartsch 1989, p. 7: Various elements of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aethiopica* are “illuminators of the text; they promise insight into it; they call for acts of interpretation. As such they necessarily feature as crucial tools in the authors’ narrative strategy and in our own rediscovery of how to read *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aethiopica*.”

⁹⁰See above, p. 26.

of reader to become.

The self-conscious presentation of narration and reception in the novels appeals to a reader who pries into hidden texts, and draws attention to this reader's methods of interpretation. In this way, the reading and interpreting of such narratives *in* the novels offers the reader an additional insight into the protocols of reading the novels themselves; s/he is put in a position of constantly analysing his or her own encounter with the text.

Leading the reader

Tales

Heliodorus, argues Bartsch, aligns the audience, or 'reader', within the text with the extradiegetic reader both by means of shared ignorance and by means of rich description which make the in-text 'reader' react in some way.⁹¹ The in-text 'reader' thus leads the external reader's response to the *Aethiopica*.⁹² One of the most famous examples of an in-text audience's reaction is the point at which Calasiris narrates the story of how he met the main protagonists Theagenes and Charicleia.

The exiled priest Calasiris narrates his tale to an eager and inquisitive in-text audience in the form of Cnemon. Cnemon often stops him, asking for more details as he narrates the story. He is a "hyperappetitive narratee"⁹³ who desires to know everything there is to know, but has to go at Calasiris' pace. At the very beginning of the tale, Cnemon refuses to let Calasiris evade the questions he has asked: where

⁹¹Bartsch 1989, p. 120. Cf. Morgan 1991, p. 86.

⁹²See *ibid.*, p. 86: "It seems at least a viable working assumption that the responses of this series of fictional audiences are intended to stand in some sort of relation to those of the real audience outside the narrative frame, that is the reader." See also *ibid.*, 91: There is quite often a hypothetical audience, constructed by words like 'obviously': "Events are frequently described as the crowd sees them, so that the crowd functions as a channel through which information passes to the reader, thus establishing a perceptual identification".

⁹³Whitmarsh 2011, p. 122. See also Morgan 1991, p. 96: "he has an insatiable appetite for narrative and a consuming curiosity, both for retrospective explication and for forward progression through the text".

Theagenes and Charicleia are from, who their parents are, how they came to be in Egypt, and what their adventures have been. As Morgan points out, Cnemon and the reader both hold the same knowledge about Theagenes and Charicleia at this point, so both are eager to discover the answers to these questions.⁹⁴

Ἵπολαβὸν οὖν ὁ Κνήμων “ἄλις” ἔφη “βουκόλων καὶ σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων αὐτῶν, ἔλαθες γὰρ με μικροῦ καὶ εἰς πέρας τῷ λόγῳ διαβιβάζων”

Therefore Cnemon interrupted. “Enough of Herdsmen and satraps and even Great Kings” he said “for I almost did not notice that you were bringing me to the end of the story.”

2.24.4

In this passage, Cnemon complains that Calasiris is trying to get out of telling him the story he desires to hear, and sets him back on the straight and narrow. The participle Ἵπολαβών is worth noting at this point; of the seven occurrences of it in this novel,⁹⁵ five of them have the meaning ‘interrupt’, and three of those instances refer to Cnemon.⁹⁶ It seems, then, that Cnemon is a particularly inquisitive person, and one who will not wait his turn to speak. He wants the narrative to be, in his eyes, relevant — he cannot understand why Calasiris is telling him about Nausicles at this point.⁹⁷

Having asked Calasiris to keep to the point, later in his narrative Cnemon once again interrupts (Ἵπολαβών) in order to ask for more details:⁹⁸

⁹⁴Morgan 1991, p. 95.

⁹⁵Ἵπολαμβάνω does not occur in any other forms in this novel.

⁹⁶The seven instances are: 2.17.1: Theagenes answers Cnemon; 2.24.4: Cnemon interrupts Calasiris’ narration; 3.1.1: Cnemon again interrupts Calasiris’ narration; 5.16.3: Cnemon interrupts Nausicles to back up his request that Calasiris tell them the story of Theagenes and Charicleia; 5.31.3: Pelorus interrupts Trachinus when they argue over who will get Charicleia; 6.8.1: Nausicles takes up the conversation and offers Cnemon his daughter’s hand in marriage; 9.24.5: Theagenes interrupts Charicleia because he is worried about their imminent sacrifice.

⁹⁷Cnemon did, in fact, ask where Nausicles had gone (2.24.1) so Calasiris is answering his question.

⁹⁸Whitmarsh notes that Calasiris’ reason for missing out things that Cnemon feels to be important is that he is obeying Cnemon’s own demands. He is “turning the tables” on him. Whitmarsh 2011, p. 235.

“Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πομπὴ καὶ ὁ σύμπαξ ἐναγισμὸς ἐτελέσθη —” “Καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐτελέσθη πάτερ” ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Κνήμων· “ἐμὲ γοῦν οὐπω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος ἀλλ’ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν ἠττημένον τῆς ἀκρόασεως καὶ αὐτοπτῆσαι σπεύδοντα τὴν πανήγυριν ὥσπερ κατόπιν ἑορτῆς ἦκοντα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, παρατρέχεις ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ λύσας τὸ θέατρον.”

“When the procession and the whole ceremony had finished —”

“And indeed it had not finished father” interrupted Cnemon. “In fact your story did not yet set me up as a spectator, but, even though I am someone who is very much a slave to listening and eager to be an eyewitness to the festival, you nevertheless run through it having both opened and put an end to the show using one phrase, just as if I had arrived after the feast.”

3.1.1

In response to Cnemon’s outcry, Calasiris then narrates the entire episode in such stunning descriptive detail that Cnemon can picture Theagenes and Charicleia and cries out Οὗτοι ἐκεῖνοι Χαρίκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης (‘It is they, Charicleia and Theagenes!’ 3.4.7).

Winkler takes this outburst as a misreading on Cnemon’s part and a confusion of narrated time with narrating time⁹⁹ but, more rightly, others take his reaction as a model for the reader.¹⁰⁰ Hardie points out that it is Calasiris who gets it wrong and thinks that Cnemon can actually see them in reality, whereas he is actually responding to an excellent description by a narrator skilled in *enargeia*.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 335.

¹⁰⁰Bartsch 1989, p. 121: “both Cnemon and the reader are in the same position; they are hearing a spectacle described rather than watching or participating in it. Yet Cnemon, who in a sense represents the reader (since it is the reader who remains in this position throughout the work), has been effectively made a spectator by the skill of the narrator, who in turn has taken on Heliodorus’ role; their relationship is a model for that of the reader and the author, and Cnemon’s reaction is presented to us as what our own should be.” See also Morgan 1991, p. 99.

¹⁰¹Hardie 1998, p. 27.

Cnemon's repeated requests for details as Calasiris narrates his story dramatize the interplay between narrator and narratee: "Kalasiris' narrative is at least as much about the roles of narrator and audience. . . as it is about a particular pair of lovers."¹⁰² Calasiris' narrative also shapes a reader for the novel as a whole: one who is willing to play the narrator's hermeneutic games of concealment and discovery.¹⁰³ The parts that Calasiris was going to miss out comprise a rich and remarkable description of the ceremony. This indicates that the reader has to read the *Aethiopica* in great depth and in an interrogative way in order to get the most out of it: the more deeply the reader interrogates the narrative and is curious about things, the more fulfilling his or her narrative experience will be.

Morgan argues that Calasiris' narrative schemes form a template for Heliodorus' narrative schemes:

Heliodoros has presented us with the paradigm of a symbiosis between narrator and audience, in which the audience demands and the narrator invites parenthetical expansion. This is a quality expected of the reader to the *Aithiopika*. . . It is almost as if Cnemon were there to educate the reader in the correct approach to the leisured pace of Heliodoros' own narrative.¹⁰⁴

Nausicles, by contrast, is not an interrogative reader: the second half of Calasiris' tale is addressed to him (5.17ff.) but even though in his recapitulation Calasiris omits details on purpose Nausicles asks no questions:

ἅπαντα ἔλεγε, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἤδη λεχθέντα πρὸς Κνήμωνα ἐπιτεμ-
νόμενος καὶ ὡσπερὶ κεφαλαιούμενος, καὶ τινα καὶ ἐκὼν ὑπερβαίνων
ὅσα τὸν Ναυσικλέα γινώσκειν οὐ συμφέρειν ἐδοκίμαζε

¹⁰²Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 332. See also *ibid.*, p. 331: "the narrative of Kalasiris to Knemon is a model, partly ironic, of how authors and readers play the game of literature together."

¹⁰³See Morgan 1991, p. 97: "Knemon is a reacting and interacting narratee." See also *ibid.*, p. 99: "Knemon presents an exact fit, cognitively and affectively, with the reader."

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 97–98.

He told them everything, shortening and, as it were, summarizing the first part that had already been told to Cnemon and purposefully skating over such things as he considered it inappropriate for Nausicles to know.

5.16.5

It is still Cnemon who interrupts asking for details,¹⁰⁵ and apparently this is well received by the company, since they are delighted with Calasiris' digression.¹⁰⁶

This raises some interesting questions both about the characters and the action, and about what this means for the reader: does Nausicles get less out of the narrative than Cnemon obviously does? What are the details Calasiris misses out? Nausicles' reaction appears to be an optimistic and practical one. He points out that Calasiris has already found Charicleia, and that it will be possible to retrieve Theagenes the following morning since Nausicles knows who he is with (5.33.4). This has a message to report about reading this text: it shows that the *Aethiopica* is aimed simultaneously at a reader who interrogates the text and at a reader who does not question it.

Dreams

The *Aethiopica* includes another story about interpretation in the herdsman/priest Thyamis' reaction to the dream he has at 1.18.4. His multiple interpretations of the dream can be read as a lesson on how to approach the act of reading narrative.¹⁰⁷ This kind of self-instructive narrative is particularly important for a text like Heliodorus' which begins *in medias res* and contains within it sections that could and do mislead a first-time reader of the novel.

¹⁰⁵Τοῦ δὲ Κνήμωνος μὴδὲ τοῦτο παραλιπεῖν ἀξιοῦντος ἀλλὰ φράζειν εἴ τινα καταμεμαθήκοι τῆς ἐπιπολαζούσης τῷ τόπῳ τραχύτητος αἰτίαν ('Cnemon begged him not to leave this out but to say whether he had learnt some reason for the roughness that is common at this point.' 5.17.2).

¹⁰⁶Ἐπὶ τούτοις κρότου γενομένου καὶ ἐπαίνου τῶν παρόντων ἀληθῆ εἶναι μαρτυρούντων τὴν αἰτίαν ('Those present applauded and praised the explanation and said that it was true.' 5.17.4).

¹⁰⁷Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 310; Whitmarsh 2011, p. 270.

In Thyamis' dream (1.18.4) Isis appears to him and says:

“ὦ Θύαμι, τήνδε σοι τὴν παρθένον ἐγὼ παραδίδωμι, σὺ δὲ ἔχων οὐχ ἔξεις, ἀλλ’ ἄδικος ἔση καὶ φονεύσεις τὴν ξένην· ἡ δὲ οὐ φονευθήσεται.”

“O Thyamis, I hand over to you this maiden, and although you will have her you will not have her, but you will be unjust and murder the stranger; but she will not be killed.”

Thyamis takes this to mean that he will have Charicleia as a wife and no longer a virgin, and that the slaying of Charicleia refers to her defloration, an experience from which she will not actually die. This is his first interpretation, and it is significant that the text frames this interpretation with two clauses that indicate that the reader should be sceptical about it.¹⁰⁸ “Ἦδη δὲ ἀπειρηκῶς ἔλκει πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βούλησιν τὴν ἐπίλυσιν· (‘presently, not being an expert, he forced¹⁰⁹ the meaning towards his own will’ 1.18.5) comes before his interpretation, and Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄναρ τοῦτον ἔφραζε τὸν τρόπον οὕτως αὐτῷ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐξηγουμένης· (‘and he thought this dream had this meaning, since his desires explained it in this way.’ 1.19.1) comes at the end.¹¹⁰ The text communicates with the reader beyond simply reporting the action of the story by drawing attention to the process of misinterpretation through which Thyamis goes. It is a suggestion to the reader that s/he should not jump to conclusions about the narrative: “[Thyamis] lacks the patient attentiveness and the ability to suspend the demand for immediate completion which every reader of a long and sophisticated novel must have.”¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸Cf. Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 310.

¹⁰⁹Winkler and Whitmarsh both note that the verb ἔλκω used here implies violence. Winkler asserts that this is violence done to the text (ibid., p. 311), and Whitmarsh says that the verb can be used to mean ‘I rape’, which is what Thyamis intends to do to Charicleia (Whitmarsh 2011, p. 170).

¹¹⁰The reactions to the oracle at 2.36.1–2 demonstrate this point too: different people interpret it different ways according to their desires. Calasiris does in fact say that the meaning of dreams and oracles depends on the outcome (χρησμοὶ γὰρ καὶ ὄνειροι τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς τέλεσι κρίνονται), as is noted by Bartsch 1989, p. 83. See also Winkler 1982 repr. 1999 and Hardie 1998.

¹¹¹Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 311.

Just before Thyamis kills Thisbe, thinking she is Charicleia, he reinterprets his dream to mean that he has had Charicleia with him for a little while, but war has taken her away from him, and that he would actually kill her.¹¹² In doing this he fits the dream around his current actions, yet there are still some anomalies: if he does kill her, then the end of the ‘prophecy’ from Isis in the dream (‘but she shall not be killed’) does not make sense.

Neither of Thyamis’ interpretations makes complete sense — he cannot interpret every element of the dream sensibly to form a coherent sequence of events — and it is only once the reader is in possession of all the narrative facts that the dream’s meaning becomes apparent. The ‘true’ meaning of the dream is what is actually played out in the text: Thyamis was in possession of Charicleia for a while, then he has to relinquish her when he takes her to the cave to prevent her being killed during the battle, then he thinks he kills her, but it was actually Thisbe who was killed by mistake, so Charicleia is in fact *not* killed (just as the dream predicts). Thyamis’ jumping to conclusions demonstrates how easy it is to misread, or to think one has understood something even though one is not in possession of all the facts.¹¹³ For example, the fact that Thisbe was in the cave as well as Charicleia is an important piece of information that neither Thyamis nor the reader knows at the time of the re-interpretation, so both Thyamis and the reader jump to the same initial conclusion: that it is in fact Charicleia who is dead. The reader has the advantage of knowing that novelistic heroines have a tendency to come back to life, so s/he may smell a rat that Thyamis does not.¹¹⁴

The way Thyamis deals with this dream also highlights the fact that the *Aethiopica* is a novel which the reader does have to look back over, to re-interpret various elements once s/he has established more of the narrative facts. Thyamis’ desires

¹¹²καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία τῶν προτέρων τὴν ὄψιν συνέβαλλεν, ὡς ἔχων οὐχ ἔξει τὴν Χαρίκλειαν, ὑπὸ τοῦ πολέμου ταύτης ἀφαιρεθείσης, καὶ ὡς φονεύσει καὶ οὐ τρώσει, ξίφει καὶ οὐκ Ἀφροδίτης νόμῳ. (1.30.4).

¹¹³Bartsch 1989, p. 80 demonstrates that dreams are used to “mislead as well as foreshadow”.

¹¹⁴The reader is also given two weighty ‘clues’, first that the woman Thyamis kills is “a woman who spoke to him in Greek” (see *ibid.*, p. 98) who is near the entrance (περὶ τὸ στόμιον, 1.30.7) and Cnemon took Charicleia into the innermost recesses of the cave (καθῆκε τὴν Χαρίκλειαν ὁ Κνήμων καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἔσχατον τοῦ ἄντρου διεβίβασε, 1.29.3), and second that the dream foretells that he will kill τὴν ξένην rather than, perhaps, αὐτήν — this does not rule out Charicleia, but it does not point specifically to her either, since Thisbe is also a ξένη.

affect the way he interprets his dreams. This dramatizes the fact that the reader's desire can affect the way s/he reads and interprets a narrative: Thyamis' experience demonstrates the fact that sometimes the reader reads what s/he wants to read.¹¹⁵ Other examples of this phenomenon in other Greek novels include Dionysius' interpretation of Callirhoe's letter to him — he is convinced that her letter ὑποδήλου (shows privately, 8.5.14) that she left him unwillingly¹¹⁶ — , and the primary narrator's 'reading' of the painting of Europa at the beginning of Achilles Tatius — he admits to interpreting it in a certain way, concentrating on certain aspects of the painting, because he is a lover.¹¹⁷

Thyamis' dream also dramatizes how the novels coax the reader to concoct his or her own counter-interpretation:

The romances. . . frequently portray an unambiguous poetic hierarchy, setting civilised, reciprocal passions that are ultimately successfully consummated above forceful, barbaric, asymmetric passions that typically end in frustration or tragedy. But, even if alternative interpretative desires such as those of Thyamis are repressed, they continue. . . to resonate.¹¹⁸

The novels thus leave space for the reader to think about alternative interpretative possibilities by deliberately placing such possibilities in the text.

In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, then, there is much discussion about the 'correct' interpretation of dreams, and quite often characters misinterpret (leading the reader astray¹¹⁹) and have to re-interpret their dreams as the narrative unfolds. The

¹¹⁵See Whitmarsh 2011, p. 169: "Readers too have desires, and these do not necessarily map onto the dominant, marriage-based ideology of the return narrative."

¹¹⁶The ὑπο- prefix is important here, just as it is in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (see pp. 219 and 229 below) — it hints at communication, or perceived communication, beyond or beneath the text.

¹¹⁷Εγὼ δὲ καὶ τὰλλα μὲν ἐπὶήνου τῆς γραφῆς, ἅτε δὲ ὄν ἐρωτικὸς περιεργότερον ἔβλεπον τὸν ἄγοντα τὸν βοῦν Ἔρωτα ('I was admiring the other aspects of the painting, but since I was a lover I was looking most curiously at the figure of Eros leading the bull', 1.2.1).

¹¹⁸Whitmarsh 2011, p. 170.

¹¹⁹Bartsch 1989, p. 84.

reader must also go through this hermeneutic process, and not to take part in it would be “to not-read”.¹²⁰ This leading of the reader is not just a self-reflexive element in the ‘sophistic’ novels, however. Dreams are also used to comment upon the narrative and direct the reader in Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca*. It is generally agreed that the dreams happen at moments of import, and are not merely scattered in the narrative:

In Xenophon’s novel, the first dream occurs at the point of commencement of the couple’s ordeals and foreshadows them, the second occurs at the point of their separation, and foreshadows their eventual reunion, and the third at the commencement of the final chronotope.¹²¹

In this way, dreams in the *Ephesiaca* divide up the narrative into episodes, and because they do so they are inextricably linked to the narrative. Habrocomes’ first dream takes place a few days into the protagonists’ voyage, after a stop to take on provisions at Rhodes:

τῆ δὲ δευτέρᾳ ἐπέπαυτο μὲν ὁ ἄνεμος, γαλήνη δὲ καὶ ὁ πλοῦς βραδύς καὶ ναυτῶν ῥαθυμία καὶ πότος ἐν τούτῳ καὶ μέθη καὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν μεμαντευμένων. Τῷ δὲ Ἀβροκόμῃ ἐφίσταται γυνὴ ὀφθῆναι φοβερά, τὸ μέγεθος ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον, ἐσθῆτα ἔχουσα φοινικῆν· ἐπιστᾶσα δὲ τὴν ναῦν ἐδόκει καίειν καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἀπόλλυσθαι, αὐτὸν δὲ μετὰ τῆς Ἀνθίας διανήχεσθαι. Ταῦτα ὡς εὐθύς εἶδεν ἐταράχθη καὶ προσεδόκα τι δεινὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀνειράτος· καὶ τὸ δεινὸν ἐγένετο.

On the second day the wind stopped, there was a calm, and the journey became slow. The sailors were relaxed and had a drinking bout, and what had been prophesied began to happen: Habrocomes dreamt that a woman stood over him, fearsome to behold, larger than a human, and dressed in crimson clothes; standing over the ship she seemed to ignite it; the others died, but he swam to safety together with Anthia. As soon

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 99.

¹²¹MacAlister 1996, pp. 197–198 n. 32.

as he had dreamt this, he was disturbed and expected some terrible occurrence because of the dream, and a terrible thing did happen.

1.12.3–4

There are elements in this dream which point to future events, and these elements have been well highlighted, particularly by Hägg,¹²² who goes as far as to suggest that the woman stands for the Phoenician pirates' ship, because she is wearing the 'Phoenician' colour (φοινικῆν). What does become clear is that the dream foreshadows the event that immediately follows it. Some pirates attack, and do burn the ship. Most of the crew is killed, but Habrocomes and Anthia are taken alive. The narrative even unsubtly points out that the dream predicts a calamitous event which then happens: *προσεδόκα τι δεινὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὄνειρατος· καὶ τὸ δεινὸν ἐγένετο*. Habrocomes gets it right. The reader is given a lot of help to make sure s/he gets it right too: disastrous events are predicted, it is pointed out that Habrocomes thinks that disastrous events will happen, then they do happen. This seems to be the obvious message that is conveyed by the narrative: dreams predict events in this novel. In short, this dream is used to foreshadow future events, and sets up an expectation in the reader that other dreams in the narrative will also turn out to be proleptic.¹²³

Habrocomes' second dream occurs when he and Anthia are in Tyre with Apsyrtus, the pirate chief whose men captured them. Habrocomes has caught the eye of Manto, Apsyrtus' daughter. Habrocomes rejects her advances, and she makes up a story to tell her father about how he tried to force himself upon her. Apsyrtus believes her entirely and orders Habrocomes to be flogged and thrown into prison. Anthia comes to see him to tell him that she is being sent to Syria, and vows to remain faithful to him. After she has gone, Habrocomes invokes his parents in a prayer and then he falls asleep:

¹²²Hägg 1971, pp. 230–232.

¹²³Ibid., p. 231. Hägg says that the dream leads the reader to expect any other dreams in the narrative to lead to simple fulfilment. Cf. Schmeling 1980, p. 34, Liatsi 2004, p. 156ff. and Oikonomou 2011, p. 50.

Ταῦτα λέγοντα αὐτὸν ὕπνος καταλαμβάνει, καὶ αὐτῷ ὄναρ ἐφίσταται. Ἔδοξεν ἰδεῖν αὐτοῦ τὸν πατέρα Λυκομήδη ἐν ἐσθῆτι μελαίνῃ πλανώμενον κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, ἐπιστάντα δὲ τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ λῦσαί τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀφιέναι ἐκ τοῦ οἰκήματος· αὐτὸν δὲ ἵππον γενόμενον ἐπὶ πολλὴν φέρεσθαι γῆν διώκοντα ἵππον ἄλλην θήλειαν, καὶ τέλος εὔρεῖν τὴν ἵππον καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενέσθαι. Ταῦτα ὡς ἔδοξεν ἰδεῖν, ἀνέθορέ τε καὶ μικρὰ εὐελπις ἦν.

As he said this, sleep took hold of him, and he had a dream. He dreamt that he saw his father Lycomedes wandering over every land and sea wearing black clothes, and stopping at the prison to free him, and letting him out of his cell; and that he himself became a horse and went through many lands pursuing another horse (a female one) and finally found the mare and became a man. When he seemed to see these things, he leapt up and was a little hopeful.

2.8.2

This dream is also broadly proleptic. It anticipates Habrocomes' release from prison and his eventual reunion with Anthia, which are events that happen later on in the narrative. Its foreshadowing quality strengthens the expectation that Anthia's dream, when it occurs, will also prove to be proleptic. The dream does present the reader with a challenge: the precise nature of the future events does not correspond with the ways in which they are presented in the dream. The fact that this dream and the ensuing narrative do not correspond has been seen as lack of skill on the part of Xenophon of Ephesus,¹²⁴ but it actually demonstrates the opposite. The reader expects, perhaps, that Habrocomes' father *will* search for him and free him from prison, since the events predicted by the first dream were fairly simple. However, it is Apsyrtus, Manto's father who realizes that he is innocent and releases him, and this abruptly disappoints reader expectation. Reading this novel is therefore revealed to be a less than easy ride — the reader is promised something that is then not quite delivered, and so has to reassess his or her trust in the narrator who set out strict guidelines with the first dream. This narrator is

¹²⁴Hägg 1971, pp. 231–232.

not to be taken at his word. The events that this dream foretells are postponed within the narrative — the second half is only fulfilled towards the very end of the novel.¹²⁵ This serves to make the reader more suspicious of the narrator, given that the events foretold in Habrocomes' first dream occur straight away.

Oikonomou argues that the appearance of Habrocomes' father in this dream actually looks backwards and forward at the same time: "Habrocomes' father was concerned while Habrocomes had not yet disclosed his love for Anthia, had sent for the oracle and had thus set him free; at the same time, Habrocomes' father will grieve when the latter does not come back".¹²⁶ Oikonomou also argues that the symbolism of Habrocomes as a stallion aligns him with Hippolytus ('the horse set free'), who shares the former's views on love at the beginning of the novel. Habrocomes' views change and mature by the end of the novel, and his dream of himself as a horse represents the intermediate stage he is going through before he becomes worthy of Anthia. Becoming human again is proleptic of a happy ending.¹²⁷

Both of Habrocomes' dreams have a clear narrative function: they are both proleptic, in that they predict things which then happen in the narrative. Sometimes the details are incorrect,¹²⁸ as happens in Habrocomes' second dream, but this creates a game between the narrator and the reader. When it comes to Anthia's dream, then, the reader expects that its function will be a proleptic one too, but he or she is made aware by his or her experience with the second dream that it may not be straightforward.

Anthia's dream takes place while she is in Tarentum, but its occurrence in the narrative is after a description of Habrocomes' thoughts and feelings.¹²⁹

¹²⁵Cf. Fernández Garrido 2003, p. 363.

¹²⁶Oikonomou 2011, pp. 52–53. The link between the oracle and the dream has been noted by MacAlister 1996, p. 191 n. 14 and Liatsi 2004, p. 162.

¹²⁷Oikonomou 2011, p. 53.

¹²⁸Schmeling 1980, p. 90 sees this as a negative point. I argue rather that this is positive, since it encourages the reader always to interrogate the narrative.

¹²⁹Oikonomou argues that the juxtaposition here is important — Anthia's reaction to her dream has to be read with Habrocomes' situation in mind. Their thoughts are reactions to, and projections of, their respective environments: "Habrocomes in a place without danger to his chastity thinks his partner is faithful, while Anthia in a place which poses danger to her chastity thinks her partner unfaithful". Oikonomou 2011, p. 59.

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα ὠδύρετο καὶ τοὺς πόνους ἔφερεν ἀλγεινῶς, τῇ δὲ Ἄνθια ὄναρ ἐπέστη ἐν Τάραντι κοιμωμένη. Ἐδόκει μὲν αὐτὴν εἶναι μετὰ Ἄβροκόμου, καλὴν οὖσαν μετ' ἐκείνου καλοῦ καὶ τὸν πρῶτον εἶναι τοῦ ἔρωτος αὐτοῖς χρόνον· φανῆναι δέ τινα ἄλλην γυναῖκα καλὴν καὶ ἀφέλκειν αὐτῆς τὸν Ἄβροκόμην· καὶ τέλος ἀναβοῶντος καὶ καλοῦντος ὀνομαστὶ ἐξαναστήναί τε καὶ παύσασθαι τὸ ὄναρ.

And he lamented and bore his troubles painfully, but a dream came to Anthia as she was sleeping in Tarentum. She dreamed she was with Habrocomes, and that she was beautiful and so was he, and it was the time at the very beginning of their love. And she dreamed that some other attractive woman appeared and dragged Habrocomes away from her; and at last, when he was crying out to her and calling her by name, she started up and the dream ended.

5.8.5–6

The narrative function of Anthia's dream has generated perplexity, to the extent that some scholars have suggested that the order of the narrative has become confused.¹³⁰ An argument is made that it does not predict anything that follows in the narrative, so the episode must have been moved: Habrocomes is indeed desired by a beautiful woman other than Anthia, but this happens before Anthia's dream in the text that we have, which implies that our text is not in its original order.

On the other hand, some scholars (who argue that we have the complete text) have suggested that Anthia's dream is analeptic, and does recall Manto's attempt to seduce Habrocomes.¹³¹ However, this does not strike me as correct, either considering the internal evidence of the other two dreams (which clearly do not recap anything), or considering an oneirocritical point of view: "It is well known that dreams... were exclusively intended to foretell the future... not to portray past

¹³⁰Dalmeyda 1926 repr. 2003, p. 67. See also Kerényi 1927, p. 169 and Merkelbach 1962, p. 100 for Habrocomes' second dream not being fulfilled because of epitomization.

¹³¹It could also recall Cyno, but she is categorically *not* beautiful.

events.”¹³² According to Plastira-Valkanou¹³³ and Giangrande,¹³⁴ dream-symbolic elements show that this is a false-dream: it shows off to Xenophon’s more learned readers that he can use complicated dream symbolism as well as more basic dream symbolism (it is interesting to note that MacAlister and Liatsi, who both demonstrate Xenophon’s use of dream-symbol interpretation, do not analyse Anthia’s dream).

Most recently, Oikonomou argues that there are several possible interpretations of Anthia’s dream if the context and style are taken into account. The dream is connected with Anthia’s state of mind and her thoughts during the day:

One reading of Anthia’s dream, then, is that it is the result of her mental state, and also of her environment in a wider sense. Its function is partly to convey this to the the readers of the novel, and partly to let the readers delight in their superior knowledge of the situation, which they share with the omniscient narrator.¹³⁵

Anthia’s dream could also be proleptic:

Anthia’s belief concerning the veracity of the story could raise the expectation that what we will learn next about Habrocomes is in tune with the dream image which, in that case, would be ‘prognostic’, as were the first and second dreams by Habrocomes.¹³⁶

However, Oikonomou goes on to point out that, because Habrocomes seems certain that Anthia has not forgotten him even if she has died, prolepsis at this point is unlikely, and “a reader is more likely to doubt Anthia’s judgement than to expect the narrator to have misled him with the extensive and well-constructed portrayal of Habrocomes.”¹³⁷ Finally, Oikonomou argues that Anthia’s dream *is* proleptic,

¹³²Giangrande 2002, p. 29.

¹³³Plastira-Valkanou 2001.

¹³⁴Giangrande 2002.

¹³⁵Oikonomou 2011, p. 65. See also Fernández Garrido 2003, p. 364.

¹³⁶Oikonomou 2011, p. 66.

¹³⁷Ibid., p. 66.

but it is the wrong way round: it refers not to Habrocomes but to Anthia, and the ‘other woman’ is Hippothous.¹³⁸ She demonstrates the parallelism between the dream and the ensuing episode and says that reading the dream as prognostic aligns it with Habrocomes’ dreams.

Anthia’s dream can also be read as having a more meta-narrative function beyond the interpretations put forward by Oikonomou. The apparent lack of fulfilment of Anthia’s dream could be clever reader manipulation: the narrative says one thing and does another, raising reader expectations (put in place by the other two dreams, as Hägg says), and then dashing them. The dreams are not supposed to reveal everything that is to come, or to be totally explicable with hindsight, but rather are supposed to perplex the reader, and to keep him or her reading right until the very end. This lack of direct prolepsis has been taken as a problem, and error on the part of the author. However, the frustration that arises because certain elements are not fulfilled is part of the *jouissance* of reading. With its anticipation of Habrocomes’ infidelity, this dream keeps the reader on the edge of his or her seat, as it were, until the very end of the narrative. This manipulation is set up by at least one other dream (Habrocomes’ second dream) — it is like a gradual ‘lesson’ on how to read this novel. The narrative constructs a template, and instructs the reader as to how to read the narrative, only to break its own rules by a small amount in the second dream and completely in the third.

At the point at which Anthia has her dream, the second half of Habrocomes’ second dream (his reunion with Anthia) has not happened — the reader is still expecting it. Perhaps knowing that only half of Habrocomes’ dream has been fulfilled makes the reader interpret Anthia’s dream with caution? When the reunion does then happen the reader has even more reason to expect that Anthia’s dream will come true — but then the narrative ends without a satisfactory fulfilment of what is suggested by her dream. This demonstrates sophisticated manipulation of the reader and draws attention to the way the novel works as a text. Anthia’s dream is intentionally misleading on a narrative level: the novel infuriates the reader with its lack of fulfilment, but manipulates him or her into reading right until the end, just in case it is fulfilled in the very last sentence. It does this by

¹³⁸Ibid., pp. 69–70.

carefully setting up its own rules about how to read dreams, then breaking them, encouraging the curious reader and yet at the same time frustrating his or her curiosity and expectations.

Counter-tales and subplots

The Greek novels are full of potential narratives, narratives about characters who are not the main protagonists, or narratives that hint at different ways in which to interpret the text, which enhance the reader's experience. They appeal to the inquisitive reader that the novels construct by drawing his or her attention towards alternative plot-lines and 'what-ifs'.¹³⁹ The reader is given a choice of narrative paths to follow and discover.

Supporting cast in the *Ephesiaca*

Leucon and Rhode start out as Habrocomes' and Anthia's slaves in Ephesus, but in the course of the narrative they enjoy their own 'mini-novel', or at least their own separate narrative. The reader learns that they are lovers, and that they have been together since they were in Ephesus (Ἦν δὲ καὶ τῇ Ῥόδῃ κοινωνήματα ἐξ ἔρωτος γενόμενα πρὸς Λεύκωνα, καὶ συνῆσαν ἀλλήλοις ἔτι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. 2.3.6). Not only are they lovers, but they experience novelistic adventure as well. They are captured by the pirates along with Habrocomes and Anthia, and are kept by the pirate chief Apsyrtus. When his daughter Manto goes to Syria with Moeris, she takes Anthia, Leucon and Rhode with her, but then orders that Leucon and Rhode be sold as far away from Syria as possible: Καὶ δὴ τὴν μὲν Ῥόδην εὐθὺς μετὰ τοῦ Λεύκωνος κελεύει ἐμβιβάσαντάς τινος πλοίῳ πορρωτάτω τῆς Συρίων ἀποδόσθαι γῆς (2.9.2). They are sold to a man in Xanthus, who treats them as if they are his children, and they lead a comfortable life together there (2.10.4).

¹³⁹See Cowan 2010 on 'sideshadowing'. This is the inclusion of elements in the text which suggest possible alternatives to the plot and thus produce a tension with the teleological thrust of the narrative.

The next time the narrative concentrates on them, we learn that their master has died and left them his estate, so they set out for Ephesus with their new wealth (5.6.3) since they assume that Anthia and Habrocomes have similarly returned to Ephesus. On the way back to Ephesus they make a stop on Rhodes and come across Habrocomes, who is given their hospitality. In this episode the fortunes of master and slave are reversed. Before, Leucon and Rhode were poor, as they were slaves, then a good life was facilitated by a benefactor; now they are able to help Habrocomes in his hour of need as they have the assets to do so. Finally everyone returns to Ephesus, and so Leucon and Rhode's journey therefore has a circular construction, just as the novels often do. Granted, Leucon and Rhode's story is not as exciting as the main protagonists' novel, but it certainly is a narrative, and one that includes a love motif. The narrator chooses not to focus on their storyline, and so the reader has to fill in the gaps in the story, imagining their experiences that happen when the narrative deals with Anthia and Habrocomes.

Rhode and Leucon are not the only supporting characters to have their own novella in the *Ephesiaca*. Hippothous, the pirate, also has his own adventure, which includes several love-narratives. His homoerotic affair with Hyperanthes can be read as set up in opposition to the heterosexual story line, because their love is unequal, and Hippothous always takes the lead:

The subordinate story of Hippothous and Hyperanthes, then, develops a contrasting kind of erotic relationship from that of the main characters. The formula of heroic rescue is predicated on an opposition or dimorphism in the roles of the lovers, such as one is active and dominant, the other passive and dependent. It is not entirely arbitrary that Xenophon should have chosen a homoerotic attachment to illustrate this type of relationship...the practice of pederasty...provided the model of an asymmetric love affair on which Xenophon could rely.¹⁴⁰

However, Hippothous' story is not meant simply to provide an antithesis to the

¹⁴⁰Konstan 1994, p. 27. The role of Cleinias' story in Achilles Tatius can be compared.

story of Habrocomes and Anthia.¹⁴¹ He is a character in his own right, and as such has his own novella, his own romantic plot. It is another strand of narrative, another glimpse into someone's private life. Hippothous has more than one romance, not all of them homoerotic, and his character develops and travels, meaning that he is not someone added to the narrative simply to facilitate the main storyline or merely to highlight its moral themes by going against them. Hippothous' narrative exists for the same reason as Leucon and Rhode's exists: to encourage the reader to think about what he is doing whilst the narrative concentrates on other characters and situations, and to suggest other narrative possibilities. All of the characters in this novel have their own stories, and sometimes the reader has to fill in the gaps in these additional narrative threads. In fact, this narrative positively encourages this sort of reading by drawing attention to instances when 'while X was doing A, Y was somewhere else doing B' using the particles μέν and δέ.¹⁴²

The stories of Leucon and Rhode, of Hippothous, and of Habrocomes and Anthia are all intertwined, which means that Xenophon of Ephesus is actually a more sophisticated author than often thought — the narrator deals with several strands of narrative possibility that are all interlocked and that between them create the novel, a novel that does not always spell it out but at the same time is a coherent whole.¹⁴³ Narratives are hinted at and suggested to the reader, who has to order the narrative in his or her own head, and fill in the gaps where parts are missing. As such, the narrative keeps developing until the very last word, and it is a narrative that is not content merely to let the reader sit back and be told everything — in this relationship the reader has to work hard too by investing in the narrative.

¹⁴¹And, as Morales points out, marriage in antiquity is *not* an equal relationship (Morales 2008, p. 48. Cf. Goldhill 1995, p. 160).

¹⁴²See Konstan 2002, pp. 5–9 for action spaces and the contrast between them in the *Ephesiaca*, and below, p. 86.

¹⁴³Cf. De Temmerman 2012c, p. 505: "Xenophon is innovative in comparison to Chariton in his construction of not just two but *four* independent story-lines... all of which involve travelling, form a complex and dense narrative web and come together only at the very end of the novel."

The ‘Thelxinoe romance’

Within the *Ephesiaca*, Aegialeus, a fisherman, narrates his own life-story which has, on the surface of it, a novelistic plot:

“Ἐγὼ” ἔφη, “τέκνον Ἀβροκόμη, οὔτε Σικελιώτης οὐδὲ ἐπιχώριος, ἀλλὰ Σπαρτιάτης Λακεδαιμόνιος τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, καὶ περιουσίαν ἔχων πολλήν. Νεὸς δὲ ὢν ἠράσθην [ἐν τοῖς ἐφήβοις καταλελεγμένος] κόρης πολίτιδος Θελξινόης τοῦνομα, ἀντερᾶ δέ μου καὶ ἡ Θελξινόη. Καὶ τῇ πόλει παννυχίδος ἀγομένης συνήλθομεν ἀλλήλοις, ἀμφοτέρους ὀδηγοῦντος θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπηλάυσσαμεν ὢν ἕνεκα συνήλθομεν. Καὶ χρόνῳ τινὶ ἀλλήλοις συνῆμεν λανθάνοντες καὶ ὠμόσαμεν ἀλλήλοις πολλάκις ἕξειν καὶ μέχρι θανάτου· ἐνεμέσθησε δὲ τις ἄρα θεῶν. Κἀγὼ μὲν ἔτι ἐν τοῖς ἐφήβοις ἤμην, τὴν δὲ Θελξινόην ἐδίδοσαν πρὸς γάμον οἱ πατέρες ἐπιχωρίῳ τινὶ νεανίσκῳ Ἀνδροκλεῖ τοῦνομα· ἤδη δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ ἦρα ὁ Ἀνδροκλῆς. Τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα ἡ κόρη πολλὰς προφάσεις ἐποιεῖτο ἀναβαλλομένη τὸν γάμον· τελευταῖον δὲ δυνηθεῖσα ἐν ταύτῳ μοι γενέσθαι συντίθεται νύκτωρ ἐξελθεῖν Λακεδαίμονος μετ’ ἐμοῦ. Καὶ δὴ ἐστείλαμεν ἑαυτοὺς νεανικῶς ἀπέκειρα δὲ καὶ τὴν κόμην τῆς Θελξινόης. Ἐν αὐτῇ οὖν τῇ τῶν γάμων νυκτὶ ἐξελθόντες τῆς πόλεως ἤειμεν ἐπ’ Ἄργος καὶ Κόρινθον, κἀκεῖθεν ἀναγόμενοι ἐπλεύσαμεν εἰς Σικελίαν.”

“Habrocomes my lad,” he said, “I am not a Greek Sicilian, nor am I a native Sicilian, but I am a Spartan from Lacedaemon from one of the most powerful families there. When I was young [when I was counted among the ephebes] I fell in love with a citizen girl named Thelxinoe, and Thelxinoe loved me too. We met while a night-time festival was being held in the city (a god guided us both) and we had enjoyment of the things on account of which we had come together. And for some time we met each other secretly and we swore to each other many times that we would hold each other fast even until death; but some god was surely our enemy. And when I was still in the ephebes, her parents engaged Thelxinoe to some local youth called Androcles; and already

Androcles was in love with her. So first the girl made many excuses to put off the marriage; but at last she was able to meet me and agreed to leave Sparta with me during the night. And so we dressed each other as young men and I cut off Thelxinoe's hair. On the very night of the wedding, having left the city, we went to Argos and Corinth, and from there we set sail to Sicily.”

5.1.4–8

Up to this point, the love-story that Aegialeus narrates has a novelistic feel to it, in that two young, rich (presumably beautiful) people meet at a festival and fall in love at first sight, guided by a god, but other potential suitors cause problems.¹⁴⁴ They pledge themselves to each other until death, which is also a novelistic trope. It is also possible they have sex before marriage (ἀπηλάυσαμεν ὦν ἔνεκα συνήλθομεν), and if this is so then this throws a rather non-novelistic spanner into the works. These are for the most part novelistic details, but this is where the analogy stops. Aegialeus continues his tale, informing Habrocomes that the couple is condemned to death by the Spartans and therefore can never return home. They live in poverty (Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνταῦθα διήγομεν ἀπορία μὲν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, 5.1.8), but they are happy (ἡδόμενοι δὲ καὶ πάντων ἀπολαύειν δοκοῦντες, ὅτι ἦμεν μετ' ἀλλήλων. 5.1.8).

Having followed a not entirely novelistic but nevertheless feasible path for a while, the story then begins to take a rather unsavoury turn. According to Aegialeus Thelxinoe has died and he has not buried her body but has kept it so she is always with him. He says that he still talks to her ‘as if she were alive’ (ὡς ζώση, 5.1.11) and eats his meals with her, and even sleeps next to her. The tale of Thelxinoe and Aegialeus comes across as slightly menacing, displaying what can be read as obsessive love. The fact that Aegialeus keeps his dead wife's mummified body in his bedroom is a rather disturbing take on Admetus' promise to Alcestis — that he will keep an effigy of her in his bedroom (Euripides *Alcestis* 348–354). There is however a romantic element to this rather macabre behaviour. Aegialeus says that

¹⁴⁴See also Whitmarsh 2011, p. 2: Aegialeus' tale is “clearly an experiment with romance mode.”

he does not see Thelxinoe as a mummy, or even as an old woman; rather, he thinks of her as she had once been when he fell in love with her: οὐ γὰρ οἶα νῦν ὀράται σοὶ τοιαύτη φαίνεται ἐμοί· ἀλλὰ ἐννοῶ, τέκνον, οἶα μὲν ἦν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι (5.1.11).

Aegialeus' narrative inserts a thread into the novel that is not 'novelistic', by which I mean that the protagonists of his tale do not return home forgiven to live their married life in luxury, but live in hardship and poverty. The lovers do, however, live happily ever after, and their love and companionship apparently transcend death, as Aegialeus keeps Thelxinoe's embalmed body, to all intents and purposes treating her as if she is alive.

Aegialeus and Thelxinoe's story is not interwoven as a strand of the main narrative about Anthia and Habrocomes in the way that Hippothous' and the slaves' narrative is. However, it does give an alternative perspective on a love story: one that does not necessarily follow the 'ideal' plot of a Greek novel. It comments on the themes of the novel by showing that they do not all have to be present for lovers' lives to turn out well. Xenophon of Ephesus hints at a life beyond the novel — an injection of 'real life' into novelistic celebrity adventure.

Aegialeus' tale also functions as a pointer within the narrative to both character and reader by showing Habrocomes that he should not give up, and by foreshadowing that his narrative will have a happy ending: he will find Anthia and they will be happy together. Habrocomes acknowledges that Aegialeus' narrative has something to say about his own:

“πότε ἀνευρήσω κἄν νεκράν; Αἰγιαλεῖ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ βίου μεγάλη παραμυθία τὸ σῶμα τὸ Θελξινόης, καὶ νῦν ἀληθῶς μεμάθηκα ὅτι ἔρως ἀληθινὸς ὄρον ἡλικίας οὐκ ἔχει”

“Will I ever find you even as a corpse? The body of Thelxinoe is a great consolation to the life of Aegialeus, and now I have learned truly that true love does not have an age limit.”

Habrocomes' speech is a lament, but it is significant that he realizes that what Aegialeus has to say is relevant to his own narrative: this immediately places him above characters such as Lucius, Encolpius and Cleitophon on a scale of self-awareness. He takes on board the fact that Aegialeus' story pertains to him and the fact that he points the significance out to the reader indicates that the narrative is encouraging the reader to keep reading — to stay curious as to what will happen to Habrocomes and Anthia, for their tale may also end positively. Habrocomes learns from this experience,¹⁴⁵ and so will the reader. Aegialeus' tale tells us that “story-telling can be complex, self-conscious and metafictional”¹⁴⁶ even when the story is, on the face of it, a very simple one.

Thisbe: an unlikely heroine

Thisbe's story in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* is on the one hand a story about someone with low status: she is a slave-girl. On the other hand the narrative about her is actually very complicated, both in the way it is narrated and with regard to the significance she holds in the novel. It is also intricately intertwined with the narratives about Cnemon and about Charicleia and Calasiris because of the connection Thisbe has with the merchant Nausicles who has brought her from Athens to Egypt and at whose house Calasiris, Cnemon and Charicleia stay.

Thisbe moves from narrated (by Cnemon and by Charias, through Cnemon) to narrator in death: it is her voice on the writing-tablet. Winkler points out that because she is the source of Charias' story, she is the “ultimate narrator.”¹⁴⁷ She manipulates Cnemon in the story he narrates about her and is complicit in a plot to entrap him (1.12). She then spins quite a complicated narrative to entrap Demaenete, and does so by deceiving several people at this point (1.15–17).¹⁴⁸ When Thisbe turns up dead in the cave, and the reader has no idea how she got there (but can guess that Thyamis killed her when he thought he was killing

¹⁴⁵Whitmarsh 2011, p. 2.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁴⁷Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 301 n. 20.

¹⁴⁸This will be discussed in detail below, p. 111 ff.

Charicleia), we learn from Cnemon (his friend Anticles told him) that Thisbe left Athens with Nausicles (who is from Naucratis, where Cnemon goes to find Thisbe to take her back to Athens to prove his father's innocence) after her plot against Demaenete was discovered (2.8–9).

In a superb piece of self-reflexivity, Cnemon suggests that he and Theagenes (and through them the reader) may learn more if they have a look at the tablet she is holding ('Αλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ, τὴν δέλτον ἦν πρὸς τοῖς στέρνοις αὐτῆς εὕρηκαμεν ἐπισκοπῶμεν· εἰκός τι πλέον ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῶς ἐκμαθεῖν 2.10.1). If the reader continues to read the *Aethiopica*, s/he too will learn πλέον. The reader learns (in a continuation of Cnemon's narrative to Theagenes and Charicleia) that Thisbe has been captured by bandits, and is kept under lock and key by the captain's right-hand man (2.10). After this Thisbe has several narrators. The reader learns from the primary narrator (2.12) that this right-hand man is Thermouthis (which solves the mystery of where he had gone earlier in the text (1.30.1) when no-one could find him — it was to find her). He had captured her from Nausicles and put her in the cave, near the entrance, when the fighting began. The primary narrator confirms that Thyamis did indeed kill her (2.12.3). Thermouthis then arrives in the cave and explains to Cnemon, Theagenes and Charicleia his side of the story — that he is in love with Thisbe, which Thisbe seems in her letter to doubt (2.14.2–3). Later Calasiris reveals to Cnemon that Thisbe had been captured from Nausicles by Thermouthis and the other brigands (2.24.1) — this is also new to Cnemon, but not to the reader who has been told that Thisbe was travelling with Nausicles by the primary narrator (2.12.2). The reader learns that Nausicles had wanted to take Thisbe to Ethiopia to be Charicleia's mother's confidante (2.24.3). The final piece in the narrative jigsaw is put in place when the reader learns that Cnemon had not found Thisbe in Egypt, as he had hoped to, because he was captured by Thyamis as soon as he arrived in Egypt (6.2.4). At last Thisbe's patchwork narrative is complete. It is she alone who has the power to fill in the gap in the narrative that she does — no-one else can put that piece in place, and she does it from beyond the grave.

After Calasiris has told Cnemon his story, Nausicles returns from his mission to

regain Thisbe and announces that Thisbe (or a ‘better Thisbe’) is his.¹⁴⁹ After Cnemon hears that Thisbe is alive he cannot sleep and goes to investigate. He hears a girl lamenting in her room, so he eavesdrops.¹⁵⁰ The fact that Cnemon only listens and does not view through the gap in between the doors is not only unusual in terms of gathering information in Greek novels (people usually *look* through gaps in doors), but also brings to mind the story of Pyramus and Thisbe in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (4.55–166). The protagonists of this tale speak through a chink (*rima*) in the wall, but they do not look at each other through it. In only listening to ‘Thisbe’ and not viewing her, Cnemon copies the actions of the lovers. The story about Thisbe in the *Aethiopica* has other resonances with the Pyramus and Thisbe story in Ovid. The episode in the cave when Cnemon and Theagenes find Thisbe and think that she is Charicleia seems to play on the same themes: Theagenes would have killed himself on finding his lover dead had it not been for Cnemon’s foresight in removing his sword. In Ovid Thisbe runs to hide in a cave to escape from the lion, and so Pyramus believes she is dead, so the fact that Thisbe is in a cave in the *Aethiopica* also resonates with the Ovidian myth.

This raises the question of whether it is possible to listen to a Thisbe without being a Pyramus. It is possible that Heliodorus would have encountered a Pyramus and Thisbe story; there is some evidence for a Greek source for Ovid’s tale, and mosaics depicting Pyramus and Thisbe in Antioch and Paphos.¹⁵¹ The Pyramus and Thisbe story that survives in later Greek, however, has a different ending to the one found in Ovid: Pyramus becomes a river and Thisbe a spring (see Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 6.339–355; 12.84–85). It is also likely that this metamorphosis into rivers is the ending given by the earlier Greek sources.¹⁵²

Particularly for the *modern* reader who sees the name Thisbe in connection with a love story there is always going to be a suggestion of the Pyramus and Thisbe story, which serves to demonstrate that literature becomes enriched as it speaks across ages. It is in the nature of the novels to speak to different readers: they are able

¹⁴⁹ τὸ δὲ παρὸν ὑμῖν ὅτι βελτίονα Θίσβην ἐκτησάμην ἀπόχρη μαθεῖν· 5.1.7.

¹⁵⁰This will be discussed in detail in chapter 2.

¹⁵¹See Knox 1989 for a discussion of the Greek sources and the mosaic at Paphos. See also Duke 1971 and Melville 1987, p. 396.

¹⁵²I thank Catherine Connors for this observation.

to “offer a satisfying rich and multifaceted narrative, capable of accommodating divergent readers with their own perspectives and tastes.”¹⁵³ Depending on the background of the reader, different readings are possible here, and it is tempting to read the Thisbe episode as a nod to the Pyramus and Thisbe tradition, but what (if anything) is it doing in the novel? I shall now explore an exciting possibility for the reason behind the author’s picking of the name Thisbe to use in a novel that forms part of a genre which contains so many *sprechende Namen*.

Duke says that the myth as it is found in Ovid “seems to be a Greek aetiological myth of a familiar type”¹⁵⁴ but that it is in the style of a Hellenistic writer. He speculates: “Perhaps he was a poet, such as Callimachus of Alexandria, or perhaps he was a writer of prose-romance, such as Xenophon of Antioch.”¹⁵⁵ The story of Semiramis and Ninus has similarities to the Pyramus and Thisbe story, and Connors argues that, given the prevalence of in-set tales in the novels, it is possible that the Pyramus and Thisbe story featured in the *Ninus* romance, most likely because of its aetiological relationship to the mythology behind silk.¹⁵⁶ It is possible that what we now know as the *Ninus* romance was part of the *Babyloniaca* attributed to Xenophon of Antioch in the *Suda*,¹⁵⁷ which means that Ovid’s Greek source for the Pyramus and Thisbe story could have been an in-set tale within the Ninus portion of a set of Babylonian tales.¹⁵⁸ It is therefore possible that this set of Babylonian tales incorporating Ninus and/or Pyramus and Thisbe is also Heliodorus’ source and that one of his narrative threads picks up and plays with the ideas of trade and trade routes. For example, Persinna’s *tainia* is made of silk (ἀπὸ σηρικοῦ νήματος 2.31.2), a point which suggests a Chinese origin and that

¹⁵³Whitmarsh 2011, p. 20.

¹⁵⁴Duke 1971, p. 322. Similarly Brewer suggests there may be an earlier Greek version that is more similar to Ovid’s version: “An Alexandrian author contemporary with Nicander, whom we cannot identify, transferred the scene of the story northeastwards to Babylon and recorded a different ending.” (More and Brewer 1978, pp. 569–570).

¹⁵⁵The mosaic at Paphos appears to be a conflation of the Greek and Latin traditions: Knox 1989, p. 323.

¹⁵⁶It is possible that the ‘Median dress’ Semiramis is said to have invented is silk (Diodorus Siculus 2.6.5–6); Connors Forthcoming.

¹⁵⁷Stephens and Winkler 1995, p. 27. See also Perry 1967, p. 171.

¹⁵⁸See Hill 1985, p. 236, Bömer 1976, p. 33 and Perdrizet 1932, pp. 197–207. See also Connors Forthcoming.

Ethiopia is a “place of cultural diversity.”¹⁵⁹ Secondly, Nausicles, who takes Thisbe to Egypt in the first place, is a merchant. He is going to take her on to Ethiopia (2.24.3) like a piece of merchandise: Nausicles hoped to get a large profit for Thisbe (μεγάλων καὶ πολλῶν τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῇ προσδοκωμένων χρημάτων, 2.24.3) and indeed he pretends that Charicleia is Thisbe because he has an eye for the profit he will make (5.8.3). At 5.8.2 the reader learns, somewhat surprisingly, that Nausicles had paid Mitranes a great deal of money to come to the island and find Thisbe. Ethiopia, the place to which Thisbe was supposed to go with Nausicles, is the very place from which Persinna’s *tainia* starts its journey with Charicleia, so implies a trade route, perhaps for silk as well as slave-girls. Silk clothing is part of the cargo of the merchant ship that Theagenes, Charicleia, and Calasiris have been travelling and which can be seen at the beginning of the novel (σηρικῆς ἐσθήτος, 1.3.2). The phrase is repeated at 5.19.2, and at 4.16 the reader learns that the merchant ship is carrying cargo from, among other places, Ethiopia, so this trade route seems likely. This background of trade routes and silk would provide a reason for the author’s picking of the name Thisbe, with its links to the silk trade, for a girl who is essentially a commodity.

Thisbe signifies a wider narrative about trade and travel within the *Aethiopica*, but I think there is also something deeper going on as regards her resemblance to Charicleia. Thisbe too was meant to be going to Ethiopia in order to be Persinna’s confidante. We learn at 2.24.3 that Nausicles is not at home because he has gone to fetch Thisbe from the herdsmen. He is particularly enraged by her capture, Calasiris says, because:

αὐτὴν καὶ βασιλεῖ τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἀπάξειν ἔμελλεν ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφασκε
γαμετῇ τῇ ἐκείνου συμπαιστρίαν καὶ συνόμιλον τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἐσομένην.

he intended to take her to the king of the Ethiopians, so he said, to be a companion for the wife of that man and someone with whom to converse about Greek affairs.

If it was possible for Thisbe to have ended up in Ethiopia, she may well have been

¹⁵⁹Whitmarsh 1998, p. 120 and n. 106. See below, p. 212.

‘recognized’ as the daughter of said king and his queen (Hydaspes and Persinna). As is repeatedly pointed out, Thisbe does actually look like Charicleia — many people confuse them: Thyamis, Cnemon (Charicleia’s speech makes him believe she is Thisbe), even Theagenes.¹⁶⁰ The whole novel could have gone a wildly different way if it had been Charicleia’s *Doppelgänger* who had gone to Ethiopia instead. At the end of the novel the recognition of Charicleia is confirmed for the most part by her resemblance to the picture of Andromeda; indeed it is the painting rather than the recognition tokens that convince Hydaspes, because — as he says — the tokens could have been acquired and used by anyone. It is at the point at which the painting is brought out that Hydaspes is swayed, and only afterwards that Sisimithres plays his trump-card of the birthmark. In fact the back-telling of Cnemon and Thisbe’s story frames the back-telling of Theagenes and Charicleia: the final mention of her is in book 6.8 when Nausicles betroths his daughter to Cnemon as a sort of apology, and he drops out of the narrative too, and it is only at this point that the narrative starts moving forwards.

On a similar note, the fact that Thisbe is still in possession of her letter when she is found dead by Cnemon and Theagenes indicates that she must have just finished writing it as Thermouthis came to put her in the cave (or was still writing it, given that there is no farewell at the end, although there does not have to be one): in it she says that she is sending the letter via an old woman, who clearly did not get given the letter. The old woman was going to be instructed to deliver the letter to a handsome Greek:

τήνδε σοι τὴν δέλτον διὰ τῆς συνοίκου πρεσβύτιδος λάθρα διεπε-
μψάμην, τῷ καλῷ καὶ Ἑλληνι καὶ φίλῳ τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἐγχειρίζειν
φράσσασα

I have sent you this tablet secretly through an old woman who lives with me, having told her to put it in the hands of the captain’s handsome Greek friend.

2.10.3

¹⁶⁰Nausicles pretends Charicleia is Thisbe, but says she is actually far more beautiful than Thisbe.

There is more than one handsome Greek in the herdsmen's village, and presumably Theagenes is more handsome than Cnemon. What would have happened if the old woman had delivered the tablet to the wrong one?

Thisbe, therefore, as a character who not only resembles the heroine but who was also on the same trajectory as the heroine, down to being hidden away in the same cave, also stands for the disruption, or even the complete unravelling of the narrative as it should proceed. She threatens it, but cannot alter it completely. Her presence is felt, however, and she remains an exciting and dangerous undercurrent, repeatedly reemerging even after her death.¹⁶¹

Not only this, but the Thisbe story is actually the subplot that Cnemon accuses Calasiris of wheeling on at 2.24.4: ἐπεισόδιον δὴ τοῦτο. . . ἐπεισκυκλήσας. Calasiris had been about to tell Cnemon the story about Nausicles and Thisbe, but Cnemon brings him back round to the story about Theagenes and Charicleia. Thisbe is thus literally the subplot to the novel, and she could at this point have hijacked the whole of Calasiris' narrative. But what would have happened if she had not been killed by chance in the cave? A girl who is the spitting image of a girl who is the spitting image of a painting could have been recognized as Hydaspes' and Persinna's daughter instead — Persinna is adamant that Charicleia looks like Andromeda, so by all accounts Thisbe must do too. Is this why this dangerous subplot needs to be killed off? Thisbe has been read as an anti-Charicleia, since she embodies everything Charicleia is not,¹⁶² and their stories are intertwined, even down to their both being in the cave without the other knowing. The cave itself is not a natural one, but man-made and intricate, like the *Aethiopica*. Morgan demonstrates that the cave, surrounded as it is by reed-beds, can stand for the novel itself:

The concentric maze reflects the narrative structure of the novel, with its narratives within narratives, and at the very centre is placed Charicleia, illuminated. Her antitype and *Doppelgänger*, Thisbe, is also hid-

¹⁶¹Cnemon points out at 6.2.1 that Thisbe's name strikes fear into both him and Nausicles. She is a μορμολυκεῖον.

¹⁶²See Morgan 1989 repr. 1999, p. 281 and Morgan 2012a, p. 575 for this.

den in the cave, in darkness. . . Chariclea is the true beauty and beautiful truth hidden at the heart of the textual labyrinth for those who know how to find their way to her.¹⁶³

Both Charicleia and Thisbe are shut in the cave for safekeeping. This raises the question: what if Charicleia had actually been killed by Thyamis? The cave, like the novel, contains more than one narrative possibility, and Thisbe is a pivotal character, even though her presence in the narrative is brief.

Once again a Greek novel has put forward what seems to be a perfectly innocent embedded narrative and given it significance, kindling in the mind of the reader alternative possibilities for the outcome of the novel. Even though Thisbe drops out of the text in book six, because of the way the novel is structured the reader will leave the novel after the recognition scene thinking back to Nausicles' intentions and wondering 'what-if'. S/he will not merely ponder the possibility as s/he goes through the text — the 'what-if' is aroused right at the end of the novel.

Longus' inset tales: learning novel lessons

Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* contains three inset stories: the stories of the wood dove (which alludes to the the tale of Pan and Pitys), Pan and Syrinx, and Pan and Echo. Each of these contains "myths of transformation, gender hostility and violent rape."¹⁶⁴ It is well known that these inset stories highlight important themes in the framing narrative, particularly as regards violence and human sexuality.¹⁶⁵ They hint at menacing undertones in the protagonists' love story and trace the development of their increasingly sexual relationship.¹⁶⁶ The first inset story is the most innocent and least violent in tone, and the final inset story (Pan and Echo) is

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 575. See also Morgan 1989 repr. 1999, p. 281.

¹⁶⁴Goldhill 1995, p. 32.

¹⁶⁵For the inset tales echoing the novel's themes, see Philippides 1980, especially p. 194; Hunter 1983, pp. 52–58; MacQueen 1990, particularly on the structural relation of the inset stories to the main narrative; Zeitlin 1990; Morgan 1994, pp. 69–70; Hunter 1996a, p. 379; Bowie 2003; Haynes 2003, pp. 63–64; Nakatani 2003, pp. 71–72; Morgan 2004, pp. 172, 195–196 and 214–215.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., p. 215; Hunter 2008b, p. 779; Montiglio 2012, p. 147.

the most violent, and leaves the reader wondering what will happen to Chloe when she loses her virginity. Daphnis' narration of this final myth comes just after he has had sex with Lycaenion, so it reflects, through its violence, Daphnis' superior sexual knowledge. The inset tales in Longus also provide for Chloe in particular a message of what sexual acculturation means for a woman, warning her about the violence involved in the loss of virginity and showing her that according to the protocols of relationships (as the narrator would have it), she must eventually be submissive.¹⁶⁷

This section will read the inset tales in a new way, arguing that these embedded narratives dramatize the act of reading erotic pastoral stories from within a novel which is itself an erotic pastoral story. The genre of pastoral poetry, which is repeatedly evoked throughout the novel,¹⁶⁸ is also an intensely self-reflexive one which explores, through embedded songs, the dynamics of its own creation and reception. It is a genre marked with metapoetic elements and which affords its readers many examples of pastoral poetry in performance within the poetry itself.¹⁶⁹ In a similar way Longus' embedded tales communicate to the reader a story about novel-reading and how to become proficient at it. In order to do this, the tales cast Chloe in the role of an intradiegetic reader who models the extradiegetic reader's approach to the novel (or one possible approach). Through the relationship between the three tales, Longus explores reading as a process in which the reader progresses from immersive absorption in the story towards an aesthetic appreciation of the narrative from a more detached perspective. The inset tales form part of the novelistic creation and direction of the reader as s/he comes to analyse his or her own reading experience and identify him or herself as curious. I shall first examine the role of the prologue as an embedded commentary on the novel which initiates from the very beginning of the text a strong metanarrative thrust that continues throughout it.

¹⁶⁷Winkler 1990, ch. 4.

¹⁶⁸See, for example Morgan 2004, pp. 2–7.

¹⁶⁹See, for example, Goldhill 1991 and Payne 2007.

The Prologue

The prologue immediately invites the reader to think of the novel as a work of art through a vivid description of the painting on which the novel is based and the grove in which it is situated, both of which are beautiful. The most telling phrase is ἄλλ' ἢ γραφὴ τερπνοτέρα (Praef. 1): the picture is more beautiful than the grove, and it will be the picture, the work of art, that the narrator is trying to emulate in his writing of the novel.¹⁷⁰

The prologue also establishes *Daphnis and Chloe* as a metanovelistic text through its narration of the novel's inspiration and creation. The narrator tells the reader, from within the text, the process he went through to form his finished product: finding an interpreter to explain the painting, and then working hard to complete the four books of which the novel consists (ἀναζητησάμενος ἐξηγητὴν τῆς εἰκόνας τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην, Praef. 3). Towards the end of the prologue the narrator specifies different types of extradiegetic reader for the novel: s/he could be νοσῶν (ailing), λυπούμενος (grieving), ἐρασθεῖς (someone who has been in love) or οὐκ ἐρασθεῖς (someone who has not been in love).¹⁷¹ It is thus implied that the novel offers something to each kind of reader and also shows how it should be read. The prologue “establishes the interpretative horizon of its public”¹⁷² and “influences the act of reading in the rest of the novel”¹⁷³ by showing the reader (through describing the painting) what subjects the novel will cover and by suggesting the kind of reader who should read it. These details about the novel's genesis, subject-matter and anticipated reception set in place the expectation that Longus' novel will be a highly sophisticated and playful addition to the genre.¹⁷⁴

More importantly the prologue establishes a link between erotics and narrative:

¹⁷⁰Teske 1991, 25. ff.

¹⁷¹Praef. 3.

¹⁷²Lauwers 2011, p. 60.

¹⁷³Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., 66: “the lack of correspondence between generic expectations and the work in front of the reader distracts him from the story itself and draws attention to Longus' own practice of writing. In this respect, the prologue establishes for a perceptive reader the interpretative horizon in such a way that it evokes a high awareness of the generic expectations and the author's playful deviations.”

the narrative will teach someone who has not been in love how to love.¹⁷⁵ Reading narrative can be figured as an erotic encounter,¹⁷⁶ and this is a novel about love, so the phrase in the prologue that promises to educate the person who has never loved (τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει, Praef. 3) also promises to educate the person who has never read a novel. Chloe herself has never loved and has never ‘read’ the inset narratives, so her journey through the text works on both levels. Through the figure of Chloe, the narrator teaches the reader not only about love but also about reading.

Chloe as in-text reader

The inset tales seem unfamiliar to Chloe. In the instance of the two stories that Daphnis narrates (the Phatta and Echo stories), it is clear that he has prior knowledge of the stories and teaches them to Chloe. She appears never to have heard them before but in both cases asks about something in nature that can be explained through a myth. Her curiosity and her casting of Daphnis in the role of a myth-maker align her with other female characters in novelistic texts, like Leucippe in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* who asks for the story of Philomela because (as Cleitophon says) ‘women are fond of stories.’¹⁷⁷ Isidora, the female addressee of Antonius Diogenes’ *The Wonders Beyond Thule*, is similarly described as a lover of learning.¹⁷⁸ Chloe is thus conforming to a novelistic female ideal by asking to be told stories.

Chloe’s naïve approach to the inset stories seems puzzling given the fact that

¹⁷⁵Highlighting a parallel between narrative and sex is something that other novelistic texts do as well. For example, sex indicates a transition from textual reality into and out of the fiction world in Lucian’s *Onos* (cf. Ní Mheallaigh 2009, pp. 115–116) and his *Vera Historia*: the fantastic adventures are framed by two episodes involving sexual encounters with monstrous women at 1.8 and 2.46 (cf. Larmour 1997).

¹⁷⁶Barthes 1975 tr. 1990; Brooks 1984. Zeitlin 1990, p. 425: The parallel between sex and narrative is particularly pertinent in this novel, in which erotic narrative strategies “are made to coincide more simply and overtly with the erotic rhythms of the plot,” and “the tale reaches its conclusion only and exactly with the sexual consummation of the wedding night.”

¹⁷⁷φιλόμυθον γὰρ πῶς τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος. (5.5.1). See below, p. 224.

¹⁷⁸... ὅτι τῇ ἀδελφῇ Ἰσιδώρᾳ φιλομαθῶς ἐχούσῃ τὰ δράματα προσφωνεῖ. ‘[he says]... that he addresses the novel to his sister Isidora, who is a lover of learning.’ (Antonius Diogenes *apud* Photius *Bibliotheca* codex 166, 111a33–34).

both she and Daphnis have been educated. At the beginning of the novel the reader learns that they have been educated because their adoptive parents believed that they came from a more privileged background and should therefore have an education to suit their status:

ἤχθοντο μὲν εἰ ποιμένες ἔσονται καὶ αἰπόλοι τύχην ἐκ σπαργάνων ἐπαγγελλλόμενοι κρείττονα, δι' ἣν αὐτοὺς καὶ τροφαῖς ἔτρεφον ἀβροτέραις καὶ γράμματα ἐπαίδευον. . .

They were annoyed that they were going to be shepherds and goatherds, since they had given indications of a better fortune since childhood — for which reason they had both nurtured them with a more luxurious upbringing and taught them to read and write. . .

1.8.1

To use the verb *παιδεύω* rather than *διδάσκω* here in a ‘sophistic’ text does not just imply that Daphnis and Chloe have been taught to read and write, but also implies that they have been trained in such a way that includes them in a particular social stratum (to which they are finally revealed as belonging¹⁷⁹) and way of thinking.¹⁸⁰ In the Imperial period the concept of *paideia* was the “knowledge of an amalgam of cultural values and capacities which were regarded as heritage from the Greek classical age.”¹⁸¹ Being *πεπαιδευμένος* meant having been through a particular system of education, which produced a cultured Greek elite.

Despite her education, Chloe appears to know nothing about the myths. However, there is a plausible explanation for why this should be when the reflexive function

¹⁷⁹See 4.21 for Daphnis’ recognition by his real parents, and 4.36 for Chloe’s recognition by hers.

¹⁸⁰See Whitmarsh 2005, p. 15, and Whitmarsh 2001, pp. 90–130. See further Goldhill 2001. The verb *παιδεύω* also puts Daphnis and Chloe on the same level as other protagonists of the novels, for example Leucippe in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is very accomplished: she plays the harp and sings in book 2.1.1 (“Ἄμα δὲ ἑαυτοὺς ἐπαινοῦντες ἐπὶ τὸ δωμάτιον ἐβαδίζομεν τῆς κόρης, ἀκροασόμενοι δῆθεν τῶν κιθαρισμάτων. . . ἡ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἦσεν. . . ‘Praising each other we went to the room of my beloved in order to hear her playing on the cithara. . . and first she sang. . .’). Leucippe can also read and write, as is demonstrated at 5.18.2–6 and 5.20.4–5.

¹⁸¹Lauwers 2011, p. 57.

of the inset tales is taken into account. The first inset tale establishes Chloe as the (unknowing) reader of erotic narrative.¹⁸² Chloe and Daphnis take on the roles of intradiegetic narratee and narrator, dramatizing the relationship between the extradiegetic narratee (the reader) and the narrator of this novel.

The first tale is introduced when a wood dove starts singing, and Chloe asks Daphnis what its song is about:

Ἔτερψεν αὐτούς ποτε φάττα βουκολικὸν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης φθεγξαμένη,
καὶ τῆς Χλόης ζητούσης μαθεῖν ὃ τι λέγει, διδάσκει αὐτὴν ὁ Δάφνις
μυθολογῶν τὰ θρυλούμενα.

Once a wood dove charmed them by singing its bucolic song from the wood. When Chloe had asked to learn what it was saying, Daphnis taught her by telling the myth of the familiar story.

1.27.1

The fact that Daphnis narrates things that are familiar (τὰ θρυλούμενα) suggests that Chloe surely would have known the myth, since she has been educated in the same way as Daphnis, but she seems to be ignorant of it. However, it is clear that Chloe wishes to learn about the dove (τῆς Χλόης ζητούσης μαθεῖν). The verb ζητέω ('I seek') implies an inquisitiveness: Chloe, in the position of the intradiegetic narratee, is 'seeking' a narrative (here an explanation) in the same way as the reader who is constructed by the novel looks for narrative and meaning by continuing to read the novel to its conclusion, and interrogates the narrative.¹⁸³ Moreover, Chloe wants to know/learn what the dove is singing: μαθεῖν ὃ τι λέγει, much as the reader wants to know/learn what the narrative says and means. The verb ζητέω is used of Chloe in the introduction to the third inset tale at 3.22.2 (ζητοῦσα), and at this point she also asks (ἐπυνθάνετο) Daphnis to explain the echo she can hear. The use of the verb πυνθάνομαι (I find out by asking) shows

¹⁸²Montiglio 2012, p. 146 n. 53 notes that Chloe seems not to know what an echo is even though Philetas has mentioned Echo at 2.7.6. I would argue that it is necessary for Chloe to take on this ignorant role in order for the dramatization of reading to take place.

¹⁸³Konstan 2009.

that Chloe is curious to discover the answer to her question, and the use of the imperfect indicates that she is persistent in her asking. Chloe's curiosity as intradiegetic narratee echoes and encourages the inquisitiveness of the extradiegetic narratee, that is, the reader of the novel, who is encouraged to read the novel in an interrogative and searching way. It also echoes the narrator's initial curiosity about the picture in the prologue, for which he needs an interpreter.¹⁸⁴

Chloe does not just act as an intradiegetic narratee for the inset stories, but it is possible to see a development in her response to them, and this echoes the process through which the reader goes when s/he reads a novel.

The metamorphic process of reading

The narrator of *Daphnis and Chloe* purposefully sets out to take the reader through an educative and metamorphic process.¹⁸⁵ He transforms a more naïve reader into one who comprehends the subtleties of the narrative.¹⁸⁶ Both Chloe, as intradiegetic reader, and the extradiegetic reader of the novel undergo this metamorphic experience, a process which can be called 'novelisation'.¹⁸⁷ The inset stories bring metamorphosis to the foreground in order to highlight the similarity between Chloe's experience of 'reading' the inset stories and that of the reader reading the text. Chloe's reactions to the inset tales dramatize the metamorphic process of reading, in particular her reaction to the second inset tale.

The second inset story has a slightly different setting to those of the first and third. It takes place when Philetas, Lamon, Dryas, Daphnis, and Chloe come together to celebrate Chloe's rescue from the Methymnians by Pan. It is not Daphnis who narrates this tale, but his father Lamon, so both Chloe and Daphnis are in the place of intradiegetic narratees. There is some indication that the intradiegetic narratees ask for the story: ὁ δὲ Λάμων ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτοῖς τὸν περὶ τῆς σύριγγος ἀφηγήσασθαι μῦθον ('Lamon promised to tell in full the story of the syrinx')

¹⁸⁴Praef. 3.

¹⁸⁵Praef. 3.

¹⁸⁶See Eco 2002 tr. 2006, p. 234 for narrative's transformation of its reader.

¹⁸⁷See Whitmarsh 2003, p. 194.

2.33.3). ἐπαγγέλλω ('I promise') implies that the narration is in answer to a request. Indeed, they persistently request that Philetas play his pipes: πάσας δεήσεις προσέφερον. This again shows that the intradiegetic readers echo the external reader by being inquisitive about narrative.

Daphnis and Chloe do not just passively listen to (or 'read') this tale, but they demonstrate their understanding and appreciation of the narrative by acting it out in the form of a dance, thereby totally immersing themselves in it and reacting to it. Arguably they do not demonstrate that they have comprehended the deeper meaning of the tale, as their interpretation of it contains none of the violence of the myth that has just been narrated.¹⁸⁸ Daphnis and Chloe's toned-down acting out of the tale injects a dangerous irony into the scene: "Like children saying a word without knowing what it means Daphnis and Chloe play at rape without taking it seriously."¹⁸⁹ However, it is clear that after she has heard and acted out the story of Pan and Syrinx, Chloe at least has internalized the deeper meaning of the tale. She and Daphnis swear oaths to love each other; Chloe swears by the Nymphs and Daphnis by Pan. Chloe asks Daphnis to swear another oath because Pan is ἐρωτικός ('amorous') and ἄπιστος ('not to be trusted'),¹⁹⁰ thus demonstrating that she has learnt from the inset tales that Pan is untrustworthy and a threat towards women. The dancing out of the myth and evidence that she has absorbed its meaning create a contrast with the aftermath of the first tale, where the narrative moves directly on to the next episode and betrays no reaction from Chloe to Daphnis' tale.¹⁹¹ Chloe's reaction to the second tale demonstrates a development in and maturation of her role as intradiegetic narratee. The fact that Daphnis and Chloe perform the story of Pan and Syrinx in a mimetic dance is interesting in itself, given that mime is a metamorphic art: the person dancing the story seems to transform into the character they are representing.¹⁹² In their dancing out of the myth, Daphnis and Chloe are transformed mimetically into Pan

¹⁸⁸Cf. Winkler 1990, pp. 119–120: "the sinister and essential elements of force, so vivid in the mythos just related by Longus, are missing from the young lovers' imitation."

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁹⁰2.39.2.

¹⁹¹Cf. Bowie 2003, p. 367.

¹⁹²Lada-Richards 2007, p. 53.

and Syrinx.¹⁹³ The metamorphic process that they go through by acting mirrors the fact that throughout the text Chloe is going through a process, just as the extradiegetic reader does.

The three inset stories track Chloe's development as a reader, or a consumer of narrative.¹⁹⁴ She progresses from having no reaction to the first story,¹⁹⁵ to displaying immersive appreciation and understanding through mimesis of the second tale, to finally showing a more detached appreciation of the third one. The kisses Chloe gives Daphnis as a reward for the third tale are not thematically related to the tale he narrates, whereas her dancing out of the Syrinx myth is intertwined with the preceding inset story. There is an incongruity between her kisses that indicate pleasure and the violence of the Echo tale; Chloe's kisses are a reward for a well-told story, a response to Daphnis' myth-making that provides a perfect explanation for the echo. Daphnis asks to be paid in kisses if he managed to teach her (εἰ διδάξειε, 3.22.4). If he teaches her, then this implies that she learns, and it is clear that she does: she gives Daphnis οὐ δέκα μόνον φιλήματα ἀλλὰ πάνυ πολλὰ ('not ten, but many more kisses') because the echo she hears μαρτυροῦσα ὅτι μηδὲν ἐψεύσατο ('bore witness to the fact that he did not lie' 3.23.5). She now knows what the echo means (that is, how it works and how it came to exist) not just what it says, which is what she wanted to know before the first inset tale. She is impressed with how the echo she can hear seems to bear out what she has been told by Daphnis, which highlights the fact that *enargeia* is important in story-telling. *Enargeia* is the very thing that Chloe is delighted to find in Daphnis' final tale, and it is also present in Dryas' mime of the vine harvest at 2.36.2. The audience is suitably impressed:

οὕτως εὐσχημόνως ὠρχήσατο ὁ Δρύας καὶ ἐναργῶς ὥστε ἐδόκουν
βλέπειν καὶ τὰς ἀμπέλους καὶ τὴν ληνὸν καὶ τοὺς πίθους καὶ ἀληθῶς

¹⁹³Daphnis and Chloe's dancing of the Pan and Syrinx myth is a mimetic representation of verbal narrative in dance, which Lucian (*De Saltatione* 35) and Plotinus (*Enneads* 5.9.11) see as like the visual art of painting or sculpture (ibid., p. 85). This echoes the narrator's representation of a visual narrative (a painting) in a verbal one.

¹⁹⁴Montiglio 2012 argues that the tales form for Chloe part of an educational journey that is musical.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., p. 148.

Δρύαντα πίνοντα.

Dryas danced this so gracefully and vividly that they seemed to see the vines and the pressing-tubs and the jars and Dryas really drinking.

Dryas' dancing informs Chloe (and the reader) about what sort of narrative to demand and recognize.

In the course of the novel Chloe goes through a process that changes her attitude to narrative, which draws attention to the fact that the extradiegetic reader, aligned with Chloe, also develops and goes through a process whilst reading: s/he transforms from a reader who does not know how this pastoral novel will work to one who understands it, just as the narrator promises. The novel affords two levels of readerly experience: the first is an experience of a love story and the second is an experience of a narrative about the journey (or process) of reading, that is, the metanarrative. The first-level reader of *Daphnis and Chloe* is the one who reads it for the love story, and the second-level reader is the one who notices the hidden narrative about reading but who can still appreciate the novel as a love story as well.¹⁹⁶ The reader moves from the first to the second level in the same way as Chloe moves from naïve to sophisticated narratee.

The educative and metamorphic process of this novel works on both levels. The semantic reader of *Daphnis and Chloe* is told at the very beginning of the novel what will happen in it: the painting in the prologue is the novel in microcosm. His or her educative journey is about learning the whole story. The critical (and therefore generically-aware) reader of the novel would situate it within the same genre as the work of Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles Tatius, and so would know the basic rules of the genre and have certain expectations. The sophistic novels in particular play to a reader who knows what to expect of the genre by going against his or her expectations. Reading Achilles Tatius' novel, *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, "consists in an ability to switch between mental frames, between over-determined generic awareness and the naïve affect of the first-time lover."¹⁹⁷ This observation about different frames, or levels, of reading is equally

¹⁹⁶Eco 2002 tr. 2006, p. 223. See above, p. 27.

¹⁹⁷Whitmarsh 2003, p. 204.

as relevant for the reader of Longus' novel. The reader of *Daphnis and Chloe* slips between his or her awareness of the general direction in which this genre goes and his or her excitement of reading a new story. Longus' novel constantly confounds the reader's expectation of the genre by blending novelistic *topoi* with pastoral, and thus plays to a generically aware reader. The slippage between the two levels of reading is set up in the prologue as soon as the narrative places pastoral side by side with novel:¹⁹⁸ here is not only a new story, but a new type of novel. This is what the narrator means when he says that he will remind those who have loved (or read novels and know how they work) and will teach those who have not loved (or read a/*this* novel and do not know how it works). Even though Chloe and the reader of the novel have παιδεία, the novel will educate them both: Chloe will learn how to be a narratee, and the extradiegetic narratee, mirroring Chloe, will learn how to read this particular novel. In addition to this, through analysing his or her experience of the text, the reader will come to realize his or her own curiosity, led by Chloe.

From reader to novelist

The narrator of the novel moves from being a 'reader' of the painting in the prologue to being the author of his story. So too Chloe moves from the role of reader to that of author, along with Daphnis, of her own story. The narrative demonstrates that Chloe learns from the tales she hears and the process through which she has gone. At 3.22.2, just before Daphnis tells her the tale of Pan and Echo, Chloe wants to find the answering group of sailors, who she is sure are responsible for the echo she can hear, not yet knowing how an echo works:

ἡ δὲ Χλόη, τότε πρῶτον πειρωμένη τῆς καλουμένης ἠχοῦς, ποτὲ μὲν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπέβλεπε, τῶν ναυτῶν κελευόντων, ποτὲ δὲ εἰς τὴν ὕλην ὑπέστρεφε ζητοῦσα τοὺς ἀντιφωνοῦντας.

But Chloe was then experiencing for the first time that phenomenon called an echo, and she looked at first towards the sea, where the sailors

¹⁹⁸Praef. 2.

were calling orders, then she turned back towards the wood, searching for those producing the answer.

ἀντιφωνοῦντας invites the reader to see a resonance between the narrative about Echo and the novel, which is an ‘echo’ of the painting: in the prologue the narrator says that a desire seized him to ἀντιγράψαι, that is, to write something in response to the painting. The novel is the narrator’s sophisticated appreciation of the story in the painting. Chloe at this stage in book three can only remain at the level of a reader, as she only searches for narrative rather than creates it. The narrator has ‘read’ the picture, consulted another authority about it, and finally written his own version.

At 2.27.2, Pan says that Eros intends to make a *muthos* out of Chloe (παρθένον, ἐξ ἧς Ἔρωσ μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει). She is thus equated with the three myths as a subject-matter for narration, and the story of her maturation from young girl to wife is the ‘myth’ in the fourth book.¹⁹⁹ She is, in effect, turned into the novel. However, as intradiegetic narratee, she does lead the reader in an educative process about how to mature as a reader: “Fiction is at the heart of Daphnis and Chloe’s maturation and, by transference, the reader’s too.”²⁰⁰ As a fiction by Love, Chloe educates readers in both love and in reading erotic fiction. She becomes a *muthos* about how to read *muthoi*.

Indeed, Chloe finally joins Daphnis in becoming the ultimate in narrators, because she and Daphnis are the ones who ‘write’ their story in picture form at the end of the novel for the narrator to ‘read’: Daphnis and Chloe “create their own myth, reflecting the artistic process of transforming life into narrative.”²⁰¹ The protagonists thus become novelists before the novelist does. At the end of the novel the

¹⁹⁹MacQueen 1990, p. 87 and Morgan 2004, pp. 16–17. See also MacQueen 1985.

²⁰⁰Morgan 2004, p. 17.

²⁰¹Fusillo 1997, pp. 218–219. See also Hunter 1983, pp. 42–43: “although Longus does not mention a cave in the ἄλσος of the prooemium, it is hardly fanciful to equate the εἰκόνες with the painting of which the whole novel is a description.” Cf. Zeitlin 1990, p. 443: “[The narrator’s] work is even more intimately linked to the world he is representing if the painting itself, as the text suggests, is the very one that Daphnis and Chloe, long after their marriage... dedicated to the Nymphs (4.39.2).” See also Morgan 2004, pp. 146–147: “We are meant to identify the painting [in the prologue] with the autobiographical images (also εἰκόνες) dedicated by the protagonists at their marriage.”

narrator invites the reader to complete the story by providing a brief outline of Daphnis and Chloe's future life, just as he had been provided with a brief outline of their story so far. This brings the reader full circle from narrative novice to creative author, mirroring Chloe's experience within the text.

This trajectory is thematized spatially in the two gardens:²⁰² the process of Chloe's 'novelisation' is traced by the different manifestations of deities in them. The ways in which the gods are presented in the two gardens resonate with the two different ways in which Chloe reacts to the tale of Syrinx and the tale of Echo. Eros is physically present in Philetas' numinous garden. It is possible to interact with him, which corresponds to Chloe's immersive experience of the Syrinx story in the mime she performs. In the second garden, deities are present as artistic representations only. Pan is depicted sitting on a rock and piping.²⁰³ He is not immanent in the park in the same way as Eros is in Philetas' garden. He is depicted in a way which does not reflect Pan as he is portrayed in the tales (that is, as a violent deity), but as if he has been tamed, or even "domesticated"²⁰⁴ by the artist who wanted him to behave in a certain way. This experience of Pan as art corresponds to Chloe's more detached attitude and mature response to the tale of Pan and Echo.²⁰⁵ She has learnt how to demonstrate aesthetic admiration of the beauty of artistic creations. The depiction of Pan in the park foreshadows Daphnis' and Chloe's demonstration of their understanding of the lessons they have learnt through their turning of their story into art that is acceptable²⁰⁶ and pleasing to the eye.²⁰⁷ That is, the narrator's gradual introduction of Pan and

²⁰²Philetas' garden at 2.3 and the more contrived garden park at 4.1; they also trace the development of the protagonists' understanding of love and desire from childish games to maturity of experience and action. See *ibid.*, p. 224: "the park embodies the same shift towards urban values... as DC's experience and the plot itself." *Ibid.*, p. 249: Daphnis and Chloe move from sexual experimentation to a serious fully-fledged relationship, which is formalized within the framework of marriage; cf. Zeitlin 1990, p. 458.

²⁰³There is no real music (for example birdsong) in this garden, Zeitlin 1994, p. 162. See also Montiglio 2012, p. 134.

²⁰⁴Newlands 1987, p. 56.

²⁰⁵Morgan 2004, p. 249 makes a similar point about the end of the novel: Chloe achieves a "distant perspective" on the countryside, which demonstrates her "transition from child to woman".

²⁰⁶The better elements of Pan are accentuated.

²⁰⁷The narrator says that their painting is the most beautiful sight he has ever seen (θέαμα εἶδον κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον (Praef. 1).

the fact that he finally turns him into a beautiful image tracks the acculturation and integration of Daphnis and Chloe,²⁰⁸ and mirrors Chloe's 'novelisation', or learning about narrative. There is an undercurrent in the garden park that hints at the triumph of town and man-made over country and the simple beauty of nature: it is extremely contrived.²⁰⁹ The way in which this is done suggests that to become a sophisticated reader one has to leave behind the fairy-tales, and sacrifice the innocence of youth, in order to appreciate aesthetic contrivance and man-made art.

The inset tales in *Daphnis and Chloe* dramatize the narration and reading of a narrative, and as such form a commentary on the novel itself in a way that finds parallels in other examples of the genre. As well as tracing Chloe's journey towards sexual maturity, the tales trace both her and the reader's development towards readerly maturity. As part of Chloe's social and sexual acculturation, she is also required to become a more sophisticated reader, and ultimately to become the author of her own narrative: she and Daphnis depict their story in art (4.39.2). In a similar way, the novel takes its reader on a didactic journey about love and reading, which transforms him or her ultimately into the author's accomplice in completing the characters' love story. The children's narration of their own tale, or selected pieces of it, in the picture echoes the reader's self-analysis: by the end of the text, the reader is able to tell a story about how s/he arrived there. In this sense, Chloe's wistful recognition of her former naivety at the close of the novel — that all those previous tentative experiences were mere 'shepherds' games' — glosses the reader's satisfying recognition of his or her own readerly growth: his or her realization that this sweet and pleasant tale is also a *fabula de se*, a story about reading itself.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸Turner 1960, pp. 121–122, demonstrates that the protagonists' changing attitudes to Pan echo their psychological development, and therefore their path to maturity, which is the acceptance of both conflict and tranquility as constituent parts of life.

²⁰⁹Zeitlin 1990, p. 446; Teske 1991, p. 92ff.; Morgan 2004, p. 224.

²¹⁰Ibid., p. 249: "The text ends with a self-referential *sphragis*".

Reception anxiety and narrative misfiring

Quite often, narratives embedded within the novels take the form of texts rather than oral narrative, or a narrative strand that is different from the main storyline, examples of which were discussed above. Literacy is an important asset for many characters in the novels, including the main protagonists.²¹¹ In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, letters are important ways for one of the lovers to communicate to the other lover the fact that they are still alive. The writing and reading of letters within a text reflects how texts themselves are written and received. Through their existence as physical texts within a physical text they encourage the reader to engage with the textual surface of the novels, withdrawing slightly from the events of the narrative and analysing his or her own encounter with the text. Letters can also seduce the reader into thinking of the possible existence of alternative or parallel narratives because they allow us access to the thoughts of the character who is writing the letter and to the interpretative process of the character who is reading it.

There are three ways in which letters encourage the reader to think about his or her experience of the text. Firstly, they highlight the potential for misreading and incorrect interpretation; secondly, they dramatize reception anxiety: what happens when the letter (or narrative) falls into the wrong hands?; thirdly, inasmuch as letters are narratives not intended for the reader, but intended for private in-text eyes, they remind the reader that the act of reading a novel is an illicit one — it is all about prying into people's private lives.

In the course of what follows I shall use Chaereas' letter to Callirhoe in Chariton's novel to show how embedded narratives ask the reader to engage actively with the text and to analyse how s/he reads the novel.

Chaereas and Callirhoe meet by chance and fall in love. They are married, but Chaereas is led to believe that Callirhoe has been unfaithful and, in a jealous rage,

²¹¹ “[T]he internal audiences of most of the novels. . . spend a good deal of time engaged in literate activities: viewing inscriptions, sending and receiving letters, and interpreting the texts of oracles. The ability to read and write appears to be a requisite trait of the heroes and heroines, along with beauty and noble descent.” Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 136.

kicks her in the stomach. She is believed to be dead and is buried, but revives in the tomb only to be captured and sold by pirates who break in. It transpires that she is pregnant by Chaereas and in order to save her child from a life of slavery she marries Dionysius who has become her master and pretends the child is his. Meanwhile Chaereas has realized she is still alive and searches for her, and during his journey he arrives at the house of a man called Mithridates. Chaereas is persuaded by Mithridates to write a letter to Callirhoe which shows that he is still alive. Mithridates also sends a letter to Callirhoe, promising to reunite the couple. In order to avoid any suspicion, he tells the slaves who are delivering the letters that they are actually for Dionysius, and only tells one person that they are for Callirhoe.

Chaereas' letter begins thus:

Καλλιρόη Χαιρέας· ζῶ, καὶ ζῶ διὰ Μιθριδάτην, τὸν ἐμὸν εὐεργέτην, ἐλπίζω δὲ καὶ <τὸν> σόν· ἐπράθην γὰρ εἰς Καρίαν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων, οἵτινες ἐνέπρησαν τριήρη τὴν καλήν, τὴν στρατηγικὴν, τὴν τοῦ σοῦ πατρός· ἐξέπεμψε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἡ πόλις πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ σοῦ. τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἄλλους πολίτας οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι γέγονασιν, ἐμὲ δὲ καὶ Πολύχαρμον τὸν φίλον ἤδη μέλλοντας φονεῦσθαι σέσωκεν ἔλεος δεσπότης.

To Callirhoe from Chaereas. I am alive, and I am alive because of Mithridates, my benefactor and, I hope, yours as well. For I was sold in Caria by barbarians who set fire to the fine trireme, the flagship of your father. For on it our city sent a search-party for you. I do not know what happened to the other citizens, but the mercy of my master has saved my friend Polycharmus and me as we were about to be executed.

4.4.7

The reader already knows what Chaereas tells Callirhoe, as the narrative follows both protagonists, but she does not know this information and neither does Dionysius, who reads the letter by mistake. This highlights the liminal position of the reader between knowledge and ignorance, and the tension between what characters

are aware of and what the external reader knows, an element of narrative to which I shall return.

Through an unfortunate series of events, it is not Callirhoe who reads Chaereas' letter, but Dionysius, and he interprets it incorrectly: when Dionysius reads the letter from Chaereas alongside the letter from Mithridates, he believes that Chaereas' letter is a plot on the part of Mithridates to seduce Callirhoe for himself:

Διονύσιος δὲ καθ' ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος πολλάκις ἀνεγίνωσκε τὰς ἐπιστολάς. κατελάμβανε δὲ αὐτὸν πάθη ποικίλα, θυμός, ἀθυμία, φόβος, ἀπιστία. ζῆν μὲν οὖν Χαιρέαν οὐκ ἐπίστευε (τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲ ὅλως ἤθελε), σκῆψιν δὲ μοιχικὴν ὑπελάμβανε Μιθριδάτου διαφθεῖραι θέλοντος Καλλιρόην ἐλπίδι Χαιρέου.

When Dionysius was by himself he read the letters many times. And varied emotions seized him: anger, depression, fear, disbelief. He did not believe that Chaereas was alive (for he absolutely did not want this to be so), but he suspected an adulterous plan on the part of Mithridates who was wishing to seduce Callirhoe with hope for Chaereas.

4.5.10

Dionysius projects his own desires on to Chaereas' letter, and in doing so he interprets it how he wants to: he would rather believe that Mithridates were plotting against him than that Chaereas were still alive.²¹² This demonstrates how someone can misread a text — even a novel — and interpret it according to their own desires. The reader can interpret what s/he *thinks* s/he has read and not what s/he has *actually* read.

Dionysius' reaction to Chaereas' letter makes the reader ask whether s/he is reading the novel correctly or forcing his or her own interpretation upon it; in doing so s/he is made to engage with his or her own reaction to the text.

²¹²This is similar to Thyamis' forcing of his own interpretation on to the dream he has in order to make it fit his own desires: see above, p. 36.

The letter is the catalyst for the second half of the novel.²¹³ Dionysius tells Pharnaces the governor, who alerts the King of Persia, who summons everyone to a trial to sort out the situation. Taking a step back from the text, this situation caused by a letter that goes astray opens up a narrative can of worms: there are so many ‘what-ifs’. If Chaereas’ letter had been interpreted correctly, even by the wrong addressee, the narrative may have taken a different course. In highlighting the misreading of Chaereas’ letter, the narrative hints at the possibility of parallel narratives and an alternative plot for the second half of the novel.²¹⁴ It encourages the reader to think about what might have happened.²¹⁵

Chaereas’ letter falls into the wrong hands: those of Dionysius, to whom the letter is not addressed. Callirhoe, the correct addressee, never actually reads the letter.²¹⁶ Dionysius as we have seen interprets it incorrectly, and this misinterpretation sets in motion the events of the second half of the novel. If Callirhoe herself had read the letter intended for her eyes, the novel might have turned out differently: “precisely because the letter is read by almost all the novel’s main characters *except* its intended addressee, it functions as the central engine of the second half of the novel, the impetus for all the action that follows.”²¹⁷ The letter therefore not only demonstrates what happens when someone misreads, but also what happens when the person reading is not the correct addressee.

Ironically, as Rosenmeyer points out, the true meaning of Mithridates’ letter (that of a plot to seduce Callirhoe) gets projected on to Chaereas’ letter.²¹⁸ Dionysius believes it is Mithridates who has written Chaereas’ letter — the wrong addressee has identified the wrong letter-writer and so has interpreted incorrectly. However, as incorrect addressee Dionysius interprets the meaning behind Mithridates’ letter correctly; Callirhoe (the correct addressee) might have been duped, since Mithri-

²¹³Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 139. Cf. Létoublon 2003, p. 280.

²¹⁴Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 143 points out that one narrative possibility is actually recognized by Dionysius himself — he could have ignored the letter and kept Callirhoe as his wife (6.2.5–6).

²¹⁵See Konstan 2009 for the active reader engaging with the text.

²¹⁶Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 139: “she will “read” the letter only once it is brought forward as evidence in a climactic courtroom scene.” Cf. Létoublon 2003, p. 283 who also points out that there are six different readers of Chaereas’ letter.

²¹⁷Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 139.

²¹⁸Ibid., p. 141.

dates' letter promised to reunite the lovers.

This highlighting of correct and incorrect addressees of letters activates in the reader an anxiety about whether s/he is the correct addressee of the novel — what kind of reader am I? Am I misinterpreting? This kind of self-doubt on the part of the reader does not just exist in this novel. The same stirring up of reader anxiety can be found within other texts too. For example, Lucian's writing style constantly makes the reader question his or her complicity in and understanding of the narrative.²¹⁹ His mocking style often makes the reader wonder whether s/he has understood it all and whether s/he is the right kind of reader. It makes the reader ask him or herself "are you sure you are reading properly, right now?"²²⁰

The reader of a novel knows that s/he is expected to interpret, to follow narrative pointers in the text such as prolepsis or analepsis. Bartsch argues that, with their embedded narrative elements, Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius go out of their way to undermine the reader's confidence in his or her ability to interpret, and in doing so they assert the novel's will and authority over the reader.²²¹ However, the fact that the narratives make the reader constantly question himself results in the novels themselves creating a drama about how to read the novel. The novels create a sense of crisis and uncertainty in the reader,²²² which makes him or her take note of the *process* of reading. It also has the effect of making a less aware reader more aware of the reading process and of how narratives work: there is

²¹⁹Goldhill 2002, p. 93.

²²⁰Ibid., p. 93.

²²¹Bartsch 1989, p. 176: "Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus make of the novel a form that plays with and undermines the conventional relation of image and viewer, text and narratee; in its most sophisticated appearance, the ancient novel... is the only form of artistic creation that asserts its own volition over that of the reader."

²²²Ibid., p. 174. In Achilles Tatius "the readers continue to supply their own interpretations, which are inevitably shown by the author to be incorrect and inadequate, or else to accept the faulty interpretations offered by the characters... in which case they are again shown to be wrong. As a result, these descriptions, by drawing into uncertainty an assumed process, compel the readers to question their ability to read." See also *ibid.*, p. 176: "readers [of Achilles Tatius] are shown their inadequacy as interpreters, and ultimately as readers, by means of their repeated inability to fill in the gaps as the author has arranged that they should be filled."

something beyond the story and its immediate intertexts.²²³ The aporetic state into which the novel thrusts the reader reaffirms the novel's plurality, and one of the strands of the multiplicitous mesh of the narrative is a story *about* reading.

Within the fiction Chaereas' letter is a private letter to his wife. He obviously does not intend it to be read by Dionysius, and it is not his fault that Dionysius chooses not to believe it. Viewing the private letter going astray, and seeing the upheaval this simple action causes, puts the reader in a position both of illicit pleasure (seeing into someone else's life, and seeing it going wrong) and of pathos (sympathizing with Chaereas and Callirhoe). The fact that Chaereas' letter is a private communication between him and his wife to which the reader of the novel is privy highlights the fact that the act of reading a novel is always a slightly illicit one: the reader is allowed access to events that are, essentially, private ones. The fact that Chaereas' letter tells the reader something that s/he already knows but turns it into private information highlights the liminality of the reader: that is, his or her ability to see more than the public eye can. By their private nature, both novel and letter invite and shape a reader who is *polypragmōn*: curious about what will happen, nosy about letters and private conversations, eager to read every single word to discover what it means.

Cleitophon's book

There is one embedded narrative in a Greek novel to which the reader is never permitted access. Cleitophon surreptitiously watches Leucippe whilst pretending to read a book at 1.6.6. It is significant that he spies on her every time he passes the doors, which are obviously open. His visual access to her is permitted by these doors:²²⁴

²²³Cf. Eco 2002 tr. 2006, p. 235 on intertextual irony: "it can gradually transform the naive reader into a reader who begins to sense the perfume of so many other texts that have preceded the one he is reading." The Greek novels transform the reader from one who simply reads, to one who becomes aware of his or her process of reading, prompting him or her through elements in the text that make him or her stop to think about what kind of reader s/he is.

²²⁴The narrative function of doors will be discussed in chapter 2.

ἀναστὰς οὖν ἐβάδιζον ἐξεπίτηδες εἴσω τῆς οἰκίας κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς κόρης, βιβλίον ἅμα κρατῶν, καὶ ἐγκεκυφὸς ἀνεγίνωσκον· τὸν δὲ ὀφθαλμόν, εἰ κατὰ τὰς θύρας γενοίμην, ὑπέλιπτον κάτωθεν, καὶ τινὰς ἐμπεριπατήσας διαύλους, καὶ ἐποχετευσάμενος ἐκ τῆς θέας ἔρωτα, σαφῶς ἀπήειν ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς.

Having got up I decided to walk up and down somewhere in the house in my beloved's presence. I took a book, and bent over it, and pretended to read; but every time that I came opposite the door, I peeped over the book at her, and when I had made several circuits and drawn fresh love from the sight of her I went away with my heart ill at ease.

We cannot know what book it is that Cleitophon is reading, but, as has been remarked, it would be extremely exciting and a point of great self-reflexivity if it were a novel.²²⁵ He takes no notice of either what he is reading or how he is reading it,²²⁶ and perhaps this is why he is not good at being in a novel: “if he had paid more attention to the book and less to ogling Leucippe, he might well have been better equipped to deal with fortune's tricks”²²⁷ and with his narrative itself.

Against this backdrop of uncertainty I make my suggestion: that Cleitophon is in fact reading (or misreading) a novel.

In the *Ninus* romance, Ninus says that he would have been a shameless sort of person if he had not discussed his betrothal to Semiramis with her family (in this case her mother), but had gone about fulfilling his desire in another way:

ἐ-

γὼ δὲ ἀναιδῆς ἂν ἦμην λάθραι
πειρῶν καὶ κλεπτομένην

²²⁵Morales 2004, p. 79 n. 135. Whitmarsh says the point is the reader does not know precisely because Cleitophon does not care, and so the reader is left frustrated: Whitmarsh 2011, p. 90, cf. Whitmarsh 2003, p. 199.

²²⁶See *ibid.* on Cleitophon not understanding what genre he is in: “Cleitophon, experiencing life from the perspective on an inept, does not realize the most fundamental law of the genre” (197), “Cleitophon's error is generic misidentification.” (198).

²²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 199.

ἀπόλαυσιν ἀρπάζων καὶ νυ-
κτὶ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ θεράπον-
τι καὶ τιθηνῶι κοινούμενος
τὸ πάθος.

but I truly would have been shameless if in secret
I had tried her virtue and stolen
my enjoyment undercover,
sharing my passion with the night, the wine-cup,
the trusted servant or nurse.

A.III.38-A.IV.5²²⁸

The things that he condemns here are very suggestive of the narrative in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: night-time, a wine-cup and a trusted servant, Satyrus, all aid Cleitophon in his various attempts to seduce Leucippe. Perhaps he had read the *Ninus* romance, or he is reading it while he is eyeing up Leucippe at 1.6.6. As we have seen, he is not really concentrating on his reading matter, which is why his approach to wooing Leucippe matches what Ninus calls ‘shameless’.

The fragment of Iamblichus’ *Babyloniaca* at *Suda* 1.9.14 is identifiable with 76b10 in Photius’ summary:

Ἰάμβλιχος· ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦτο χαλεπὸν ἦν καὶ σπάνιόν τι τῆς τε οἰκουροῦ
φυλαττούσης καὶ ἄβρας τινὸς ἄλλης συμπαρούσης, ἀναπεῖθει τὴν
κόρην λαθοῦσαν τοὺς γονεῖς ἀποδρᾶναι

Iamblichos: Since this was a difficult and infrequent thing, while the housekeeper was keeping watch and another favourite maid-slave was present, he persuaded the maiden secretly to run away from her parents.²²⁹

This appears to come from the section of the novel that recounts the adventures of Trophime and her lover, a slave. Again, this short fragment seems to have shades

²²⁸Text and translation: Stephens and Winkler 1995.

²²⁹Text and translation: *ibid.*

of Achilles Tatius in it: the themes are similar — people keeping watch, complicity of slaves, a girl running away from her parents. Is it possible that Achilles Tatius is alluding to this, or to this tradition? Is the *Babyloniaca* also contained within the book that Cleitophon is reading?

If, as is possible,²³⁰ the *Ninus* narrative is included in a compendium of *Babyloniaca*, then it is exciting to think about the possibility that it is this very set of Babylonian tales that Cleitophon is reading. It is because he is not concentrating, but using the book as a prop over which he can ogle Leucippe, that he does not identify the correct patterns of courtship and co-opts Leucippe into his narrative by pursuing her in a manner which can be found in the novels but is not the one usually followed by the protagonists. If he had read the novel correctly he would have been better equipped to deal with his own novel.

The fact is that the reader cannot ever know what the book is, and it is in itself an interesting point that s/he wants to know — s/he is *curious* about the book. This curiosity can lead to an extreme case of guesswork, as just demonstrated, meaning that the reader becomes aware that s/he is curious, so in a way this book, although mentioned briefly, stands for the whole novel.

Conclusion

The novels use narratives embedded within them and characters' (intradiegetic readers') reactions to those narratives to direct, or mis-direct, the reader, just as happens with dreams in Heliodorus and Xenophon of Ephesus. Novels also use embedded narratives to talk self-consciously about the process and experience of reading. Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* has encoded within its text a dramatization of the process of reading. Embedded storylines can also add more depth and thematic variety to the curious reader's narrative experience. Stories about seemingly minor characters, such as Thisbe, are actually providing the curious reader with alternative narrative experiences, and making him or her think about and search

²³⁰See above, p. 55.

for the rich plurality that is available in the novelistic texts. Embedded narratives within texts provoke the reader into asking what kind of reader he or she is, making him or her analyse his or her experience with the text and giving him or her a choice between reading for the story or reading for the whole experience. Finally, the case of Cleitophon's book demonstrates beautifully the fact that the curious reader enters into a collaborative relationship with the narrator of the text.

In providing the reader with many strands to follow, embedded narratives that self-consciously comment on the surrounding narrative invite and nurture a curious reader. This is a reader who will search in the text for these kinds of narrative, implementing active reading.

Chapter 2

Curious reading and interior space

Introduction

In the course of this chapter²³¹ I shall argue that the way interior space is employed in the Greek novel maps the narrative experience of the reader, and creates a reader who is *πολυπραγμῶν*, one who is encouraged to penetrate the text with his or her curiosity. I shall argue that enclosed spaces are portrayed in the Greek novel in such a way as to encourage and create this type of active, *πολυπραγμῶν* reader. The dynamic between exterior and interior forms a model of reading that is inquisitive and explorative in several ways. Interior spaces can be spied into by characters, and hence by the reader. Enclosed spaces are also used to control the release of knowledge through the opening and closing of doors within the narrative. It is also possible for enclosed spaces to be entered by characters, and this crossing of boundaries into interior spaces by characters within a novel that is in turn being read forms a self-reflexive commentary on the penetrable nature of the novel. The privileged view into interior spaces constructed by the novels, particularly a view into sexual spaces, plays on the reader's *sōphrosunē* and thus allows for self-analysis.

Reading narratives of love and desire injects a shade of the improper into curiosity.

²³¹Some ideas in this chapter developed out of Masters level essays.

It is not just curiosity, but curiosity about other people’s love-lives. Desire drives the narrative of a novel, as it becomes both the reason for the narrative, and the feeling the reader has towards it:

We can, then, conceive of reading of plot as a form of desire that carries us forward, onward, through the text. Narratives both tell of desire — typically present some story of desire — and arouse and make use of desire as dynamic of signification.²³²

Chariton says that it is a characteristic of love to be curious, and that people who are in love²³³ become nosy about things: φύσει περίεργός ἐστὶν ὁ Ἔρως κάκειῖνος δι’ ἑαυτὸν πολυπραγμονήσει περὶ τῶν γεγονότων (3.9.4). The Greek novels encourage the reader to pry into people’s private lives, and their love-lives, theorizing the curious reader in part as someone who has a desire for narratives about desire.²³⁴

The lie of the land

Space has, according to Lowe, three main functions in narrative: “to *limit*, to *structure* and to *reify* the reader’s modelling of the story.”²³⁵ It is thus an effective narrative tool for communication with, and guidance of, the reader. Studies of space in the Greek novel have tended to focus on geographical space, which is of course essential to the plot of the novel. Removing the protagonists from their home and transporting them to a different place is an important motif in the novels,²³⁶ and the journey that they take is often the basis for the structure of the

²³²Brooks 1984, p. 37.

²³³In this case Dionysius.

²³⁴Whitmarsh shows that Eros is a powerful force within the novels on both a plot level and a metanarrative level. He is both the reason for the protagonists’ desire and, through the promise of the protagonists’ sexual consummation and the fulfilment of the narrative, also the reason for the reader’s desire for closure (Whitmarsh 2011, pp. 35–37). See also Zeitlin 1990, pp. 424–425.

²³⁵Lowe 2000, p. 41.

²³⁶Cooper 1996, p. 34: “displacement and the curiosity it begets are the narrative end of romance’s emphasis on travel”; see also Morales 2005, p. 4.

narrative,²³⁷ as Lowe demonstrates:

All the stories, even Longus', are spatially patterned on a circle of exile and return between thematically opposed geographical zones: Greece and barbary, city and country, Europe and/or Asia and/or Africa. In all cases alienation from the home territory dissociates the hero and heroine from their citizen roots, cutting them off from family and community and finally imperilling their status as free persons rather than chattels. This traversal of categories regularly involves movement between regions of contrasting political order.²³⁸

Geographical space is thus used in the Greek novel to comment upon politics and power structures. Travel is important in the Roman novel too: Lucius, in Apuleius (as in the Greek *Onos*), makes a journey in ass-form, and the *Satyricon* includes many changes of location. However, these novels focus on a Greco-Roman sphere, whereas the 'ideal' Greek novels focus more upon interactions with cultures further afield:

the great majority of the extant ancient novels show a strong orientalisising impulse, meaning that they include travels far from home and seek out encounters with the foreign, exotic and the marvellous.²³⁹

The case of *Daphnis and Chloe* is rather different, since all the action takes place on the island of Lesbos, and the only travelling of the sort similar to that found in the other four 'ideal' novels takes place when Chloe is captured by the Methymnians and is taken aboard their ship (2.20–29). They only sail ten stades, however, before

²³⁷See Morgan 2007b and Romm 2008, pp. 112 ff. See also Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 105: "In essence, all the character's actions in Greek romance are reduced to *enforced movement through space* (escape, persecution, quests); that is, to a change in spatial location." (Bakhtin's emphasis) Montiglio argues that the *nostos* is not such an important part of the travelling: "the return is a mere coda to round off the journey and the story." (Montiglio 2005, p. 233). For Whitmarsh, on the other hand, the return is "[t]he defining feature" of narrative romance (Whitmarsh 2011, p. 14).

²³⁸Lowe 2000, p. 228.

²³⁹Romm 2008, p. 112.

Chloe is rescued by Pan. In book one, Daphnis is also captured by pirates. He is still able to swim to the shore, so this cannot be said to count as a voyage, and is what Morgan calls another of Longus' "narrative dead ends".²⁴⁰ The 'travel' in *Daphnis and Chloe* is of a different sort:

Travel in space has become internalized to become psychological and emotional development, and the protagonists' real adventures are the stages through which they pass on their journey to maturity.²⁴¹

Romm points out that in *Daphnis and Chloe* it is time, rather than space, that is important, as the novel remains true to its rural setting and follows the seasons of the year.²⁴² The other 'ideal' novels do not have such a pronounced sense of the passage of time as a driving force behind their plots. Indeed Bakhtin argues that the passage of time is immaterial while the protagonists are in adventure-time: "We have here an *extemporal* hiatus between two biological moments".²⁴³ Konstan, on the other hand, says that time is actually very important because it serves to test the fidelity of the protagonists.²⁴⁴

Konstan takes a different angle on narrative space, demonstrating how the novelists create separate 'action spaces' within the texts: "Space... is not just a matter of distance travelled, but also of the creation of separate spheres of action for the hero and heroine."²⁴⁵ According to Konstan, action spaces are essentially like spotlights following a particular character or group of characters: the 'agent'. As long as

²⁴⁰Morgan 1994, p. 66: "It is difficult to resist the feeling that these atrophied incidents are intended as dead-pan caricatures of conventional romantic adventures. Although they are integrated into *Daphnis and Chloe* in the sense that they give rise to events which form part of Longus' real agenda, in themselves these 'adventures' are narrative dead ends, whose function in the development of the plot does not justify the lengths with which they are treated."; See also Lowe 2000, pp. 233–234.

²⁴¹Morgan 1994, p. 66.

²⁴²Romm 2008, p. 110.

²⁴³Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 90 (my emphasis).

²⁴⁴Konstan 1994, pp. 46–47. See also Konstan 2002, 1: "Time does matter in the ancient Greek novels: if *erôs* is to serve as the basis, it must be put to the test, proved able to endure, and in the process transformed into a stable emotion that transcends the allure of physical beauty that was its origin." See further Branham 2002, pp. 165–172 and Kim 2008.

²⁴⁵Konstan 2002, p. 1.

the spotlight stays on the same agent, the action space is the same ('continuous action space'), even if the agent goes on a journey. If there is a temporal leap, the action space changes ('discontinuous action space'), and if the action continues in a different place as well as time, this discontinuity of action space is more pronounced.²⁴⁶ Konstan's argument is that the novels' use of multiple action spaces emphasizes the distance between the protagonists and their autonomy from the point at which they leave their initial (shared) action space until the point at which they arrive at their marriage or reunion and final (shared) action space.²⁴⁷ Switching from the heroes' action space to the heroines' and back again throughout the novel highlights the symmetry that the novels set up.²⁴⁸ Not all of the novels stand up to this analysis, as Konstan himself notes, but those that do the most are Chariton's *Callirhoe* and Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*, the reason being that they are most similar to historiography, which also makes use of action spaces.²⁴⁹

Space is also used in the Greek novel to create and comment on identity.²⁵⁰ Connors argues that in the novels, "*representations of places construct identities.*"²⁵¹ This moves away from the Bakhtinian theory that space is the background against which identity is confirmed: that is, identity, particularly private identity, does not change. Bakhtin argues that the identity of the place that the protagonists are in does not matter: one needs sea for a pirate attack, but it does not matter which one as geographical spaces are interchangeable:²⁵² "The nature of a given place does not figure as a component in the event; the place figures in solely as a naked, abstract expanse of space."²⁵³ However, it is clear that the novels use their descriptions of spaces or places to make statements about 'other' cultural identities:

²⁴⁶Ibid., p. 2.

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 9.

²⁴⁸Ibid., p. 9.

²⁴⁹Ibid., p. 10.

²⁵⁰See Whitmarsh 1998, Whitmarsh 1999 and Perkins 1999.

²⁵¹Connors 2002, p. 13 (Connors' italics). There has been a theoretical move towards thinking of *place* rather than space as "a realm that is constructed, narrated, situated in time." Ibid., p. 13.

²⁵²Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 100.

²⁵³Ibid., p. 100.

[the novels] stage a host of characters who embody “oriental” types, from lecherous tyrants to equally sinister femmes fatales. They attribute human sacrifices to non-Greeks and are full of stereotypes about barbarian excesses.²⁵⁴

In addition to commenting on ‘other’ cultural identities, the novels also construct Greek identity against this ‘other’ identity: “Most of the ancient novels take place in locations where Greeks (however defined) necessarily encounter non-Greeks and thus explicitly contrast ethnicities and cultural behaviours.”²⁵⁵ The *Aethiopica* in particular has been read as a novel that constructs a cumulative identity for the protagonists as they travel through different places.²⁵⁶

It has been argued that geographical space in the Greek novel challenges identity too: “Being Greek is seemingly tested when characters leave their native shores, are deprived of their accustomed status through misfortune, and have to negotiate dangerous circumstances and unfamiliar behaviours.”²⁵⁷ Being in a geographical space that is ‘other’ can also cause the protagonists to lose sight of or even to deny their identity: “The numerous episodes of faked identity and misrecognition emphasize the wanderers’ experience of estrangement from that which is originally theirs: fatherland, family, rank, even name.”²⁵⁸

Most recently, *Space in ancient Greek literature*²⁵⁹ provides an overview of how space is used in literature as a setting for the plot,²⁶⁰ as an illuminator of the themes of the narrative, and as a way to represent ideas symbolically (for example using a *locus amoenus*) or inform the reader about a character either when a character is found in a certain space or when the space is focalized through that

²⁵⁴Montiglio 2005, p. 226.

²⁵⁵Stephens 2008, p. 57.

²⁵⁶Whitmarsh 1999, p. 20 interprets “the acculturation of Charicleia and Theagenes... as an acquisition of cultural identity, and... the *Aethiopica* itself as an exploration of this theme.”

²⁵⁷Stephens 2008, p. 62.

²⁵⁸Montiglio 2005, p. 226.

²⁵⁹de Jong 2012b.

²⁶⁰Laird 1993, pp. 152–153 demonstrates that a ‘story-world’ is the “*mimesis* of space, time, values, characters, events, etc. generated by the narrative of a text”. On fiction worlds (in Theocritus) see Payne 2007 and Klooster 2012, pp. 101–103.

character (this is called the “psychologizing” function²⁶¹). The chapters in the book that cover the Greek novels²⁶² draw attention to the dichotomy between public and private as well as to geographical space, but their focus is not solely upon the effect such themes have upon the reader.

Whitmarsh has argued that Hippias’ house in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* stands for Hippias’ patriarchal power,²⁶³ and yet at the same time is the backdrop for Cleitophon and Leucippe’s challenging of that power and their appropriating of his ordered space to re-define it as their sexual space.²⁶⁴ This movement of analysis towards private and domestic space paves the way for more research on this level.

A new focus

In the course of this chapter I intend to move the emphasis from thinking about geographical space as a plot-motor or as a way of highlighting themes such as symmetry or identity, to thinking about space on the more intimate level of interior and private spaces. I shall explore how the Greek novel directly involves the reader by writing private or enclosed spaces and inviting him or her into them. The Greek novel invites the reader (in any time) to cross boundaries that s/he would not normally be able to cross in the world s/he inhabits, those between public space and other people’s private spaces. As Hunter demonstrates, “There is always something voyeuristic about novel-reading... both the novelist and his readers, concerned to discover ‘what is going on’ are *curiosi* and/or *πολυπραγμόνες*.”²⁶⁵ That is, any experience of novel reading is tantamount to spying on someone else’s private life and experiences.²⁶⁶ Morales expands on this, and argues that it is not just the novel that puts an emphasis on what can be seen: “Greek literature has

²⁶¹de Jong 2012a, p. 16.

²⁶²De Temmerman 2012a, De Temmerman 2012b, De Temmerman 2012c, Morgan 2012a and Morgan 2012b.

²⁶³Whitmarsh 2010a, p. 328: “The house represents and indeed... enacts parental control.”

²⁶⁴Ibid.

²⁶⁵Hunter 2009, p. 51.

²⁶⁶See Bakhtin below, p. 90.

always been ocularcentric.”²⁶⁷ In *Vision and Narrative* she argues that meaning in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is constructed through the way the gaze is used. I take this one stage further and argue that a theory of how to read the novels is constructed through the act of viewing into spaces within them. I shall show how the Greek novel constructs its reader as *πολυπραγμῶν* through the ways his or her experience of enclosed spaces is represented. Before I move on to analyse the Greek novels, I shall first compare the use of enclosed spaces both in the Roman novel and in some other narrative texts.

“Snooping about”

Literature written in the pre-Hellenistic era was both public in form and concerned with public themes in terms of its content, but Hellenistic literature became thematically more and more about private lives and intimate details.²⁶⁸ Bakhtin argues that the ancient novel evolved as part of the process of resolving the dichotomy between the public nature of the forms of literature and the private nature of literary themes and content in the Hellenistic era:

[T]he quintessentially private life that entered the novel at this time was, by its very nature and as opposed to public life, *closed*. In essence one could only *spy* and *eavesdrop* on it. The literature of private life is essentially a literature of snooping about, of overhearing “how others live”.²⁶⁹

According to Bakhtin the Greek novel tried to resolve this problem by fitting private life (which necessarily *does not* have an observer) into public forms, for example trials, in adventure-time.²⁷⁰ The Roman novel, on the other hand, resolved

²⁶⁷Morales 2004, p. 9.

²⁶⁸Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 123.

²⁶⁹Ibid., p. 123. Brooks 1993 demonstrates that the modern novel revolves around invasion of privacy, but Bakhtin shows that the ancient novel is also based on this premise.

²⁷⁰Bakhtin 1975 tr. 1981, p. 123.

the problem by constructing protagonists who were able to observe and report on private lives because of their lowly status.²⁷¹

The following section will demonstrate that the reader of the novels is constructed as one who spies, and that therefore spying as a trope for reading encourages that reader's curiosity, and encourages him or her to recognize him or herself in the character who is doing the spying (or internal 'reading').

Through the keyhole

The Roman novel puts emphasis on enclosed or intimate spaces, and the ways in which they can be seen into by characters. For example, in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Photis makes it possible for Lucius to spy on his host's wife through a hole in her door:²⁷²

ad illud superius cubiculum suspenso et insono vestigio me perducit ipsa, perque rimam [h]ostiorum quamquam iubet arbitrari, quae sic gesta sunt. iam primum omnibus laciniis se devestit Pamphile et arcula quadam reclusa pyxides plusculas inde depromit, de quis unius operculo remoto atque indidem egesta unguedine diuque palmulis suis adfricta ab imis unguibus sese totam adusque summos capillos perlinit. . .

she led me to that upstairs room quietly and on tiptoe and told me to be a witness, through a crack in the door, to what was going on. First of all Pamphile took off all her clothes and then having opened a casket she brought out several jars from it. She removed the cover from one of these and took some ointment out of it, rubbed this for some time between her palms and then smeared it all over her body from the tips of her toenails to the top of her head. . .

3.21

²⁷¹Ibid., p. 122.

²⁷²More generally, Apuleius' novel puts emphasis on viewing and being viewed. See Slater 1998 and Slater 2003.

One of Lucius' main character traits in the *Metamorphoses*, indeed his problem,²⁷³ is his *curiositas*.²⁷⁴ He is always very eager to find things out and to report them to the reader. As Lucius is an ego-narrator, this very firmly constructs the reader as *curiosus*, since everything s/he sees is focalized through Lucius. At this point in the text, Lucius views his host's wife through a crack in a door (*per rimam*). It is clear from this voyeuristic viewing through a door that is closed that Lucius should not be doing this. Nevertheless he does, and he takes the reader with him as he does so.

Pamphile first takes off her clothes (*omnibus laciniis se devestit*) and then massages all of her body with the ointment she has taken from a jar (*ab imis unguibus sese totam adusque summos capillos perlinit*). This is all done before leaving to go and visit her lover,²⁷⁵ which activates erotic overtones in the passage. Lucius' and the reader's eyes follow Pamphile's hands as she massages her whole naked body with the ointment, so their gazes become erotic. The vocabulary adds to the erotic nuances of this passage: the noun *rima* (crack, cleft) can be used to mean the opening of the vagina.²⁷⁶ The act of illicit viewing in the text mirrors the act of reading: the gaze of the reader upon something erotic highlights the similarity between reading narrative and erotic viewing. Lucius is viewing a private scene, just as the reader has a 'private' view on the characters in the narrative.

Laird has noted that the action of viewing through a hole in the door, as in the passage above, gives the narrator an opening into someone else's feelings:

The narrator's precaution in presenting this whole incident as something which he observed through a hole in a door should alert us to the

²⁷³Cf. Freudenberg 2007, p. 238.

²⁷⁴He denies that he is curious, whilst implying he is at the same time: "*impertite sermonis non quidem curiosum, sed qui velim scire vel cuncta vel certe plurima;*" (Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 1.2).

²⁷⁵*Fotis... me accurrit indicatque dominam suam, quod nihil etiam tunc in suos amores ceteris artibus promoveret, nocte proxima in avem sese plumaturam atque ad suum cupitum sic devolaturam;* ('Photis... ran up to me and declared that her mistress, because she had not advanced her love affair with her other skills, would make herself into a feathery bird and fly off to her object of desire in this way that very night' Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 3.21). Freudenberg 2007, p. 252 also notes this.

²⁷⁶Adams 1982, p. 95.

idea that he is throughout presenting someone else's story. In Petronius and Apuleius (and numerous successors including John Cleland and the Marquis de Sade) observation through cracks and keyholes is not so much a frequent incident in stories as a narrative technique that allows a story-teller information from which he can provide insight into feelings and motivations of other characters.²⁷⁷

That is, presenting something that has been observed both strengthens the truth-value of what it is that is being presented and provides the narrator with a way of authenticating his reporting of other characters' points of view. Laird's premise is that observers cannot be omniscient, and yet such scenes are often presented from an omniscient narrator's point of view: Pamphile's feathers are soft, her nose is hard, and so on. To Laird, this sounds as if Pamphile is focalizing, as she is the only one who can truly know that her feathers are soft and her nose is hard.²⁷⁸ However, this seems to me to be slightly odd argumentation. It is, rather, not that this is Pamphile's focalization but that it is Lucius' focalization. He is imagining how she would feel to the touch, thus heightening the erotic implications of the passage, and tempting the reader to fantasize too. Indeed, readers do get vicarious imaginative experience through their reading,²⁷⁹ which is focalized through the narrator, so this is exactly what Lucius as narrator is promoting here.²⁸⁰

There are two other instances in the *Metamorphoses* that demonstrate viewing into private spaces. In one passage, Lucius, presumed mad, has been locked in his masters' bedroom, into which he fled after having his life threatened by a cook. In the morning, the men who have been placed on guard outside the room wonder if he is still mad:

²⁷⁷Laird 1993, pp. 166–7.

²⁷⁸Ibid., p. 165.

²⁷⁹Culler 1997, p. 112.

²⁸⁰Laird reads the passage 3.21–2 as programmatic for reading the novel, but not in terms of spatial experience: “Pamphile and/or Lucius are metamorphosed and/or intoxicated. The metamorphosis and/or intoxication work on the reader too, who begins to realise, like Lucius, that the more he attempts to investigate closely what is going on the more confused and stupefied he becomes.” (Laird 1993, p. 169) This resonates with my argument that the reader of the Greek novels is encouraged towards self-analysis.

illos qui meae tutelae pervigiles excubias agitaverant ausculto de meis sic altercare fortunis: “Adhucine miserum istum asinum iugi furore iactari credimus?” “Immo vero iam virus increscente saevitia prorsus extinctum.” Sic opinionis variae terminum ad explorationem con- fuerunt, ac de rima quadam prospiciunt sanum me atque sobrium otiose consistere.

I listened to those who had been guarding my safety all night outside my door discussing my condition thus: “Do we think that that wretched ass is still throwing himself about in a perpetual fit?” “No, by now the poison will have put itself out completely through its increasing ferocity.” Thus they turned to investigation to put an end to the varying opinions, and through a crack they watched me standing quietly, sane and sensible.

9.3

This provides the reader with a double focalization: Lucius can hear through the door, in his usual curious way, and the men outside can see him. The reader takes on both perspectives.²⁸¹ This situation reminds the reader also of the fact that Lucius the narrator is a human consciousness and intelligence inside the body of an animal.²⁸² The passage therefore highlights the bivalent point of view of Lucius throughout most of the novel, commenting on his status both as *actor* and *auctor* and also as ass and human.

The second passage takes place when Lucius has been eating his owners’ food and they are unaware of this, but are curious as to why he looks so healthy when the hay they leave for him does not seem to be eaten:

et hora consueta velut balneas petitori, clausis ex more foribus, per

²⁸¹See also the discussion of the wedding night in Longus, below, p. 139.

²⁸²The most striking obstacle for Lucius, in both the Latin and Greek *Ass* narratives, is the fact that he cannot speak when he is an ass. See Whitmarsh 2010b, p. 138: “The *Ass* narrative is thus a vehicle for exploring the duality of first-person narrative: the voluble narrator is full of language, whereas the ass is consigned to silence”.

quandam modicam cavernam rimantur me passim expositis epulis inhaerentem.

And at the usual time, having closed the door as was their custom just as if they were going to the baths, they watched me through a small crack tucking into the meal that was laid out.

10.15–16

In both of these instances it is other people who view Lucius, instead of Lucius watching the actions of others, which has different implications for the theorization of space and reading. I shall expand on these below.²⁸³

It is not just viewing that constructs the reader of the Roman novel as curious. The effect of discovering information is also achieved by having Lucius overhear things, which the reader also ‘overhears’ by virtue of focalizing through Lucius. As Laird shows (see above p. 92), the text uses scenes of viewing into private spaces as a verification of facts: whatever is reported carries more truth value, since it is *seen* by the main protagonist. Overhearing what other people say is also part of this verification. At 9.30 Lucius suggests the reader may like to know how he knows everything that he narrates, even what people do in secret:

Sed fortisan lector scrupulosus reprehendens narratum meum sic argumentaberis: “unde autem tu, astutule asine, intra terminos pistrini contentus, quid secreto, ut adfirmas, mulieres gesserint, scire potuisti?” accipe igitur, quem ad modum homo curiosus iumentum faciem sustinens cuncta quae in perniciem pistoris mei gesta sunt, cognovi.

But perhaps, attentive reader, hearing my narrative, you will ask this: “But how are you, clever little ass, able to know what the women were doing in secret (as you make clear) while you were shut up inside the walls of the mill?” Therefore listen to the way I, a curious man with the appearance of an ass, discovered everything that they did to destroy my baker.

²⁸³p. 103.

The answer here eventually turns out to be that he overheard the baker's daughter explaining to the household a dream she had had which had foretold the future to her. The phrase *scrupulosus lector* implies that Lucius knows that he is dealing with an attentive reader — one who will delve into the text and question everything. Indeed, at the beginning of the text he invited him or her to be so: *Lector intende*.²⁸⁴ In the passage above he imagines that the reader will engage with the text vocally, demanding answers (*argumentaberis*), just as Konstan imagines the readers of *Apollonius King of Tyre* shouting out both questions about the text and the answers to them.²⁸⁵ The *Metamorphoses* thus in one paragraph theorizes its reader. The word *curiosus*, which Lucius uses to describe himself, reflects on to the reader, implicating him or her in Lucius' journey of discovery. However, having emphasized the fact that the reader is likely to be suspicious of how he knows what he is narrating, Lucius does not actually explain very well how he came to know about what the women were doing *secreto*, which is intriguing. He does not say exactly what the baker's daughter said, or give any details, but vaguely implies that she has spoken without making much effort to report her story in detail:

quae nullo quidem domus infortunium nuntiante cuncta cognorat, sed ei per quietem obtulit sese flebilis patris sui facies adhuc nodo revincta cervice, eique totum novercae scelus aperuit de adulterio, de maleficio et quem ad modum larvatus ad inferos demeasset.

Although no-one had informed her of the family's misfortune, she knew everything. The image of her weeping father had appeared to her while she was asleep, a noose still tied around his neck, and had revealed every crime of her stepmother. He told her about the adultery and sorcery, and how he had been bewitched and had gone down to the Underworld.

9.31

This incongruity between Lucius' assertion that he can explain how he knows everything, and his vagueness in actually explaining it alerts the reader to the

²⁸⁴Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 1.1.

²⁸⁵Konstan 2009, p. 11.

chinks in Lucius' armour. Drawing attention to this by anticipating the questions the reader may ask serves to amplify the tension between what a narrator can know and what a narrator can merely suggest, drawing the reader into narrative-constructing fantasy.

There are several points in the text that form aural complements to Lucius' visual snooping, and thus also construct the reader as curious, and it is worth looking at these briefly. To begin with, there is an emphasis upon sound in the Prologue. The narrator says that he will caress the reader's ears with his narrative, rather than his or her eyes: *auresque tuas...permulceam* (1.1). He also asks the reader to forgive the fact that he is an inexperienced *speaker* of Latin (*rudis locutor*, 1.1) before going on to talk of his act of writing. At 1.2, very near the beginning of the text, Lucius explains how he (in human form at the moment) tried to hear what other people on the road were saying: *ac dum ausculto quid sermonis agitent...* He is thus constructed as nosy even before he is turned into an ass, setting up how this novel will be narrated: as a journey of discovery about other people's affairs. When he is turning into an ass at 3.24, Lucius points out that his ears become big: *et aures immodicis horripilant auctibus*. Drawing attention to this is significant, since although he can no longer speak, his faculties of hearing and of understanding remain: *sensum tamen retinebam humanum* (3.26). Having big ears implies that his natural curiosity will be amplified. He can still comprehend what is happening to him while he is an ass, and often this warns him of impending danger. For example, he gleans information through listening to the robbers' conversation as they go along the road:

nam et secum eos animadverteram conloquentes, quod in proximo nobis
esset habenda mansio et totius viae finis quieta eorumque esset sedes
illa et habitatio.

For I turned my attention to them saying to each other that we would soon be making a stop and having a rest at the end of our whole journey, and that their headquarters and dwelling were there.

He had been considering collapsing on the road, but decided not to after he witnessed the robbers throwing their other ass off a cliff for doing the same thing. It is because he witnessed this, and also because he heard that the robbers' lair is not far, that Lucius decides to behave. There are two points at which the robbers discuss actually killing Lucius, at 6.26 and 6.31–32. The first time he escapes death by deciding to run away, which he would not have been able to do had he not overheard the robbers' conversation; the second time he is rescued by Charite's fiancé. 7.22–23 sees Lucius overhearing a plot either to kill or castrate him, but at this point he is rescued by chance, a somewhat short-lived victory, as he is subsequently maltreated by his owners.²⁸⁶ Therefore Lucius is not able to act upon what he has heard every time he hears a warning about his future. A good portion of the novel consists of stories that Lucius has heard from others and includes in his narrative. There are many such episodes, but the most significant portion of text is the Cupid and Psyche tale, which takes up the best part of two books (4.27–6.24). At the end of the narration by the old woman Lucius says that he wishes he had a pen to write it down. This creates irony on one level, since he does (eventually) have a pen and does write it all down,²⁸⁷ but by drawing attention to the fact that such a good story is overheard he highlights the link between snooping and narrative experience.

In an ego-narrative, the very fact of ego-narration means that the narrator cannot be omniscient. Distanced viewing through holes in doors and overhearing what others say help to build up his authority as a narrator, by providing the reader with 'proof': he was there and can vouch for the characters in his narration. In addition to this, the presentation of narrative that is spied upon or overheard emphasizes the partial or limited perspective of the narrator. It also strengthens the construction of the reader as *curiosus*: the reader too is viewing a scene through a crack in the door or overhearing a story told to the narrator by someone else. Yet at the same time, focalizing through the partial perspective of someone who is viewing through 'keyholes' or overhearing draws attention to the very ambiguous

²⁸⁶His driver is attacked by a bear and Lucius runs away. He is caught by someone, but they are accused of stealing him and he is returned to his owners who beat him mercilessly.

²⁸⁷West 2003, p. 66 n. 22 notes that there is a paradox in his not being able to use a pen whilst in the form of an ass.

position that the reader is in, both witnessing the action of the text and being led by what is left out of the text to construct his or her own fantasy.

It is worthwhile at this juncture looking at a passage containing voyeuristic viewing into a private space in Petronius' *Satyricon*, since this is the text most often generically situated with Apuleius as a Roman novel. The text is littered with sexual episodes, many of which are watched by other people, often through holes in closed doors. The following passage takes place during an orgy. Giton and Pannychis are shut in a room together, in order to have sex:

Itaque cum inclusi iacerent, consedimus ante limen thalami, et in primis Quartilla per rimam improbe diductam adplicuerat oculum curiosum, lusumque puerilem libidinosa speculabatur diligentia. Me quoque ad idem spectaculum lenta manu traxit, et quia considerantium <co>haeserant vultus, quicquid a spectaculo vacabat, commovebat obiter labra et me tanquam furtivis subinde osculis verberabat.

Therefore, when they had been locked in and were lying there, we sat in front of the door of the bedroom, and Quartilla wickedly cut a chink in the door, applied her curious eye to it, and with wanton attentiveness watched their childish game. She pulled me to the same entertainment with an insistent hand, and since our cheeks were so close together, whenever she could spare a moment from the spectacle, she turned her lips close to mine and bruised me with sly kisses.

Petronius *Satyricon* 26

The fact that Encolpius watches activity that is specifically sexual and the fact that he does this *per rimam* construct his gaze as erotic. His viewing also stimulates sexual activity. As has already been discussed,²⁸⁸ the word *rima* has sexual connotations, and so adds to the already erotic atmosphere. The vocabulary used emphasizes the dubious setting of this extract: the words *improbe* ('with a lack

²⁸⁸See p. 92.

of moral principle', 'shamelessly') and *libidinosa* ('wanton') in particular reflect this.²⁸⁹

Unlike the *rima* in the passage from Apuleius above, this chink is not a pre-existing one. Quartilla makes it *improbe*. Continuing the idea of the experience of the text as an erotic one, this wicked cutting of a hole in order to see through it into a private space stands for the reader's forceful entrance into the text, and the desire to see *everything*.

In a parallel passage to the one in Apuleius quoted above,²⁹⁰ in [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Onos* Lucius watches his host's wife transforming into a bird:

Κάπειδὴ ἑσπέρα ἦν, ἄγει με λαβοῦσα πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ δωματίου, ἔνθα ἐκεῖνοι ἐκάθευδον, καὶ κελεύει με προσάγειν ὀπῆ τινι τῆς θύρας λεπτῆ καὶ σκοπεῖν τὰ γινόμενα ἔνδον. ὄρῳ οὖν τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα ἀποδυομένην. . . εἶτα κιβώτιον ἄδρὸν ἀνοίξασα, πάνυ πολλὰς ἔχον πυξίδας ἐν αὐτῷ, ἔνθεν ἀναιρεῖται καὶ προφέρει μίαν· ἡ δὲ εἶχεν ἐμβεβλημένον ὅ τι μὲν οὐκ οἶδα, τῆς δὲ ὄψεως αὐτῆς ἔνεκα ἔλαιον αὐτὸ ἐδόκουν εἶναι. ἐκ τούτου λαβοῦσα χρίεται ὅλη, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνύχων ἀρξάμενη τῶν κάτω, καὶ ἄφνω πτερὰ ἐκφύεται αὐτῇ, καὶ ἡ ῥὶν κερατίνη καὶ γρυπὴ ἐγένετο. . .

And when it was evening, she took me and led me to the door of the bedroom in which they were sleeping, and told me to put my eye to a narrow crack in the door to view what was going on inside. I saw the lady taking off her clothes. . . then having opened a large box which had a great number of caskets in it, she then picked up and took out one of them. What it had in it, I do not know, though on account of its

²⁸⁹On the sexual scenes in the *Satyricon*, see Sullivan 1968, pp. 232–253. He argues that the sexual scenes can be used to create a psychoanalytical profile of the author's sexual preferences, or indeed Nero's; Zeitlin 1971 repr. 1999, pp. 23–24, n. 59 sees the sexual episodes as inversions of normal pornographic material because they contain a high level of sadism but a low level of satisfaction: "What should be a typical pornographic experience turns instead into failure, humiliation, and rejection. Most often, sex in the *Satyricon* is either a source of frustration or an assault upon an unwilling victim."; Gill argues that the sexual scenes are in keeping with the spectacle-centred nature of the rest of the novel (Gill 1973).

²⁹⁰See p. 91.

appearance I thought it was olive oil. She took some of this out and, starting with her toenails, she anointed herself all over, and suddenly she grew feathers, and her nose became horny and aquiline. . .

[Pseudo-]Lucian *Onos* 12

Just as in the passage from Apuleius, Lucius views the woman from a hidden position, which emphasizes the fact that he should not really be doing it. ὀπή has the same connotations as *rima*, and so gives this passage an erotic charge. Lucius watches Hipparchus' wife strip and then anoint herself with oil ὅλη (all over) in preparation to go and see a lover,²⁹¹ which again adds to the erotic backdrop. The reader's eyes follow her as she anoints herself. There is a fantasy here that is brought abruptly to a halt with καὶ ἄφνω πτερὰ ἐκφύεται αὐτῆ.

There are two more points in the *Onos* at which this sort of voyeuristic viewing through a crack in a closed door takes place. The first is at 47:

οἱ δὲ γενναιότατοι μέγαν με καὶ πίονα ὀρώντες καὶ τὰ κριθίδια μὴ δαπανώμενα, ἀλλ' ἐν ταύτῳ μέτρῳ ὄντα, εἰς ὑπόνοιαν ἔρχονται τῶν τολμημάτων τῶν ἐμῶν, καὶ προελθόντες ὡς εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον ἀπιόντες, ἔπειτα τὰς θύρας συγκλείσαντες, προσβαλόντες ὀπῆ τινα τὰ ὄμματα τῆς θύρας ἐσκοποῦντο τᾶνδον. κάγω τότε μηδὲν τοῦ δόλου εἰδὼς ἡρίστων προσελθὼν.

When these noble fellows saw that I was big and fat, and that the barley was not being used up, but stayed at the same level, they came to be suspicious of my daring deeds, and, leaving as if they were going to the baths, when they had closed the door they put their eyes to a crack in the door and looked inside. And then I, ignorant of their trick, approached my meal.

This passage not only shows this novel's interest in looking into private spaces again, but it also demonstrates the fact that private spaces can function as spaces

²⁹¹As noted in my discussion of the passage from Apuleius on p. 92.

of revelation: Lucius, albeit unknowingly, reveals to the characters (who were previously unaware of this fact, although the audience knew) that he has been eating all of their food. Food is for consumption, and in narrative can stand for the reader ‘eating’ the text and for the reader being overwhelmed by the ‘food’ of the text.²⁹²

Once again the viewers look through an ὀπή in a closed door, and even though what they are viewing is not erotic, given the way in which this word is used elsewhere in the text, it can be argued that this is eroticized viewing. The text therefore constructs the reader as someone who is viewing in an erotic way, *whether s/he wants to or is aware of it or not*.²⁹³

At the final point at which a private space is spied into in the *Onos*, Lucius is again the object of the gaze both of a character and the reader. At 51, Lucius has sex with a woman, whilst he is still in asinine form.²⁹⁴ This affair continues until Lucius’ keeper persuades his owner to watch them through a gap in the door:

καὶ ἐμοῦ μὴ εἰδότος ἄγει αὐτὸν ἐσπέρας ἤδη ἔνθα ἐκαθεύδομεν, καὶ
διὰ τινος ὀπῆς τῆς θύρας δείκνυσί με ἔνδον τῆ μείρακι συνευναζό-
μενον.

And unknown to me, when it was evening, he brought him to the place where we slept, and through a crack in the door showed me inside in bed with the lass.

52²⁹⁵

In this passage and the passage above, just as in the passages from Apuleius,²⁹⁶ Lucius (who is in his ‘private’ space) does not know that he is being viewed, which demonstrates that the representation of characters in private spaces maps out the

²⁹²Rimell 2002.

²⁹³This also happens in the passage involving food from the Latin version, quoted above on p. 94: the Latin says the viewers *rimantur*, which recalls *rima*.

²⁹⁴See p. 251 for further discussion of this passage within the context of female subjectivity.

²⁹⁵This passage is not included in the Apuleian version of the story.

²⁹⁶Discussed on pages 93 and 95.

state of being read, in that the characters in narrative are usually unaware that they are being read.

These two passages do not really conform to Laird's analysis that viewing through a gap in a door allows the narrator a chance to verify what it is he is telling the reader.²⁹⁷ Since it is Lucius who narrates the fact that he is inside the room, he knows what he was doing and how he felt. It is in fact a reversal of what has happened before. Lucius is telling the story of the people on the other side of the door while they are watching him. This demonstrates that space is used in the novel as a way of controlling the release of knowledge. In these passages the reader has the double satisfaction of already knowing what Lucius is up to, and then seeing the same information being released to characters within the narrative.

Whatever is inside an enclosed space ought to be concealed from those outside it, yet the novels make use of enclosed spaces to show the reader what s/he should not or would not ordinarily be able to see and this creates a paradox, a particularly interesting one in the case of an ego-narrator. In the novels, then, there is a tension between concealment and exposure which runs through the entire narrative, and is not limited to the treatment of spaces. The passages just discussed also show well the split character of the ego-narrator. The narrated-I is inside the room, whilst the narrating-I takes a step back and with hindsight describes the situation from both sides of the door, which deepens the paradox.

Spying on the heroine

As has been seen, viewing through a gap in a door (*rima* / ὀπή) is a common occurrence in the Latin novels, and in [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Onos*. This spying situation can also be found in the Greek novels. In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, Achaemenes (Cybele's son) views Charicleia through an ὀπή:

διακύψας διὰ τῶν ὀπῶν καθ' ὅς διενήνεκτο τῶν κλείθρων ἢ ἄλυσις
εἶδ' ἑ τε τὰ γινόμενα

²⁹⁷Discussed above, p. 92.

stooping to peep through the holes through which the chain of the bolts was fastened, he saw what was going on.

7.15.2

Achaemenes is struck with desire because of Charicleia's beauty, and tries to imagine what she would look like if she were not lamenting:

Τὴν μὲν δὴ Χαρίκλειαν παντάπασιν ἀγνοῶν ὅμως τοῦ κάλλους ὑπερ-
θαύμαζε καὶ τίς ἂν ὀφθείη καὶ ποία μὴ θρηνοῦσα ἐνενόει καὶ τὸ
θαῦμα λανθάνον εἰς ἐρωτικὸν πάθος αὐτὸν κατέφερε·

He had never seen Charicleia before, but he was very impressed with her beauty, and thought about what she would look like if she were not lamenting; and, unnoticed, admiration carried him towards love.

7.15.3

Charicleia would obviously look even more beautiful if she were not weeping and tearing her hair. As we have seen, viewing through an ὀπή sexualizes Achaemenes' viewing, and that of the reader focalizing through him. The reader is invited to fantasize as Achaemenes does: his trying to picture Charicleia's beauty leads the reader to try to imagine what Charicleia looks like. Achaemenes is linked still further with the reader of the novel as when Cybele gets back and catches him spying through the door, she asks: Τί πολυπραγμονεῖς, ὦ τέκνον; (What are you being so inquisitive about, my child? 7.16.1). As I have argued so far, the reader that the novels cultivate is one who is inquisitive: one who peers into enclosed spaces and pictures or imagines the events that take place. At this point the reader, focalizing through Achaemenes, is caught spying as well: the text turns the reader's image back on to him or her, asking him or her why s/he is being inquisitive, and making him or her reflect upon the fact that s/he is curious.

As Hunter notes,²⁹⁸ there is a 'spying' scene in *Apollonius King of Tyre*. Tarsia, Apollonius' daughter, has been sold to a brothel-keeper, and she manages to preserve her virginity by telling her life story to the men who come to be her clients.

²⁹⁸Hunter 2008a, p. 270.

Once they have heard and have been moved by her story, her first two clients watch her telling her story to other clients. They do this through a peep-hole, in much the same way as Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* and *Onos*, and Encolpius in the *Satyricon* do:

Illis expectantibus per occultum aspectum omnes, quicumque <in>ibant,
dantes singulos aureos plorantes abscedebant.

With them watching through a peep-hole, whoever went in, having given a single gold coin, came out weeping.

Apollonius King of Tyre Resc. A, 35

Hunter argues that the men who come to hear her, Athenagora and his companion, are in-text readers, and that their actions mirror the reader's experience of reading the text:

That these clients are one kind of potential reader of *Apollonius* is an idea that is written into the text. Athenagora and his friend, Tarsia's first two clients, subsequently conceal themselves to watch Tarsia 'perform' with others; such spying would normally have sexual activity as its object. . . , but here the two men, like we ourselves, are spying on an adventure narrative.²⁹⁹

Athenagora and his friend are actively watching Tarsia perform her narrative, just as the reader watches the narrative play out when he reads. They have chosen to watch (and hear) her repeating a story they have already heard, which could mean that they get something new out of it every time, thus mirroring the reader's experience of novels even more closely. They are also watching other in-text 'readers' 'reading' Tarsia's text, which has the potential to construct them as critics (analysing someone else's 'reading') or as double-spies (they are spying on Tarsia *and* her 'reader').

²⁹⁹Ibid., p. 270.

Listening at doors: Thisbe or Charicleia?

When Calasiris and Cnemon are staying at Nausicles' home Cnemon hears a woman lamenting, and thinks she is Thisbe (even though Thisbe is definitely dead³⁰⁰). He is in fact listening to Charicleia, whom Nausicles has taken back from Mitranes by pretending she is Thisbe. As discussed above,³⁰¹ Cnemon crucially only puts his ear to the gap in the door, and not his eye, as is usual in these situations:³⁰²

ἐπί τε τὸ δωμάτιον ὑπὸ τοῦ θρήνου χειραγωγούμενος ὥρμησε καὶ ταῖς
θύραις καθ' ὃ συνέπιπτον ἀλλήλαις τὸ οὔς παραθέμενος ἐπηκροᾶτο

Guided by her lamentation, he made haste to her room, where he placed
his ear to a crack between the doors and listened.

Heliodorus *Aethiopica* 5.2.6

This approach is unusual for Cnemon, since earlier in the novel he delights in the fact that Calasiris' description is so vivid that he is able both to see and hear the festival that Calasiris described in his narration. He has clearly not read his Herodotus, in which he would have found that ears are less trustworthy to men than their eyes: ὧτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν (*Histories* 1.8). If he had followed this advice then his knowledge would have been greater and more accurate, although it would perhaps have caused the narrative to short-circuit.

What he hears confirms for Cnemon that it is indeed Thisbe who is in the room. The girl talks about being a slave, about being kept in the robbers' cave, and about having a lover. Crucially, for Cnemon, she also says that her lover wept for her as if she were dead even though she was still alive (ἐκεῖ με καὶ ζῶσαν ἐθρήνησε καὶ τεθνεῶσαν, ὡς ᾤετο, ἐδάκρυσεν, ὡς ἀνηρημένην ἐπένηθεν· 5.2.9). All of these

³⁰⁰Though heroines in novels do have a tendency to come back to life again, and Thisbe does look and (apparently) sound like Charicleia, and her story was for a while on the same trajectory.

³⁰¹See p. 54.

³⁰²See [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Onos*, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Petronius' *Satyricon*.

details are true of both Charicleia and Thisbe, so it is therefore possible to be convinced, as Cnemon is, that the girl is Thisbe. To add to the confusion, she then proceeds to call herself Thisbe: *θεάσαιό ποτε Θίσβην τὴν σὴν· τοῦτο γάρ με καλέσεις καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος* (2.5.10). However, clues are left for a reader who reads in more depth than Cnemon does. For example, he does not stop to consider what the girl means by *τοῦτο γάρ με καλέσεις καὶ μὴ βουλόμενος* ('you will call me [Thisbe] even though you do not wish to'), which makes little sense in relation to Thisbe herself. The narrator says that Cnemon was not sure to begin with, but by the end of the speech he is convinced that the girl is Thisbe. If he had listened more carefully to the entire speech, then perhaps he would not have jumped to the conclusion that this girl must be Thisbe when the more logical conclusion is that she is Charicleia, whom he knows to be alive.

Cnemon gets the wrong impression because he does not 'read' the situation as carefully or in as great a depth as a reader of a novel (particularly this one) should. Since Charicleia does look like Thisbe, though, it might not have made any difference if he had applied his eye to the gap in the door. It is implied that the similarity between even their voices is very striking, since even Cnemon himself does not believe it is Thisbe to begin with, but is clearly convinced it is when he listens to her speaking. Just before this episode of eavesdropping he is less quick to believe the girl is Thisbe:

“Οὐ μὴ μανῶ” πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κνήμων “Θίσβην ὅτι περίεστιν ἀκηκοώς;”

‘Surely I am mad’ Cnemon said to him “if I have heard that Thisbe is still alive?”

5.2.2

His first reaction is that he must surely be mad if he has heard that Thisbe is alive,³⁰³ since he knows that she is not, because he saw her body:

³⁰³Similarly, in Phlegon of Tralles' *Mirabilia* Charito accuses the nurse of being mad when she reports that she has seen Philinnion even though the girl is dead (1.3).

“ἐκείνην δὲ ἀνηρημένην τούτοις ἐγὼ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐγνώρισα καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βουκόλοις χερσὶ ταυταισὶ ταῖς ἐμαῖς κατέθαψα.”

“I recognized her lifeless body with these eyes, and I buried her on the herdsmen’s island with these hands of mine.”

5.2.3

The fact that Thisbe is dead, and that Cnemon definitely bore witness to this fact is strengthened by τούτοις ἐγὼ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς and χερσὶ ταυταισὶ ταῖς ἐμαῖς. This is not just something he just heard about, but he actually took part in her discovery and burial: he was a first-hand witness and can verify the facts. And yet his curiosity is stirred by this mystery, to the point that he cannot sleep, so he goes to investigate:

“ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν βίωην εἰ μὴ θάπτον ὑπεξελθὼν τρόπον ὄντινα δὴ πολυπραγμονήσαιμι τίς ποτε πλάνη τὸν Ναυσικλέα κατείληφεν ἢ ὅπως παρὰ μόνους Αἰγυπτίους οἱ τεθνεῶτες ἀναβιοῦσιν.”

“I shall not in any way be able to live if I do not slip out quickly and find out in some way whatever this delusion might be that has taken hold of Nausicles, or how the dead come back to life only among the Egyptians.”

5.2.4

There is an irony here, in that Cnemon’s object here is to πολυπραγμονεῖν — to discover what is going on —, yet when he is listening at the door, he does not take full advantage of his position to ascertain the truth. Cnemon believes Nausicles has been taken in by a πλάνη, which deepens the irony since he then falls victim to the very same πλάνη, whereas Nausicles knows exactly what he is doing, and that Charicleia is not Thisbe. There is a further level of irony since Cnemon already knows that Thisbe and Charicleia can be mistaken for one another, as this is exactly what happened in the cave when he and Theagenes found Thisbe’s body;

in fact it was Cnemon who said the body was Charicleia's in the first place, and he who then re-identified it as Thisbe. He should therefore know that it is easy to make this confusion between them. The word *πλάνη* is worthy of note in this context, since it means both 'a travelling' and 'a going astray', in the sense of an error. The *Aethiopica's* plot is based heavily on travel, and it also leads its readers astray, suggesting different possible narratives.

The fact that Cnemon does not read this episode correctly is indicative of the fact that he will not make it to the end of the narrative: his ability as a reader falls short of that of the extradiegetic reader.

Opening narrative doors

So far, the focus has been upon cracks in doors. Now, doors will be opened: this section will concentrate on how the opening and closing of doors can play a significant role in leading characters and the reader through the text in a process of discovery. In the section following this one, 'Reading interiors' (p. 125 ff.), the focus will be upon forceful entrance into enclosed spaces.

When Theagenes and Charicleia beg Cnemon to tell them his story he responds with *τί ταῦτα κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις; τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τῶν τραγῳδῶν*. ('Why do you stir up and force open these things, to quote from the tragedians?'" 1.8.7).

Firstly, by mentioning Tragedy and quoting a line from Euripides' *Medea*,³⁰⁴ the Athens in which Cnemon locates this private tragedy is Classical Athens,³⁰⁵ a perfect setting for the wicked stepmother who is found in this tale.³⁰⁶ The novel alludes not just to a myth, but specifically to (Athenian) performance. Theatrical

³⁰⁴E. *Med.* 1317.

³⁰⁵The novel is set some time in the late sixth to early fifth century BC, but there are some anachronisms (Morgan 1989, p. 350).

³⁰⁶The theme of the wicked (and/or amorous) stepmother was a popular one in Greek myth. Although there is no evidence for the 'amorous stepmother' in Classical Athens itself, stepmothers were a common phenomenon and often appear as the scapegoats in legal cases, particularly inheritance disputes: Watson 1995, pp. 20–91 and 211. See also Trenkner 1958, pp. 64–66.

vocabulary is used often in this novel,³⁰⁷ and serves as a reminder that, whilst Tragedy must stay outside the doors of the house, novels are able to venture (and encourage their readers to venture) wherever they please. Athens is also the perfect location for a trial. In Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* Theron is reluctant to sell Callirhoe in Athens, as his crew suggests he should:

μόνοι γὰρ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν Ἀθηναίων;
δῆμός ἐστι λάλος καὶ φιλόδικος. . .

Are you the only people who have not heard about the nosiness of the Athenians? They are a people who gossip and they are fond of justice. . .

1.11.6

Since the Athenians are φιλόδικος there is no surprise that a trial forms part of Cnemon's story.³⁰⁸

Secondly, the allusion to the Medea functions on a deeper level. When Medea says the line that Cnemon imitates here (l. 1317) it includes the word πύλη (gate /door): τί τάσδε κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις πύλας. The allusion in the *Aethiopica*, although it does not mention doors, still suggests that 'reading' Cnemon's narrative is like opening a door on to a situation, and Morgan's translation of the phrase picks up on this: "Why do you batter and prize open these doors. . . ?"³⁰⁹ *Mochloi* (crowbars) are used to break into Callirhoe's tomb (Chariton *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 1.9.3). The pirates batter down the doors of the tomb, enabling the reader to get at both Callirhoe and *Callirhoe*. The verb used here in Heliodorus suggests that Cnemon's narrative, and by extension the novel itself, is something that can be prised or forced open. The phrase therefore reflects upon the curious reader of the text of the *Aethiopica* as a whole: s/he too is invited to force open the doors of the

³⁰⁷See Walden's survey of stage terms (Walden 1894) and, most recently on this topic, Morgan 2012a, pp. 574–575.

³⁰⁸There is also no surprise that Cnemon the Athenian is so curious about Calasiris' story, since the Athenians are renowned for their curiosity. See above, p. 15.

³⁰⁹Morgan 1989, p. 359.

narrative, just as Theagenes and Charicleia are accused of doing to Cnemon's narrative. The reader of this text and of Cnemon's story certainly will get to see what goes on behind closed doors, something which the audience of Tragedy does not get to see. The novel goes further inside the door than Tragedy — all the domestic affairs take place off-stage in Tragedy, whereas the reader is able to see into the drama in Cnemon's story even though it is a domestic one.

Spatial dynamics: how to create a narrative

The fact that Cnemon's phrase at the beginning of his narration suggests he has doors in mind becomes more striking when the rest of his story is taken into account, since doors play a particularly important role at the crux of his narrative.

Cnemon tells the story of why he was exiled from Athens. His step-mother Demaenete had been plotting revenge against him, because he refused to accept her advances, and as part of this plot she has got the slave-girl Thisbe to persuade Cnemon that she (Demaenete) is having an affair. Cnemon is understandably cross on behalf of his father and asks Thisbe to prove it to him. Thisbe comes to him in the night and says that the adulterer is in the house: τὸν μοιχὸν ἔνδον εἶναι κατεμήνυε (1.12.1).

The doors to Demaenete's bedroom are closed and Cnemon bursts in:

Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπέστην, λύχνου τέ τινος ἔνδοθεν ἀύγῃ διεξέπιπτε καὶ τὰς θύρας ἐπικειμένους ὡς ὀργῆς εἶχον ἐρραγεῖς ἀνοίγω, καὶ εἰσδραμῶν “ποῦ ποτε ὁ ἀλιτήριος” ἐβόων “ὁ λαμπρὸς τῆς πάντα σωφροσύνης ἐρώμενος;” καὶ ἄμα λέγων ἐπήειν ὡς ἄμφω διαχειρισόμενος.

When I got there, the glow of a lamp inside filtered out, and the doors were closed, but since I was angry I burst them open and ran into the room, shouting, “Where is he, this sinner, this shining beloved of that

lady, chaste in every way?” And with these words I stepped forward to slay them both.

1.12.2

Cnemon does not know the truth about the situation when he is outside the room. The truth is that there is no adulterer, and his father Aristippus is in bed with Demaenete. The only way Cnemon learns this truth is by opening the door and running into the room. Thisbe has disappeared, but after Cnemon has been exiled she seemingly regrets what she has done.³¹⁰ Therefore she promises to demonstrate to Aristippus that Demaenete has been meeting with an adulterer in a stranger’s house:

“ἐπιδείξω γάρ σοι τήμερον ἅμα τῷ μοιχῷ τὴν Δημαινέτην ἐν οἰκίᾳ καὶ ταῦτα ἄλλοτρία ἐκτὸς τοῦ ἄστεος κατακεκλιμένην.”

“Today I shall show you Demaenete in bed together with her lover in a house — and not even in her house — outside the town.”

1.16.4

That is, Thisbe is promising to provide Aristippus with knowledge, and it is very specific knowledge that is tied to a specific domestic interior space. The way in which she orchestrates the scene that follows is particularly interesting in terms of how she uses space to create a fiction:

αὐτὴ δὲ προλαβοῦσα παρεκάλει τὴν Ἄρσινόην εἰς ἕτερον μεταστῆ-
ναι δωμάτιον καὶ σχολὴν αὐτῇ παρασχεῖν· ἐρυθριᾶν γὰρ ἔφη τὸ
μειράκιον ἄρτι τῶν Ἄφροδίτης μούμενον. Τῆς δὲ πεισθείσης ἐπαν-
ελθοῦσα παραλαμβάνει τὴν Δημαινέτην καὶ εἰσαγαγοῦσα κατακ-
λίνει τε καὶ τὸν λύχνον ἀφαιρεῖ τοῦ μὴ γνωρισθῆναι αὐτὴν παρὰ

³¹⁰She is actually covering her own back because she fears both that she will be found out for being complicit in Demaenete’s plot, and that Demaenete is beginning to plot against her.

σοῦ δῆθεν τοῦ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ διάγοντος. Καὶ σιωπῶσαν πληροῦν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν παρεγγυήσασα “ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν νεανίαν ἄπειμι” φησὶ “καὶ ἤξω σοι φέρουσα. πίνει δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἐν γειτόνων.” Καὶ ὑπεξελθοῦσα τὸν Ἀρίστιππον ἔνθα προεΐρητο καταλαμβάνει, καὶ δεσμεῖν ἐπιστάντα τὸν μοιχὸν ἤπειγεν· ὁ δὲ εἶπετο καὶ ἐπιστὰς εἰστρέχει τε εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον καὶ τὴν κλίνην πρὸς μικρὰν τῆς σεληναίας αὐγὴν χαλεπῶς ἀνευρὼν “ἔχω σε” εἶπεν “ὦ θεοῖς ἐχθρά.”

She went on ahead to ask Arsinoe to depart into another room to provide her with quiet: for the young man was embarrassed, she said, since he was even now being initiated into the mysteries of Aphrodite. When Arsinoe had been persuaded, Thisbe returned and fetched Demaenete, and having led her inside she laid her down on the bed and removed the lamp so that she would not be recognized by you, although really you were in Aegina. And when she had promised to fulfil her desire in silence, Thisbe said: “I am going to the young man, and I shall bring him to you. He is currently drinking in a neighbour’s house.” She went out secretly and found Aristippus in the agreed place and urged him to catch the adulterer in the act and detain him; so he followed her and ran suddenly into the room and finding the bed with difficulty in the faint light of the moon, he said “I have you, curse you!”

1.17.2–3

Every single actor in this passage has to start in a different physical space in order to make the fiction work, and each one has been set up with a different story. Arsinoe is banished to another room so she cannot see what is going on, and believes that Thisbe is entertaining a shy young man. Demaenete is installed in Thisbe’s bedroom, believing she is going to sleep with Cnemon who is now Arsinoe’s lover (and Cnemon, who is fictionally currently drinking at the house of a neighbour, is to believe (fictionally) that he is sleeping with Arsinoe, except in reality he knows nothing of this, is at this stage in Aegina, and is not Arsinoe’s lover). Finally, Aristippus is in the garden where the monument of the Epicureans

stands, and believes he is going to catch Demaenete with her ‘lover’. By moving each person at the right time Thisbe can make each of them believe in the story she has spun them.

Just like Cnemon, Aristippus learns the ‘truth’ when he enters the bedroom (εἰστρέχει τε εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον). However, this ‘truth’ is in fact fiction: there is no lover. All the same, he does at this point learn the overall truth, that Demaenete is untrustworthy and a schemer, even if the method by which he learns it is a set up in the dark. Thisbe takes advantage of the interior nature of the space that she, Aristippus, and Demaenete are in one final time to make sure the outcome of the drama is the one she wants:

τάς τε θύρας ὡς ὅτι πλεῖστον ἐψόφησε καὶ “ὦ τῆς ἀτοπίας, διαδέ-
δρακεν ἡμᾶς ὁ μοιχός” ἀνεβόησε

She slammed the doors as loudly as possible and shouted: “What a disaster! The adulterer has got away!”

1.17.4

Aristippus only has Thisbe’s word for this: the closed doors, as well as creating a dramatic scene, prevent him leaving the room in order to chase the (imaginary) lover.

Thisbe manipulates the narrative through her use of space as a tool to withhold and put forward information as she stage-manages this whole episode to ensure that her audience ‘reads’ it in the right way. Novelists manage spaces to lead the reader through the text in the same way. What is interesting about this episode is that the reader (and the in-text ‘readers’ Theagenes and Charicleia) already knows what is going on: s/he is kept in the know every step of the way. It is the characters in the fiction who are led through the story and duped by means of Thisbe’s spatial choreography. This makes it ironic, and even surprising, that such an expert manipulator of space falls foul of a space-plot laid against her. She dies simply because she is in the wrong place at the wrong time, indeed in a space in

which it is very difficult to maintain control: a labyrinth (2.4–5).

Similar themes and similar use of space to create a narrative can be found in one of the Athenian law cases: Lysias 1 (*On the murder of Eratosthenes*). Although this speech postdates the time when the novel is set, just as the *Medea* does, it is nevertheless fruitful to compare the way in which interior space and doors are employed to guide the reader of the text.

Interior space and particularly the opening and closing of doors on to an interior space play an important role in the discovery of an act of adultery that has actually taken place. Euphiletus explains how he came to know of his wife's adultery. Apparently her quarters were downstairs in his house, so that she could attend to the baby in the middle of the night. One night when her lover comes to the house, she locks her husband in his quarters:

ἀπιούσα προστίθησι τὴν θύραν, προσποιουμένη παίζειν, καὶ τὴν κλεῖν ἐφέλκεται.

As she left she closed the door, pretending she was joking, and drew the bolt across.

13

Euphiletus actually hears his wife's lover arriving and leaving, but thinks nothing of it, as he does not know about him, so at the time cannot put what he hears together with what he knows; and his wife covers up what was actually happening with a story about the baby's lamp:

ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἦν πρὸς ἡμέραν, ἦκεν ἐκείνη καὶ τὴν θύραν ἀνέωξεν. ἐρομένου δέ μου τί αἱ θύραι νύκτωρ ψοφοῖεν, ἔφασκε τὸν λύχνον ἀποσβεσθῆναι τὸν παρὰ τῷ παιδίῳ, εἶτα ἐκ τῶν γειτόνων ἐνάψασθαι.

When it was dawn my wife came back and opened the door. When I asked why the doors had made a noise in the night, she said that the

lamp near the baby had gone out, and so she had got a light from the neighbours.

14

The narrative that is implicit here is one constructed around doors. Euphiletus is locked in his room: he has no knowledge of what is happening in his house because he has been effectively removed from it. The noise that the doors make is significant, as it signals the arrival of the adulterer into the house (a transgression of a boundary, which also stands for the adultery about to take place) and (presumably) his leaving again. It is this noise of the doors, and the fact that he was locked in, that Euphiletus remembers when someone suggests to him that his wife has a lover:

καὶ μεστὸς ἦν ὑποψίας, ἐνθυμούμενος μὲν ὡς ἀπεκλήσθην ἐν τῷ
 δωματίῳ, ἀναμιμνησκόμενος δὲ ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐψόφει ἡ
 μέταυλος θύρα καὶ ἡ αὐλειος, ὃ οὐδέποτε ἐγένετο, ἔδοξέ τέ μοι ἡ
 γυνὴ ἐψιμυθιῶσθαι.

I was full of suspicion as I reflected on how I was locked in my room, remembering that on that night the inner and outer doors made a noise (which had never happened) and I had thought my wife was wearing makeup.

17

The creaking of the inner and outer doors (the audience is given more detail this time), and that fact that he was locked in for the night are the first things on his list of evidence. The fact that his wife is wearing makeup seems to come second to these, as if it is not quite as relevant; indeed he only thinks that she was, or she seemed to him to be wearing makeup, but he is certain about the noisy doors. Euphiletus enlists the help of a slave-girl in finding out what his wife has been up to:

ἐπειδὴ δὲ πάντα εἴρητο αὐτῇ, εἶπον ἐγώ, “ὅπως τοίνυν ταῦτα μηδεὶς ἀνθρώπων πεύσεται· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐδὲν σοι κύριον ἔσται τῶν πρὸς ἔμ’ ὠμολογημένων. ἀξιῶ δέ σε ἐπ’ αὐτοφώρῳ ταῦτά μοι ἐπιδείξαι· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδὲν δέομαι λόγων, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔργον φανερὸν γενέσθαι, εἴπερ οὕτως ἔχει”.

When she had told me everything, I said, “Now let no-one else find out about these things; otherwise, your agreement with me will be worth nothing. I expect you to show me them in the act. For I do not need words, but clear proof whether that is how it is.”

21

This passage resonates with Thisbe’s two offers in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*, that she will show Cnemon his step-mother’s adulterer and that she will show Aristippus his wife and her lover, after explaining to him the ‘full story’. Both texts involve a slave-girl leading her master to a situation where he will enter a room and discover an act of adultery against him. Except, of course, in the *Aethiopica* there is no adulterer. It is useful here to compare Palaestra leading Lucius to spy on Hipparchus’ wife through the crack in the door. As Lucius himself says, slaves know everything: δοῦλοι γὰρ ἐπίστανται καὶ καλὰ καὶ αἰσχρὰ (*Onos* 5). It is also interesting that the adulterer in Lysias 1 seduces the wife by propositioning the slave-girl first, which finds a comparison in Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (1.4). Similar complicity of slaves can also be found in the *Phoenicica* (A.2 Recto 7–15) and the *Babyloniaca* (Suda 1.9.24).

The slave girl becomes very important in Euphiletus’ ensuing narrative, as she is the one who has left the door open in order to allow Euphiletus and his mob to enter the house:

καὶ δαΐδας λαβόντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐγγύτατα καπηλείου εἰσερχόμεθα, ἀνεωιγμένης τῆς θύρας καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνθρώπου παρεσκευασμένης. ὥσαντες δὲ τὴν θύραν τοῦ δωματίου οἱ μὲν πρῶτοι εἰσιόντες ἔτι εἶδομεν αὐτὸν

κατακείμενον παρὰ τῆι γυναικί, οἱ δ' ὕστερον ἐν τῆι κλίνῃ γυμνὸν ἔστηκότα.

We took torches from the nearest inn, and entered, since the door had been opened in preparation by the girl. Having pushed open the door of the bedroom, those of us who entered first saw him still lying next to my wife; and those who came in later saw him standing naked on the bed.

24

Just as Cnemon and Aristippus do in the *Aethiopica*, Euphiletus pushes open the door and rushes into the room. Each time, the verb of movement into (εἰσ-) somewhere highlights the penetration into the room in question: εἰσδραμὼν (*Aeth.* 1.12.2) εἰστρέχει (*Aeth.* 1.17.3) εἰσερχόμεθα and εἰσιόντες (*Lysias* 1.24).

Euphiletus has no idea what has been going on, although he is encouraged to suspect, and learns the truth only when he enters his wife's room and finds the adulterer. The many times doors are mentioned draws attention to the relationship between space and knowledge in this text. The 'readers' of this text³¹¹ are led into Euphiletus' house, into the most private part of it — the women's quarters. Reading the text is like a journey of discovery, with the doors facilitating this discovery.

When the adulterer visits and Euphiletus is locked in his bedroom, the reader is essentially locked in with him — all s/he knows is what Euphiletus is doing and what he can hear. The reader therefore focalizes through Euphiletus, and is in his situation, which means that s/he is complicit in his entering into his wife's bedroom with a mob and discovering the adulterer. Making sure that the jury focalizes through Euphiletus means that they can only see the story from his perspective and are on his side. It is pertinent that Euphiletus wants visual proof and does not want to rely simply on rumour (ἀξιῶ δέ σε ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ ταῦτά μοι ἐπιδειξάι· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδὲν δέομαι λόγων, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔργον φανερὸν γενέσθαι,

³¹¹These include the jury at the trial.

Lysias 1.21). Offering visual proof lends truth to his account (he actually saw it, therefore it actually happened)³¹² and confirms events for the jury, which means they will be more likely to take his side.

There is something else at stake here too: that an adulterer enters a citizen's house and (more importantly) wife's room means he is getting to the very heart of an Athenian household: the room where the conception of legal Athenian citizens happens. Euphiletus says that his wife had had a son, so he has begun to trust her (ἐπειδὴ δέ μοι παιδίον γίγνεται, ἐπίστευον, 6), which turns out to be his undoing. In Chariton's novel Callirhoe is not allowed to go with Chaereas to visit his father, since according to customs as a new bride she is not allowed out of the house until she has borne Chaereas a son.³¹³ This custom is founded on the concern about the violation of a citizen's wife, and by extension his household. The same concerns permeate Cnemon's story in the *Aethiopica*: if there is an adulterer, then how can Aristippus know if any potential children are his or not? The truth about the bedroom is the central anxiety of patriarchal society.

Discovery and verification

In Phlegon of Tralles' *Mirabilia*, different spaces stand for different levels of knowledge, and various levels of validation and verification of that knowledge, in a similar way to the spaces discussed above. A girl comes back from the dead to spend the night with the young male guest at her parents' house. The nurse views the couple through a door. Because the beginning of the text is lost it is unclear whether there is a gap in the door, or between the doors, as in other 'spying' passages, or if she is just looking through a slightly open door:

<...> εἰς τὸν ξενῶνα προσπορεύεται ταῖς θύραις, καὶ καιομένου τοῦ
λύχνου καθημένην <ε>ἶδεν τὴν ἄνθρωπον παρὰ τῷ Μαχάτῃ.

³¹²See above, p. 92.

³¹³Reardon 1989, p. 25 n. 11.

She went to the doors of the guest-room, and since the lamp was burning she saw the girl sitting by Machates.

1.1

The fact that the first person to witness this is a nurse is reminiscent of other situations in which slaves have knowledge that the family does not, for example Palaestra, Photis, Thisbe, and the slave-girl in Lysias 1. Philinnion's mother comes to look later on, and cannot believe it, even though she is now able to see what the nurse reported for herself:

ἀνακύψασα δ' οὖν ἡ μήτηρ τὰ μὲν ἱμάτια καὶ τὸν τύπον τῆς ὄψεως ἐνόμιζεν ἐπιγινώσκειν, τὴν δὲ ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάσαι κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον δυναμένη, τὴν ἡσυχίαν ὤετο δεῖν ἔχειν·

Therefore her mother peered in and thought she recognized her clothes and the appearance of her face, but since she was in no way able to discern the truth she decided it was necessary to remain silent.

1.5

The next day Philinnion's parents make Machates promise to tell them next time she visits, and he does. The girl cannot return again after she has been seen by them, as she herself says:

“ὦ μήτηρ καὶ πάτερ, ὡς ἀδίκως ἐφθονήσατέ μοι μετὰ τοῦ ξένου ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας γενέσθαι ἐν τῇ πατρῷα οἰκίᾳ λυποῦσαν οὐδέν. τοιγαροῦν ὑμεῖς μὲν πενθήσετε ἐξ ἀρχῆς διὰ τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην, ἐγὼ δὲ ἄπειμι πάλιν εἰς τὸν διατεταγμένον τόπον· οὐ γὰρ ἄνευ θείας βουλήσεως ἦλθον εἰς ταῦτα.”

“O mother and father, how unjustly you grudged my being with the guest for three days in my father's house, not doing anyone any harm. For this reason you will grieve all over again because of your curiosity,

and I will go back to the place arranged for me; for it was not without divine will that I came here.”

1.11

More importantly, she cannot come back because of their *polypragmosunē*, by which she evidently means their prying into the private affairs of their guest. The reader, by taking part in this *polypragmosunē*, focalizing through Philinnion’s parents, is complicit in her eventual demise.

The news about Philinnion quickly spreads, and people gather in the Assembly. Along with the others, the narrator wants to learn the truth, so he goes to her tomb:

ἀνοιχθείσης δὲ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν τῆς καμάρας, εἰς ἣν πάντες οἱ οἰκεῖοι μεταλλάσσοντες ἐτίθεντο, ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων κλινῶν ἐφάνη τὰ σώματα κείμενα, τῶν δὲ παλαιότερον τετελευτηκότων τὰ ὀστᾶ, ἐπὶ μόνῃς δὲ ἥς ἡ Φιλίννιον ἐτέθη καὶ συνέβη ταφῆναι εὔρομεν ἐπικείμενον τὸν δακτύλιον τὸν σιδηροῦν, ὃς ἦν τοῦ ξένου, καὶ τὸ χρυσόκλυστον ποτήριον, ὅπερ ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ Μαχάτου τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν.

When we had opened the chamber into which all the deceased family members had been placed, bodies were seen lying on the other biers, and the bones of those who had died longer ago, but on the one on which Philinnion had been placed to be buried we found lying there only the iron ring, which belonged to the guest, and the gilded wine-cup, which she had taken from Machates on the first day.

1.15

Absolute verification of the truth seems, in this text, to take place in interior spaces: first the bedroom, then the tomb, then the bedroom again. It is only by going to the scene of the crime, as it were, that what has taken place can be fully verified. After they have seen the facts, the people who return to the Assembly

seem confused: no-one is able to form a coherent picture of events even though everyone saw that the tomb was empty and that the dead girl was in the guest room at her parents' house. When they were in these two places, events seemed much clearer.

This is all reported in a letter, a fact which is only learnt at the very end when the letter is signed, since the beginning of the text is lost. The opening of the doors to the tomb to 'read' the situation inside mirrors the act of the recipient of the letter who has to open the tablet on which it is inscribed. The fact that the 'ghost-story' appears in a letter has implications on the level of play between truth and fiction — it is made more believable because it has been written down not simply reported orally.³¹⁴ Indeed the writer says that if the letter's recipient wishes to write to the King about these events, he can send him one of the people who examined the case in detail (ἵνα καὶ τῶν σωμάτων τινὰ τῶν ἱστορούντων τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐξαποστείλω σοι. 1.18). Presumably this person would be one of those who went to the tomb with the narrator, one of those who opened the door of the tomb and 'read' what he saw there. In writing his experience down to send to someone, framing it using space, and providing additional witnesses, the writer of this letter asserts the truth-value of what he says.

Doors and interior space used to verify truth play an important role in the virginity test that is found in book eight of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. A priest explains that at the back of the temple of Artemis there is a grove, and in the grove there is a cave in which hangs a set of panpipes. These panpipes are a little way inside the doors of the cave: ἀνάκειται δὲ σύριγξ ὀλίγον ἔνδον τῶν τοῦ σπηλαίου θυρῶν (8.6.1).

The way the test works is this:

ὅταν οὖν αἰτίαν ἔχη τις οὐκ εἶναι παρθένος, προπέμπει μὲν αὐτὴν ὁ δῆμος μέχρι τῶν τοῦ σπηλαίου θυρῶν, δικάζει δὲ ἡ σύριγξ τὴν δίκην. ἡ μὲν γὰρ παῖς εἰσέρχεται κεκοσμημένη στολῆ τῇ νενομισμένη, ἄλλος

³¹⁴The truth-value of the epistolary form is discussed by John Morgan in a forthcoming article (Morgan Forthcoming).

δὲ ἐπικλείει τὰς τοῦ σπηλαίου θύρας. κἄν μὲν ἦ παρθένος, λιγυρόν τι μέλος ἀκούεται καὶ ἔνθεον, ἦτοι τοῦ τόπου πνεῦμα ἔχοντος μουσικὸν εἰς τὴν σύριγγα τεταμιευμένον, ἢ τάχα καὶ ὁ Πάν αὐτὸς αὐλεῖ. μετὰ δὲ μικρὸν αὐτόματα μὲν αἱ θύραι ἀνεώχθησαν τοῦ σπηλαίου, ἐκφαίνεται δὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐστεφανωμένη τὴν κεφαλὴν πίτυος κόμαις.

Whenever someone is accused of not being a virgin, the people escort her up to the doors of the cave, and the panpipes give judgement. The girl enters adorned in the customary attire, and someone else shuts the doors of the cave. If she is a virgin, a sweet and inspired melody is heard – either the place has musical breath that controls the syrinx or perhaps it is even Pan himself playing. After a while the doors of the cave are opened of their own accord, and the virgin appears with her head garlanded with sprigs of pine.

8.6.12–13

The doors of the cave are mentioned three times in short succession, which indicates that they are important to the ritual. What happens inside the cave is not seen by anyone, and if the girl is found not to be a virgin she disappears without a trace. When Leucippe is sent into the cave Cleitophon worries that she is behind closed doors with no means of escape: σὲ δὲ καὶ εἴσω θυρῶν ἀπεκλείσαμεν ὡς ἐν πολιορκίᾳ, ἴνα, κἄν διώκη, μὴ δύνῃ φυγεῖν (8.13.3). When she comes out of the cave after this test, the doors are once again mentioned: καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνεφγμένας εἶδομεν τὰς θύρας (8.14.1). The doors act as a way of engaging the reader's curiosity: there is something happening behind those closed doors, but what is it, and (how) can the reader find out?

Leucippe is shut inside an interior space to find out what has been happening inside her. The doors here remind the reader of the dream Cleitophon reports at 4.1.6–7 in which he cannot enter the temple of Aphrodite because the doors are shut: κλεισθῆναι τὰς θύρας. Both sets of doors stand for Leucippe,³¹⁵ and this ties in with novel's obsession with getting inside her, but crucially what actually

³¹⁵Although see Morales 2004, pp. 221–222 who argues that the dream refers to Melite.

happens during the virginity test is not witnessed by anyone, which highlights the inscrutability of the novelistic heroines. This once again leads to reader fantasy or collaboration with the text, which in turn brings the reader to realize that s/he is being inquisitive.

‘The doors made a noise’

In *On the murder of Eratosthenes* one of the things that makes Euphiletus suspicious is that he remembers that on the night the adulterer came to the house the doors made a noise as the adulterer arrived and left: ἐψόφει ἡ μέταυλος θύρα καὶ ἡ αὐλειος (17). The noise that the doors make signifies that there is someone present, and this theme can also be found in the novels.

When Theagenes and Charicleia are under house-arrest in Arsace’s palace and are lamenting the death of Calasiris and their plight, the noise made by the doors signals Cybele’s entrance into the room in which they are being kept:

Ἡ δὲ Κυβέλη πρὸς τοὺς νέους εἰσδραμοῦσα ἴχνη τῶν θρήνων κατελάμβανε· πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ψόφον τῶν θυρῶν ἀνοιγομένων κατέστελλον μὲν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ πρὸς τὸ σύνηθες σχῆμα καὶ βλέμμα διαπλάττειν ἔσπευδον· οὐ μὴν ἔλαθόν γε τὴν πρεσβῦτιν, τῶν δακρύων ἔτι τοῖς ὄμμασιν ἐπιπλανωμένων.

As Cybele rushed in towards the young couple, she found the marks of their sorrow; for although at the sound of the doors as they opened they began to arrange themselves and hurried to feign a usual appearance and countenance, they did not escape the notice of the old woman, since their eyes were still full of tears.

7.17.1

The noise of the doors opening alerts Theagenes and Charicleia to the fact that Cybele is entering the room; conversely, they are unable to hide the truth (that they have been crying) from Cybele, because she is now in the room with them.

In Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* the noise of doors announces the arrival of Leucippe's mother when Cleitophon has entered Leucippe's bedroom:

ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ τὸν ψόφον ἀκούσας ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν, εὐθὺς ἀνεπήδησα· ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην παρῆν.

I heard the noise of the doors opening and immediately leapt up, but she was already at the bed.

2.23.6

Once again, the warning created by the noise the doors make does not do much to help the couple beyond signalling the presence of someone else in the room. Although Cleitophon does escape and Pantheia does not know who it was who was in bed with her daughter, he still feels compelled to flee Tyre, and Leucippe receives a fierce reprimand from her mother.

The doors in these passages function as vehicles of access to knowledge, or facilitators of knowledge: the people inside the interior space are alerted to the fact that someone is entering the space by the sound — the *ψόφος* — of the door, and the person who comes through the door discovers what is going on inside the interior space. The reader already knows what is going on inside and outside, and this demonstrates the double focalization that is common in the novels: the reader knows more than the characters because s/he occupies a liminal position.³¹⁶

Reading interiors

There are various points in the Greek novels at which characters enter spaces which they should not. This transgression of interiors by characters traces the action of the reader of a novel: s/he too is entering a space in which s/he does not belong, a world which s/he does not inhabit. I shall begin by discussing tombs and women's quarters. The reason I shall concentrate on these is that they are by their very natures spaces that imply a transgression when certain people enter them.

³¹⁶See Whitmarsh 2011, p. 190. and below, p. 135 ff.

Tombs

Here I shall discuss the tombs into which Anthia (in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*) and Callirhoe (in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*) are placed whilst actually still alive. Callirhoe is kicked in the stomach by Chaereas, falls unconscious, and is presumed to be dead. Separated from Habrocomes and faced with marriage to someone else, Anthia takes what she thinks is poison, but which turns out to be a sleeping potion. Having been buried alive, both women are subsequently captured by pirates who break into their tombs looking for treasure.³¹⁷

Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ νυκτὸς ἐπιγενομένης λησταί τινες μαθόντες ὅτι κόρη τέθαπται πλουσίως, καὶ πολὺς μὲν αὐτῇ κόσμος συγκατάκειται γυναικεῖος, πολὺς δὲ ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον καὶ ἀναρρήξαντες τοῦ τάφου τὰς θύρας, εἰσελθόντες τὸν τε κόσμον ἀνηροῦντο καὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν ζῶσαν ὀρώσι·

Meanwhile when night had fallen certain pirates, who had learned that a girl had been buried richly and that she there lay buried with her plentiful women's finery and a lot of silver and gold, went to the tomb and broke open the doors of the tomb, and having gone in both took away the jewellery and saw Anthia alive.

Xenophon of Ephesus *Ephesiaca* 3.8.3

The violence in this passage is evident: ἀναρρήγνυμι ('I break through') implies that force was used to open the doors of the tomb. The doors here guide the reader into the text, just as doors in paintings "function as veritable guidelines for the penetration of the observer's gaze into [them]."³¹⁸ The pirates are breaking their way into the tomb to find the treasure inside, echoing the reader breaking his or her way into the text, reading through the layers of narrative to find the 'treasure'

³¹⁷In Phlegon of Tralles *Mirabilia Machates*' counter-narrative is that Philinnion is simply a girl wearing clothes that have been stolen from Philinnion's tomb (1.10: ὄφειτο δὲ νεκρορύκτας τινὰς διωρυχέναι τὸν τάφον καὶ πεπρακέναι τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ τὰ χρυσία τῷ πατρὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπου).

³¹⁸Gandelman 1991, p. 47.

inside a novel. These pirates are transgressive characters: they are not supposed to be anywhere near Anthia's tomb, let alone inside it. They are representative of the reader's position of ambiguity between being invited to read the narrative and penetrating his or her way into it with his or her curiosity.

The break-in to Callirhoe's tomb is described in more brutal detail:

Ἐπεὶ δὲ μοχλοὶ προσηνέχθησαν καὶ σφοδροτέρα πληγὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀνάρρηξιν τοῦ τάφου...

When the crowbars were brought forth and the blows became stronger in the process of breaking open the tomb...

Chariton *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 1.9.3

ἀνάρρηξιν comes from the same root as ἀναρρήξαντες in the passage from Xenophon of Ephesus. The robbers are forcing their way into the tomb, invading an enclosed space. Not only this, but πρὸς implies that their pounding becomes more vicious the nearer they get to their goal; a reader both reads forcefully and strives for the end of a novel, which is his or her goal. The pirates who invade Callirhoe's tomb are called τυμβωρύχοι. τυμβωρυχέω ('I break open graves') is forceful, and indicates violation. These men do not just steal the contents of tombs, but they physically break into them, wanting to gain possession of the treasure. The reader in a sense wants to gain possession of the text: to understand it to its fullest extent and his or her greatest capability.

Both sets of robbers are representations of the reader in a sense, penetrating their way into a space and finding something that is against their expectations. In Chariton the first pirate to enter the tomb is terrified by what he sees (κάκεϊνος φοβηθεὶς ἐξεπήδησε, 1.9.4) and thinks Callirhoe is a ghost: ἐφθέγγατο “φεύγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν· δαίμων γάρ τις φυλάττει τὰ ἔνδον καὶ εἰσελθεῖν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει.” (1.9.4). Theron, their leader, then investigates and realizes the truth about the situation (ἐνόησε τὴν ἀλήθειαν 1.9.6) because he is clever: δεινός. He has 're-read' the situation and come to the correct conclusion. The reader of the novels is

encouraged to pry and to penetrate, and sometimes what s/he finds is not what s/he expects to find. The reader also has to read attentively to come to the right conclusions about elements of the narrative. Here, the first pirate's discovery of Callirhoe and Theron's re-reading of the situation mirrors the reader's experience of thinking that Callirhoe was dead and then discovering that she is still alive.³¹⁹

Women's quarters

Another private space in the novels that has the potential for more transgression than some is women's quarters. Of the passages quoted so far, many fall into this category, demonstrating a narrative interest in spaces that are not normally seen into. As well as depicting characters viewing into women's quarters, novels also show characters physically entering women's quarters.

In book two of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Cleitophon makes a night-time visit to Leucippe's bedroom:

ἤκομεν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τῆς ἐρωμένης: . . . ἐγὼ δὲ εἰσήειν, ὑποδεχομένης με τῆς Κλειοῦς ἀψοφητί, τρέμων τρόμον διπλοῦν, χαρᾶς ἅμα καὶ φόβου.

We arrived at the doors of my beloved; . . . and I went in, with Cleio letting me in without a sound, quivering with a twofold trembling, simultaneously from joy and fear.

2.23.3

Since it is in the women's quarters, Leucippe's bedroom is clearly a space which Cleitophon should not be entering, and as soon as he gets into it he is chased out by her mother who has had an ominous dream.

³¹⁹The description of her funeral is long, and the narrative does imply that she is dead (ἀποθανούσης, 1.5.2), but the careful reader will have picked up on the fact that she only gives the *appearance* of being dead: ἐπέκειτο νεκρᾶς εἰκόνα πᾶσι παρέχουσα, 1.5.1.

Before Cleitophon enters Leucippe’s room, Satyrus has just called him an Ὀδυσσεύς (2.23.2) because his ‘Cyclops’ (Conops, who sits up late preventing Cleitophon visiting Leucippe, 2.20.1) has been put to sleep by a drug.³²⁰ Odysseus is also someone who goes into somewhere he shouldn’t — the Cyclops’ cave:

Καρπαλίμως δ’ εἰς ἄντρον ἀφικόμεθ’, οὐδέ μιν ἔνδον
εὕρομεν, ἀλλ’ ἐνόμεινε νομὸν κάτα πίονα μῆλα.
ἔλθόντες δ’ εἰς ἄντρον ἐθηεύμεσθα ἕκαστα·

Swiftly we came to the cave, and we did not find him inside, but he was pasturing his fat flocks in the fields. Having entered the cave, we gazed at each thing.

Homer *Odyssey* 9.216–218

Like Cleitophon, Odysseus is caught in a space that he should not be in. He is punished for entering this space, but both he and Cleitophon are successful in escaping from their respective situations. Cleitophon’s experience of being caught somewhere he should not be forms a warning to the reader: do not get carried away. Much as in Apuleius, where Lucius’ *curiositas* is used to warn the reader to be vigilant, here Cleitophon’s over-eager entrance into Leucippe’s bedroom serves to make the reader take notice of the dangers of rushing headlong into the novel, whilst concurrently encouraging an active approach. Cleitophon describes himself as experiencing joy and fear at the same time. These emotions form a metaliterary commentary on the reader’s encounter with the text. Cleitophon’s joy in anticipation of entering Leucippe’s bedroom stands for the reader’s joy in anticipation of a new story, and his fear perhaps stands for the reader’s fear of submitting completely to his or her desire for the text and being taken over by, and getting lost in, the story.

The intrusion of characters into female space is by no means only found in the ‘Sophistic’ novels. In Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe* Callirhoe is sent to be

³²⁰2.23.2.

looked after at court by the queen Stateira whilst there is a break of five days in the trial to decide who her husband is. During this time the king, who has fallen in love with Callirhoe, visits the women's quarters more than is usual:

ὑπόπτευε δὲ καὶ βασιλέως τὰς πυκνάς εισόδους καὶ τὰς ἀκαίρους φιλοφροσύνας. πρότερον μὲν γὰρ σπανίως εἰς τὴν γυναικωνίτιν εἰσήει· ἀφ' οὗ δὲ Καλλιρόην εἶχεν ἔνδον, συνεχῶς ἐφοίτα.

She was becoming suspicious of the frequent visits of the king and his untimely friendliness. For before he seldom came into the women's quarters, but from the time when he had Callirhoe there he began to make frequent visits.

6.1.6-7³²¹

This not only shows that the king is physically visiting the women's quarters, which is odd in itself, since Stateira says he did not used to do so as much before Callirhoe arrived, but also stands for the desire he has for Callirhoe. This mirrors the reader's experience of reading as being led though the spaces of the text, and his or her desire for Callirhoe, which is courted throughout the text.³²²

A parallel to these episodes of entering women's quarters can be found in *Apollo-nius King of Tyre*. At the very beginning king Antiochus falls in love with his own daughter, and although he tries to overcome his desire, one day it gets the better of him. He *inrumpit cubiculum filiae suae* ('rushed into his daughter's bedroom') and *stimulante furore libidinis diu repugnant<i> filiae suae nodum virginitatis eripuit* ('driven on by the force of his lust he tore apart the knot of his daughter's virginity although she resisted for a long time' Resc. A, 1). The verb *inrumpe* ('I rush in') resonates with ἀναρρήγνυμι in the passages from Xenophon and Chariton discussed above,³²³ as it can also have the more violent meaning 'I break in'. It prefigures Antiochus' rape of his daughter, which is described using equally forceful vocabulary: *eripio* means 'I rob', 'I tear away', and 'I take by force'.

³²¹See also 5.9.7.

³²²For example the bath scene at 2.2.

³²³See p. 126 ff.

All of these instances of entering spaces that contain women, particularly instances where force is used, can be read metaphorically as the penetration of women's bodies.³²⁴ The passages describing the two tombs and Leucippe's bedroom all use the word *θύρα* (door), which can be read as symbolizing the vagina,³²⁵ particularly given the violence involved in the breaking open of the (chaste women's) tombs, and the sexual intentions of Cleitophon. There is no mistaking the parallel that can be found between bedroom and body in *Apollonius King of Tyre*. With this in mind, I shall now move on to discuss women's bodies as an interior space in the ancient novel.

(Female) bodies

In the Greek novel, bodies are often “metaphors and mirrors for the very experience of reading.”³²⁶ The vulnerability of bodies within the text stands for the penetrability of the text itself. The reader wants to know both the text and the bodies it represents. The novels invite their readers “to investigate these bodies by representing their torments as the object of a fascinated gaze: the gaze of the narrator and his implicit and explicit audience”,³²⁷ and the body in the text “marks the conjunction of public and private, exterior and interior”.³²⁸ In a sense, by reading with *polypragmosunē*, the reader is pulling back the layers of the text, stripping the narrative, perhaps even flaying the narrative body, peeling back the skin of the text.³²⁹ The story of Marsyas in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* provides an example of how the peeling back of skin lays bare the narrative body:

clamanti cutis est summos derepta per artus,
nec quidquam nisi vulnus erat; cruor undique manat

³²⁴See Whitmarsh 2010a, pp. 334–339.

³²⁵See Henderson 1975, pp. 137–138, 168 and 171.

³²⁶König 2008, p. 127. See also *ibid.*, p. 138: “Associations between body and text are deeply ingrained both in the structure of the Greek and Roman novels and in the detailed texture of the reading experiences they offer.”

³²⁷Ballengee 2005, p. 131.

³²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 131.

³²⁹Gandelman 1991, pp. 139–140.

detectique patent nervi trepidaeque sine ulla
 pelle micant venae; salientia viscera possis
 et perlucentes numerare in pectore fibras.

As he screamed, his skin was torn away from the surface of his limbs, and he was nothing except a wound; blood streamed everywhere; uncovered sinews lay exposed, and trembling veins quivered without any skin. You could count the throbbing organs and shining lungs in his breast.

Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6.387–391

In these lines, the narrator “invites the reader to look closely at the inner organs now laid bare.”³³⁰ This represents not just the inner organs laid bare, but also the text laid open to the reader: the narrative at its most vulnerable and yet most horrifying. It almost dares the reader to look, especially as the narrator directly addresses the reader/listener (*possis. . . numerare*).³³¹

The female protagonists of the novels are always young and beautiful and because of this they attract the gaze of male characters. The texts often invite the reader to be curious and look closely at the heroines, following the gaze of the male characters in the text. The titles of the Greek novels (which all have recorded in the manuscript tradition the formula τὰ περί or τὰ κατά and the main protagonists’ names³³²) imply a curiosity about the characters. In particular, there is a certain sense of voyeuristic transgression in reading a narrative that is about a woman, because a woman’s story should remain hidden,³³³ yet the female protagonists’ names appear brazenly in the titles of the novels, willing the reader to be curious about and uncover their narratives and private lives. Narrative text and body are linked in the modern novel as well as in the ancient novel: “narrative desire. . . becomes oriented toward knowledge and possession of the body.”³³⁴ The object of this desire

³³⁰Segal 2001, p. 86.

³³¹Cf. Segal 1998, p. 34.

³³²Whitmarsh 2005, p. 600.

³³³Ibid., p. 606.

³³⁴Brooks 1993, p. 8.

is often women within the text — the reader wants knowledge and possession of the attractive female protagonist.

Despite the interest in the female body, fuelled by narrative desire, *actual* female bodies remain the most elusive of spaces in the Greek novel. The reader of the Greek novel is never let into this most private of ‘spaces’. Ballengee says that adventure-time in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is about getting inside spaces, particularly the body:

Adventure-time emerges as a chronotope of experimentation or play that centers around penetrating the body into its hidden, inner areas — the mysterious region wounded by *eros*.³³⁵

The text has an obsession with trying to get inside Leucippe, through her fake disembowelment, fake beheading, and the association of her with her room and the rose she sings about.³³⁶ She is compared to Marsyas during her fake disembowelment (3.15.4). More specifically, as Morales says, she is compared to the image of Marsyas that the sculptors portray.³³⁷ Despite the fact that in the myth Marsyas is flayed, as the passage from Ovid narrates, it is not possible to flay a statue — to peel back its top layer. One can, on the other hand, peel back the layers of narrative. Comparing Leucippe to a *statue* of Marsyas protects her from being violated, just as the stage-managed disembowelment in which this image is set protects Leucippe from being sacrificed. The opening and shutting of doors to the cave in the description of Leucippe’s virginity test at 8.6³³⁸ and the clandestine nature of the test itself also draw attention to the fact that ultimately the reader of the novel cannot get inside Leucippe.³³⁹ As one narrative interior that the reader cannot breach, it is particularly fitting that this cave is the location for testing virginity, especially given the fact the reader *does* know what happens during the test for chastity inflicted upon Melite, who is not a virgin. This, coupled with the fact that

³³⁵Ballengee 2005, p. 155.

³³⁶Whitmarsh 2010a, 336: “A series of images associates Leucippe with sweet interiors.”

³³⁷Morales 2004, p. 170.

³³⁸See above, p. 123

³³⁹“Leucippe’s ‘virginity test’ is markedly abstract and non-physical.” Morales 1995, p. 47.

Cleitophon does narrate his sexual encounter with Melite, albeit euphemistically, has the effect of making Melite's body more 'knowable' than Leucippe's. Leucippe apparently never tells Cleitophon what happened during the virginity test as he does not seem to know and therefore cannot narrate it.³⁴⁰

The descriptions of wedding nights in Xenophon and Longus (discussed below³⁴¹) and in Chariton are euphemistic, just as Cleitophon's description of sex with Melite is. When Anthia is trying to attract Habrocomes she displays as much of her body as is permissible (μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν ἂν τὰ δυνατά, ἵνα Ἀβροκόμης ἴδῃ: 1.3.2). However, there is no detailed description at this point as there has previously been.³⁴² Even Daphnis' tuition by Lycaenion, which does include a few technical details,³⁴³ descends into vagueness: αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ φύσις λοιπὸν ἐπαίδευε τὸ πρακτέον. ('Nature herself taught him the rest that he should do', *D&C* 3.18.4). The reader never gets that close to any of the female protagonists: they are all devastatingly beautiful yet at the same time immaculately chaste.³⁴⁴ There is never any *detailed* description of sex apart from in Cleitophon's speech in defence of female lovers, in which he seems to display some knowledge of sex, including female orgasm.³⁴⁵ The reader is invited by Cleitophon's speech, and by other tantalizing sections in the Greek novels, to fantasize the rest, to complete the picture from his or her own knowledge. A similar example of this phenomenon can be found in Ovid *Amores* 1.5. Here the poet describes Corinna's naked body parts rather than the girl herself³⁴⁶ and leaves the reader to imagine what takes place: *cetera quis nescit?* (1.3.25). Hardie asks the question 'how far can you go' as a curious reader? He concludes that the poet excludes the reader from the text both by refusing to

³⁴⁰See Chapter 4 for women's resistance to being written.

³⁴¹See p. 137 ff.

³⁴²At 1.2.6 there is a detailed description of what she looks like and what she is wearing.

³⁴³μαθοῦσα ἐνεργεῖν δυνάμενον καὶ σφριγῶντα, ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἐπὶ πλευρὰν κατακλίσεως ἀνίστησιν, αὐτὴν δὲ ὑποστορέσασα ἐντέχνως ἐς τὴν τέως ζητουμένην ὁδὸν ἤγε: 'finding that he was ready for action and erect, she raised him from lying on his side, and having spread herself beneath him she skilfully led him towards the long-sought path' 3.18.4.

³⁴⁴Apart from Callirhoe, who marries Dionysius to save her unborn child by Chaereas, and no mention is made of their wedding night. See Konstan 1994, pp. 44–55 for chastity vs. fidelity.

³⁴⁵However, he says his experience is with prostitutes: ἐγὼ μὲν πρωτόπειρος ὢν εἰς γυναῖκας, ὅσον ὀμιλῆσαι ταῖς εἰς Ἀφροδίτην πωλουμέναις: ('I am a novice when it comes to women, in as much as I have consorted with those selling the joys of Aphrodite.' 2.37.5).

³⁴⁶Hardie 2002, p. 45.

describe the sex that is implied and by starting the next poem as an *exclusus amator*.³⁴⁷ Similarly, the texts of the novels draw the reader in, suggesting that s/he should penetrate the text/body, but at the same time denying him or her that pleasure, ultimately making the reader create his or her own narrative, and seemingly taking no responsibility for what the reader may imagine. The reader that the novels promote is thus one who is curious above and beyond the textual surface, and passages like Cleitophon's speech, the wedding nights, and Anthia's self-display highlight this by showing the reader to him or herself so s/he can analyse his or her reading and ask him or herself how far s/he can go. That is, by catching the reader in the act of extending the narrative, the novels lead him or her to self-analysis.

Standing on both sides of the door

In many scenes in the Greek novels the reader's privileged, liminal, position is equivalent to standing on both sides of the door at once. In between spying through doors and being in this privileged position is the scenario of being behind a door: in the room but hidden.

Hiding behind doors

The theme of watching from a concealed place can be found in Herodotus' *Histories*, which is an important example to compare, since the Greek novel (particularly the earlier 'pre-Sophistic' texts) has many parallels with historiography.³⁴⁸ Candaules is trying to persuade his bodyguard Gyges to see his wife naked, to prove she is the most beautiful woman alive, and he comes up with a plan for how this can be achieved:

³⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 40–45.

³⁴⁸Hägg 1983, p. 114.

ἐγὼ γάρ σε ἐς τὸ οἶκημα ἐν τῷ κοιμώμεθα ὄπισθε τῆς ἀνοιγομένης θύρης στήσω· μετὰ δ' ἐμὲ ἐσελθόντα αὐτίκα παρέσται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἐμὴ ἐς κοῖτον. κεῖται δὲ ἀγχοῦ τῆς ἐσόδου θρόνος· ἐπὶ τοῦτον τῶν ἱματίων κατὰ ἕνα ἕνα ἐκδύνουσα θήσει καὶ κατ' ἡσυχίην πολλὴν παρέξει τοι θεήσασθαι.

I will bring you to the chamber where we lie and place you behind the open door; and after I have entered, my wife will also come to bed. There is a chair standing near the entrance: on this she will put each item of her clothing as she is undressing, and you will be able to look at her quite at your leisure.

Herodotus *Histories* 1.9.2

The difference between the passages discussed above and this one is that here there is no hole in the door, but rather the door is open (ἀνοιγομένης) and Gyges is on the inside of the door and hiding behind it. The idea of invading someone's privacy whilst they are ignorant of it is still present though: Gyges stands for the reader, who is also on the inside of this door, and can also see Candaules' wife getting undressed. Gyges makes a mistake, however, because when he carries out this plan, Candaules' wife sees him leaving her room. The characters in a novel obviously do not ever 'see' the reader (although the narrator can address him or her), so here Gyges does not completely mirror the reader. Here Candaules' wife *is* aware that she is being 'read', within the fiction, which in a way spoils the voyeurism for the reader. It puts Candaules' wife in charge: the text invites a curious reader then shows the reader to him or herself.³⁴⁹

In the examples above,³⁵⁰ the reader is focalizing through a character who is watching from a concealed place, but in the example from Herodotus, Gyges is concealed in the same room as the person he is watching. The reader is constructed by this usage and representation of private space as someone who is 'spying' on the (private) events in the narrative. The door is important in this passage from Herodotus, as

³⁴⁹Cf. p. 103 for characters being unaware that they are read.

³⁵⁰See p. 91 ff.

a means for the choreography of Gyges' voyeuristic experience, just as doors have also been important in providing holes through which to spy in previous examples.

A less filtered version of the 'spying' on narrative events just discussed can be found in the ways the narrators of the Greek novels construct access to knowledge through their use of enclosed spaces.

In Chariton's novel, Whitmarsh argues:

[t]he romance narrator gives us greater insight than that offered to the curious public: we see the actors behind closed doors, the person behind the veil, even the intimate thoughts in the hearts of the characters.³⁵¹

This privileged insight can also be found in other examples of the genre. Instead of focalizing through a character who is spying or who is in the same enclosed space as the person or events being watched, the reader focalizes through the narrator who shares his privileged perspective. The following section will demonstrate how the novels allow or invite the reader to see through walls and closed doors rather than viewing through gaps in doors or gaining knowledge by opening doors.

Novelistic wedding nights

The reader is able to see what goes on 'behind closed doors' in the scene on the wedding night in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*.

Ἵπ' αὐτῇ τῇ σκηνῇ κατέκλιναν τὴν Ἀνθίαν, ἀγαγόντες πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην, ἐπέκλεισάν τε τὰς θύρας.

Τοῖς δὲ ἑκατέροις πάθος συνέβη ταῦτόν, καὶ οὔτε προσειπεῖν ἔτι ἀλλήλους ἠδύναντο οὔτε ἀντιβλέψαι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἔκειντο δὲ ὑφ' ἡδονῆς παρεμμένοι, αἰδούμενοι, φοβούμενοι, πνευστιῶντες. . .

Beneath this canopy they lead Anthia to Habrocomes, laid her down, and closed the doors.

³⁵¹Whitmarsh 2011, p. 190.

The same emotions came to both of them and they were not able to say anything to each other or to look each other in the eye but they lay resigned to pleasure, modest, fearing, panting...

1.8.3–1.9.1

The reader, focalizing directly through the narrator, is inside the room but the characters within the novel are on the other side of the door which is shut: ἐπέκλεισάν τε τὰς θύρας. The reader is able to go much further than the crowd and look at Anthia and Habrocomes, who are overcome with shyness about the situation: οὔτε προσειπεῖν ἔτι ἀλλήλους ἠδύναντο οὔτε ἀντιβλέψαι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. The narrative raises conflicting reactions in the reader at this point, who can either feel coy along with the protagonists, or revel in his or her superior knowledge.³⁵² This passage confronts the reader with the transgressive nature of reading a novel by suggesting to the reader what is happening whilst simultaneously not quite telling him or her. By excluding the crowd from the bedchamber, the narrator draws attention to the privileged position that the reader is in, so he or she is encouraged to question how appropriate it is for him or her to be thinking about this scene. The reader must make a choice about whether to add his or her own knowledge, collaborating with the narrator in order to experience the narrative to its full, or to allow a veil to be drawn over the text. Either way allows the reader to self-analyse as curious, since the text makes the reader engage with his or her own experience.

At the end of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* there is also an episode describing the wedding night:

τότε δὲ νυκτὸς γενομένης πάντες αὐτοὺς παρέπεμπον εἰς τὸν θάλαμον, οἱ μὲν συρίττοντες, οἱ δὲ ἀλοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δᾶδας μεγάλας ἀνίσχοντες, καὶ ἐπεὶ πλησίον ἦσαν τῶν θυρῶν, ἦδον σκληρᾶ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ καθάπερ τριαίναις γῆν ἀναρρηγνύοντες, οὐχ ὑμέναιον ᾄδοντες.

³⁵²A similar superiority is invoked in the reader when Daphnis and Chloe fail in their attempt to have sex at 3.14. See Konstan 1994, p. 80.

Δάφνις δὲ καὶ Χλόη γυμνοὶ συγκατακλιθέντες περιέβαλλον ἀλλήλους καὶ κατεφίλουν, ἀγρυπνήσαντες τῆς νυκτὸς ὅσον οὐδὲ γλαῦκες, καὶ ἔδρασέ τι Δάφνις ὧν αὐτὸν ἐπαίδευσε Λυκαίνιον, καὶ τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γινόμενα ἦν ποιμένων παίγνια.

Then when it was night everyone escorted them to the bridal chamber, some playing pipes, some playing the flute, others holding aloft huge torches. And when they were near the door, they began to sing with harsh and rough voices as if they were breaking up the ground with three-pronged forks not singing the marriage hymn. And Daphnis and Chloe lay together naked and hugged each other and kissed, and were more sleepless that night than owls. And Daphnis did some of the things that Lycaenion had taught him, and then Chloe first learned that what had happened on the edge of the wood had been shepherds' games.

4.40

Although the text becomes euphemistic at this point, the reader, with his or her superior knowledge, can fill in the details and construct the scene for him or herself. The focalization here is double: the narrator shows what is going on on both sides of the door at once, describing both the couple and the crowd. There is a paradox here, in that the narrator tells the reader more than the characters on the outside of the door know, except that the characters in the marriage procession of course *do* know what is going on on the other side of the door. The narrator is using space to highlight different levels of knowledge. Morgan says “the text leaves the reader outside the bedroom but reminded by the violent singing of the ambivalence of even marital sex.”³⁵³ However, I would argue that rather than leaving the reader outside the door, the text takes the reader inside the room, or at least enables him or her to see through the door. The narrator and reader invade the private space of the newly-wed couple.

³⁵³Morgan 2004, p. 249. Goldhill 1995, p. 44 more persuasively argues “Longus leaves us not merely with a grating wedding song, but with a carefully constructed moment of voyeurism, as he takes us to the bedroom door and invites — but bars — our gaze within.”

This is something that a reader can do that a character cannot: occupy the liminal space between public and private, between textual exteriors and interiors.³⁵⁴ Allowing the reader to occupy this liminal space is the novelistic way of theorizing what Genette calls “zero focalization”,³⁵⁵ that is, focalizing through the point of view of the omniscient narrator.

In this passage there is a game being played with the revelation of facts and their simultaneous concealment. This is highlighted by the use of the euphemism ἀγρυπνήσαντες τῆς νυκτὸς ὅσον οὐδὲ γλαῦκες. The use of a euphemism instead of a detailed description not only makes the reader construct the scene for him or herself, but also draws attention to the fact that s/he is viewing something that ought not to be viewed. The narrator does not give the reader the full picture here, although the reader is invited into the bedroom, but encourages the reader both to create narrative and to self-analyse.

These passages show that the reader of a novel is constructed as nosy, and that the use of space exemplifies this model of reading. Xenophon’s narrator goes further than Longus’ narrator, and says: Ταῦτα εἶπε, καὶ περιφύντες ἀνεπαύοντο καὶ τὰ πρῶτα τῶν Ἀφροδίτης [ἐρώτων] ἀπήλαυον (‘She said these things, and clinging to each other they relaxed and enjoyed the first fruits of Aphrodite’ 1.9.9). This is again euphemistic, but gives something away: it allows for and suggests the creation of a reader fantasy, or the reader’s completion of the narrative with his or her own experience, which means that the reader will notice his or her curiosity (through self-analysis).

Access to knowledge

Above I argued that the noise of doors opening and closing often represents access to knowledge.³⁵⁶ The same is true of doors themselves. The reader is in a privileged

³⁵⁴Cf. Whitmarsh 2011, p. 190: “As readers, we are placed in an uncertain, liminal position, as *both* the ‘reading public’ *and* the private audience who hear much more of the story’s truth than any internal narratee does.”

³⁵⁵Genette 1972 tr. 1980, p. 189.

³⁵⁶See p. 124 ff.

position as again s/he can see what is happening on both sides of a shut door.

Doors in paintings act as “gaze-directing devices” for the viewer; they can “permit the gaze of a specific character to connect with its object”³⁵⁷ and “stand for the impossibility of seeing what is represented”.³⁵⁸ The importance of doors in the Greek novel is that the reader has the ability to see through doors that the characters cannot. For the reader the impossibility of seeing what is represented becomes a possibility because of his or her unique relationship with the narrator and text. It is fruitful here to compare some of the Hellenistic literature mentioned in the introduction to this thesis. The dramatic and narrative purpose of doors in Herodas’ *Mimes* can help us to think about how doors are used programmatically in novels too. In particular *Mimes* One and Six invite the reader or audience to see into a private house and to hear a conversation between two women, thus casting him or her in the role of eavesdropper and voyeur.

Eavesdropping in Herodas

Herodas’ *Mime* Six depicts a conversation between two women in one of their houses, which brings the reader into the private domestic sphere. Metro has come to Coritto’s house in order to find out where Coritto acquired her dildo, which is one of a pair. Zanker asserts that the setting is the living-room of Coritto’s house, which has some rooms off it into which the slaves are sent.³⁵⁹ Metro clearly does not want the slaves to hear the reason for her visit:

ἀλλ’ οὐνεκεν πρὸς σ’ ἦλθον — ἐκποδῶν ἡμιν·
φθείρεσθε, νόβυστρ’, ὦτα μούνον καὶ γλάσσαι
τὰ δ’ ἄλλ’ ἔορτή — λίσσομαί σε, μὴ ψεύση³⁶⁰

But I have come to you because — be off with you out of our way,

³⁵⁷Gandelman 1991, p. 36.

³⁵⁸Ibid., p. 41.

³⁵⁹Zanker 2009, p. 167.

³⁶⁰The texts for the *Mimes* are taken from Zanker 2009.

blockheads, all ears and tongues but on holiday when it comes to everything else — I beg you, do not lie. . .

15–17³⁶¹

Through this instruction she implies that the slaves are nosy and gossips (ὄτ᾽ αὐτῶν μοῦνον καὶ γλάσσαι). She obviously does not want this conversation to be talked about or repeated by them. However, she has not considered that the slaves may listen at the door of the room into which they have been sent. There is a fascination with slaves knowing what they should not about their masters, and having ready access to this knowledge.³⁶² When Lucius wants to know about the secrets of magic, in which his host's wife engages, it is a slave he goes to in both the *Onos* and the *Metamorphoses*. Indeed we have seen that much of his narrative, particularly in Apuleius, is made up of things he has happened to overhear or see because of his servile status.³⁶³ Coritto is also concerned about the women's privacy, since she says αὐτὰὶ γὰρ εἶμεν ('for we are alone') at line 70 after suggesting that men are inferior to this sex-toy.³⁶⁴ They may be alone within the fiction of the mime, but the reader has a privileged view into this scene, so by highlighting the fact that the women are by themselves, Coritto draws attention to the fact that they are being read or viewed by the external reader or audience.

Metro, who asks a great many questions about by what means and from whom Coritto acquired the dildo, is "insatiably curious."³⁶⁵ Her questions are a template for the reader's questions: s/he is shanghaied by the text into being interested in this object as well. These questions are, as Zanker argues, carefully structured to obtain the information Metro needs.³⁶⁶ This has the effect of guiding the reader through the text in the quest to find out about the private lives of these women.

³⁶¹There are variations on whether it is Metro or Coritto who says these lines, but this does not alter my argument here.

³⁶²Sabnis 2011, p. 1. See also Hall 1995, p. 54.

³⁶³Hall notes that Lucius is reduced to the status of a slave so he can tell stories from a double perspective (ibid., p. 49). It is interesting that although in the [Pseudo-]Lucianic *Onos* Lucius makes the point that slaves know everything, he does not say this in the Apuleian version of the story, the one in which many inset tales occur.

³⁶⁴Cf. Hutchinson 1988, pp. 252; Zanker 2009, p. 181.

³⁶⁵Cunningham 1971, p. 161.

³⁶⁶Zanker 2009, pp. 182–183.

Coritto is displeased to discover that someone named Nossis, who is the daughter of Erinna, has got her hands on this dildo, which Coritto herself lent only to Euboule. The juxtaposition of these two female poets is a point of debate among scholars. Cunningham says it is a “malicious reference” to Erinna’s relationship with Baucis.³⁶⁷ Zanker also argues that the effect here is negative: “Herodas is making misogynistic fun of the women poets through Mētrō, probably also partly along the divide between realistic and erotic poetry.”³⁶⁸ He says “this animosity is partly because Herodas viewed their personal emotions... as antithetical to his own preferences in subject-matter, and therefore turns out to be a further instance of his engagement with poetry.”³⁶⁹ The mention of Nossis and Erinna can also be read in another way. Herodas is making this point: you (the reader) think you know what women talk about when they get together, and this is what you think they talk about, so I am going to write about what you think I should. However, the mention of Nossis and Erinna in the middle of all this throws the reader off balance and raises the level of the text: it is a self-conscious annotation by the poet — you did not expect to find this here; women actually talk about more wide-ranging matters.

Metro must have had a similar conversation with Nossis about the dildo to find out where she got it and so on. The women are creating a story about it as it passes from one to the next. And what of the other one? It must surely have a similar story surrounding it, and at the end of this poem Metro is going off to discover its story but starting at the other end of the trail — with the person who made and sold it. An object passed from woman to woman is reminiscent of oral storytelling passed from generation to generation. The dildo can thus in this poem be read as symbolic of the power of speech.

In line 98 Coritto instructs her slave to close the door (τὴν θύρην κλείσον) and count the hens to check they are safe, apparently because chicken-stealing is rife (οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ πορθεῦσι / ὠρνιθοκλέπται, κῆν τρέφη τις ἐν κόλπῳ.). Zanker suggests that this domestic ending has a double meaning:

³⁶⁷Cunningham 1971, p. 164. Cf. Headlam 1922, p. 290.

³⁶⁸Zanker 2009, p. 171.

³⁶⁹Ibid., p. 186. Conversely it is also possible that Herodas is acknowledging a debt to (a) lost work(s) by the(se) female poet(s).

Korittô appears not only to be referring to her humble circumstances, but also still to be thinking of sexual satisfaction and to be punning on the idea that penises should be carefully guarded and nourished since people steal them just as much as Eubolê and Nossis have stolen Korittô's leather dildo.³⁷⁰

Given that it is possible to read the ending as being just as lewd in subject matter as the rest of the poem, it is also possible to read the order to close the door as Coritto's way of trying to ensure that no more of her *sexual* secrets escape through it as well as her sexual objects. The poem, along with its subject matter, is now closed to the reader, just as Coritto's door is.

Similarly, in *Mime* One a door is the focus of the beginning of the poem. There is a knock at the door, and this sets the text in motion:

(ΜΗΤΡΙΧΗ) Θρέισσ', ἀράσσει τὴν θύρην τις· οὐκ ὄψῃ
μή τις παρ' ἡμέων ἐξ ἀγροικίης ἤκει;
(ΘΡΕΙΣΣΑ) τίς τὴν θύρην;
<ΓΥΛΛΙΣ> ἐγῶδε.
<ΘΡ.> τίς σύ; δειμαίνεις
ἄσσον προσελθεῖν;
<ΓΥ.> ἦν ἰδοῦ, πάρεμι' ἄσσον.
<ΘΡ.> τίς δ' εἰς σύ;
<ΓΥ.> Γυλλίς, ἡ Φιλαινίδος μήτηρ.
ἄγγειλον ἔνδον Μητρίχη παρεῦσάν με.

Metriche Threissa, someone is knocking at the door; will you not see
if it is one of our people who has come from the country?

Threissa Who is at the door?

Gyllis It is I.

Threissa Who are you? Are you afraid to come nearer?

Gyllis See there, I have come nearer.

³⁷⁰Zanker 2009, pp. 180-181.

Threissa Who are you?

Gyllis I am Gyllis, the mother of Philainis. Announce to Metriche inside that I am here.

1.1–6

Once Gyllis is safely through the door and inside the house the main section of the text can begin, but only after the slave has been banished (στρέψον τι, δούλη, 1.8), just as happens in *Mime* Six. A similar checking on the women's privacy takes place:

<ΓΥ.> . . . ἀλλὰ μήτις ἔστηκε
 σύνεγγυς ἡμιν;
 <ΜΗ.> οὐδὲ εἶς.
 <ΓΥ.> ἄκουσον δὴ
 ἃ σοι χρεΐζουσ' ὦδ' ἔβην ἀπαγγεῖλαι·

Gyllis Is there anyone standing near us?

Metriche No-one

Gyllis Then listen to the things I came wanting to tell you.

1.47–49

The reason that Gyllis checks that they are alone is because the nature of the conversation is once again illicit: Gyllis has come to Metriche, whose husband is absent, with a proposition from a young man. The fact that Gyllis is trying to persuade Metriche to be seduced by the young man in question means that the door in this text, the door to her house, hovers around symbolizing access to Metriche's body.³⁷¹

These two doors in Herodas' *Mimes*, one placed at the end of a text and the other at the beginning, are programmatic in that they stand for the reader or audience being invited in (in *Mime* One) and shut out again (in *Mime* Six). This resonates with the way in which, as I shall now discuss, doors in novels can represent access to knowledge.

³⁷¹See above on doors into women's quarters (p. 131 ff.).

A privileged view: the novelistic reader and knowledge

In Achilles Tatius, Conops keeps his door open so he knows what is going on. Conops is described in the text as *πολυπράγμων* (2.20.1),³⁷² so it is significant that he leaves his door open: if his door were closed it would be impossible for him to perform his role as an inquisitive observer of events.³⁷³ This is the problem that Satyrus needs to get around as he plans Cleitophon's meeting with Leucippe. The answer is to drug Conops — a silent and non-visual way of dulling his perception.

Closed doors, on the other hand, represent security and privacy for the characters.³⁷⁴ A door that is vitally important to the narrative in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* is the door to Thermouthis' hut. Thisbe is shut inside Thermouthis' hut as he is trying to keep her a secret from those on the outside, and she cannot see what is going on outside it, as she says in her letter:

κάμῃ κατακλείσας ἔχει μηδὲ ὅσον προκύψαι τῶν θυρῶν ἐπιτρέπων,
ὡς μὲν αὐτός φησι, διὰ φιλίαν τὴν περὶ ἐμὲ ταύτην ἐπιθεὶς τὴν
τιμωρίαν, ὡς δὲ ἔχω συμβάλλειν, ἀφαιρεθῆναί με πρὸς τινος δεδιώς.

Having locked me up he keeps me, not even allowing me so much as to put my head outside the door, saying that he has placed this punishment upon me because of his love for me, but as I reckon he is afraid that I might be taken away by someone.

2.10.2

It is obvious that the door is kept closed. However, Thisbe does manage to find out that Cnemon is also in the Herdsmen's village:

Ἄλλ' ἐγὼ σε θεῶν τινος ἐνδόντος καὶ εἶδον, ᾧ δέσποτα, παριόντα καὶ
ἐγνώρισα. . .

³⁷²See the discussion of Conops as a model for the reader at Morales 2004, pp. 84–87 and p. 13 ff. of the introduction to this thesis.

³⁷³Although see p. 14 of the introduction to this thesis: his is a particularly lazy way of gleaned information.

³⁷⁴Although not privacy from the reader.

But by the grace of some god I saw you going past, master, and I recognized you. . .

2.10.3

This means that she is, ironically, right under Cnemon's nose but he does not know it. The door stands in the way of his access to knowledge, and almost stands in the way of Thisbe's access to knowledge too. The door is important on a plot level too, since if Thisbe and Cnemon had come together earlier in the narrative, the novel may have taken a different turn, and perhaps Thisbe would never have been secreted in the same cave as Charicleia, once again activating the possibility of the latter's death.

Charicleia locks her door so she can be alone to grieve when Calasiris, Cnemon and Nausicles do not return with Theagenes after going to find him.

ἡ Χαρίκλεια δὲ χωρισθεῖσα μόνη τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ τὸ σὺνηθες ἔρχεται
 δωμάτιον καὶ τὰς θύρας εἰς τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἐπικλεισαμένη πρὸς οὐδενός
 τε ὀχλεῖσθαι. . .

Charikleia alone withdrew from the others and went to her usual room and locked the doors securely so that no-one would disturb her.

6.8.3

Charicleia takes great pains to make sure that the door is locked so none of the characters finds or interrupts her. The reader is on the inside of the door so can see her, and can hear her lamenting. The reader is also given a description of how she messes up her hair, tears her dress, and weeps, and so knows what her appearance is likely to be: the following morning Calasiris comes to find her and is taken aback at how she looks, but guesses the cause.

Similarly, the tent in the *Calligone* fragment acts as a private space in which a woman vents her emotions. Calligone goes to her tent to weep and rend her clothes, just like Charicleia. Eubiotus sends everyone away, affording her some privacy:

ἐλθοῦσα

δὴ ἐπὶ σκηνὴν καὶ ῥίψα-
 σα ἑαυτὴν ἐπὶ τῆς στιβάδος
 ἀνωλόλυξεν μέγα καὶ διω-
 λύγιον, καὶ δάκρυα ἐξέρ[ρ]εον
 ἀθρόα· κατερρήξατό τε τὸν χι-
 τῶνα. ἐπεμελείτο δὲ ὁ Εὐ-
 βίωτος μηδένα παρεῖναι
 ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ
 Having come
 into the tent and
 hurled herself onto the mattress,
 she gave a loud piercing cry;
 her tears flowed
 abundantly; she ripped her clothing.
 Eubiotos saw to it that
 no one stayed
 in the tent

*PSI 981.3–10*³⁷⁵

Stephens and Winkler ponder what Eubiotus is doing when he moves the other characters out of the tent:

Is he guarding her true identity, which in her turmoil she might reveal to those who should not know it? Is he protecting the secret of her love for Eraseinos? Or is he merely giving her the privacy to express her feelings freely?³⁷⁶

Calligone here behaves as other novelistic heroines do in private, which suggests that the latter of these speculations is most likely.

³⁷⁵Text and translation: Stephens and Winkler 1995.

³⁷⁶Ibid., p. 268.

Finally, Callirhoe shuts herself in her room to have a conversation with herself (along with her picture of Chaereas and her unborn baby) about the pregnancy and whether to marry Dionysius:

Ἀνελθοῦσα δὲ εἰς τὸ ὑπερφῶν ἢ Καλλιρῶν καὶ συγκλείσασα τὰς
θύρας...

Callirhoe went upstairs to her room and closed the doors...

Chariton *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 2.11.1

The point of her closing the doors is to provide herself with some privacy from the outside world while she makes a difficult decision.

These examples all have slightly different things to say about space and knowledge — in the first the open door stands for access to knowledge. In the second a closed door stands for lack of knowledge, or, put another way, an obstruction to knowledge, and in the last two a closed door gives the heroines reassurance that within the fiction they are alone, so others have no knowledge of what they are doing. This has the effect of suggesting that closed interior space represents the inner psychic world of the characters within the space: privacy is where emotions come to the fore.³⁷⁷ However, as always, the external reader can see through these closed doors, indeed is invited by the text to see through them, and this serves to feed his or her curiosity.

Sexual space and the reader('s *sōphrosunē*)

Here I will explore how the novels ask the reader to think about and analyse his or her experience of reading a particular type of narrative and subject matter, that is, how does the curious reader react to reading erotic narrative?

³⁷⁷De Temmerman 2012b, p. 494: “Secret or private information, and its communication... are often staged in secluded or remote settings, whose isolation often highlights the vulnerability of one of the characters involved.” See also *ibid.*, p. 497.

Longus draws attention to the problem of reading erotic narrative by asking for self-control in writing the stories of others (‘Ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν. Praef. 4). Morgan argues that the plural ἡμῖν includes the reader in the narrator’s prayer, as whenever the narrator refers to himself elsewhere, it is in the singular.³⁷⁸ By involving the reader the narrator leads him or her on, ironizing the ‘good’ reader but also catching out the transgressive reader even though the narrative constructs one, because there is no getting away from the fact that there will be erotic elements in this text which is a love story:

The prayer is a duplicitous indemnity clause, which alerts the reader to the fact that there is prurient material to come, and challenges him to find it by disingenuously suggesting that smut is in the eye of the beholder.³⁷⁹

The novel invites the reader to read in both ways, and leads a self-aware reader to realize this fact. Before the story even begins the narrative establishes that the reader has a duplicity: he feigns self-control but is actually reading for illicit pleasure. This is what Cleitophon does when he pretends to be reading a book but is in fact ogling Leucippe:

ἐβάδιζον ἐξεπίτηδες εἴσω τῆς οἰκίας κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς κόρης, βιβλίον ἅμα κρατῶν, καὶ ἐγκεκυφῶς ἀνεγίνωσκον· τὸν δὲ ὀφθαλμόν, εἰ κατὰ τὰς θύρας γενοίμην, ὑπέλιπτον κάτωθεν. . .

I decided to walk up and down somewhere in the house in my beloved’s presence. I took a book, and bent over it, and pretended to read; but every time that I came opposite the door, I peeped over the book at her. . .

Achilles Tatius *Leucippe & Cleitophon* 1.6.6

³⁷⁸Morgan 2004, p. 150.

³⁷⁹Ibid., p. 148. Cf. Goldhill 1995, 44: “The narrator’s opening prayer in *Daphnis and Chloe* for *sophrosune*. . . establishes not so much an ideal as a ludic complicity with the reader.”

Here Cleitophon's actions with his book are similar to the reader's reading of a novel: he pretends to be reading, whilst really curiously viewing (or rather ogling) the beautiful female protagonist. He does this *κατὰ τὰς θύρας*, which aligns reading with getting a look through a doorway early on in this novel. His lack of self-control is evident. This pretending-to-do-something-else whilst actually being a curious reader is also what the men who spy on Lucius while he is eating are doing.³⁸⁰ Encounters with texts are always going to be furtive, even more so texts that are love-stories.

Perhaps Longus' narrator has already fallen into the trap of being a transgressive reader who does not exercise self-control: "the narrating voice is not that of the controlling authorial intelligence, but rather of a *failed reader driven by desire*."³⁸¹ He lays this out in front of the current reader, challenging him or her to think about, ask him or herself, and discover what kind of reader s/he is. In the course of what follows I will discuss two examples of how interior space is constructed in such a way as to play on the reader's propriety,³⁸² to tempt him or her and in doing so to make him or her self-analyse and realize that s/he is curious. The first example is from [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Amores* and the second is from Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.

Suggestive text

In [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Amores* Lycinus gives a description of the statue of Aphrodite in the temple at Cnidus from two different perspectives: viewed from the front she looks like a woman; viewed from the back she looks like a 'Ganymede'.³⁸³ There is a door in the temple specifically so that the statue can be viewed from behind, which is opened for Lycinus and his companions by the woman who keeps the

³⁸⁰See above p. 101 ff.

³⁸¹Morgan 2004, pp. 17–18, my emphasis.

³⁸²Goldhill 1995, p. 14 asks how far a *sōphrōn* reading of *Daphnis and Chloe* is possible: "How stained, how dirtied, is the reader by an inability to read innocence innocently? Longus' establishment and then manipulation of the possibilities of extreme naivety manipulates also the reader's self-positioning."

³⁸³Osborne 1994, p. 84 calls her a "sculpture in the round". Cf. Zanker 2004, pp. 42–44.

keys (ἀνοιγείσης τῆς θύρας, 14). Just as in the viewing passages in the *Onos*, the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aethiopica*, the characters spy on the statue, constructing the reader who, as we have seen in this type of situation, focalizes through them. The characters in the text, and the reader too, do not realize that this statue can be interpreted in two different ways until the woman opens this door: the opening of the door stands for the reader being ‘let in’ to this scene and its viewpoint.³⁸⁴ This story about the statue of Aphrodite also sends a deeper message about reading. Lycinus is not just describing the statue and the temple in which it is situated to the reader, but also to his in-text reader, Theomnestus, who reacts to this scene: Theomnestus says:

ὡς ὑπ’ ἄκρας ἡδονῆς τῶν λεγομένων ἐν Κνίδῳ διατρίβειν ὥομην
ὀλίγου τὸ βραχὺ τοῦτο δωμάτιον αὐτὸν ἡγούμενος εἶναι τὸν νεῶν
ἐκεῖνον.

For through my intense enjoyment of your narrative I thought I was in Cnidus, almost imagining this small chamber to be that temple.

53

The in-text reader Theomnestus engages with the ‘text’ placed before him, imagining that the room he is in is actually the temple of Aphrodite, and so the space in which Aphrodite is revealed to Lycinus and his companions is superimposed upon the space in which Lycinus reveals what he saw to Theomnestus. Lycinus’ ‘text’ is so vivid and enjoyable that his ‘reader’ is transported to the place he is talking about, just as the reader of novelistic texts is transported into them by the presentation of spaces within them. There is a further level of reading in this episode, however, which encourages the reader of the text to ask him or herself what kind of reader he or she is by appealing to his or her curiosity, just as the novels do.

³⁸⁴Osborne 1994, pp. 84–85 demonstrates that the statue has to be viewed from both sides simultaneously, that is, by a group of people, for the narrative to work: a viewer is the object of the statue’s gaze and becomes self-conscious about it when he himself is viewed also.

Lycinus and his companions notice a stain on the statue's thigh, and are told by the attendant a story about how it got there. An unnamed character used to visit the temple, spending all day gazing at the statue because he had fallen in love with it (15–16). Eventually, the young man hides in the temple one night:

ἤδη γὰρ ἐπὶ δύσιν ἡλίου κλίνοντος ἡρέμα λαθὼν τοὺς παρόντας
 ὄπισθε τῆς θύρας παρεισερρύη καὶ στὰς ἀφανῆς ἐνδοτάτω σχεδὸν
 οὐδ' ἀναπνέων ἠτρέμει, συνήθως δὲ τῶν ζακόρων ἔξωθεν τὴν θύραν
 ἐφελκυσσάμενων ἔνδον ὁ καινὸς Ἀγχίσης καθεῖρκετο. . . τῶν ἐρωτικῶν
 περιπλοκῶν ἴχνη ταῦτα μεθ' ἡμέραν ὄφθη καὶ τὸν σπῖλον εἶχεν ἡ
 θεὸς ὧν ἔπαθεν ἔλεγχον.

For, when the sun was already sinking to its setting, quietly escaping the notice of those present, he slipped in behind the door and, standing unseen near the inmost part of the chamber, hardly breathing he did not move, and when the attendants had closed the door from the outside in the usual way, this new Anchises was locked in. . . These marks of his erotic embraces were seen when day dawned, and the goddess had that blemish as proof of what she had suffered.

16

Hunter suggests that the man is a ‘reader’ (but he only does so in parentheses and with a question mark) because he shuts himself up all night alone with his object of desire.³⁸⁵ I would take this further, remove Hunter’s parentheses and question mark, and argue that the man *is* a reader: he gets to know the statue, becoming obsessed with it, drawn in by it just as a reader is drawn in and directed by a text. He must first have got to know the statue by viewing it through the door, as Lycinus and his companions do, and in this passage he slips in through the door (ὄπισθε τῆς θύρας). This imitates the reader’s penetration into the text (and guides Theomnestus’ in-text reading). The doors are then closed (συνήθως δὲ τῶν ζακόρων ἔξωθεν τὴν θύραν ἐφελκυσσάμενων) and he is locked inside the temple. He does all this λαθὼν τοὺς παρόντας (‘escaping the notice of those present’),

³⁸⁵Hunter 2008a, p. 269.

perhaps suggesting the reader's surreptitious relationship with an erotic text. This in-text reader is very much caught doing what the external reader hopes not to be caught doing.³⁸⁶ Is this another warning to the reader to maintain his or her *sōphrosunē*? Is it another case of the reader having a mirror held up to his or her act of reading — it seems to go further than the Greek novels' seeming abdication of responsibility for the reader.³⁸⁷ This text offers two alternatives for its reader. Theomnestus, who is in the removed position of being the in-text reader of another in-text reader, says he enjoys hearing Lycinus' story. In contrast with the reaction of the man in the temple of Aphrodite, his pleasure is more measured: it signals to the extradiegetic reader that this pleasure is perhaps more like his or hers should be. Theomnestus has the self-control not to get carried away, and so perhaps should the reader of the text. The text holds up and juxtaposes the two 'readings' and asks the reader to identify what kind of reader s/he is. The reader who is curious will realize s/he is so, and the reader who has self-control will recognize this. Both paradigms of reading encourage the reader's self-analysis.

Lycaenion's teaching space

Lycaenion is a liminal character, both in terms of her having lived in the town and the country, meaning she is on the edge of that divide,³⁸⁸ and in terms of her name having connections with names of prostitutes,³⁸⁹ which constructs her as somewhat on the edge of society. She is, by virtue of her liminality, a suitable character to orchestrate Daphnis' initiation into the world of sex. The place to which she leads him at 3.17.1 is for Daphnis a space of transition.³⁹⁰ The place is described as an enclosed space. It is the thickest part of the wood (ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὸ πυκνότατον ἐγένοντο, 3.17.1), which implies that it is well-surrounded. In addition to this, the

³⁸⁶Freudenberg 2007, p. 240: "watching for pleasure in the novel always has the nasty potential to catch us in the act of pleasuring ourselves. And that is a very nasty thing to be caught doing." Cf. Goldhill 1995, p. 43.

³⁸⁷See page 135.

³⁸⁸Cf. Morgan 2012b, p. 550.

³⁸⁹Morgan 2004, p. 208.

³⁹⁰It is interesting that she lures Daphnis to this place by constructing a fiction around it (LaPlace 2010, p. 67). In chapter 4 I will discuss women's creativity within narrative.

superlative *πυκνότατον* implies that the trees in that place are growing very close together and perhaps that their branches have become entwined, forming a kind of outdoor ‘room’ similar to that found in the painting of Europa in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. The branches in the painting have become entwined to form a sort of ceiling above the flowers below because the trees are so close together:

συνεχῆ τὰ δένδρα, συνηρεφῆ τὰ πέταλα· συνῆπτον οἱ πτόρθοι τὰ φύλλα, καὶ ἐγένετο τοῖς ἄνθεσιν ὄροφος ἢ τῶν φύλλων συμπλοκή. ἔγραψεν ὁ τεχνίτης ὑπὸ τὰ πέταλα καὶ τὴν σκιάν· καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἠρέμα τοῦ λειμῶνος κάτω σποράδην διέρρει, ὅσον τὸ συνηρεφές τῆς τῶν φύλλων κόμης ἀνέφωξεν ὁ γραφεύς.

The trees were close together; their foliage grew thick. The branches joined their leaves together, and the intertwining of the leaves fashioned a roof for the flowers. The artist had depicted shade beneath the leaves, and the sun gently shone through here and there on the meadow beneath, wherever the painter had opened up the thick shade of the foliage of the leaves.

1.1.3–4

The use of the word *ὄροφος*, which means a reed for thatching houses, implies that the branches have become woven like thatch and have produced the sort of covering one would find over a domestic building. If the trees in the painting in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* are close enough together to form a roof, then it should also be the case that their trunks are in the place of walls,³⁹¹ and this is also implied by *πυκνότατον* in *Daphnis and Chloe*. Lycaenion and Daphnis are performing an act that should take place within a domestic space, and even though it takes place outside, there are further implications of interiority. For example, the space must be quite well enclosed since Lycaenion tells Daphnis that if he brings Chloe here to have sex with her no-one will see her if she weeps or hear her if she screams: *ἄγαγε αὐτήν εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον, ἵνα κὰν βοήση μηδεὶς ἀκούσῃ κὰν δακρύσῃ*

³⁹¹Indeed, Martin 2002, p. 146 says the painting is an “image of a meadow enclosed as if in the room of a house”.

μηδεὶς ἴδη (3.19.3). This is not the first time Lycaenion has taken advantage of the concealing nature of shrubbery. When she watches Daphnis and Chloe attempting to copy the way in which the sheep and goats mate, she is hidden in a thicket:

εἷς τινα λόχμην³⁹² ἐγκρύψασα ἑαυτὴν ὡς μὴ βλέποιο πάντα ἥκουσεν ὅσα εἶπον, πάντα εἶδεν ὅσα ἔπραξαν· οὐκ ἔλαθεν αὐτὴν οὐδὲ κλαύσας ὁ Δάφνις.

She hid herself in a thicket, so that she might not be seen, and heard everything they said and saw everything they did; and Daphnis' crying did not escape her notice.

Longus *Daphnis and Chloe* 3.15.4

Lycaenion has hidden herself ὡς μὴ βλέποιο, and yet can watch everything the two of them do. Perhaps she leads Daphnis to the thickest part of the wood so that no-one will see or hear them together; she is of course married to someone else. Lycaenion's emphasis on not being seen reminds the reader that s/he can see her, and s/he can also see Daphnis and Chloe. The sudden desire of the text for sex to take place in an enclosed space rather than in the open (as may well have happened, and as Chloe's mother is afraid of³⁹³) therefore reminds the reader of the privileged and liminal position s/he is in, and the fact that s/he is encouraged both to be a Lycaenion and spy on the narrative, and also to fill in the gaps in the narrative. Both at this point and at the very end of the novel sex is referred to euphemistically. There is an irony in the fact that Lycaenion sees Daphnis crying before she seduces him, but encourages him to take Chloe to the place where no-one will see her crying. This is indicative of Lycaenion's superiority over the couple.

³⁹²It is a point worthy of note that this word is used particularly of the lairs of wild beasts (LSJ p. 1063), and Dorcon lies in wait in a thicket at 1.21.3 (noted by Morgan 2004, p. 209). Daphnis himself is found in a λόχμη which suggests perhaps that sex outside is appropriate at this point as he is a wild beast, but once he has been restored to his urban family, only sex inside is appropriate.

³⁹³3.25.2.

This space to which Lycaenion takes Daphnis, closed to the outside world and anyone who may wander by, functions as a revelation space, or a space in which knowledge is imparted: Lycaenion reveals the ‘secret’ of sex to Daphnis. The revelation is figured as teaching — much of the vocabulary she uses is pedagogical: παραδίδου μοι [τερπνὸν] σαυτὸν μαθητήν· ἐγὼ δὲ χαριζομένη ταῖς Νύμφαις ἐκείναις διδάξω. (‘Give yourself to me as a [delightful] pupil; and I will teach you, pleasing those Nymphs.’ 3.17.3). Daphnis picks up on this when he asks Lycaenion to διδάξαι τὴν τέχνην (to teach [him] the skill) at 3.18.1. All of this pedagogical vocabulary strengthens the sense of initiation in the passage.

The reader is in this space with Daphnis and Lycaenion. S/he can hear and see them even though Lycaenion’s aim is for this to be somewhere where no-one can see or hear what is going on. Once again this serves to construct the reader of the novel as one who enters enclosed spaces and the novel as something that is enterable, with the reader invading its privacy.

The thickest part of the wood is the opposite of the ‘edge of the wood’ where Daphnis and Chloe’s sexual experimentation takes place. Lycaenion is teaching him something here as regards sex and space, but what? The following is from Morgan’s commentary on ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης at the very end of the novel (4.40.3):

edge of the wood: DC’s “games” have taken place in the pasture. However, as the scene of D’s tuition by Lykainion, the wood stands for completed sex; DC’s non-penetrative erotic games were on the edge of the sexual space.³⁹⁴

This highlights the relationship between knowledge and space: full knowledge of sex is only experienced within a certain space.³⁹⁵ Given that this is a text focused so much on desire and the cures for it, this also implies that full knowledge of this narrative takes place only within a particular space: the space in which the reader

³⁹⁴Morgan 2004, p. 249.

³⁹⁵Morgan 2012b, p. 545 argues that the pasture stands for innocence, the forest for completed sex, and the protagonists’ games on the edge of the wood stand for a “movement towards, but not a consummation of, mature sexuality.”

finds him or herself at the beginning of the text — that of the grove. The reader achieves knowledge of him or herself through reading the narrative that is based on the picture in the grove.

The ship as a liminal space in the novels

Thalmann suggests that the Argo in Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* is a piece of Greek space that is mobile.³⁹⁶ This means that the Argo is a portion of Greek identity that can travel with the Argonauts, and a home away from home that helps them keep hold of this Greek identity as they make their voyage.³⁹⁷ Similarly, in the *Aethiopica* for many of the herdsmen their boats are both transport and dwelling place, and so represent their identity and way of life. The herdsmen, by contrast with the protagonists, consider the lake, with its boats and huts, their homeland: *Καί πού τις βουκόλος ἀνήρ ἐτέχθη τε ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ καὶ τροφὸν ἔσχε ταύτην καὶ πατρίδα τὴν λίμνην ἐνόμισεν* (1.6.1). The narrator goes into detail about the living arrangements of the herdsmen. In order to stop their children falling into the marsh when they are young the herdsmen attach ropes to them. The infant's experience of space is limited by the fact that the rope only allows them to reach the door of the boat or hut: *Ἔρπειν δὲ ὀρεγόμενον εἰ αἴσθοιτο, ἰμάντα τῶν σφυρῶν ἐξάψας ὅσον ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ σκάφους ἢ τῆς καλιᾶς προβαίνειν ἐπέτρεψε* ('If someone perceived a child reaching out to crawl, having tied a leash to its ankles he allowed it to advance as far as the edge of the boat or hut' 1.5.4). The herdsmen's experience of the place where they live therefore expands as they grow up, from a boat to a lake. This draws attention to the 'otherness' of these Egyptian herdsmen, who live permanently on boats, as opposed to the Greek protagonists who live on dry land and make their money through less dubious methods than banditry and for whom the position of being on a boat signals a period of flux in their lives. On the other hand the mention of children, of women weaving, and of fish being prepared and eaten on the herdsmen's boats serves to destabilize the 'otherness' of the herdsmen, making them familiar by demonstrating the sheer mundaneness

³⁹⁶Thalmann 2011, p. 63.

³⁹⁷Cf. Cohen 2006, p. 663.

of their everyday life. Yet on top of this using the word *καινόν* (1.5.4) to describe the way children are kept on the boats defamiliarizes the situation: these herdsmen are engaged in everyday activities, yet they are bandits and unfamiliar, so even their everyday activities can seem alien. This adds to the deliberate disorientation of the reader at the beginning of this narrative that begins *in medias res*.

For the most part the ships in the Greek novels work in a different way. They cannot be a piece of the protagonists' home country or identity that they can take with them on their travels, since many of them are pirate ships, or other ships of a different origin from that of the protagonists; for example, the ship on which Calasiris, Theagenes and Charicleia leave Delphi is Phoenician. In the *Herpyllis* fragment it is ships that separate the lovers. They each seem to be on a different ship, and the male narrator's ship is faster, leaves port more quickly and then is driven onward by a storm, whereas Herpyllis' ship remains in the harbour:

πρὸς βραχὺ δ' ὄρων-
τέ[ς σ]φας ἀφηρπαζόμεθα,

We watched them for a short time and then were snatched away

P. Dubl. C3 II. 23–4³⁹⁸

Ships are responsible for the separation of the lovers in the canonical novels too, even in *Daphnis and Chloe*, which includes no significant travel. Both Daphnis and Chloe are captured on different occasions and taken away by ship. The ships could be even more of a threat to Daphnis and Chloe because of their island pastoral existence, but this is swiftly cancelled out by the fact that both protagonists are rescued from the ships.

Often in the novels the protagonists are on board ships not of their own volition, but because they have been captured by bandits. It is the function of said bandits to open up potential narratives, and it is significant that this takes place at sea or other places which have liminal qualities to them:

³⁹⁸Text and translation: Stephens and Winkler 1995.

The anti-structural agency of the liminal period is embodied elementally in the sea (always a space of unpredictability, ‘fluidity’); and, as far as human agents go, in the *déclassé* bandits and pirates, human traffickers (always men) who occupy marginal spaces like woods, caves and shores, or semi-civilised villages.³⁹⁹

Bandits are capable of changing completely the direction in which the narrative seems to be heading: “they create sudden disorder, rapidly relocating the protagonists and/or changing their social status (typically from free to slave).”⁴⁰⁰ They are also the people responsible for the commodification of the heroine, as she becomes a tradable piece of property when in the possession of pirates.

For example, Theron, the pirate who takes Callirhoe from her tomb, can be read as an anti-narrator, or alternative narrator. He puts the foundations in place for several different potential narratives: “Théron preside à la multiplicité des péripéties, il symbolise le jeu des possibles narratifs.”⁴⁰¹ This is because he is the one who is responsible for capturing Callirhoe and moving her. He is also captured by Chaereas after he has sold Callirhoe, and concocts a tale that he is a Cretan saved from death by virtue of his pious behaviour. Because of his status as narrative potentializer it is quite significant that he dreams about a locked door: *κοιμηθεὶς δὲ ἐνὺπνιον εἶδε κεκλεισμένας τὰς θύρας* (1.12.5).⁴⁰² He takes this as a sign not to throw Callirhoe overboard immediately and leave, which is what he had just thought about doing, but to wait one more day. He then succeeds in finding a buyer for her. Theron dies well before the end of the narrative, so it is possible that this dream reveals to the reader that although he is shaping the narrative for the time being, ultimately, he gets no say in the final outcome: the narrative is quite literally closed to him. Theron dies at 3.4.18, having constructed the ensuing narrative (he tells Chaereas where Callirhoe was sold, and so Chaereas immediately sails there). However, he does not tell anyone who he has sold Callirhoe to. This means that even after his death, Theron has a certain control over the narrative.

³⁹⁹Whitmarsh 2011, p. 217.

⁴⁰⁰ibid., pp. 158–159. See also ibid., pp. 46–47 and Lalanne 2006, p. 197.

⁴⁰¹Kasprzyk 2001, p. 162.

⁴⁰²Dreaming about a locked door means exclusion from an intended journey, according to Artemidorus. Reardon 1989, p. 34 n. 27. See also Fernández Garrido 2003, p. 350.

Ships are obviously very important to the narrative in terms of getting the protagonists from one place to another and in terms of bringing new possibilities into the narrative when the protagonists are shipwrecked or captured by bandits, but what does the ship as a space on the liminal ocean symbolize?

A particularly memorable ship is the one in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* on which Cleitophon and Melite travel to Ephesus. Cleitophon refuses to sleep with Melite because he does not want to consummate their marriage until they reach land, since Leucippe ‘died’ at sea. Melite tries to persuade him using a metaphor in which she sexualizes the ship,⁴⁰³ and says that anywhere can be a bedroom for lovers: πῶς δὲ τόπος τοῖς ἐρώσι θάλαμος (5.16.3). Similarly in the *Aethiopica* a ship is described as a θάλαμος (5.29.1). When Calasiris has arranged Charicleia’s bogus marriage to Trachinus he asks that the ship be Charicleia’s bridal chamber. What does it mean for a ship to be designated a θάλαμος by two novelists? A bridal chamber is a transition space: it stands for the loss of virginity. The ship is also a transition space, as it travels across the liminal space of the sea taking its passengers from one land to another. The superimposed spaces of the ship and the bridal chamber thus signify, in texts in which the couple are significantly not married at the beginning of the narrative, the adventures through which the protagonists go and the transition the heroine experiences at the end (or after the end) of the text.

Another ship, also in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, that seems to function as more than just a means of travel is the one on which the protagonists leave Berytus (2.31.6). Leucippe is not present during the conversation about sex which takes place on board ship at 2.35ff, but she is asleep in the innards of the ship: οὐδὲ ἡ Λευκίππη παρῆν, ἀλλ’ ἐν μυχῶ ἐκάθευδε τῆς νηός (2.35.1). Is the purpose of this that the reader finds out what Cleitophon is really like (he has experienced prostitutes (2.26.1)) but Leucippe does not? Is he boasting to the unnamed narrator by pretending not to know much about women, but in fact showing that he does indeed have the right knowledge? It does not escape the attention of his companions that his description belies his inexperience: Καὶ ὁ Μενέλαος, “Ἀλλὰ σὺ μοι δοκεῖς,” ἔφη, “μὴ πρωτόπειρος ἀλλὰ γέρων εἰς Ἀφροδίτην τυγχάνειν”

⁴⁰³This is discussed in more detail at p. 248.

(‘And Menelaus said “But you seem to me to be not a novice but an old hand at the experiences of Aphrodite.”’ 2.38.1). The ship on the sea at this point in this novel comes across as a space in which anything can be said with no repercussions because of the shifting and unpredictable nature of the sea. That is, the sea functions almost as not-space or anti-space, forever changing and moving.⁴⁰⁴ This means that the ship is a space in flux where narrative themes can be tested. In Lucian’s *Navigium* — the title in Greek is, tellingly, Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί: ‘The ship, or the *wishes*’ — the ship becomes a vehicle for Adimantus’ fantasy, as he thinks about what he could do if he had a ship, and in the *Vera Historia* a ship enables the narrator to visit many fantastic places. The adventures in books 9–12 of the *Odyssey* that are set in a fantasy realm also take place at sea, which is a place of struggle.⁴⁰⁵ Van Nortwick describes the sea in the *Odyssey* as “a symbol. . . of disorder and oblivion” and says that it also stands for Odysseus’ “restless motion”.⁴⁰⁶ This symbol of narrative potential that is the sea can be seen in the novelistic texts too, and Achilles Tatius is certainly experimenting with using a ship as a testing ground on this shifting surface to see how far the narrative and the genre can be pushed when Cleitophon talks about his sexual experience.

For the reader, then, when a ship appears in a novel it is not only a space in which narrative can be tested but also stands for the wanderings and adventures of the protagonists, essentially being a reification of the whole of the novel’s ‘adventure time’ because a ship always appears on the shifting and liminal space of the sea.

Conclusion

Space is used in the Greek novel not only to map out the narrative and how it is revealed to the reader, but also to form a commentary on the way a reader of narrative actually reads, and how the texts suggest the ways they can be read. It

⁴⁰⁴Lalanne 2006, p. 111: “Au niveau des représentations, la mer est perçue par les Grecs comme un lieu mouvant, incertain, à l’image de la vie elle-même.” See also Cohen 2006, p. 648 and Whitmarsh 2011, p. 217, quoted above on p. 159.

⁴⁰⁵Schein 1996. Cf. Segal 1994b, pp. 8, 24.

⁴⁰⁶Van Nortwick 2009, p. 58. See also Segal 1994b, pp. 44–45.

is apparent from the discussion above that novels (and oratory) can go further into the private domestic space than Tragedy and even Comedy, although that genre in particular is concerned with private lives. By displaying the very innermost parts of people's lives the novels encourage a curious and explorative reader who is keen to pry into private spaces, even into bridal chambers where the conception of legal citizens takes place. Enclosed spaces are viewed by characters just as the reader views the action of the narrative, which demonstrates that the novels have a self-reflexive commentary about reading written into them. Enclosed spaces are also invaded by characters who have dubious intentions, theorizing a reader who is not only *πολυπραγμῶν*, but who actively penetrates the text. The possibility of penetrating female bodies in the text holds a mirror up to the reader, catching him or her out in his or her created fantasy, into which the text itself tricks him or her. There is, however, always a point at which the novels stop describing and leave the reader to fill in the gaps in the narrative: at this point the novels make the reader realize what s/he is. They play to and construct a curious, or explorative, reader, leading him or her up to a certain point only to frustrate him or her with the result that the reader has to imagine the remainder of the narrative. Drawing attention to this by purposefully figuring the reader as curious and then drawing a veil over certain aspects has the effect of forcing the reader to self-analyse or self-diagnose as curious.

Chapter 3

Narrative deceptions

Introduction

This chapter will investigate some elements of the novels that are not all they seem at first glance. These are elements that imply that some deception of the reader or of the characters within the narrative is going on. In including deception in their narrative schemes the novels construct a game for the reader to play with the text. This game entails using curious reading to collaborate with the text and uncover how one might interpret the novels in question: the reader is encouraged to be alert and to interrogate the text. The aim of this chapter is not to provide concrete answers, but to explore some of the questions that the novelistic texts suggest to and provoke in the reader once s/he has identified him or herself as curious.

Cleitophon's narrative

Cleitophon's narrative, which takes up most of Achilles Tatius' novel, is technically an embedded narrative (albeit a long one) since it appears as a story within the narration of the unidentified primary narrator. The way in which Cleitophon

introduces his narrative can disorientate the reader so that s/he begins to question how to approach the whole novel, something that can enhance his or her reading experience.⁴⁰⁷

Here I want in particular to discuss the fictionality of Cleitophon's story. He says: Σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις . . . λογῶν τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε. 'you are stirring up a swarm of narrative; for my experiences are like fiction.' (1.2.2) The *logos/muthos* dichotomy is Platonic.⁴⁰⁸ The Platonic intertexts in this novel have been commented on extensively, and several different critical opinions are outlined by Morales.⁴⁰⁹ Morales herself argues that Platonic ideas (and Stoic) are important to the narrative but that they are used as "pastiche" rather than "coherent and exclusive ideologies".⁴¹⁰ Ian Repath is currently engaged in an extensive analysis of Platonic intertexts and their importance for Achilles Tatius' novel.⁴¹¹

Here I shall consider the play between *muthos* and *logos* within the context of this text as a work of fiction. If Cleitophon says his life is like fiction, how much is he fictionalizing? Put another way, is this really the story of his life, or is he making it up? This short statement of Cleitophon's, because it is itself situated within fiction, makes the reader wonder whether he is in fact creating a fiction, especially given the fact that when the primary narrator has taken Cleitophon to the grove he says that now is the time for listening to his *logoi*, since the place is good for *muthoi* (1.2.3)⁴¹² — is it all untrue? This vocabulary destabilizes the narrative: *muthoi* can raise questions about knowability, that is, they are unknowable rather than out and out lies.⁴¹³ *Muthoi* are also old fictional tales,⁴¹⁴ and so by saying his narrative is like one, Cleitophon lays claim to a literary history for himself:

⁴⁰⁷See Whitmarsh 2011, p. 82: "the important point is not to root out demonstrable truths in this fictional text, but to allow these unsettling questions to resonate."

⁴⁰⁸See also *Republic* 5.450b for a wasps' nest of narrative: οὐκ ἔστε ὅσον ἐσμὸν λόγων ἐπεγείρετε. The *muthos/logos* theme is brought up again in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* at 7.4.1, and also 1.17.3 (see Morgan 2007a, pp. 112–113). For *muthos/logos* more generally in novelistic literature see also Morgan 2004, p. 182, Hodkinson 2003 and Hunter 2008b, pp. 778–784.

⁴⁰⁹Morales 2004, pp. 51–52.

⁴¹⁰Ibid., p. 60.

⁴¹¹Repath Forthcoming.

⁴¹²Morgan 2007a, p. 112.

⁴¹³Fowler 2011, pp. 46–47.

⁴¹⁴Ibid., p. 51.

the reader cannot help but wonder whether he is constructing a narrative from his “mythological dictionary and *Bluffers’ Guide to Culture*”.⁴¹⁵ Perhaps there is a (fictional) novel inside Cleitophon’s head that he is just itching to narrate, but he does not understand the conventions of genre, which is why some things do not add up.⁴¹⁶ It is a little convenient that someone who wants to tell a story meets someone to whom he can tell it at just the right point in time.

With this possibility that Cleitophon is creating a fiction in mind, the way in which he introduces himself to the primary narrator should be reconsidered. He says: “Ἐγὼ ταῦτ’ ἂν ἐδείκνυν. . . τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθῶν” (1.2.1). Even the fact that he has suffered many insults at the hands of love (τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθῶν) could be part of his fiction: the very status of this text as a love-story (μύθων. . . ἐρωτικῶν, 1.2.3) is destabilized and undermined by this possibility.

If Cleitophon is making it up, how should, or can, the reader conceive of the narrative? It is possible that Cleitophon has been shipwrecked during the storm that is mentioned by the primary narrator at the beginning of the novel (Ἐνταῦθα ἦκων ἐκ πολλοῦ χειμῶνος. . . 1.1.2). In antiquity, the shipwreck survivor made his way to the nearest temple.⁴¹⁷ He would thank the god for his safety and survival with “an appropriate sacrifice or offering. . . a testimonial plaque. . . a picture of the catastrophe survived, the story itself,”⁴¹⁸ and tell his tale to those who visited the temple, often in return for alms. In literature, the shipwreck survivor in the temple was a common *topos*,⁴¹⁹ and in Lucian’s *On Salaried Posts* (1) the narrator says that there are those who visit temples and embellish or make up stories for money. Both Cleitophon and the unnamed primary narrator seem to be in the position of having arrived at a temple after a storm. It is entirely possible that *both* Cleitophon *and* the stranger to whom he tells his story are frauds out to get each other’s money. Indeed, is the primary narrator telling his story to an unsuspecting passer-by?⁴²⁰ This possibility (and it is of course only a possibility — we cannot know) leads to

⁴¹⁵Morgan 2007a, p. 113.

⁴¹⁶See Whitmarsh 2003, pp. 197–198; cf. Marinčič 2007, p. 183: “he commits a generic misinterpretation and erroneously takes the novel for a tragedy, thus becoming a comic character.”

⁴¹⁷Winkler 1985, pp. 238–240.

⁴¹⁸Ibid., p. 239.

⁴¹⁹Ibid., p. 240.

⁴²⁰See Lucian’s *On Salaried Posts* (1).

the total collapse of the novel (both the primary narrator's tale and Cleitophon's) as trustworthy, which is itself exciting, especially given the fact that the frame is not returned to at the end of Cleitophon's narrative, and gives the curious reader yet another avenue to pursue.

The phrase ἐμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος (1.3.1) has some bearing on how Cleitophon and his story are presented: "Casting Clitophon as a Phoenician, and fashioning his story, therefore, as a Phoenician tale, creates particular expectations of both narrator and novel. 'Phoenician' has many associations."⁴²¹ One of these associations is the deceitful character of the Phoenicians, so Cleitophon's tale could be made up. Morales says that the fact that his narrator is Phoenician, coupled with the obsession with *muthos* versus *logos* that in fact permeates the novel, means that, "[a]t the very least, Achilles is flirting with the possibility that Clitophon has fabricated his account."⁴²² On top of this, the question of the reliability of the primary narrator's memory, and who is actually telling this story, is brought up by Marinčič: "the reader is implicitly invited to question the reliability of the first narrator. Was he really able to reproduce faithfully the long speech of the Phoenician stranger?"⁴²³ Maybe the whole thing is the primary narrator's story — his swarm or wasps' nest of narrative. By transposing his ordeals on to Cleitophon, he is protecting himself from looking stupid for not getting and keeping the girl. It is significant that he is a lover (ἄτε δὲ ὄν ἐρωτικὸς, 1.2.1), because this means that he will have an inherent interest in Cleitophon's story, as well as in certain elements of the picture of Europa, as he himself notes. He is also *periergos* (or at least scrutinizes the painting περιεργότερον 'most curiously' at 1.2.1), which is presumably why he finds it easy to extract Cleitophon's tale (although Cleitophon is not reluctant to tell his story).

Murray says that drawing attention to the dichotomy between *muthos* and *logos* is a strategy used by Plato to distance the person speaking from their tale in order

⁴²¹Morales 2004, p. 48.

⁴²²Ibid., p. 56.

⁴²³Marinčič 2007, p. 172. Added to this question is one posed by Whitmarsh 2011, p. 82: "How... can we gauge the extent to which Clitophon's words have been re-encoded as Greek by the primary narrator?"

to draw attention to the narrative problem caused by that tale.⁴²⁴ Could Achilles Tatius be drawing attention to his narrative layers by using this device on top of the distancing that already exists in the novel? The Platonic intertext strengthens the opportunity for reading Cleitophon as, if not a fraud, then a fabricator of narrative.

These are all possibilities that the text brings up and with which it tempts the reader, concealing whatever the ‘truth’ about Cleitophon’s story may be through cleverly not returning to the frame, forcing the reader into a state of *aporia* that is simultaneously stimulating and frustrating.

Narrative lies in Chariton

Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe* sometimes suffers from being ‘pre-sophistic’. It is generally agreed to be the earliest of the extant Greek novels,⁴²⁵ and as such can be dismissed as simple. However, I hope now to show that Chariton’s novel pulls the reader in different directions in a way that is sophisticated, and challenges what the reader believes to be true within the fiction. The narrator purposefully gives the reader glimpses of other narrative possibilities.

At every important juncture in Chariton, there is a lie or a misunderstanding that shapes the ensuing narrative, and there are two particularly important instances of this that stand at the beginning of the novel and half way through it.

Right at the very beginning of the text, Callirhoe already has many suitors who come to ask for her hand in marriage:

καὶ μνηστῆρες κατέρρευον εἰς Συρακούσας, δυνάσται τε καὶ παῖδες
 τυράννων, οὐκ ἐκ Σικελίας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ Ἰταλίας καὶ ἠπείρου
 καὶ ἔθνων τῶν ἐν ἠπείρῳ.

⁴²⁴Murray 1999, p. 256.

⁴²⁵See, for example, Tilg 2010, pp. 2 and 90 and Bowie 2002. *Contra* these are O’Sullivan 1995 and Whitmarsh 2011, p. 264.

And suitors rushed to Syracuse, both rulers and sons of tyrants, not only from Sicily, but also from Italy and the continent and from the peoples of the continent.

1.1.2

However, Eros manufactures it so that Callirhoe's narrative plays out in a certain way, namely that she falls in love with Chaereas. This is the first instance in the novel where things run counter to how the reader expects they will go at first. The suitors are incensed that Callirhoe marries someone who is not one of them, and so they plan to have their revenge. This is the sequence that forms the lie that sets in motion the events of the first half of the novel. Chaereas has to go to the country to see his father who has fallen from a ladder,⁴²⁶ and that night the suitors leave evidence that a revel has taken place outside his door. Callirhoe obviously denies that a revel has taken place, since none has, and Chaereas believes her. However, this first instance of deception provides the backdrop for further deceiving of Chaereas. The suitors manage to persuade him, by means of an elaborate fiction, that Callirhoe has been committing adultery. They employ a man to play the part of an adulterer entering Callirhoe's house (having first seduced the maid, 1.4.1–2), and another man to persuade Chaereas that his wife is committing adultery and that he should lie in wait in order to watch the first man going into the house (1.4.2–8). Cleitophon sees the first man being let into the house by the maid, and presumes that this is Callirhoe's lover (1.4.9–10). This results in him confronting Callirhoe and kicking her, causing her to faint and everyone to presume she is dead (1.4.11–1.5.1). This episode provides the impetus, ultimately, for the entire novel: Chaereas would not have kicked Callirhoe if he had not have believed the story of her adultery, so the events that followed would not have happened. Thus the very beginning of the novelistic adventures in this text is constructed around a lie.

The second half of the novel is also formed around a lie, this time caused by the

⁴²⁶It is not clear whether the message Chaereas receives is made up by the suitors or that it is just their good luck that Chaereas' father has indeed fallen from a ladder. The episode is introduced with the sentence *τοιαύτης οὖν ἐπινοίας ἐκεῖνος ἤρξατο* (1.2.6) but later Chaereas' father is reported as feeling better (*τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ῥᾶον ἐσχηκότος*, 1.3.3), implying that he had indeed been taken ill.

misinterpretation of a letter.⁴²⁷ Dionysius' belief that Chaereas is dead and that Mithridates is trying to seduce Callirhoe is the sole reason for the trial.⁴²⁸ Had the Great King, petitioned by Pharnaces on behalf of Dionysius (4.6.1), not summoned the trial, the narrative could have turned out very differently. During the course of the trial, the Great King Artaxerxes wants Callirhoe to remain in his hospitality because he has fallen in love with her (6.1). On the day on which he was supposed to make his decision about whether she should marry Chaereas or Dionysius, he tells Artaxates (his chief eunuch) that he has had a dream in which the gods told him to sacrifice to them for a month, during which time no trials can be held (6.2.2–3). This fabricated dream is the reason why he delays his decision about Callirhoe for a month: here a lie deceives the entire cast of the novel and prolongs the narrative.

There are several other lies or misunderstandings that shape the narrative considerably. One vital example is that Dionysius believes that Callirhoe's child is his throughout the entire novel, so Dionysius' narrative, as the reader experiences it, is a deception. He is overjoyed when the child is born (3.7.7), and it is implied that he continues to believe that the child is his beyond the end of the narrative: at 8.5.15 he says that his child will in the future leave him to go to Callirhoe (ἀπελεύση ποτέ μοι καὶ σὺ, τέκνον, πρὸς τὴν μητέρα). For him the fact that the child is his is the truth, but what would have happened if he had found out the real truth or had questioned the length of the pregnancy? What Plangon says when she suggests the plan to Callirhoe implies that Dionysius will not question it: “ὁ χρόνος οὖν ἡμῖν βοηθεῖ· δύνασαι γὰρ δοκεῖν ἑπταμηνιαῖον ἐκ Διονυσίου τετοκέσαι.” (“time will help us, for you can make it seem as if you gave birth to Dionysius' child after seven months.” 2.10.5). It seems as though female schemes and knowledge have a part to play in creating narrative here.⁴²⁹ Dionysius does not for one second consider the possibility that the child is not his, even though he knows that Callirhoe has been married before. The narrative could have taken a wildly different turn had Dionysius not been deceived.

⁴²⁷This is discussed more fully above, p. 73 ff.

⁴²⁸It is ironic that Mithridates does believe that he is in with an outside chance with Callirhoe, and that this was partly his motive for sending Chaereas' letter (4.3.11–4.4.1).

⁴²⁹See below, p. 176 ff. and chapter 4.

The first and second halves of the novel very much depend upon misunderstandings, which has the effect of making the reader insecure about what s/he is reading, perhaps even undermining him or her. There are also other important points at which lies drive the narrative, and Dionysius' narrative experience is completely based on a falsehood. This means that the curious reader is tested throughout the narrative, and encouraged to think about alternative plot-lines and outcomes for the story. In particular there is a question mark over what will happen to Calirhoe's baby after the end of the text, and this will be discussed in more detail below.⁴³⁰

Persinna and Calasiris

In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* there are certain tensions brought up by the fact that Persinna's narrative, embroidered on a *tainia*, is embedded in Calasiris' narrative, and reported by him (4.8).⁴³¹ Calasiris has, by the time he narrates the contents of the band, proved himself to be a slippery narrator. He deliberately withholds information — indeed he withholds from the reader at this point the fact that he met Persinna, until the point at which he narrates himself telling Charicleia this fact. Winkler regards the contradiction between a) Calasiris learning who Charicleia is by reading Persinna's narrative and b) Calasiris already knowing the story because he has met Persinna as “a deliberate narrative strategy on Calasiris' part, and hence an aspect of the larger problem of his honourable mendacity.”⁴³² He points out that all Calasiris actually knows is that Charicleia is white (he learned this from Persinna) and that she is at Delphi (he learned this from the gods in a dream).⁴³³ On the other hand, this disparity can be read as evidence of Calasiris' unreliable narration, or desire to appropriate the narrative for himself. Calasiris' unreliable, or perhaps misleading, narration raises some important issues when it comes to the question of how to read and interpret Persinna's narrative.

⁴³⁰See p. 180 ff.

⁴³¹The relationship between Persinna's narrative and Heliodorus will be treated in chapter 4.

⁴³²Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 286.

⁴³³Ibid., p. 339.

Firstly, is it Persinna's narrative? Hilton writes:

In narratological terms, the role of focalizer shifts imperceptibly from Kalasiris to Persinna for the time it takes to read the letter... so that in effect the narrative is doubly embedded.⁴³⁴

In this case, it would seem that it is Persinna's narrative. However, it is still Calasiris who reports it: by the time it is reported to Cnemon and the reader, Calasiris no longer has the band and is not reading directly from it.

Secondly, it is difficult to tell whether what Calasiris tells Cnemon about his relationship with Persinna is the truth or not. Calasiris reports that Persinna has in fact told him that she wants her daughter to be found (4.12–13) — but is the reader to believe this? At 4.12 Calasiris tells Charicleia (1) that Persinna told Calasiris what she wrote on the band (2) that Calasiris was told by the gods that Charicleia was alive, and that he told Persinna this fact and (3) that Persinna asked Calasiris to find her daughter and reunite them. There is no way of telling whether any of this is true or just a ruse to make Charicleia come with him (Calasiris has already lied to Charicles about Charicleia being a victim of the 'evil eye'), and Heliodorus has cunningly killed Calasiris off by the time Persinna (re)enters the story. Calasiris is a narrator wont to be economical with the truth, to twist narrative for his own purposes, so his narrative may be different to, or less complete than, the narrative he is reporting. Moreover he may even have added improvised details to it to make the story more convincing or gripping for his 'reader' Cnemon (and Charicleia).

The third, related, issue that comes up is that of whether there is more on the band than Calasiris claims:

ἐπερχόμενος τοιάδε ἠύρισκον τὸ γράμμα διηγούμενον.

⁴³⁴Hilton 1998, p. 85.

As I went through the letter, I began to find that it contained a narrative as follows.

4.8.1

This phrase, particularly the words *τοιάδε* and *ἠύρισκον*, invites the reader to think about the potential for there being more information on the band to search through. *τοιάδε* ('as follows', 'such things') is word that has a representative force (this sort of; that sort of; etc.), and suggests more than is reported, implying that Persinna's narrative says more than Calasiris would have the reader believe. Is he actually quoting it verbatim? Calasiris seems to repeat Persinna's entire narrative from memory. However, later, when he shows the band to Charicleia, he says: *ἔλεγον ἅπαντα τὴν τε γραφὴν ἐπιὼν ἐν μέρει καὶ πρὸς ἔπος ἐρμηνεύων*: 'I told her everything, both going through the letter bit by bit and translating it word by word.' (4.11.4) Winkler takes the *ἅπαντα* to refer to the fact that Calasiris not only tells Charicleia her story but also lays the decision she has to make before her.⁴³⁵ However, it is possible to read it as if Calasiris tells Charicleia everything that was on the band: more than he narrates to Cnemon (and the extradiegetic reader). The possibility of a deeper layer destabilizes what the reader thinks s/he knows about the narrative, and makes him or her want to know more, thus stimulating his or her curiosity.

In order to work out whether Calasiris has narrated to Cnemon all there is to be found on the band, it is helpful to look at reports of things that have been written in other novels. There is a precedent within the genre of totally verbatim quotations, with no representative words, indicating that the word *τοιάδε* in Calasiris' narration implies that there is more that he does not report. However, if letters in novels are taken into account, the waters become murky.

Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* is a novel that contains several inscriptions, and these inscriptions are always either quoted verbatim or just reported, never paraphrased:

⁴³⁵Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 342.

Οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν ἐξιστόρησαν καὶ ἀνέθεσαν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἥλιου
 ἱερὸν πανοπλίαν χρυσοῦν καὶ ἐπέγραψαν εἰς ὑπόμνημα ἐπίγραμμα
 τῶν ἀναθεντῶν

Οἱ ξεῖνοι [κλεινοὶ] τάδε σοι χρυδήλατα τεύχε' ἔθηκαν, Ἀν-
 θία Ἀβροκόμης θ', ἱερῆς Ἐφέσιοιο πολῖται.

And they toured around the whole city and set up as an offering to the
 temple of Helios a golden panoply and they inscribed as a record an
 epigram for those who had set it up:

“The [renowned] strangers dedicated to you these weapons of
 beaten gold, Anthia and Habrocomes, citizens of holy Eph-
 esus.”

1.12.2

There are no words with a representative force here, such as the *τοιᾶδε* in the
 phrase from Heliodorus.⁴³⁶

The reporting of the inscription at 3.2.13 is perhaps narratologically a closer case
 to that in Heliodorus, in terms of levels of narrative embedding. Hippothous is nar-
 rating his tale, and tells Habrocomes what he wrote on Hyperanthes' tombstone:

ἐπέγραψα εἰς μνήμην τοῦ δυστυχοῦς μειρακίου ἐπίγραμμα παρ' αὐτὸν
 ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν πλασάμενος

Ἴππόθοος κλεινῶ τεύξεν τόδε <σῆμ'> Ἑπεράνθη,
 οὐ τάφον ἐκ θανάτου ἀγαθὸν ἱεροῖο πολίτου
 ἐς βάθος ἐκ γαίης, ἄνθος κλυτὸν, ὃν ποτε δαίμων
 ἥρπασεν ἐν πελάγει μεγάλου πνεύσαντος ἀήτου

I inscribed in memory of the unfortunate young man an epigram that
 I made up that very moment:

⁴³⁶5.11.5-6 in the *Ephesiaca* when Anthia dedicates her hair to Habrocomes is a similar occur-
 rence. It is introduced: ἀνατίθησιν ἐπιγράψασα. . .

Hippothous built this <tomb> for famous Hyperanthes, a tomb not worthy of the death of a sacred citizen, the renowned flower whom once an evil spirit snatched from the land into the deep as a great storm was blowing on the ocean.

This is a better example, as it is reported within a narration, just as Persinna's narrative is, and so is at the same level of embedding. Again, there is no representative word, no "I wrote this sort of thing".

Both of the letters in Xenophon of Ephesus (2.5.1 and 2.3.4) and the message sent by messenger from Manto to her father (2.12.1) are introduced with the word *τοιᾶδε*. In Chariton, Chaereas' letter at 4.4.7 is introduced with *τοιούτης*, and at 4.5.7 the letter from Bias is referred to as *τὴν ἐπιστολὴν* then is simply narrated. Again, Pharnaces' letter at 4.6.3 is introduced with the word *ἐπιστολὴν*. Chaereas' letter to the king at 8.4.1ff. is *ἐπιστολὴν... τοιούτην* and the final letter (Callirhoe's) at 8.4.5 is introduced with *οὕτως*. The reading and writing of these letters is never narrated by a character within the story, but always by the external narrator. In Achilles Tatius, Cleitophon says of Leucippe's letter at 5.18.2ff: *ἐγγράπτο δὲ τὰδε*.⁴³⁷ This example, of Cleitophon reading Leucippe's letter, most closely resembles Calasiris reading Persinna's letter in terms of levels of narrative. *τὰδε* is a deictic pronoun, and as such implies a kind of narratorial assertion of truth, more so than the unspecific *τοιᾶδε*.

These examples show that Calasiris is within his generic narratorial rights to introduce Persinna's letter with the non-specific word *τοιᾶδε*. His slipperiness as narrator, however, does raise the possibility that he has summarized or paraphrased what she wrote for his own purposes. This means that the reader has to read carefully and with curiosity to grasp Persinna's narrative voice.⁴³⁸ There is no doubt that the band does exist, and that it carries on it a message about Charicleia, explaining the circumstances of her birth. At the end of the novel it is brought forward and read as a piece of evidence, but (crucially) it is not read out. Her narrative is, however, successfully communicated to characters and to the reader.

⁴³⁷He writes a letter back at 5.20.4ff, which is introduced thus: *ἄρχομαι δὴ γράφειν*.

⁴³⁸Further implications of Persinna's narrative will be discussed in chapter 4.

Lying speech and feminine wiles: Anthia and Callirhoe

Throughout the *Ephesiaca*, Anthia makes up stories about herself in order to protect her chastity, which is threatened several times. Haynes argues that in her constructed narratives which are aimed at those who possess her Anthia is protecting her identity, because “to reveal her name would allow the honour of her social group to become tarnished.”⁴³⁹ Haynes says that Anthia only reveals her true identity as a last resort in book five.⁴⁴⁰ However, Anthia in fact reveals her identity and history to the goatherd with whom she is sent to live at 2.9.4: *διηγείται δὲ ἥτις ἦν, τὴν προτέραν εὐγένειαν, τὸν ἄνδρα, τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν* (‘she told him who she was and about her former nobility, her husband and her captivity’). I shall argue that Anthia’s lies are not told in order to protect the honour of her background, but rather to postpone and finally to evade the possible narrative with which the narrator threatens her.⁴⁴¹ By acting in the way she does, Anthia is able to deceive characters within the text and put off some of the narrative routes down which the novel seems to be about to travel.

There are three occasions on which Anthia postpones and evades her impending fate by means of persuasive speech.⁴⁴² The first is when she is captured by Perilaus at 2.13. He falls in love with her, and tries to persuade her to marry him, but she postpones the wedding:

ἵκετεύει δὲ αὐτὸν ἀναμεῖναι χρόνον ὀλίγον ὅσον ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα, καὶ ἄχραντον τηρῆσαι· καὶ σκήπτεται <μέν τι>, ὁ δὲ Περίλαος πείθεται. . .

She begged him to hold off for a short time, as much as thirty days,

⁴³⁹Haynes 2003, p. 55.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid., p. 55.

⁴⁴¹For example, having to work in the brothel rather than simply staying there.

⁴⁴²There are other occasions on which she lies about her identity. See Haynes 2003, p. 55.

and to keep her undefiled; and she made some excuse, and Perilaus was persuaded. . .

2.13.8

σκήπτεται here carries connotations of fabrication, implying that Anthia is making up an excuse. **πείθεται** could mean both that Perilaus was persuaded by her excuse and that he obeyed her command to keep her undefiled for thirty days. The Greek neatly encompasses both meanings by using a verb form that could be either Passive or Middle.

Similarly Anthia lies to Psammis, an Indian ruler who desires her and buys her as a slave, at 3.11. He does not propose marriage, but instead wishes to have sex with her:

Ὦνησάμενος δὲ ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος [καὶ] εὐθὺς ἐπιχειρεῖ βιάζεσθαι
καὶ χρῆσθαι πρὸς συνουσίαν·

Having bought her the barbarian immediately made an attempt to take her by force and to use her for sex.

3.11.4

This time the reader is actually told what Anthia's excuse was, rather than just being told that she made one:

οὐ θέλουσα δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἀντέλεγε, τελευταῖον δὲ σκήπτεται πρὸς τὸν Ψάμμιν (δεισιδαίμονες δὲ φύσει βάρβαροι) ὅτι αὐτὴν ὁ πατὴρ γεννωμένην ἀναθείη τῇ Ἴσιδι μέχρις ὥρας γάμων καὶ ἔλεγεν ἔτι τὸν χρόνον ἐνιαυτοῦ τεθεῖσθαι. “Ἦν οὖν” φησὶν “ἐξυβρίσης εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς θεοῦ, μηνίσει μὲν ἐκείνη, χαλεπὴ δὲ ἡ τιμωρία.” Πείθεται Ψάμμις καὶ τὴν θεὸν προσεκύνει καὶ Ἀνθίας ἀπέχεται.

She was unwilling and refused at first, but later she made an excuse to Psammis (barbarians are superstitious by nature) that when she

was born her father had dedicated her to Isis until the right time for marriage and she said that the time was still a year's time away. "Therefore if you commit violence against the ward of the goddess, she will be wrathful, and her revenge will be harsh." Psammis was persuaded and made obeisance to the goddess and kept away from Anthia.

3.11.4–5

Once again Anthia **σκήπτεται**: she makes something up. It is of course possible that this tale is a variation on what she told Perilaus, but she shows signs of fitting her story to her audience: **δεισιδαίμονες δὲ φύσει βάρβαροι**. This additional comment could be taken as the narrator's focalization, but since it is given as Anthia's reason for concocting a story, I think that this is still within Anthia's focalization, as it displays her motive for picking this particular kind of story.⁴⁴³ Psammis is persuaded by her story just as Perilaus was before him, and obeys her (the double meaning is once again made a potentiality by **πείθεται**), which shows that Anthia is obviously a very persuasive speaker.

The most sophisticated of Anthia's lies is the story that she tells to a brothel-keeper. At 5.7.4 she pretends to be ill with **τὴν ἐκ θεῶν καλουμένην νόσον** ('the disease called the one from the gods'), that is, epilepsy, so that she does not have to carry out the duties of a prostitute. When the brothel-keeper demands to know the origin of the illness, she invents a history for herself, just as she did when talking to Psammis:

Ἡ δὲ Ἀνθία “καὶ πρότερον” ἔφη, “δέσποτα, εἰπεῖν πρὸς σὲ ἐβουλόμην τὴν συμφορὰν τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ διηγῆσασθαι τὰ συμβάντα, ἀλλὰ ἀπέκρυπτον αἰδουμένη νυνὶ δὲ οὐδὲν χαλεπὸν εἰπεῖν πρὸς σέ, πάντα ἤδη μεμαθηκότα τὰ κατ’ ἐμέ. Παῖς ἔτι οὖσα ἐν ἑορτῇ καὶ παννυχίδι ἀποπλανηθεῖσα τῶν ἐμαυτῆς ἦκον πρὸς τινα τάφον ἀνδρὸς νεωστὶ τεθνηκότος· κἀνταῦθα ἐφάνη μοί τις ἀναθορῶν ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ κατέχειν ἐπειρᾶτο· ἐγὼ δ’ ἀπέφυγον καὶ ἐβόων· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἦν

⁴⁴³See de Jong 1987, p. 118: implicit embedded focalization often expresses motive.

μὲν ὀφθῆναι φοβερός, φωνὴν δὲ πολλῶ εἶχε χαλεπωτέραν· καὶ τέλος ἡμέρα μὲν ἤδη ἐγίνετο, ἀφείς δέ με ἐπληξέ τε κατὰ τοῦ στήθους καὶ νόσον ταύτην ἔλεγεν ἐμβεβληκέναί. Ἐκεῖθεν ἀρξαμένη ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς κατέχομαι. Ἄλλὰ δέομαί σου, δέσποτα, μηδέν μοι χαλεπήνης· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ τούτων αἰτία.”

And Anthia said “Master, I wished to tell you before about my misfortune and to explain what happened, but I hid it as I was ashamed; and now it is not difficult to tell you, as you have already learnt everything about me. When I was still a child, at an all-night festival I lost my companions and I came to the tomb of a man who had died recently; and there someone appeared to me, leaping from the tomb, and tried to take hold of me; and I began to run away and kept shouting. And the man was fearsome to behold, and had a voice that was much worse; and at last when it was day, he let me go and struck me on the chest and said that this disease had come upon me. Beginning from that point I have been affected by the misfortune at different times in different ways. But I beg you, master, do not be angry; for I am not the cause of these things.”

5.7.7–9

The brothel-keeper is convinced by Anthia’s tale, and she does not have to work as a prostitute but is looked after instead. Crucially, the brothel-keeper makes an allowance for her *because it is not her fault*: συνεγίνωσκε δὲ αὐτῆ, ὡς οὐχ ἐκούση ταῦτα πασχούση (5.7.9). This is a suggestion that she put in his mind at the end of her speech (οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ τούτων αἰτία), which shows again, just as the speech directed at Psammis did, that she can shape a speech for her audience.⁴⁴⁴

Anthia thus presents the reader with a character who is capable of twisting the truth and fabricating tales in order to survive. In a sense, she is in control of her own narrative, even though she is often portrayed throughout the novel as quite

⁴⁴⁴Haynes 2000–1, p. 84: “She is easily able to pander to her captors’ preconceptions.”

powerless and totally at the mercy of men (twice bandits).⁴⁴⁵ Through her lying and manipulation she directs the reader away from the narrative that s/he thinks the narrator has in mind, and in doing so controls the narrative and shapes the reader's experience.⁴⁴⁶

It is useful to draw a parallel here with Callirhoe in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, because she is also a female character who twists the truth to her advantage. When Chaereas has finally regained Callirhoe, she writes a letter to Dionysius that is in some ways deceptive. In it, she does not break his belief that her child is his, but encourages it. She also writes the letter without telling Chaereas (ἐποίησε δίχρα Χαιρέου, 8.4.4). Callirhoe asserts her narrative by claiming it as her own: ταῦτά σοι γέγραφα τῆ ἐμῇ χειρὶ (these things I have written to you in my own hand, 8.4.5). She includes many instructions: do not remarry, marry her son to Dionysius' daughter from his previous marriage, and send the child to her when he is grown up. This all creates a potential for a future narrative after the end of the novel.

The letter (8.4.5–6) is very gently written, as is demonstrated by the vocabulary that is used: Callirhoe begins by saying Καλλιρὴ Διονυσίῳ εὐεργέτη χαίρειν: 'Callirhoe greets Dionysius her benefactor'. Throughout the letter she is kind and positive, as is demonstrated by the phrases δέομαί σου, μηδὲν ὀργισθῆς: ('I beg you, do not be angry') and εἰμὶ γὰρ τῆ ψυχῇ μετὰ σοῦ ('for I am with you in spirit'). She calls him ἀγαθὲ Διονύσιε: 'good Dionysius' and at the end calls herself 'your Callirhoe': Καλλιρῶς μνημόνευε τῆς σῆς. Callirhoe appears to care for Dionysius, which indicates that perhaps there is more to their marriage, on her side, than pure necessity. This is demonstrated again in her words to Stateira at 8.4.9:

ταύτην... δὸς Διονυσίῳ τῷ δυστυχεῖ, ὃν παρατίθημι σοί τε καὶ βασιλεῖ.
παρηγορήσατε αὐτόν. φοβοῦμαι μὴ ἐμοῦ χωρισθεῖς ἑαυτὸν ἀνέλη.

⁴⁴⁵She is not the only woman in this novel who lies — Manto lies to her father (2.5.6–7). If he had continued to believe her, the novel would have had a significantly different ending.

⁴⁴⁶This strategy of delaying narrative with lies is typically feminine and recalls Penelope in the *Odyssey*.

Give this to poor Dionysius, whom I hand over to you and the king.
 Console him. I am afraid lest, parted from me, he take his own life.

These words seem to be spoken with an element of sympathy and care: she believes that Dionysius may not be able to cope without her, and genuinely wants Stateira and the king to look out for him. On the other hand, it may be that she is thinking of her son all the time — who knows what would happen to him if Dionysius were to kill himself! Whichever is more likely, by speaking these words Callirhoe is shaping Dionysius' future as well as that of her son and Stateira and the king, which affords her a narrative voice. Her actions invite the reader to think about the continuation of the narrative beyond the end of the text. Callirhoe provides a female perspective on events, and tellingly it is one that could be interpreted either as betraying her own feelings or as disguising her own feelings and coldly manipulating other characters to her advantage.

Conclusion

These novelistic texts contain elements of deception which prompt the reader to analyse if s/he is reading correctly: s/he is forced into a position of thinking about his or her reading experience. This is similar to how the erotic elements in the texts work.⁴⁴⁷ The deceptive elements go further in a way, because they test not the reader's *sōphrosunē* but his or her ability to deal with the implications of narrative and to identify what it is that the text is proposing s/he take from it. The novels suggest possible alternative narrative routes to be explored by the reader, and this encourages him or her to read more closely, questioning the text at every given opportunity.

Both Anthia and Callirhoe use clever rhetoric, chosen specifically for their audiences. This gives them a female narrative voice that shapes the reader's experience by inviting him or her to think both about the female perspective and about how

⁴⁴⁷See chapter 2, especially p. 149 ff.

the narrative is changed by that female perspective. With this background of female characters shaping and enhancing the curious reader's experience of the text in mind, the next chapter will explore some of the female voices and perspectives within the texts in more depth.

Chapter 4

Reading female voices

Introduction

In this chapter I shall explore further some of the narrative routes down which the reader can go once s/he has identified him or herself as curious. That is, using *polypragmosunē* as a starting point, what further aspects of the text can be uncovered? This chapter will demonstrate that female characters in the Greek novel have a significant role within the text, by arguing that they have more than simply a presence in the text. They have a narrative voice, which is a thread available for the curious reader to follow and explore. The main female protagonists of the novels will not always be the focus of discussion in this chapter, since some of the lesser characters, by their very virtue of being characters who are described in less detail or who only appear for a short time in the text, often have a greater role to play in terms of encouraging the reader to pry into their narrative. Egger argues that the female characters in the novels have less social freedom than their contemporary counterparts; they suffer from what she calls an “archaizing handicap”.⁴⁴⁸ It is nevertheless possible to read the women in the novels as having a power that goes beyond simply their erotic power, for which Egger argues.⁴⁴⁹ It is not my aim

⁴⁴⁸Egger 1994b, p. 271.

⁴⁴⁹See Egger 1994a and Egger 1994b. See also Haynes 2000–1 for female power.

here to discover a 'lived female experience' (although I shall not take the novels completely out of their cultural context); I wish instead to show the relationship of female characters to the reader: they form part of the guide about how to read the text, and are not simply a narrative object, stimulating the reader's curiosity because they are beautiful and elusive. In other words, female characters are not simply there to invite the reader's curious gaze, but they also have a subjectivity which actively directs the reader's reading of the text and constructs it as a curious one.

In addition to the methodologies employed in the previous chapters, it will be necessary here to engage with feminist theory, because this chapter will explore the power of female characters to communicate directly with the reader. Feminist theory does not form a coherent theoretical approach. As Schmitz says, the variety found in feminist theory "is not due to some lack of logical rigor in its proponents, but rather a conscious rejection of the demand for a monolithic model of thought"⁴⁵⁰ and it demonstrates "a lively plurality of opinions and attitudes."⁴⁵¹ There are helpful elements within this 'lively plurality' that I wish to utilize in the course of this chapter. Cixous and Irigaray's ideas of 'feminine writing', behind which lie questions of how it is possible "for women to express themselves in a language which is... dominated by a male perspective"⁴⁵² become important to my argumentation in this chapter. The women that I have chosen to discuss do manage to express themselves from behind the text that is written by a male, from a male perspective, and (presumably) for a predominantly male readership. In doing so, they resist their narrator (/author) and invite the reader to read from a perspective that is different from, or even in conflict with, that of the controlling narrative voice. Female thoughts and feelings are displayed to the reader through the filter of the male narrator. Whenever women speak or write, a tension is created between the potential display of the female voice and its erasure by the male narrator of the text. The display of women's thoughts and feelings within a male-narrated text creates a slippage between direct access to woman as expressing subject and filtered access to woman as always-written object; in other words, a

⁴⁵⁰Schmitz 2002, p. 176.

⁴⁵¹Ibid., p. 177.

⁴⁵²Ibid., p. 180.

tension between women's direct readability and their inscrutability. Particularly pertinent to my argument is Jardine's idea of Gynesis: "For Jardine... there are always spaces in the text, over which the narrative has lost control, and these can be coded as 'feminine' and 'woman'."⁴⁵³ It is some of these 'spaces' that I shall explore in the course of this chapter (particularly in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and Lucian's *Onos*, since ego-narrative in particular invites this thrust of analysis), as well as the speeches, letters, and thoughts of female characters. The very nature of a male-narrated text means that any female perspective is filtered and has to be searched for in the tension between male text and the female speech or thought it presents. Ultimately, I shall concentrate on the female characters' creativity as the instrument they use to direct the reader's experience:

every woman is author of the page and author of the page's author.
The art of producing essentials — children, food, cloth — is women's
ultimate creativity.⁴⁵⁴

What this means in terms of the novels is that female characters have a narrative power beyond simply the text; they have the power to communicate with the reader on a different level, and to break through the 'male' text. Every female character whom I shall discuss in this chapter demonstrates a creativity which affords her a narrative voice, or subjectivity. This voice drives certain elements of the narrative and shapes the reader's experience, encouraging him or her to pry into a perspective that is against the main grain of the text.

There are in the Greek novels points at which the female characters defy the narrator, creating their own agency and breaking through the dialogue between narrator and reader. In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, Persinna demonstrates that she has a narrative voice by physically inscribing her own narrative in embroidery on a band of silk, and this narrative ultimately shapes the story of the *Aethiopica*. Leucippe in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* takes this narrative subjectivity a stage further by subtly undermining the ego-narrator from behind his narrative, even

⁴⁵³Haynes 2003, p. 13.

⁴⁵⁴Gubar 1985, p. 306.

though she has relatively little speech. Cleitophon narrates her, but it becomes apparent that he never really understands her. Finally, Palaestra and the other women in [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Onos* display an ability to control the ego-narrator's narrative by framing and shaping it. Leucippe and the women in the *Onos* are particularly interesting in terms of their narrative voices, or narrative power, as they are featured within ego-narrated novels. These female characters perform a role that is slightly different to and more powerfully subversive than that played by the female characters in the other novels: they do not just drive the narrative, but they also resist their narrator in a more striking way, and in doing so they challenge the reader to find them, stimulating his or her curiosity.

I intend to argue that these female characters who drive or control the narrative shape the reader's experience by encouraging him or her to pry into their narratives and to read against the grain of the text. That is, a resistant female voice in a text encourages a resistant reader. This resistant, or resisting, reader is traditionally one who reads from a female perspective.⁴⁵⁵ As Liveley suggests, the aim of resistance is not to misread in a perverse manner, but to think about texts in a new way,⁴⁵⁶ to ask different questions of them. This is what I hope to achieve in this chapter, indeed, this is the position of a curious reader who is ready to interrogate the text to the utmost degree.

Before discussing the Greek novels, this chapter will begin by briefly analysing the two female characters in Theocritus' *Idyll* 15 (the reasons for comparing this genre will by now be apparent). This text plays with the ideas of female creativity and reading from a female perspective. It shows women reacting to texts and in doing so leads the reader to read from a female perspective. Because it concentrates on women 'reading', women's language and female creativity, this text provides a useful background to illuminate an investigation of women in the novels.

⁴⁵⁵Fetterly 1977, p. xx: "As readers and teachers and scholars, women are taught to think as men". Questioning or going against this kind of reading results in a reading that can be termed female, or resistant.

⁴⁵⁶Liveley 1999, p. 199.

Reading (as) women: Theocritus *Idyll* 15

At the beginning of this *Idyll*, Gorgo visits Praxinoa at her house and the setting is a domestic one: Praxinoa is not yet dressed to go out, she is looking after her baby, and her weaving is still out. The reader of the text is invited to view into the everyday domestic, even boring and monotonous, lives of these women. After an introductory conversation in which both women complain about their husbands, Gorgo says:

βᾶμες τῷ βασιλῆος ἐς ἀφνειῷ Πτολεμαίῳ
 θασόμεναι τὸν Ἄδωνιν· ἀκούω χρῆμα καλόν τι
 κοσμεῖν τὰν βασίλισσαν.⁴⁵⁷

Let us go to the palace of rich Ptolemy in order to see Adonis. I hear that the queen is arranging something beautiful.

22–24

These lines reveal the purpose behind Gorgo's visit to Praxinoa's house and draw the reader further into the text. The reader too will go to the palace and see whatever the beautiful thing is that the queen is arranging for the festival. Crucially for this poem, s/he will view this festival through the eyes of these women.

The Adonis festival is a female one that is not conducted out of sight of men: "what the women see here is a festival where women are so fully in charge that they need not exclude men."⁴⁵⁸ The fragments of the novelistic *Phoenicica* appear to depict an Adonis festival.⁴⁵⁹ Whatever is going on appears to be taking place on a roof (τοῦ τέγους, A.1 Recto 6) There appear to be women dancing (αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἀῶθι[ς /]αι καὶ διετελοῦ[ν] ὀρχούμενα[ι /τῆ]ι ὀρχήσει ἀλλήλας, A.1 Recto 8–10), and men are present (as is evidenced by several masculine definite articles) but it is unclear from the extremely fragmented nature of the text whether they are

⁴⁵⁷The text is from Hunter 1999.

⁴⁵⁸Griffiths 1981, p. 255.

⁴⁵⁹Stephens and Winkler 1995, p. 345.

actually taking part in what is going on or just watching the festival. The sexual encounter between Persis and the narrator is also not out of place at the Adonis festival.⁴⁶⁰

In Menander's *Samia* Moschion describes the Adonis festival at which he gets a girl pregnant:

ἐξ ἀγροῦ δὴ καταδραμῶν
ὡς ἔτυ|χ[έ] γ' εἰς Ἀδώνι' αὐτάς κατέλαβον
συνηγμένας ἐνθάδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετὰ τινῶν
ἄλλων γυναικῶν· τῆς δ' ἑορτῆς παιδιὰν
πολλήν|ν ἐχούσης οἶον εἰκός, συμπαρῶν
ἐγινόμην οἶμαι θεατῆς· ἀγρυπνίαν
ὁ θόρυβος αὐτῶν ἐνεπόει γάρ μοι τινά·
ἐπὶ τὸ τέγος κήπους γὰρ ἀνέφερόν τινας,
ὠρχο|ῶντ', ἐπαννύχιζον ἐσκεδασμέναι.

Coming back in a hurry from our farm I found them, as it happened, gathered at our house for the Adonis-festival along with some other women. The festivities, as one might expect, were providing a good deal of fun and since I was there along with them I became a sort of spectator. The noise they were making was giving me a sleepless night — they were carrying their garden on to the roof, dancing, celebrating the night away, scattered all over the roof.

38–46⁴⁶¹

It is clearly a lively festival, and one that is private and domestic.⁴⁶² By opening up the palace for this domestic festival, the queen Arsinoe in Theocritus' fifteenth *Idyll* opens up her private life to the crowd in the text and the reader outside the text, just as the private life of the two women is opened up at the beginning of the

⁴⁶⁰Stephens and Winkler 1995, p. 345.

⁴⁶¹Text and translation Bain 1983.

⁴⁶²See Neils 2008, p. 245.

text. When the women arrive at the palace they admire a tapestry that depicts Adonis:

ΓΟΡΓΩ

Πραξινοά, πόταγ' ὦδε. τὰ ποικίλα πρῶτον ἄθρησον,
λεπτὰ καὶ ὡς χαρίεντα·

Gorgo

Praxinoa, come here. First look at the beautifully woven tapestries,
how light and elegant they are.

78–79

Again Gorgo's speech draws the reader into the text and constructs him or her as part of the audience. The imperative ἄθρησον ('look') in an emphatic position at the end of the line highlights this; it is not just Praxinoa who is instructed to look, but the reader as well. λεπτὰ and χαρίεντα serve to help the reader outside the text imagine what the women are looking at as well as telling the viewer within the text (Praxinoa) what to do and what to take notice of. λεπτὰ and χαρίεντα are words of literary criticism and therefore can also refer to the poem itself.⁴⁶³ Objects in Theocritan *Idylls* often stand for the poems that surround them, the most famous example being the ivy cup in *Idyll* 1.⁴⁶⁴ It depicts among its scenes a boy weaving a trap for grasshoppers whilst guarding a vineyard (*ll.* 45–54). His weaving can be read as a reification of the act of writing poetry.⁴⁶⁵ The language of weaving used to describe the ivy on the cup “associates the cup with the ‘cricket-trap’ depicted on it”,⁴⁶⁶ thus linking the artefacts within the poem more deeply with the creation of the poem itself. Similarly, the woven object within *Idyll* 15

⁴⁶³Goldhill 1994, p. 218; Hunter 1996c, p. 117. Gorgo also plays with Homeric allusion, since the phrase λεπτὰ τε καὶ χαρίεντα can be found at *Odyssey* 10.223 (Goldhill 1994, p. 217; Hunter 1996b, p. 150).

⁴⁶⁴Lines 23–56. See most recently Klooster 2012. This cup is exchanged for a song, and so makes it equivalent to song.

⁴⁶⁵Hunter 1999, pp. 62, 77. See also Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, p. 143 and Montiglio 2012, p. 136.

⁴⁶⁶Hunter 1999, p. 78.

encourages the reader to think even more about the link between weaving and text.⁴⁶⁷

Gorgo's speech reminds the reader that the poem too (and Theocritus' poetry as a whole) is beautifully contrived, light, and elegant. The reader is constructed as a viewer by the text, admiring both the poetry and the tapestry.

After Gorgo has told Praxinoa to look at how light and elegant the tapestries are, Praxinoa, who clearly agrees with her, answers:

πότνι' Ἀθαναΐα, ποῖαί σφ' ἐπόνασαν ἔριθοι,
 ποῖοι ζωογράφοι τὰκριβέα γράμματ' ἔγραψαν.
 ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐστάκωντι καὶ ὡς ἔτυμ' ἐνδινεῦντι,
 ἔμψυχ', οὐκ ἐνυφαντά.

Lady Athena, What sort of weaving women worked hard at them, and what sort of artists drew the precise drawings. How realistically they stand and how realistically they go about. They have life in them, they are not woven.

80–83

Praxinoa praises the skill of the women (ποῖαί) who wove the scene, and the skill of the men (ποῖοι) who drew the outlines. She is particularly impressed by how lifelike the figures are and by the fact that they do seem to be alive, even breathing.⁴⁶⁸ The tapestry seems to be a collaboration between men and women, but it is the women who have been doing the weaving, bringing the drawings to life with their creative skill. The women are the ones who ἐπόνασαν, and they have created something

⁴⁶⁷See Skinner 2001, pp. 214–215. For weaving as text see McIntosh Snyder 1981, Scheid and Svenbro 1994 tr. 1996 chapter 5 and Segal 1994a. See also Fletcher 2009 for the link between weaving and narrative in Euripides' *Ion*.

⁴⁶⁸One can compare Herodas *Mime* 4, often discussed alongside this *Idyll*, in which two women visit the temple of Asclepius and comment upon the various artworks. They too are impressed with the verisimilitude they find and use the correct words to describe it: ἀληθιναί, line 72, is a technical term from art criticism (Zanker 2004, p. 85).

λεπτά, which, as we have seen, is vocabulary used of creating poetry and so brings the women to the level of creator.⁴⁶⁹

While Praxinoa is vocalizing her admiration for the tapestry, particularly the depiction of Adonis, a man asks (or rather orders) her to be quiet:

παύσασθ', ὦ δύσταντοι, ἀνάνυτα κωτίλλοισαι,
 τρυγόνες: ἐκκναισεῦντι πλατειάσδοισαι ἅπαντα.

Cease, wretched women, that endless prattling, like turtle-doves! They will wear you out by pronouncing everything broadly.

87–88

Here the man asserts control over her and silences her, or tries to: Praxinoa answers him back. However, in thinking that the women are just prattling idly the man has missed the point:

By experiencing eros through viewing the tapestries, by desiring what is forbidden and alien (Adonis, a passive young boy), Praxinoa is transported into the world of the Adonia. But the bystander is oblivious to how Praxinoa's experience is appropriate to the festive occasion; instead he objects to her violation of patriarchal social norms for women's behavior in a public space.⁴⁷⁰

Praxinoa's reaction is legitimately part of her experience, and the man cannot relate to it. Women are not easily silenced in this text: the narrator of the Adonis hymn is female, so even though the man has silenced Praxinoa's description, he has not silenced womankind. Indeed, Praxinoa's use of the Doric dialect exercises her right to freedom of speech.⁴⁷¹ The Ptolemies, whose palace she is visiting,

⁴⁶⁹See Felson 1994, p. 42.

⁴⁷⁰Burton 1995, p. 59.

⁴⁷¹Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, p. 374.

traced their ancestry back to Heracles, a Doric hero,⁴⁷² and Fantuzzi and Hunter argue that the ‘otherness’ of Doric “marks it as the preserver of genuine Greek tradition”.⁴⁷³ Praxinoa is not in fact out of place here, and her Doric accent serves to prove rather than disprove this.

As Dover points out,⁴⁷⁴ the man also speaks in Doric dialect, and this has interesting implications for the reader of the text:

In thus calling attention to the possibility of *unrepresented* linguistic difference within the textual representation of speech, the passage speaks directly (and self-reflexively) to the kind of literary *mimēsis* offered by the Syracusan Theocritus; as the women admire the lifelike ‘realism’ of the tapestries, we are forced to confront our own interpretative models for dealing with the characters of a ‘lifelike’ mime.⁴⁷⁵

The reader is thus forced to examine his or her own prejudices about literature and characterization. As well as female experience, or female ‘reading’, female creative and productive power is also celebrated in this *Idyll*. Women make the tapestry, and a girl sings the hymn. Gorgo praises the girl who performs the hymn even before she has spoken:

μέλλει τὸν Ἄδωνιν ἀεΐδειν
 ἅ τᾶς Ἀργείας θυγάτηρ, πολὺίδρις ἀοιδός,
 ἅτις καὶ πέρυσιν τὸν ἰάλεμον ἀρίστευσε.
 φθεγξέιται τι, σάφ’ οἶδα, καλόν·

A very wise singer, the daughter of Argeia, is about to sing the Adonis hymn, and she also performed the best lament last year. She will sing something beautiful, I know well.

⁴⁷²Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, p. 375.

⁴⁷³Ibid., p. 377.

⁴⁷⁴Dover 1971, p. 207.

⁴⁷⁵Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, p. 372.

After the song, Gorgo again praises the singer and draws attention to the fact that she is a woman:

Πραξινόα, τὸ χρῆμα σοφώτατον ἅ θήλεια·
ὀλβία ὅσσα ἴσατι, πανολβία ὡς γλυκὸν φωνεῖ.

Praxinoa, she is a very wise thing, this women; blessed in as many things as she knows, and exceedingly blessed since she sings sweetly.

145–146

The hymn links Arsinoe with her mother, not her father (ἅ Βερενικεῖα θυγάτηρ. . . Ἄρσινόα, 110–111), Aphrodite is identified through her relationship with her mother (Κύπρι Διωναία, 106) and the girl who sings the hymn is also identified through her mother not her father (ἅ τῶς Ἀργείας θυγάτηρ, 97).⁴⁷⁶ Female creativity is evident in the contents of the hymn itself. There is, as Burton points out,⁴⁷⁷ a detailed description of how the cakes are made. It is women (γυναῖκες) who have made these cakes, mixing them carefully and shaping them. The verb used here is πονέω, which links the creation of the cakes with the creation of both the hymn and poem: “the emphasis on how carefully the cakes are crafted suggests an analogy to the hymnist’s craft in composing a hymn, as well as to the poet’s own craft.”⁴⁷⁸ The poet is aligning himself with female creativity, which is appropriate in a text that centres around a women’s festival. However, there is something deeper going on in this text, as regards female creativity.

The hymn itself has caused consternation and debate among scholars because of its mediocre style.⁴⁷⁹ Goldhill asks what the implications are for the poem as a whole when Gorgo says that the woman who recites the song is wise, and concludes: “[i]n short, the tension between the song’s performance and its audience’s

⁴⁷⁶Griffiths 1981, pp. 254; Burton 1995, p. 76.

⁴⁷⁷Ibid., p. 143.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid., p. 144 and see n. 113.

⁴⁷⁹Dover 1971, pp. 209–210; Goldhill 1991, pp. 276–277; Goldhill 1994, 218 ff.; Hunter 1996c, pp. 123–4.

reaction inevitably poses for the reader of the *Idyll* a question of *sophia*, its recognition, its authority, its deployment.”⁴⁸⁰ Is the poem parodic, then, or is it not? To this question can be added the question: what are the implications for the reader reading from the wise perspective of a woman who says that women are wise even though they are apparently no masters of poetry? These questions are the point of this text: like the novels, this poem is literature that makes the reader interrogate the text and work hard both to discover what is really going on, and to discover what kind of reader s/he is.

The women in *Idyll* 15 ‘read’ both the image and the text of the hymn and appreciate the way in which they are produced and performed respectively. The reader is drawn in by the women’s admiration of the image and the hymn so s/he becomes a reader of women reading and appreciating the creativity of women.⁴⁸¹ The way the women ‘read’ the image, made by women, indicates that they are not mere passers-by, but more expert: “the women scrutinize the textiles with the eyes of practiced fabric workers.”⁴⁸² The women know how much work has gone into this tapestry, from the very production of the cloth itself.⁴⁸³ This constructs them as the learned audience in the text, and the tapestry stands in for the poem: it represents the “elegant court literature produced under Ptolemaic patronage”.⁴⁸⁴ The men in the poem do not understand the realm of female creativity. Not only does the man who tries to silence Praxinoa try to pass her comments off as chattering, but Praxinoa’s husband Dinon also demonstrates a lack of comprehension about his wife’s shopping list:

λέγομες δὲ πρόαν θην

“πάππα, νίτρον καὶ φῦκος ἀπὸ σκανᾶς ἀγοράσδειν” —

⁴⁸⁰Goldhill 1994, p. 221.

⁴⁸¹Burton 1995, p. 107: “In both Herodas’s *Mime* 4 and Theocritus’s *Idyll* 15, the relation between audience and art is raised to a subject of thematic interest: the poems’ readers have, within the fiction of the poems, people looking at art, and outside the fiction of the poems, themselves looking at art. Thus, in the experience of fictive viewers of art, readers can see their own interpretive problems mirrored.”

⁴⁸²Skinner 2001, p. 118.

⁴⁸³Whitehorne 1995, p. 72.

⁴⁸⁴Skinner 2001, 214: “the female viewer is... a surrogate for the trained reader.”

ἵκτο φέρων ἄλας ἄμμιν, ἀνήρ τρισκαιδεκάπαχυς.

The other day we said to him: “papa, buy sodium carbonate and red dye from the store.” He came back with salt for us, that great oaf of a man.

15–17

Traditionally *νίτρον* and *φῦκος* have been translated as ‘soap’ and ‘rouge’ respectively, but Whitehorne has demonstrated that *νίτρον* is used in the process of fulling wool, and that *φῦκος* is a red dye.⁴⁸⁵ Plutarch says that *νίτρον* is used to help in the process of dyeing using specifically red dye at *De defectu oraculorum* 433b: *καθάπερ τῆς μὲν πορφύρας ὁ κύαμος τῆς δὲ κόκκου τὸ νίτρον δοκεῖ τὴν βαφὴν ἐπάγειν μεμειγμένον* (. . . “just as the bean seems to further the dyeing of purple and sodium carbonate (*nitron*) that of scarlet when mixed with the dye”). Given that Praxinoa has obviously spent the morning spinning, it makes sense for these two words placed together in one line to refer to the process of creating textiles.⁴⁸⁶

Dinon obviously does not see that there is any difference between sodium carbonate and salt, so buys the one that makes more sense to him. Whitehorne’s point is that salt is even more expensive than *νίτρον* so Dinon not only has money to throw away, but has been taken advantage of by the shopkeeper who sold him the salt. He argues that the women are in a contest to be the one who can show she has the most disposable income, and this contest takes the place of other contests in Theocritus’ other *Idylls*.⁴⁸⁷ However, the fact that Dinon misunderstands what it is his wife has sent him to buy is indicative of a whole level of female narrative, creativity and skill that goes above the heads of the men who are portrayed in it, right down to the torn scarf, which means a lot to Praxinoa.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁵Whitehorne 1995, pp. 64–66. See also Gow 1952, pp. 270–271.

⁴⁸⁶Whitehorne 1995, p. 66.

⁴⁸⁷Ibid., p. 68.

⁴⁸⁸Skinner 2001, p. 214.

The implications of reading from a female perspective, understanding all the undercurrents that are set in place by the vocabulary associated with the production of cloth, are exciting. Theocritus is Syracusan, like the women portrayed, which has the effect of linking him more firmly with his female characters.⁴⁸⁹ He dares to use the female register to speak about feminine subjects and to discuss female reactions. Although the Adonis festival was not hidden from men, they would not have attended, so this is the only way in which the poet can deliver an ‘authentic’ representation both of the events and of the participants’ reaction to them. Having his characters comment upon how well-made the tapestry is and how beautifully the hymn is sung⁴⁹⁰ encourages the reader to reflect upon how well-written the poem is: the reader is seduced into reading from a female perspective and participating in a female festival almost without realizing it — and to understand the text fully one has to read from a female perspective. In the *Samia* Moschion makes an interesting point: he is a **θεατής**, standing on the outside of the festival and looking on to it. The reader of Theocritus’ text is at one level a **θεατής** of the festival, but if s/he reads from a female perspective, s/he becomes more than that: an active participant.

Reading from a female perspective has its own problems, or thrills. The gap between the poet and his characters produces a tension,⁴⁹¹ and the reader or audience of the poem has to ask very many questions of and about the text: “As the women evaluate the depiction of Adonis, the work of evaluation — of the women’s response — is turned back on the reader (as the reader formulates a response to the poetic work of art).”⁴⁹² The reader will come to two separate conclusions depending on whether s/he reads the women or reads as the women, and this is the point of the poem: it remains “tantalizingly unclear”⁴⁹³ what the reader’s reaction to the hymn should be. In this text the reader is given a choice about the perspective s/he takes, but is encouraged to take a female perspective. A layer of narrative about female

⁴⁸⁹Hunter 1996c, p. 118 suggests that they “act the role of the informing poet”.

⁴⁹⁰For Gutzwiller “[d]elicacy of fabric, intricacy of design, sweetness of scent serve to define a feminine aesthetic” in Nossis’ poetry (Gutzwiller 1998, p. 82). Perhaps here too the women are appreciating what they see and hear as only a female can?

⁴⁹¹Goldhill 1994, p. 216.

⁴⁹²Ibid., p. 218.

⁴⁹³Klooster 2012, p. 117.

creativity lurks beneath the surface. In much the same way as the novels do, this work, by concentrating on female agents, generates a female subjectivity which encourages the reader to read from a female perspective, thus inviting him or her to read against the grain and explore an alternative, supplementary meaning.

Keeping in mind this background of female creativity, and layers of female interpretation and meaning within male-narrated texts, I turn now to the Greek novels.

Inscribing narrative: Persinna

This section will demonstrate how Persinna shapes the *Aethiopica* through her actions, her inscribing of the story of Charicleia's birth, and her identification with 'Heliodorus'.

The *Aethiopica* traces the story of Charicleia (who was exposed at birth) and Theagenes as they fall in love and go through the usual novelistic adventures en route to Charicleia's birthplace, Ethiopia, where they can eventually be married.

At the point at which the reader encounters Persinna's narrative, Calasiris is relating to Cnemon the story of how he came to be the self-appointed guardian of the novel's heroine, Charicleia. He reveals to Cnemon and the reader much of Charicleia's back-story, but Cnemon and the reader still do not know who exactly Charicleia is. Calasiris tells us that Charicleia had been exposed as a baby with a band (*tainia*) on which her birth-mother Persinna had embroidered the narrative of her conception and birth. She had done so in royal Ethiopian script, so none of Charicleia's 'guardians' so far had been able to read it apart from the man who rescued her, Sisimithres, who disappears from the narrative before managing to tell anyone what Persinna wrote. However, Calasiris can read the script, and so the reader finds the answer to the question s/he has been asking for the first three books: who exactly *is* Charicleia? The reader learns from Persinna's narrative that Charicleia is the daughter of the king and queen of Ethiopia, but was born white, due to the fact that her mother had caught sight of a picture of Andromeda at the

moment of her conception. Persinna exposed the baby Charicleia when she was born, fearing that she would be accused of adultery, told Hydaspes the baby had died, and included the band among the recognition tokens as an explanation for whoever rescued Charicleia and for Charicleia herself.

Haynes, in her book *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel* has surprisingly little to say about Persinna or her letter, given how important she is to the narrative. She is mentioned in passing a number of times, and Haynes does say that Persinna's lack of understanding when Charicleia weeps over Theagenes' imminent sacrifice demonstrates well the fact that "the authors of the novels discounted any meaningful communication between mothers and children."⁴⁹⁴ Persinna's letter actually demonstrates hugely meaningful communication, as it is this letter that leads Charicleia back to her home and family. Persinna could just have exposed her child and not left any explanation, thus altering the story considerably. Anderson points out that Persinna's letter is "one of the most pivotal and provocative episodes of [Heliodorus'] novel."⁴⁹⁵ He does not, however, address the fact that such a 'pivotal' and 'provocative' narrative is put in the mouth, or rather the hands, of a female character. Hilton also sees Persinna's letter as important, writing: "the script [it] presents (that of the birth of a prodigy) is what provides the story with its imaginative power and originality."⁴⁹⁶ He argues that the letter detailing Charicleia's birth, and the mystery surrounding it, echo and enhance the enigmatic nature of the narrative. Again, he does not really address the fact that the letter is written by a female character. Whitmarsh argues that the *tainia* demonstrates how the novel itself should be read:

the word 'local' [ἐγγχωρίοις, 2.31.2] serves the crucial function of defining ethnographically the culture-specific, the non-universal. This cultural exclusivity does a number of things: it plays a narrative role, allowing Kalasiris access to information which Charikles does not have (although he possesses the band), it underscores the private, interpersonal tone of the letter, but it also... makes this text into a reading

⁴⁹⁴Haynes 2003, p. 118. Cf. Johne 1996, pp. 202–203.

⁴⁹⁵Anderson 1997, p. 303.

⁴⁹⁶Hilton 1998, p. 80.

problem. In order to decipher the *tainia* — and by implication the *Aithiopika* itself? — you have to read from a non-Greek perspective.⁴⁹⁷

Although Whitmarsh acknowledges the important function of women's creativity within Homeric epic, and the fact that Persinna's narrative fits into this tradition, this is not the main thrust of his article.

Persinna not only acts as a narrative catalyst but also inscribes a female perspective into the text of the *Aethiopica*, and is a pivotal character in terms of her identification with the narrator of the text and with creative women in myth. All of these things encourage the reader to read in a searching way, thus appealing to his or her curiosity.

Persinna as narrative catalyst

Persinna's most important action within the text is her exposure of Charicleia. Even though this is a fairly simple action, it is not insignificant. The text invites the reader to ponder whether and in what ways Charicleia's story would have been different if Persinna had not exposed her at birth. It sets the reader thinking about whether Charicleia would have remained in Ethiopia and married Meroebus, who is picked out for her at the end of the novel by her parents.⁴⁹⁸ Or perhaps Persinna would have been rejected by Hydaspes for adultery and Charicleia would have lived a life of poverty and misery. The exposure of Charicleia is therefore the action that both acts as a catalyst to her story and shapes it.

The narrative that Persinna embroiders on the band that she leaves with her daughter is also important on several levels in the narrative of the *Aethiopica*. The simplest function that it serves is to reveal to the reader Charicleia's back-story. It also reveals to Charicleia her origins. It is the point at which Calasiris reveals what is written on the band to Charicleia that the 'real' events of the story start, that is,

⁴⁹⁷Whitmarsh 1998, p. 119.

⁴⁹⁸Hydaspes says to Meroebus: οἱ γὰρ πατρώοι καὶ γενεάρχαι θεοὶ τε καὶ ἥρωες ἡμῖν μὲν θυγατέρα σοὶ δὲ νόμφην, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐξευρήκασιν. 'For the gods and heroes, our ancestors and the founders of our race, have found a daughter for us and a bride for you, as it seems' 10.24.1.

the journey to find Charicleia's homeland and parents.⁴⁹⁹ Persinna, or rather her letter, is therefore a narrative catalyst, and this affords Persinna narrative power, since she is the reason for Charicleia's journey to Ethiopia.

Persinna's voice

A female point of view

The language of the embroidered letter reveals Persinna's thoughts and feelings in several ways. She uses vocabulary indicative of pain and grief, coupled with phrases that betray her motherly feelings and concerns for the future. She talks at the beginning of the narrative about the pains of childbirth, and how Charicleia is her daughter only by these, as opposed to through the experience of bringing the child up: μέχρι μόνων ὠδίνων θυγατρὶ (4.8.1). The letter she writes she describes as an ἔγγραφον θρηῖνον (4.8.1). She also says that it was written in tears and blood, which makes graphic both the pain of childbirth and the pain of Persinna's subsequent sacrifice.⁵⁰⁰

... κοσμήσασα καὶ ταινία τῆδε, [καὶ] ἔλεεινῶ διηγῆματι τῷ σῷ τε
κἀμαυτῆς, ἐνειλήσασα, ἦν ἀπὸ δακρῦων τῶν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ αἵματος
ἐχάρακτον ὁμοῦ πρωτοτόκος καὶ πολύθρηνος γενομένη.

...having bedecked you with and wrapped you in this band, your
pitiable narrative and mine, which I inscribed out of tears for you and
blood, being at the same time a first-time mother and much aggrieved.

4.8.6

⁴⁹⁹Anderson 1997, p. 309: "In revealing, finally, who Charicleia is and why, as daughter of the king and queen of Ethiopia, she was secretly sent away from home to be adopted eventually by the priest of Apollo at Delphi, the letter explains the fundamental motives behind the movement of the plot."

⁵⁰⁰cf. Hilton 1998, p. 83: "the physical pain of the birth stands metaphorically for the grief felt by the queen in writing the story of her daughter's conception and subsequent exposure."

Emphasis is placed here on the fact that Charicleia is her firstborn, which makes her having to give her up more poignant. The passage also links embroidering the letter and childbirth as female creativity, a point to which I shall return.⁵⁰¹

Persinna highlights the reason why she is writing to her daughter: it is because she has been deprived of her presence: τὰς ἐμψύχους καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁμιλίας τοῦ δαίμονος στερήσαντος (4.8.8). This draws attention to Charicleia's exposure as something Persinna was compelled to do. Throughout her narrative, Persinna's bond with her child is brought to the forefront by the use of vocabulary. The word 'daughter' appears three times in her letter: θυγατρὶ...θύγατερ...θύγατερ, and is accompanied by παιδίον, and the word μητηρ. Bringing attention to the fact that Charicleia is Persinna's child using this vocabulary emphasizes the fact that Persinna did not want to abandon her, but was forced to because she was afraid that she would be accused of adultery.

Persinna says that the band can act as the funeral tears of a mother at the graveside, should Charicleia die: ἔσται...ἐπιτύμβια καὶ μητρὸς ἐπικήδεια δάκρυα (2.8.8). The band therefore encompasses the potential entirety of Charicleia's life, since it is relevant to both her birth and her death. Furthermore, the verb χαράττω (4.8.1) calls to mind funerary inscription, so the *tainia* can, as Hilton puts it, act "both as a birth-token and as a death-amulet."⁵⁰² The band also conveys a positive hope for the future. Persinna tells Charicleia to honour chastity (τιμῶσα σωφροσύνην, ἥ δὴ μόνη γυναικείαν ἀρετὴν χαρακτηρίζει, 2.8.7), which demonstrates a motherly hope for her daughter to turn out respectably.

Persinna's narrative therefore works on a basic level as a window on to a woman's perspective, but there is more to this embroidered letter than meets the eye.

Communicative power

Persinna's narrative has immense power as a piece of communication. It successfully relates to the reader, to Calasiris, and to Charicleia (to name but a few

⁵⁰¹See p. 206 ff.

⁵⁰²Hilton 1998, p. 83.

audiences) who exactly Charicleia is, who her parents are, and where she comes from: pieces of information vital to anyone's identity, but particularly to Charicleia, the wandering exile. Persinna's narrative thus solves the mystery of the first three books, and provides motivation for the ensuing narrative.⁵⁰³

Part of the power of Persinna's communication is that it is believed. Her narrative is actually very persuasive, as no-one really questions the truth of it. Hydaspes, for one, has every right to question her faithfulness, given the potential for adultery to have taken place, but the only thing he questions is that Charicleia is actually the same person as the baby that was born and exposed. He seems for a while (understandably) to have trouble with believing that the baby was actually white in the first place. He says: λευκὴν γὰρ πῶς ἂν Αἰθίοπες ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἐτεκνώσαμεν; ('How could we, both Ethiopians, against probability, produce a white daughter?' 10.14.5). However, once he has seen Charicleia and the painting of Andromeda side by side, he believes that 'maternal impression' has taken place and that the baby and Charicleia are the same person:

... ὥστε καὶ τὸν Ὑδάσπην οὐκέτι μὲν ἀπιστεῖν ἔχειν, ἐφεστάναι δὲ πολὺν χρόνον ὑφ' ἡδονῆς ἅμα καὶ θαύματος ἐχόμενον.

...so that Hydaspes no longer held on to disbelief, but stood still for a long time, held by joy and wonder at the same time.'

10.15.1

Before Hydaspes accepts this, however, he suggests that Charicleia could be an impostor who has come into possession of the recognition tokens and thinks she can deceive Persinna and Hydaspes into accepting her as their daughter:

Ἦ πόθεν ὅλως ὅτι αὕτη ἐκείνη, καὶ μὴ διέφθαρται μὲν τὸ ἐκτεθὲν τοῖς δὲ γνωρίσμασιν ἐπιτυχῶν τις ἀποκέχρηται τοῖς ἐκ τῆς τύχης; μή τις δαίμων ἡμῖν ἐπιπαίζει καὶ ὥσπερ προσωπεῖον τῆ κόρη ταῦτα

⁵⁰³Cf. Anderson 1997, p. 309.

περιθεις ἐντροφᾷ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ περὶ τεκνοποιΐαν ἐπιθυμία καὶ νόθον ἡμῖν καὶ ὑποβολιμαῖον εἰσποιεῖ διαδοχὴν, καθάπερ νέφει τῇ ταινίᾳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπισκιάζων.

Indeed, how can we be sure that this girl is she, and it is not that the abandoned child perished, and that someone chancing upon the tokens has misused the gifts of fortune? Or that it is not some god playing with us, and having given these things to this girl, using her as a mask, is mocking our desire to have a child and imposing upon us an illegitimate and supposititious succession, obscuring the truth on the band just as with a cloud?

10.13.5

Hydaspes' quibble does not seem to be with the truth of Persinna's claims, but rather with the truth of Charicleia's claims that she is the same child as the one mentioned on the band.⁵⁰⁴ He absolutely believes the assertion his wife makes in her narrative that she was faithful and that she gave birth to *his* child, and no one else in the novel questions Persinna's authority on this point, even though the revelations in the final book take place in public. It is the one accusation against which she arms herself completely: She is not guilty (οὐδὲν ἀδικούσα, 4.8.2) but was convinced she would be accused of adultery (πεπεισμένη τὴν σὴν χροιάν μοιχείαν ἐμοὶ προσάψουσαν, 4.8.6) so exposed her baby to protect her honour. Persinna alone has the power to know these facts and to communicate them effectively. Callirhoe, like Persinna, has a difficult decision to make regarding the preservation of her virtue. In a sense, both women shape their own future narratives by their decisions. Callirhoe decides the opposite to Persinna — she keeps her child, but also facilitates his privileged upbringing by marrying Dionysius and passing him off as his child. "Chariton redefines fidelity as loyalty to a partner's interests rather than physical chastity."⁵⁰⁵ Persinna does the opposite — she is worried that Hydaspes will suspect her faithfulness, so she actually disappoints his interests.

⁵⁰⁴Cf. Whitmarsh 1998, p. 121: it is rather a suggestion on the part of Hydaspes that Charicleia may not be who she claims herself to be.

⁵⁰⁵Haynes 2003, p. 50.

Both women, then, make a sacrifice — Persinna of her child and Callirhoe of her chastity — in order to protect their ‘virtue’.

The fact that Persinna is a woman has important implications for the strength of her narrative. As a woman, Persinna does not have access to the ‘normal’ ways of communication, in the assembly and so on, so she needs another method.⁵⁰⁶ As a queen, she has more verbal authority than the average woman, but she still needs to communicate the truth of this quite delicate matter in a manner that is cautious. By creating something that is more permanent than a speech, (evidently) more durable than a letter, and portable, her narrative and communicative power remain strong for a long time. The strength of Persinna’s narrative lies in the fact that it is permanently written on an object, not fleeting like a speech. This kind of communication through domestic objects is associated with women in the literary tradition, for example Penelope, Helen, Arachne and Philomela.⁵⁰⁷

Haynes says that Persinna is “too entrenched in the conventions of patriarchy to stand up before society and persevere in her fight to be believed about her child’s paternity.”⁵⁰⁸ However, this seems to put too modern a slant upon the interpretation of Persinna’s actions, or lack thereof. In fact, Persinna creates a long-lasting testament that is located in the domestic sphere but can also break into the public sphere when the time is right.⁵⁰⁹ She lays the groundwork for this by addressing her narrative to several sets of people (4.8.2). She has written it primarily to her daughter (πρός τε σέ ποτε, θύγατερ), and then to her daughter’s saviour (πρός τε τὸν ἀναιρησόμενον) and to the whole of humanity (πρός τε αὐτὸν ὅλον τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον). Persinna’s narrative therefore *does* in fact break the boundaries of the patriarchal system whilst remaining an entirely female creation as it speaks to different levels of reader, and even breaks through Heliodorus’ narrative: the whole of humanity is the potential audience for the novel. By recording her story silently yet durably on a domestic, womanly object, Persinna is actually both obeying

⁵⁰⁶See Whitmarsh 2004, pp. 87–105 for spheres in which women could not speak.

⁵⁰⁷See below, p. 205. Sebesta 2002, p. 133 says that textiles become texts to be read by women, for example Penelope ‘reads’ Odysseus’ clothing in the *Odyssey*, and in Euripides’ *Ion* and *Electra* clothing is used as a recognition device. See also Joplin 1984 repr. 2002, pp. 271–278.

⁵⁰⁸Haynes 2003, p. 119.

⁵⁰⁹cf. Anderson 1997, p. 317.

the conventions of patriarchy and (more importantly) asserting her own autonomy within this potentially repressive system. This ultimately gives her power, as her narrative has to be read; it is always there to be read, forever telling its tale, and cannot simply be silenced, as a woman's speech can. The obvious mythological parallel here is Philomela, whose speech is silenced, but whose communicative potential is not silenced. Philomela is raped by her sister Procne's husband Tereus, and then has her tongue cut out to stop her telling anyone. She weaves her story into a tapestry, and Procne is able to understand what has happens and help her plan revenge.⁵¹⁰ Segal, writing about Ovid's rendition of the myth, and his portrayal of Philomela as a female narrator and Procne as a female reader, says "When the narrative shifts to a female teller and a female audience, the male skill in rhetoric and persuasion changes to a non-verbal, gestural and pictorial mode involving garments or cloth, typically the work of women."⁵¹¹ This is also what happens in the *Aethiopica* — Persinna makes use of cloth, an item from the domain of women, to narrate her story to her daughter. Essentially both Philomela's weaving and Persinna's embroidery are communicative devices between women.⁵¹² There are verbal allusions to Philomela's story too. Persinna calls the band an ἔγγραφον θρηῆνον (4.8.1), "a phrase which calls to mind the tapestry woven by Philomela."⁵¹³

There are unpalatable undercurrents in both stories. Persinna could be accused of adultery, and it is this thought that makes her expose her child when she is born white instead of black. The horrific elements in the Philomela story in Ovid include the (adulterous) rape, the cutting out of Philomela's tongue, the hiding of Philomela from Procne, and the dismemberment and cooking of Itys. The association of Persinna with Philomela through woven communication reminds the reader of the potential for Persinna to be punished severely for adultery. Both stories include an element of female narrative that will not be suppressed, that triumphs

⁵¹⁰Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6.412–674.

⁵¹¹Segal 1994a, p. 264.

⁵¹²Cf. Hilton 1998, p. 83. West 2003 suggests that the novels may have been read to women as they worked at the loom, since this was a well-known environment for the telling of stories (as happens at the beginning of Ovid *Metamorphoses* Book 4), which links storytelling and female creativity further, just as in Theocritus' *Idyll* 15.

⁵¹³Hilton 1998, p. 83.

over male narrative.⁵¹⁴ The Philomela story resonates with Persinna's story in another way too. In the *Aethiopica* there are two potential child-killings: one when Charicleia is abandoned by her mother at the start of her story, and the other near the end when she is almost sacrificed by her father. In the Philomela myth, Procne kills her son by Tereus (Itys), cooks him, and serves him up for dinner in revenge for the way Tereus has treated Philomela. The grim ending of Philomela's story plays with reader expectation in the *Aethiopica*, creating suspense as to how the story will end, but eventually child-murder is happily avoided, to the reader's relief. Persinna, like Philomela, proves to be an effective narrator and communicator using a wholly female yet unsilenceable type of documentation, and it is this fact which gives power to her narrative. Paradoxically, Persinna's method of narration is one that involves no speaking, but its narrative potential as something that is seen and read is powerful enough to be effective both in terms of revealing the truth to the characters within the narrative, and in terms of communicating with the reader.⁵¹⁵

As well as demonstrating that traditional female narrative can be powerful, the *tainia* also sites women's narrative as the location of conflict between public and private dimensions in the novel. Persinna's letter is quite a personal one, and is essentially addressed to her daughter. However, it gets read by and communicated to the general public, which includes the crowd at the end of the novel, and the reader who is outside the novel. The *tainia* highlights the novels' consciousness that they are exposing the private to public eyes, since Persinna seems aware that her narrative cannot possibly be kept secret.

Persinna as a creative force

Winkler treats the message written on the band as a communication from Persinna to *Hydaspes* rather than to Charicleia,⁵¹⁶ even though the letter is clearly addressed

⁵¹⁴See above on the durability of the band. Philomela's way of communicating is also durable.

⁵¹⁵As noted above, p. 172, the focalization shifts to Persinna at the point of reporting (Hilton 1998, p. 85). One can compare Leucippe (below, p. 226 ff.) — it is the narrator teasing the reader with the possibility of a female perspective.

⁵¹⁶Winkler 1982 repr. 1999, p. 311.

to ‘my daughter, whatever she may be called,’ and later Persinna writes **Ταῦτά σοι διείλεγμαί τὸ γράμμα διάκονον εὐραμένη:** ‘This message was the only way I could find to convey all this to you’ (4.8.8). More plausibly, Winkler also reads Charicleia herself as the message to the king:

It requires a web of international intrigue. . . to create a context in which the king of Aithiopia (and his people) can accept with full understanding the sentence that Persinna wanted to say to him at the moment of Charikleia’s birth, ‘This child, though white, is your daughter.’ Charikleia herself is the message or communication of the queen to the king, at the time a failed communication, wrapped in her own story and sent away as a challenge to the higher powers to make the child’s birth believable.⁵¹⁷

This is an interesting stance to take, and one that is pertinent to my argument, since it implies that Persinna has not only shaped a text, but has also given birth to one. This has the effect of making her the mother of the *tainia*’s narrative.⁵¹⁸ Charicleia’s identity is not complete without the knowledge of what is written on the band, which makes the band part of Charicleia and Charicleia part of the band. Charicleia *is* to all intents and purposes the contents of the band: Persinna says she wraps it around her: **σε κοσμήσασα καὶ ταινία τῆδε, [καὶ] ἔλεεινῶ διηγῆματι τῷ σῶ τε κάμαυτῆς, ἐνειλήσασα,** (4.8.7). Charicleia’s identity is that narrative that Persinna writes: born white to two royal Ethiopians and abandoned. It overwrites her previously-given identity of temple-servant (**ζάκορος**) to Artemis.⁵¹⁹ Since both the *tainia* and the *Aethiopica* are about Charicleia, and Persinna has given birth to the *tainia* and Charicleia (who is the whole reason for the novel), it follows

⁵¹⁷Ibid., pp. 311–312.

⁵¹⁸See also *ibid.*, 312–313: “When Charikleia is born white Persinna understands the cause (τὴν αἰτίαν ἐγνώριζον) but feels equally sure that she will not be understood and so consigns her daughter/message to fine needlepoint, hoping that the ministering letters will not remain mute and unread/unfulfilled (τὸ γράμμα διάκονον. . . τάχα μὲν κωφὰ καὶ ἀνήνυτα). Fear of misinterpretation is Persinna’s motive for withholding her daughter/knowledge from Hydaspes and for launching her child/text rather into the uncertain world of coincidence and happenstance where ignorance and ambiguity are the rule (τὸ γὰρ ἄδηλον τῆς τύχης ἀνθρώποις ἄγνωστον, 4.8).”

⁵¹⁹4.1.2.

that Persinna is the force behind the whole narrative. The potential for reading Persinna as mother of the novel is made more pertinent by the fact that the novel's title could have been *Charicleia*.⁵²⁰

Reading Persinna as the mother of narrative becomes more persuasive when a collection of metaphors for 'woman' is taken into account. The metaphor of women's bodies as empty spaces for men to fill is a common one,⁵²¹ and includes fields,⁵²² ovens,⁵²³ and (most significantly) writing-tablets. The woman becomes a blank surface on which the man inscribes his possession.⁵²⁴

In *The Wonders Beyond Thule*, another novelistic text, it is a woman, Dercyllis, who provides the writing-tablets (that is, the empty space) for the narrative to be written upon:

Ταῦτα Κύμβα Δεινίας διεμυθολόγησε, καὶ κυπαριττίνας δέλτους προ-
ενεγκῶν, ἐγγράψαι ταύταις τὸν Ἐρασινίδην Ἀθηναῖον συνεπόμενον
τῷ Κύμβῳ (ἦν γὰρ τεχνίτης λόγων) παρεκελεύσατο. Ὑπέδειξε δὲ αὐ-
τοῖς καὶ τὴν Δερκυλλίδα· αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τὰς κυπαριττίνας δέλτους
ἤνεγκε.

These things Deinias told to Cymbas, and having brought cypress writing-tablets, he ordered Erasinides the Athenian, Cymbas' companion, to write on them (for he was skilled in writing). He also showed them Dercyllis; for it was she who brought the cypress writing-tablets.

Antonius Diogenes, *ap.* Photius *Bibliotheca* 166, 111a20–25

⁵²⁰See Whitmarsh 2005, pp. 593–596: in the Byzantine era the novel was known as *Charicleia* — several manuscripts attest this. See also Morgan 1996, p. 421: the title *Charicleia* was circulating from around 7th century AD.

⁵²¹See DuBois 1988, pp. 39–166 but also Lovibond 1994, pp. 93–94 (women become a space/receptacle in/on to which male impressions are stamped) and Carson 1999, p. 79. For women as a blank space more generally see Gubar 1985.

⁵²²Dougherty 1998, pp. 270–271: “The female body is often characterized in classical literature as a fertile field, ready to be ploughed and sown with seeds.”

⁵²³As receptacles for ‘loaves’, which are children.

⁵²⁴DuBois 1988, p. 145: marriage and reproduction are ‘inscription’ by the husband. Persinna denies Hydaspes this by asserting her own inscription.

Dercyllis does provide much of the narrative in *The Wonders beyond Thule*: Ταῦτα πάντα Δεινίας κατὰ Θούλην ἀκούσας διηγουμένης Δερκυλλίδος (‘Deinias heard all of these things in Thule, from the mouth of Dercyllis’, *ap. Photius Bibl.* 166, 110a39–40). However, she does not physically write it down: that task is done by a man, who is ‘skilled in writing’. The only physical thing she can do as a woman is to provide the blank writing-tablets. Persinna, by contrast, takes this a stage further, as she both provides the blank space and inscribes it. She acts as the space in which Charicleia is inscribed (by Hydaspes), but then takes matters into her own hands by exposing the child and lying to her husband. She provides her own ‘writing tablet’ in the form of a piece of woven silk to be embroidered, and she writes her narrative on to it, thus breaking convention by taking over the inscription of Charicleia. The text that Persinna inscribes (χαράττω) is her possession and her creation.

The fact that Persinna creates and deceives aligns her with Penelope⁵²⁵ in Homer’s *Odyssey*. The novel contains many Homeric allusions, so this parallel is easy to draw. Charicleia herself is like Odysseus: both Charicleia and Odysseus are on a journey, and more importantly their journeys take the form of *nostos*: home-coming.⁵²⁶ Just as Odysseus has a mark on his body to aid his recognition (a scar), so does Charicleia: she has a birthmark.⁵²⁷ The link between them becomes more marked at 5.22.3, when Odysseus sends Penelope’s wishes to Charicleia (via Calasiris’ dream) because she holds chastity highly:

τὴν κόρην δὲ ἦν ἄγεις παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς γαμετῆς πρόσειπε, χαίρειν γὰρ αὐτῇ φησι διότι πάντων ἐπίπροσθεν ἄγει τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τέλος αὐτῇ δεξιὸν εὐαγγελίζεται.

My wife greets the maiden you have with you and tells her to rejoice

⁵²⁵Persinna and Penelope are both aligned with the ‘authors’ of the texts they are in — Persinna as will be discussed below (p. 211 ff.), and Penelope through her act of weaving, which is what poets do with words.

⁵²⁶See Whitmarsh 2011.

⁵²⁷Hilton 1998, p. 89: “To the educated reader the blemish resembles the scar of Odysseus with whom the heroine is closely associated.” Hilton lists similarities at *ibid.*, p. 89 n. 41.

because she holds chastity above all things, and she announces the good news that the end of her story will be favourable.

5.22.3

Honouring chastity is what Persinna tells Charicleia to do in her embroidered letter. Penelope is a woman who weaves, and uses her weaving to create a fiction about herself. She lies to the suitors by means of the shroud, by saying that when she has finished it she will marry one of them, but she unpicks it every night to delay the inevitable for three years.⁵²⁸ Thus she uses female skill to deceive men and to control her own fate. Felson says, of Penelope: “Associations with both her epithet *periphrôn* and her name (perhaps from *pênê*, “woof” or “loom”) suggest that she is the sort of character who actively weaves her life story.”⁵²⁹ Just as Penelope creates a fiction by means of a woven item, Persinna also creates a fiction, in that she lies to her husband about the birth of their baby, but instead of using the embroidery as part of the lie, she defends the lie she was forced to tell with the truth that can be found on it. Both women use their creative ability to *defend* themselves, but whilst Penelope uses her female skill to deceive men, Persinna uses hers to communicate primarily with her daughter (θυγατρι) and bypass the sphere of men, which ultimately serves to align her more with Philomela, as was discussed above.⁵³⁰

The fact that Persinna can be identified with Penelope through her creation of cloth and narrative brings into play how a good wife should behave: weaving, needlework and so on is very firmly within the sphere of *women*. Persinna’s exposure of her child is her way of proving her fidelity, as much as is Penelope’s refusal to marry one of the suitors, and, for a while, her refusal to recognize Odysseus until she is absolutely certain. These women are constructed as paradigms of womanly virtue.

⁵²⁸Homer *Odyssey* 2.88–110, 19.138–56 and 24.131–48.

⁵²⁹Felson 1994, p. 17.

⁵³⁰See p. 205 ff.

Persinna's story and Heliodorus' story of authorship

Persinna's narrative not only reveals female perspectives but it also shows a concern for authority and literary origins as well as genealogical ones.

The narrative on the band has been read as a kind of *mise-en-abyme* for the novel itself. Charicleia herself refers to it as *γράμματα δὲ τάδε τύχης τῆς ἐμῆς τε καὶ ὑμῶν διηγήματα*: 'the story of my destiny and the narrative of your lives' (10.12.4). *γράμματα* could also be taken as the 'marks' of Charicleia's identity, which resonates with her birthmark, and strengthens the argument that the *tainia* and Charicleia are not complete without each other. Persinna's narrative also contains the themes of the novel in microcosm:

Persinna's ribbon, dramatically brought to our attention by the author's game of concealment and discovery, stands as a monument in the erotic landscape of the *Aethiopica*. Though this episode is brief, the accumulation of finely interwoven and complementary erotic threads around this mysterious object makes an unusually concentrated and narratologically sophisticated contribution to the novel's exploration of desire, sex, marriage, and chastity.⁵³¹

Anderson shows that there is a metatextual element to the narrative on the band, but Whitmarsh, on the other hand, argues that Persinna's narrative is in many ways not metatext:

There are certainly crucial respects in which the *tainia* is *not* equivalent to the *Aithiopika*: it is perhaps rather a countertext, a brief, intimate

⁵³¹Anderson 1997, p. 312. See also *ibid.*, p. 322: "Persinna's ribbon is certainly one of Heliodorus' most spectacular narrative tricks, but it is also an intimate and provocative erotic collage, a delicate synthesis of eroticism and *σωφροσύνη*. Within it lies the novel's initial act of *ἔρωσ* — the conception of the heroine, the very start of the tale and the foundation from which all subsequent action arises. And behind this momentous event lies an erotic painting which, in proclaiming love the inspiration for heroic accomplishments and marriage the ultimate reward, anticipates the eventual consummation of desire at the novel's close."

address from mother to daughter where the *Aethiopika* is a large-scale text for public consumption; or, again, an affecting, simple and personal tale where the *Aithiopika* is ironic, complex and authorially recessive.⁵³²

However, he goes on to say that there are several elements of the *tainia* which point towards bigger questions for the *Aethiopika* and how it can be read. For example, the ‘woven’ nature of the band echoes the sophisticated entwined nature of the narrative as a whole. For Whitmarsh, the fact that the message on the band is written in royal Ethiopian, the fact that the band is made from silk (possibly suggesting a Chinese origin), and the fact that Persinna’s name hints at a Persian element all come together to indicate the differing cultural perspectives from which the novel can be read.⁵³³ The letter is woven and exotic, mirroring the intricately woven and exotic form of the novel.

Extending the idea that the band is connected to the novel on this metafictional level, it is evident that the band cannot be read simply as a private communication *within* the text because there are striking parallels between the way Persinna writes her message and the way ‘Heliodorus’ signs off his narrative with his *sphragis*.

‘Heliodorus’ claims to be a Phoenician (and therefore a non-Greek) in his *sphragis*:

Τοιόνδε πέρας ἔσχε τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν περὶ Θεαγένην καὶ Χαρίκλειαν Αἰθιοπικῶν· ὃ συνέταξεν ἀνὴρ Φοῖνιξ Ἐμισσηνός, τῶν ἀφ’ Ἡλίου γένος, Θεοδοσίου παῖς Ἡλιόδωρος.

This is the end of the Ethiopian story about Theagenes and Charicleia, which a Phoenician man from Emesa composed, one of the race of Helios, the son of Theodosius, Heliodorus.

10.41.4

Persinna, similarly, says that she is an Ethiopian (and therefore a non-Greek) in the introduction to her narrative:

⁵³²Whitmarsh 1998, p. 119.

⁵³³Ibid., pp. 119–120.

Περσίννα Βασίλισσα Αιθιοπῶν τῇ ὅ τι δὴ κληθησομένη καὶ μέχρι μόνων ὠδίνων θυγατρὶ δῶρον ἔσχατον χαράττω τόνδε τὸν ἔγγραφον θρήνον.

I, Persinna, the Queen of the Ethiopians, inscribe this written lament as a last gift to my daughter, whatever she may be called, and mine only up to the pains of birth.

4.8.1

Both claim authorship of their respective texts. ‘Heliodorus’ says he is the man who συνέταξεν the narrative (4.8.2), whilst Persinna says χαράττω: I inscribe. Both also twice claim Helios’ race as their ancestry. Persinna says that Helios is ὁ γενεάρχης ἡμῶν and follows this with Ἡμῖν πρόγονοι θεῶν μὲν Ἡλῖός τε καὶ Διόνυσος (‘Our forefathers among the gods are Helios and Dionysus’ 4.8.3). ‘Heliodorus’ link with the god is made clear in his name, and he adds that he is τῶν ἀφ’ Ἡλίου γένος.

The strategies of both ‘Heliodorus’ and Persinna are the same: they make themselves owners of their texts by claiming identity, ancestry and authorship. The *heteroglossia* of Persinna’s embedded text highlights the presence of other voices, perspectives, and untold narratives in Heliodorus’ text. That is, the fact that Persinna’s narrative is written in Ethiopian but narrated in Greek, coupled with the fact that she is aligned with the non-Greek ‘Heliodorus’, emphasises the different perspectives from which the novel can be read, and the different voices that can be found within it. Thus, ‘Heliodorus’ uses Persinna as a projection of the authorial self. She acts within the text as the ‘Heliodorus’ of the *sphragis* does, revealing an untold, metaliterary story about concern for authenticity, through the assertion of authorship over her text. As a writing woman this is important: she does not merely create an alternative perspective on — and in — the text, but through being aligned with the author of that text she demonstrates female creative power within the ‘male’ text.

Persinna’s narrative is used literally to inscribe and put on record a female perspective on the world, in an otherwise male-narrated text. She claims authorship of

her text/daughter, and discusses her feelings and fears. The subject matter of her text, that of conception and childbirth, is pertinent to a female narrator. By the alignment of Persinna with the author, and the construction of her as a creative force, Persinna's fictional assertion of her identity as mother of Charicleia becomes interwoven with Heliodorus' assertion of authorship of the novel.

Persinna is someone without whom the narrative could not happen as it does, as she shapes Charicleia's future narrative for her by writing the letter on the *tainia*. She breaks into the male world whilst remaining in the female sphere of creativity, and in doing so she becomes the person upon whom the whole narrative depends. She can be identified with other women in myth who act in similar ways in terms of creativity,⁵³⁴ and can also be read as a projection of the authorial self: an experiment with authorship within the text. Persinna's experience and importance can be found by the reader who, once curious, looks deeper into the text for further voices, making the text work harder. The text itself makes the reader too work harder, leading him or her to piece together Charicleia's narrative and making him or her think about how Persinna relates to the narrator/author figure. Although Persinna is vitally important to the text and her creativity is what drives the narrative, she and the primary narrator of the *Aethiopica* are not in competition with one another. This is not the case in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, to which I now move on.

Undermining the narrator: Leucippe

This section will demonstrate that Cleitophon's misreading or misinterpretation of Leucippe leads to the revelation, through his narration, of an alternative story formed by Leucippe.⁵³⁵ Leucippe resists the thrust of her own plot, just as Anthia

⁵³⁴Within the novel genre (the ideal five) she can also be identified with Callirhoe, who is the only woman in the genre who is both a heroine and a mother. Chloe does not become a mother until the very end of her narrative, but Callirhoe seems to act as heroine, female antagonist (adulterer) and mother — the three women who appear in the novel genre are merged into one in her. Egger 1994a, p. 40 notes that Callirhoe is both chaste heroine and sexually assertive woman.

⁵³⁵An earlier version of this section appeared as Dollins 2012.

does,⁵³⁶ and just as Penelope does in the *Odyssey*. The curious reader is encouraged to read against the grain of the text by looking for this alternative story. The case of Leucippe is complicated by the fact that she is always doubly narrated, by Cleitophon and by the primary narrator. If the reader is not careful, she could be written or narrated out and disappear completely. The more the reader tries to find her voice by searching through the layers of narrative, the less it and she are available to be found. The narrative challenges the reader to think about a female perspective and whether it is ever possible to grasp it in a (triple-layered) male-narrated text.

In contrast with the ‘happy’ ending of the novel, which ends with the marriage of Leucippe and Cleitophon, the beginning of Cleitophon’s narrative is a shock, since he appears to be deeply unhappy. Although the plot of the novel for the most part follows a ‘conventional’ novelistic outline, it is not clear that the couple live happily ever after. Leucippe is absent from the beginning of the novel,⁵³⁷ and she is not mentioned until she appears in the story that Cleitophon tells to the unnamed narrator. This leaves the reader asking very many questions, one of which is ‘where is Leucippe?’⁵³⁸ What has happened to Leucippe between the end of the story and the beginning of Cleitophon’s narrative, which is chronologically after the events of the story?⁵³⁹ At the end of the novel the protagonists pray for good fortune in marriage, which adds to the ominous atmosphere at the beginning:

παρῆμεν οὖν ὡς καὶ συνθύσοντες αὐτῷ καὶ εὐξόμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς τούς τε ἐμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου γάμους σὺν ἀγαθαῖς φυλαχθῆναι τύχαις.

Therefore we were present in order to sacrifice together with him [Callisthenes] and to pray to the gods that both my marriage and his be guarded by good fortune.

8.19.3

⁵³⁶See p. 176 ff.

⁵³⁷Cf. Whitmarsh 2009, p. 137.

⁵³⁸See Hägg 1971, p. 234; Most 1989; Repath 2005.

⁵³⁹The exchange with the unnamed narrator cannot be very long after the events that Cleitophon is about to narrate, since the narrator says that he can see Cleitophon is not far from being one of the god’s initiates (1.2.2).

After this, Leucippe and Cleitophon set out from Tyre for Byzantium (καὶ διεγνώκαμεν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ παραχειμάσαντες διελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον. 8.19.3), but this is nowhere near Sidon, which is the setting for Cleitophon's narration to the unnamed narrator. Sidon is, however, up the coast from Tyre. As shown above⁵⁴⁰ there has been a storm, and Cleitophon may have been shipwrecked en route to Byzantium.⁵⁴¹ The storm may explain the absence of Leucippe (through death or being swept ashore elsewhere⁵⁴²), but Cleitophon himself never actually mentions any storm or shipwreck. If Leucippe and Cleitophon went on a voyage at the end of their story, then where is she, and why has she essentially been written out of the novel? Part of my aim here is to 'find' Leucippe, and to demonstrate that, although she rarely speaks and eventually even disappears, she has a power within this text. The tension created by Cleitophon's status as an ego-narrator will first be outlined; this tension is fundamental to the reader's interpretation and understanding of Leucippe's role within the fiction.⁵⁴³

Cleitophon's ego-narrative

The Cleitophon that the reader meets at the beginning of the text becomes the ego-narrator for the rest of the text, that is, a later version of himself narrating an earlier version. The fact that Cleitophon is both narrator and narrated in his narrative causes problems of interpretation for the reader.⁵⁴⁴ Cleitophon the narrator cannot give away too much of what he has learnt in hindsight at points when Cleitophon the narrated character does not yet know these things.⁵⁴⁵ He has to keep up a fiction of restricted focalization. This restricted focalization provokes questions in the reader's mind of how the narrator knew certain things, and therefore how far s/he can trust Cleitophon's presentation and interpretation of

⁵⁴⁰See p. 166.

⁵⁴¹He would have sailed along the coast.

⁵⁴²This does happen in this novel: at 3.5 a storm sweeps various members of the party ashore in different places along the Egyptian coast.

⁵⁴³See Winkler 1985 for the tension created by ego-narration.

⁵⁴⁴Compounding this problem is the matter of the primary narrator, to whom Cleitophon narrates his tale.

⁵⁴⁵See Reardon 1994, pp. 81–82 for the various ways in which Cleitophon does this.

events.

The presentation of events from a restricted point of view seems to become a problem for Cleitophon as he proceeds in his narration. As the novel progresses, Cleitophon (the narrating-I) has an increasingly loose grip on what the narrated-I actually knows when the action takes place. He seems unable to sustain satisfactorily the fictional restricted perspective of the narrated-I. This narratorial ‘problem’ is demonstrated clearly by Hägg’s analysis: to begin with, Cleitophon narrates other characters’ feelings and perspectives as he observes them, or as he gets to know them from being told by other people. That is, it is his experience that is prioritized.⁵⁴⁶ However, later on Cleitophon seems to lose control of this carefully structured way of narrating, and other people’s feelings are narrated at the point at which they happen as if he is experiencing them: “the order of narration is not determined by the moment of perception but by the “actual” chronology of the events.⁵⁴⁷ Cleitophon thus sometimes conflates by *paralepsis* the different perspectives of the narrating-I and narrated-I.⁵⁴⁸ Reardon too notes this when, for example, Cleitophon tells the story of Callisthenes and Calligone, which contains details he cannot possibly have known at the point at which he situates it.⁵⁴⁹ Whilst Hägg sees this as a weakness of Achilles Tatius’ narrative, it does not have to be. Whitmarsh takes this slippage in perspective as an intentional and cleverly-crafted part of a narrative about initiation into narration.⁵⁵⁰ Throughout the novel, Cleitophon (the narrated-I) moves from naivety to knowingness about how to act in and narrate a novelistic text (the position of the narrating-I):

The events of *Leucippe & Clitophon* constitute, for Clitophon, an object lesson in learning how to deal with novelistic narrative. By the time of the *telos* of the narrative, he is initiated (*τετελεσμένος*) into the wiles of narration, thus creating the Clitophon that we meet at the start as

⁵⁴⁶Hägg 1971, p. 303.

⁵⁴⁷Ibid., p. 303. See also Lowe 2000, pp. 246–248 and Morgan 2007a, pp. 105–106. van Mal-Maeder 2007, p. 143 argues that the change in narrative technique means that the trial conforms to the genre of Declamation.

⁵⁴⁸De Temmerman 2012a, p. 524.

⁵⁴⁹Reardon 1994, p. 82. See also Lowe 2000, p. 247.

⁵⁵⁰Whitmarsh 2003.

a narrator.⁵⁵¹

For Whitmarsh, the naïve Cleitophon is a narrative construct, and this is emphasized by the frame at the beginning of the novel:

Achilles underscores the narrational disjunction between Clitophon the narrator and Clitophon his self-cited, ‘fictional’ construct: this is the starkest instance in the novel of narratorial distance, irony in its most pungent form.⁵⁵²

The novel constantly confounds what the reader thinks s/he knows about what Cleitophon knows as either narrated-I or narrating-I, leading him or her to wonder what the implications are for interpreting Leucippe in this web of contrived narrative. Can the narrating-I see Leucippe’s real feelings and is he ironizing his former self? Or, on the other hand, is she an instrument for or an accomplice of the hidden author function, ironizing Cleitophon from beyond his narration? The hidden author is a narrative construct that the author uses to poke fun at and trip up the ego-narrator.⁵⁵³ Morgan argues that there is a ‘hidden author’ function in this text which ironizes Cleitophon by representing him as confusing life for literature,⁵⁵⁴ but I intend to argue here that Leucippe is also complicit in the process of poking fun at Cleitophon.

The problematic narration of Leucippe

Whitmarsh argues that Achilles Tatius’ narrative destabilizes the authority of the narrator by proposing alternative perspectives.⁵⁵⁵ Extending this, I shall argue that Achilles Tatius constructs a narrative that encourages the reader to look for

⁵⁵¹Whitmarsh 2003, p. 199.

⁵⁵²Ibid., p. 202.

⁵⁵³See Conte 1996, pp. 21–28 for the hidden author in the *Satyricon*.

⁵⁵⁴Morgan 2007a.

⁵⁵⁵Whitmarsh 2003, p. 192. Lowe 2000, p. 249 argues that the text teaches the reader not to trust the narrator, but rather the ‘rules’ of the genre.

Leucippe’s original ‘voice’ by highlighting points at which Cleitophon misunderstands or has the potential to misunderstand. The reader is put in the position of not knowing whether what Cleitophon narrates corresponds with what Leucippe actually thinks or feels.⁵⁵⁶ This opens up gaps in the narrative through which the reader can potentially glimpse the ‘real’ Leucippe. Five instances of these ‘gaps’ in the narrative caused by the tension created by Cleitophon’s self-centred narration will now be explored.

Leucippe’s reaction to Cleitophon’s advances

Leucippe and Cleitophon does not follow novelistic convention, in that Leucippe does not fall in love with Cleitophon at first sight. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the *Ephesiaca*, and the *Aethiopica*, each of the protagonists falls in love on seeing the other. In Achilles Tatius’ novel, however, “Leucippe does not fall in love at first sight; she has clearly read her Ovid and knows the rules, and she unideally yields to seduction”.⁵⁵⁷ It is not completely clear, though, that Leucippe does know the rules: it is possible to find in the text quite a different Leucippe from the one who allows herself to be seduced.

Cleitophon gives a long account of different ‘lovers’ in nature in order to make Leucippe amenable to love (Βουλόμενος οὖν εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι, λόγων πρὸς τὸν Σάτυρον ἠρχόμεν 1.16.1). Throughout his speech, he says he keeps glancing at Leucippe, to see whether she is listening, and whether she is affected by his words. Crucially, she ὑπεσήμαινεν οὐκ ἀηδῶς ἀκούειν: ‘she gave secret signs that she heard [what I said] not without pleasure’ (1.19.1).⁵⁵⁸ However, this is Cleitophon’s reading of the outward appearance of a female’s inward or inner thoughts. The verb ὑποσημαίνω encourages the reader to start asking him or herself how Cleitophon can know what Leucippe is thinking. Perhaps he has got it right: Leucippe *does* find pleasure in his speech, and reciprocates

⁵⁵⁶Morgan 2007a, pp. 117-119 demonstrates how Cleitophon forces Leucippe to play the role he has designed for her, and he briefly outlines how Leucippe can be read in a different way because of this. See also Morales 2004, pp. 162-3.

⁵⁵⁷Reardon 1994, p. 86.

⁵⁵⁸‘Secret’ translates the sense of the ὑπο here.

his desire, and shows this with the ‘secret signs’ of a smile. Perhaps, on the other hand, the ‘secret signs’ are a smile that is misinterpreted as pleasure when in fact it is a wry smile to herself because Cleitophon is missing the mark with his impressive monologue on love. It is significant that Leucippe communicates non-verbally at this point, as this demonstrates that women occupy a domain that is off the patriarchal page.

As I have already shown, the tension between what Cleitophon (as narrated-I) can know and relate about other people, and what Leucippe (who is at this point silent) may actually experience creates the possibility of a different version of the story.⁵⁵⁹ The undercurrents that are created here are that Leucippe does not care for Cleitophon’s advances or rhetorical display, and that Cleitophon misinterprets or even makes up her reaction. Indeed, she does not actually say anything to Cleitophon for quite some time in the narrative — and when she does so it becomes another source of misinterpretation for Cleitophon. The undercurrents in the narrative suggest the existence of the ‘hidden author’ function: Cleitophon narrates what he knows, but certain elements in the text hint that there is another voice in the narrative.

Leucippe’s reaction to Cleitophon’s kiss

Cleitophon concocts a devious plan to make Leucippe kiss him. He chances to see her ‘cure’ a bee sting on her servant Cleio’s hand by murmuring an incantation over it, and he proceeds the next day to pretend that he too has been stung, but on the lip.⁵⁶⁰ Leucippe therefore murmurs her spell close to his lip, and he seizes the opportunity to kiss her. There does not appear to be any mutuality: Cleitophon says ἡ δὲ διασχοῦσα, “Τί ποεῖς;” ἔφη, “καὶ σὺ κατεπάδεις;” (‘She, pulling away, said “what are you doing? Are you too making a spell?”’ 2.7.5). It is almost as

⁵⁵⁹See Morgan 2007a, p. 118.

⁵⁶⁰τότε οὖν κατὰ τύχην μέλιττά τις ἢ σφήξ περιβομβήσασα κύκλω μου τὸ πρόσωπον παρέπτῃ κἀγὼ λαμβάνω τὸ ἐνθύμιον καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλὼν τοῖς προσώποις προσεποιούμενη πεπλήχθαι καὶ ἀλγεῖν. ‘Then by chance a bee or wasp was buzzing about and flying around my face; and I had a thought, and putting my hand to my face I pretended I had been stung and was in pain.’ (2.7.3).

if she does not understand the kissing act: this ‘τί ποιεῖς;’ is not a question that implies ‘you should not be doing that’, but rather a question asked out of lack of knowledge, since it is followed by another question which asks Cleitophon to analyse what the action is. The forceful **διασχοῦσα** indicates that whatever the kiss means, Leucippe does not like it. Cleitophon narrates this, but is blinded by desire for Leucippe, and cannot see what the external reader can see, that there is more than one way of interpreting what Leucippe says and does. Exactly the same participle is used of Melite at 5.13.5, and this is the only other instance of the participle in the novel: **εἶτα διασχοῦσα εἶπεν**: “**Αὕτη μοι τροφή.**” (‘then, tearing away, she said “this is my sustenance”’). This implies that women in this novel are, through their resistance, trying to evade being narrated.⁵⁶¹ If the reader aligns him or herself with Leucippe here, s/he too is encouraged to **διέχειν**: to resist.

At the end of this episode Cleitophon kisses Leucippe once again, and more forcefully. Once again Leucippe’s feelings about this kiss differ from those of Cleitophon.⁵⁶² This is shown by the fact that Cleitophon says **ἡ δὲ ἠνείχετο, κωλύουσα δῆθεν**: ‘and she bore it with patience, pretending to prevent me.’ (2.7.7) This short phrase hints at a different underlying situation in two ways. Firstly, the verb **ἀνέχω** does not seem hugely positive; it means to bear with patience, to hold out, or to bear up. Read one way Cleitophon is essentially saying that Leucippe just bore with it whilst he kissed her, which hints at her inner state of mind. Secondly, the adverb **δῆθεν**, used ironically, has the effect of negating the participle **κωλύουσα**, implying it is not true, hence my translation ‘pretending to prevent’. This is Cleitophon’s interpretation of her actions, but it could be that she is actually trying to prevent him kissing her — the adverb also has the force ‘in truth’ or ‘really’, so the phrase could be translated ‘she put up with it, but really she was preventing me’. This subtle double meaning of one word means that Cleitophon, without knowing it, has yet again provided the reader with Leucippe’s true feelings whilst not being able to read them for himself.

The possibility of reading Leucippe’s true feelings into this kissing scene is made stronger by the fact that at the end of the scene, when they are interrupted by

⁵⁶¹The metaliterary implications of this will be developed later at p. 230.

⁵⁶²See Morgan 2007a, p. 118.

the approach of Leucippe's servant, Cleitophon admits to not knowing what she thinks: *διελύθημεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἄκων καὶ λυπούμενος, ἢ δὲ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἶχεν* ('we broke apart, I unwillingly and with some grief, but I do not know how she felt' 2.8.1). He clearly has no idea what Leucippe is thinking, but his overall narration of her implies that he does know.⁵⁶³

Prior to the kissing scene, Cleitophon calls Leucippe *δέσποινα* (2.6.2). Her reaction to this can be read in two ways. Cleitophon says *ἢ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὺ καὶ ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος, ὅτι συνήκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ "Χαίρε, δέσποινα,"* ('And she, smiling sweetly, showed through her laughter that she understood why I said "greetings, mistress"', 2.6.2). Leucippe's communication at this point is wordless, and Cleitophon, being male, actually cannot read this non-verbal female narrative, as he misapprehends the situation, thinking that Leucippe reciprocates his desire. Although Leucippe smiles at this *γλυκὺ* (indicating she appreciates his attentions) she then says *Ἐγὼ σή; μὴ τοῦτ' ἐῖπης*: 'I yours? Do not say this.' This raises some questions of interpretation: why does she tell him not to say this? Is it flirting, or is it genuine? Leucippe's words, which seem to contradict her smile,⁵⁶⁴ can be read more subversively than Cleitophon's interpretation of them (that she reciprocates and is teasing) allows for. Leucippe's words communicate to the reader without Cleitophon noticing, even though he is the one who narrates them.⁵⁶⁵ The phrase *ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος* performs a function similar to that of *ὑπεσήμαινεν* at 1.19.1. It encourages the reader to think about what it is Cleitophon is saying and whether he might be mistaken. He implies that he can read Leucippe's body language, indeed that it is clear to him what she means,⁵⁶⁶ but at the same time an element of doubt creeps in: she is laughing. Is she laughing because she does understand and reciprocates his desires, or is she laughing at him? It could be a laugh of pleasure or a laugh of derision, which heightens the tension in this scene between what Cleitophon knows and what he does not.

⁵⁶³Cf. Morales 2004, p. 111.

⁵⁶⁴Morgan 2007a, p. 118.

⁵⁶⁵Cf. Apuleius 2.5 when Byrrhena says to Lucius 'everything you see is yours,' meaning not only that he is welcome in her house but also that the statue of Actaeon is very relevant to his narrative. Lucius never appears to realize this.

⁵⁶⁶*ἐμφανίζω* means 'I show forth', 'I make clear', 'I exhibit'.

This episode dramatizes the tension created by Cleitophon's narration of other people's feelings. Ironically, he identifies this tension by admitting he does not know how Leucippe feels. However, even after saying that he does not know Leucippe's opinion of him and his advances he carries on attempting to seduce her as he has been advised by his friend Cleinias that one should be persistent with women.

The elopement

At the point at which Cleitophon and Leucippe apparently decide to elope. Cleitophon has almost been caught in Leucippe's bedroom by her mother and has been persuaded by his friend Cleinias that he should flee because of this. It is interesting that Cleinias says *τάχα δὲ καὶ τὴν κόρην συμφυγεῖν πείσετε*: 'and perhaps you will persuade the girl to flee with you' (2.27.2). The word *τάχα* inserts a certain element of doubt here, and it can be read as meaning that Cleinias knows or suspects that Cleitophon feels more for Leucippe than she does for him. Once again Cleitophon reports someone else's speech in a way that leaves ambiguity as to interpretation. It is not possible to be sure of what Cleinias means, but reading it in this doubtful way makes sense when coupled with other indications of Leucippe's lack of interest in Cleitophon. For example, Leucippe does not beg Satyrus to take her with Cleitophon because of the desire she feels for him, but says *ἔξαρχάσατέ με τῶν τῆς μητρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅπη βούλεσθε*: 'snatch me away from my mother's sight, wherever you wish' (2.30.1). This implies that Leucippe's reasons for running away are not concordant with Cleitophon's.⁵⁶⁷ She does not even address these words to Cleitophon, but to Satyrus, who is charged with finding out whether she wishes to leave. He does not get a chance to ask her before she asks him to take her away. Her request follows a passage which reports her thoughts and feelings (2.29) but they are all feelings of shame and grief and most of the passage takes the form of *sententia*,⁵⁶⁸ it does not demonstrate a passionate desire to elope with her lover. Leucippe sees Cleitophon's plan, then, more as a way of getting

⁵⁶⁷Cf. Morgan 2007a, p. 119: "A sceptical reading of his account of the episode will leave the reader in doubt that she really was expecting him that night, and the reason she gives for eloping with Kleitophon is not that she cannot live without him, but that her mother's attentions are intolerable." See also Alvares 2006, p. 5 and Reardon 1994, p. 87.

⁵⁶⁸Morales 2004, p. 109.

away from her overbearing mother than the commencement of a relationship. Once again, Cleitophon has misread the signs Leucippe sends out, and in effect he denies Leucippe the chance to put her feelings into her own words by glossing over them with a rhetorical showpiece.⁵⁶⁹ It is ironic that although Cleitophon clearly reports a situation that implies Leucippe's true feelings, he (as narrated-I) cannot see them for himself. This further demonstrates the 'hidden author' function poking fun at his character: he knows more than his character, and communicates this fact to the reader by highlighting the opaque nature of Cleitophon's narration.⁵⁷⁰ The female character in the text represents another story, another perspective for which the reader has to search.

Philomela

In book five of the novel, Leucippe, Cleitophon, and their companions come across a picture of the myth of Philomela in an artist's shop. Leucippe's lack of reaction both to the painting of Philomela and her tapestry, and to Cleitophon's subsequent explanation of the myth,⁵⁷¹ indicates to the reader that something is not quite right. Although it is obvious to the in-text reader Menelaus (and to Cleitophon) that this painting is relevant to Leucippe in some way, Leucippe herself does not seem to realize this or have anything to say about it. Morales says Leucippe is keen to understand the painting, and this strengthens the comparison between her and Philomela.⁵⁷² However, it is not at all clear that she does understand it, which indicates that Cleitophon does not know how to handle her. By rights, she should have some reaction to this myth of violence towards women. It is clear from this that Cleitophon does not know what a 'female' response to that narrative should be. He reports the fact that Leucippe has seen the picture, indeed that she asks to know what it means, but he thinks that she is interested in it because 'women are fond of stories' (φιλόμυθον γὰρ πως τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος, 5.5.1). Even when

⁵⁶⁹Cf. Morales 2004, 201: Cleitophon reports Leucippe's feelings, but resorts to generalizations about shame, as he cannot know what she is thinking.

⁵⁷⁰See Morgan 2007a, p. 107.

⁵⁷¹After the description of the picture it is Menelaus who reacts. After Cleitophon's explanation the narrative moves on straight away — no reaction of anyone is recorded at all.

⁵⁷²Morales 2004, p. 108.

Cleitophon has explained it, Leucippe does not react in the way Cleitophon's narrative suggests she ought — indeed, he records no reaction at all after his explanation of the myth. Leucippe seems not to understand the relevance of this painting to her story, and this implies that Cleitophon has little control over her. If Cleitophon had narrated Leucippe reacting to the myth or understanding the relevance of Philomela to her own experience, his narrative control over her would be clearer, but as it stands it seems as if he does not know how to construct female narrative. Leucippe, by acting in this way, demonstrates a refusal to conform to how Cleitophon tries to get her to behave and to how his inclusion of the Philomela story suggests she should behave.⁵⁷³

It is possible to read the picture as predicting doom for Cleitophon. It has been argued that Cleitophon's interpretation of the picture highlights female discovery and revenge, which leads the reader to believe that Leucippe will take revenge on Cleitophon for sleeping with Melite.⁵⁷⁴ However, although the narrative thus hints at (and leads the reader to expect) Leucippe's discovery of Cleitophon's adultery, Leucippe never finds out and thus never avenges herself.⁵⁷⁵ Perhaps, though, between the end of the narrative and the beginning Leucippe has found out, and has exacted revenge on Cleitophon by leaving him, which would explain why she is so notably absent at the beginning of the novel, whilst also accounting for why Cleitophon is so miserable at that point. It is also completely possible that Leucippe has died in the shipwreck, or elsewhere: the terrible mutilation of Philomela could hint at this too (and Leucippe's death would count as revenge as well, in terms of dues paid by Cleitophon).

Cleitophon cannot understand Leucippe's non-verbal communication, as was evidenced above. Philomela also communicates wordlessly. If Cleitophon really understood the picture, he would be able to understand non-verbal female communication, especially by the time he comes to narrate the novel. However, the episode just discussed demonstrates that in his re-telling of the story he has not learnt

⁵⁷³This is similar to how the narrative moves straight on after the description of Charicles' funeral: Cleitophon appears to have difficulty reading people and sympathizing with their experiences. Cf. Whitmarsh 2011, p. 91.

⁵⁷⁴Bartsch 1989, p. 74.

⁵⁷⁵Ibid., p. 74.

from Philomela at all.

Leucippe's letter

Cleitophon alone of novelistic heroes marries another woman, Melite, in the belief that Leucippe is dead. However, Leucippe has not died, but has become one of Melite's slaves. She recognizes Cleitophon and writes him a letter. Her letter is a point in the narrative at which her 'voice' can be heard, so is a particularly important episode to look at when hunting for her perspective. As a character narrated by Cleitophon, she is very much 'read' in this text. However, the fact that she writes a letter affords an opportunity for her perspective to come through. However, it is of course filtered through Cleitophon's narrating — whatever she appears to have written is just what Cleitophon says she has written. Cleitophon, the slippery narrator, reads her text and interprets it for the reader, just as Calasiris does with Persinna's text.⁵⁷⁶ Both Cleitophon and Calasiris are potentially unreliable and self-serving narrators, which adds another dimension to the inscrutability of these women: their narratives are even further out of reach.

Leucippe's letter begins thus:

Λευκίππη Κλειτοφῶντι τῷ δεσπότη μου.
 Τοῦτο γάρ σε δεῖ καλεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἀνὴρ εἶ τῆς ἐμῆς.
 ὅσα μὲν διὰ σὲ πέπονθα, οἶδας· ἀνάγκη δὲ νῦν ὑπομνήσαι σε.

From Leucippe to my master Cleitophon,
 for this is what I must call you now, since you are the husband of my
 mistress. I have suffered many things because of you, as you know; but
 it is now necessary to remind you.

5.18.3

⁵⁷⁶See above, p. 171 ff.

She continues in this accusatory tone throughout the letter, implying that she has suffered a great deal for Cleitophon⁵⁷⁷ but it has had no effect on him. She also asks Cleitophon to send her home. Strikingly, her only mention of any relationship with Cleitophon is when she asks if she has done all of these things ἵνα σὺ ὁ γέγονας ἄλλη γυναικί, καὶ γὼ τῷ ἑτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ γένωμαι; ('just so I would become to another man what you have become to another woman.' 5.18.4). She thus implies that she has an attachment to him, but it is not overstated, as it perhaps might be if she felt the same way about Cleitophon as he presents himself as feeling about her. She also says she remains a virgin, implying she has saved herself for him, which does tie in with Cleitophon's professed feelings for her. Morgan argues for the letter actually revealing Leucippe's own perspective because it reveals a side to Leucippe that is not one of the roles Cleitophon tries to get her to play: "this is the voice neither of willing sex-object nor of generically demure virgin."⁵⁷⁸

Leucippe does not speak very often in the novel. When Cleitophon asks her a direct question (Μέχρι τίνος ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ἰστάμεθα, φιλότατη; 'How long must we stop at just kissing, dearest?' 2.19.1), he does not say she responded. He simply says he was able to persuade her to have sex with him through repeating his request. The very first time she does speak in the narrative (2.25.1ff.) it is in response to her mother's accusation that she has had sex with Cleitophon. At 2.30.2, she asks Satyrus to take her away from her mother. At 3.18.5, she asks Menelaus to tell Cleitophon the story of her false sacrifice; the narrator uses her to introduce a new element, and it is interesting that it is a story about a deception. 4.1.3 is the point at which she tells Cleitophon that she has been persuaded by Artemis in a dream to preserve her virginity until marriage. At 4.17.4 the first word she utters when she is recovering from having been drugged is 'Cleitophon'. 5.5.1 is when Leucippe asks to be told the meaning behind the myth of Philomela — again, she is used to introduce a story. At 5.22.3, Leucippe and Melite have a conversation. Leucippe is able to manipulate Melite into telling her that Cleitophon will not have sex with her, which is good news for Leucippe. At

⁵⁷⁷Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 150 notes that the letter is used as a recapitulation for the reader, since it outlines the events of the novel so far.

⁵⁷⁸Morgan 2007a, p. 119. Cf. Rosenmeyer 2001, p. 149. Létoublon 2003, p. 280 says that this is not Leucippe's point of view.

6.12.1 she sarcastically tells Sosthenes that she hopes he has just as good fortune in life as he is bringing her by arranging a liaison with Thersander for her. Crucially, Sosthenes does not understand her meaning, and continues to extol Thersander's virtues. Leucippe replies at 6.12.3, saying that she does not care who Thersander is. Sosthenes still does not understand and thinks she is joking. 6.16 is Leucippe's lament — she unwittingly reveals to Thersander and Sosthenes who she is, and that she is playing the part of Lacaena.⁵⁷⁹ At 6.20.3, she eloquently defends herself against Thersander's violent speech, and then at 6.22.1 she asserts that she is still a virgin. Further to this, at 8.7.1, she demands to be given a virginity test. Leucippe's letter fits in with some of the themes that this list reveals. In it she protests her virginity, which is something she personally does four times in the novel. She also writes eloquently, just as she has defended herself eloquently against Sosthenes and Thersander. On the one hand, then, the Leucippe portrayed through the letter does fit in with the general scheme Cleitophon has for her. On the other, it also betrays a sense of her wanting to be in control of her own narrative, and not behaving exactly as Cleitophon wishes: she asks Cleitophon for money so that she can buy her freedom and go home to her father.

Leucippe's verbal communication, however, is not as strong as her non-verbal communication. It only tells us as much as Cleitophon knows and wants the reader to know. It takes what Leucippe does not say to reveal more depth in the narrative, to display her narrative agency and her metaliterary role in the text.

Leucippe behind the narrative

As well as the elements just discussed, which centre around Cleitophon's suspect narratorial skills, the novel also constructs a deeper layer of narrative that invites the reader to think about the portrayal of women, and how much they communicate without actually speaking. Leucippe is not very talkative for someone who is (according to Cleitophon) so eager to flirt, but the way she is described in the text

⁵⁷⁹See Morgan 2007a for a discussion of whose focalization this is, and how Cleitophon knows what she said when he was not even there.

speaks volumes about her function in it. Leucippe manipulates the text, communicating with the reader from behind and beyond it, and performing a metaliterary function. This function can best be seen in the vocabulary used to describe her.

hyposēmainō

At 1.19.1, ὑπεσήμαινεν is a significant word to use of Leucippe.⁵⁸⁰ The ὑπο- prefix implies that there is an undercurrent of meaning. Whitmarsh says that Cleitophon's speech "communicates at the subverbal level,"⁵⁸¹ and that Leucippe 'giving secret signs' means that she has read his subtextual message and is replying on this level. However, the verb actually functions on a level even deeper than this. *Hyposēmainō* invites the reader to read between the lines and peel back the layers of narrative to find the female perspective which is beneath (ὑπο) the main narrative, but which can be found if the reader rallies his or her curiosity to search for it. This kind of wordless communication through body language hints at a female narrative, perhaps even something that cannot be controlled by a male. The verb signifies Leucippe's role as a shifting and ambiguous layer of meaning underneath Cleitophon's narrative. Cleitophon, as Morgan demonstrates, casts Leucippe in two roles in his narrative: that of someone who reciprocates his desires, and that of a generic romantic heroine. Both of these roles are ones that he projects on to her, and not what she actually *is*.⁵⁸² ὑπεσήμαινεν demonstrates that there is potentially a different Leucippe lurking under Cleitophon's bluffing narration. This Leucippe is a site of shifting meaning, which is perhaps why Cleitophon's portrayal of her is not consistent. The reader is far enough removed from Cleitophon's narration of the story to notice the deeper meaning that he cannot see in his own telling of it.

⁵⁸⁰This is the only occurrence of this verb in the novel.

⁵⁸¹Whitmarsh 2003, p. 201 and Whitmarsh 2011, pp. 243–244.

⁵⁸²Morgan 2007a, p. 118.

diaschousa

At 2.7.5, the participle *διασχοῦσα* is used of Leucippe starting away from Cleitophon's kiss. The verb indicates that Leucippe is trying to get away from Cleitophon, but there is also a metaliterary element to this too.⁵⁸³ The use of this verb implies that Leucippe is also trying to get away from the narrator. Coupled with the use of *ὑπεσήμεαιεν*, which encourages the reader to look for extra or parallel layers of narrative, the metaliterary interpretation of this word is tempting: Leucippe wants to be ambiguous, does not want to belong to the narrator or Cleitophon, and does not want to be 'written'. In context the participle underlines her autonomy in metaliterary terms: she is breaking free of her narrator, hinting to the reader that s/he should not accept Cleitophon's interpretation of her. As a site of shifting and resistant meaning she is resistant to interpretation as well as to being written. Paradoxically, she is the one element of the text that remains consistent (in her inscrutability), and so reveals the purpose behind the narrative: to make the reader think hard about the nature of narrative and how it functions.

Leucippe as a device of the 'hidden author'

Leucippe is an instrument by which the 'hidden author' function winks at the reader over the head of the narrator. Words such as *ὑπεσήμεαιεν* and *διασχοῦσα*, coupled with the fact that there is always a potential different meaning whenever Cleitophon narrates Leucippe, create a layer of narrative behind the one Cleitophon narrates. This is a layer in which it is not at all certain that Cleitophon is in control. Cleitophon is made to narrate Leucippe's evasion of being narrated and her communication with the reader from beyond his narrative without noticing it himself. She is thus, as a device of Achilles Tatius' 'hidden author', an element that is beyond Cleitophon's control.

There is, then, an alternative storyline lurking beneath Cleitophon's narrative: one that tells a rather different tale to the one Cleitophon wants to tell, and this alternative storyline is one that pushes through Cleitophon's narrative without him

⁵⁸³As suggested above, p. 221.

noticing. The Leucippe who lurks in this alternative storyline beneath the text is not only a different Leucippe from the one Cleitophon thinks he is narrating, but is also the vehicle by which the ‘hidden author’ in Achilles Tatius’ novel makes fun of Cleitophon, communicating with the reader from behind his narrative. Everything Leucippe says or does is narrated by Cleitophon, but his interpretation of her always leaves potential for another interpretation. As such she has a certain power and manipulates the reader by causing him or her to glimpse the alternative perspective in the text. The irony is that Cleitophon narrates this ‘hidden author’ and this Leucippe without even noticing, and they peep out through the gaps in his narrative.

The reason Leucippe is nowhere to be seen at the beginning of the novel is, I suggest, that Cleitophon does not have the narrative skill to control her beyond the end of his story. He introduces her into his narrative, but once she is there he cannot control her as she signals to the reader from behind his back, as it were. At some points it is almost as if Leucippe does not belong in Cleitophon’s narrative, and he has dreamed her up as a character whom he then does not know how to handle. This would also provide another explanation for why she vanishes at the end — Cleitophon the narrator is not sure where his narrative is heading when he begins it.⁵⁸⁴ One final⁵⁸⁵ time, Achilles Tatius’ ‘hidden author’ draws attention to Cleitophon being out of his narrative depth by highlighting the absence of his narrative agent at the very beginning of the text.

Cleitophon’s slippery narration reveals that there is more to Leucippe than meets the eye, through his mis-reading of her reactions to various events. Leucippe functions as more than just the heroine of the text; she is the instrument or vehicle for the ‘hidden’ author. Certainly the way in which she both is written and escapes being written indicates the presence of another voice. In the way that Leucippe functions on a meta-textual level she leads the reader to question what s/he knows about how narrative works, and in doing so she encourages the *polypragmōn* reader to pry into and deconstruct the layers of narrative within this novel. As such she undermines the ego-narrator by remaining just beyond his grasp and even off the

⁵⁸⁴See Nimis 1999 on open-ended narrative.

⁵⁸⁵Or initial.

page.

Controlling the narrative: women in [Pseudo-] Lucian's *Onos*

Women in [Pseudo-]Lucian's *Onos*, in particular the slave-girl Palaestra, are extremely important to the narrative. They frame and shape Lucius' narrative (or Lucius' status as something that can be read). In doing so, they encourage the reader to read against the grain of the text. There is in this text an infra-structure of female narrative, which will be the focus of the following section.

The *Onos* is often treated as a 'simple' and unsophisticated version of Apuleius' *Golden Ass* (which is thought to come from the same Greek *Ass*-narrative tradition),⁵⁸⁶ and is therefore not given the full attention that it deserves.⁵⁸⁷ I hope to show that the *Onos* is not only worthy of detailed study but is also a more sophisticated text than it seems at first.

The plot of the *Onos* is as follows. Lucius is travelling and searching for an adventure. He meets Abroea who tells him to be wary of his host's wife as she is a witch. Lucius seduces Palaestra, a slave, so he can get at Hipparchus' wife's magic. Lucius watches Hipparchus' wife smear her body with a potion and turn into a bird. He wants to do the same, but Palaestra gets the wrong potion and he turns into an ass. Lucius goes through many adventures as an ass before being restored to human form and returning home.

Hall reflects upon the fact that in the *Onos*, although we are given the double

⁵⁸⁶Eg. Hägg 1983, 181: "We leave behind the comparatively simple Greek *Story of the Ass* which in all likelihood was intended chiefly to entertain, and enter the more complex novel structure of the *Metamorphoses*."

⁵⁸⁷Exceptions include Hall 1995, Ní Mheallaigh 2009 and Whitmarsh 2010b.

perspective of educated elite man and slave,⁵⁸⁸ there is no female perspective.⁵⁸⁹ Women are simply objectified and treated in a misogynist manner: “with one exception, every woman in the *Ass* either practices witchcraft or is outrageously sexually voracious or ostentatious, or stupid, or cruel, or old, or ugly, or criminal, or some combination of these.”⁵⁹⁰ I disagree with the assertion that women are treated always as objects in the *Onos*. It will become clear that the female characters in the *Onos* are important, more important than Lucius to some extent, as they shape and frame his narrative.

At the end of her article, Hall muses about what would have happened if Lucius had been turned not into a male ass, but a female one. Would the narrative have been the same? Would what the ass saw and experienced have been filtered through a gendered perspective? Hall then takes this one stage further and points out that Hipparchus’ wife is a female who *does* go through a metamorphosis in this text: “The most subversive ancient novel *never* written would surely have been the *Bird*, the one which recorded her perspectives on early second-century Greek society.”⁵⁹¹ This point can be expanded upon: there is also the exciting potential lurking in the background for Hipparchus’ wife to have become an ass herself — she had that formula! This is yet one more example of another subversive (ie. female-focalized) Greek novel that was never written — there are at least three potentialities within the *Onos*.

The female perspective suggested as possible but ultimately claimed to be absent by Hall is an idea that I wish to take forward. The Greek *Ass* narrative is of course one that does contain somewhere in its history a female voice. The *Oxyrhynchus*

⁵⁸⁸Hall 1995: The metamorphosis of the narrator allows the text to “offer a different, and truer, vision of the society from which it emanated than the ‘ideal’ Greek novels.” (48–49) “The Lucius-ass accurately verbalises his double vision through the medium of his social bilingualism. While fluent in the highbrow dialect of contemporary literati, he is also a flamboyant user of ‘vulgar’ demotic.” (49).

⁵⁸⁹Ibid., 57: “The *Ass*’s double vision. . . , while permitting a unique perspective of the lowest classes in Greece under the Roman imperial administration, does not do the same for the lived experience of ancient women.”

⁵⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 56–57. The exception is the young woman at 22, who is beautiful, and *παρθένος* but is still objectified. She is *σφόδρα καλήν* and on display for the reader: *κατεσπαραγμένην τὴν ἐσθῆτα*.

⁵⁹¹Ibid., p. 57.

Papyrus 4762 is a fragment of an episode of an ass-story in which the ass has sex with a woman, which would seem to tie in with both the *Onos* and the *Metamorphoses*. The fragment is pertinent to my hunt for female perspective, as it makes use of female speech:

“δεινῶς φλέγομαι [
 ρευμα μ’ ἤκει δι[ὰ σέ,?
 ἴδητε, κνωμένη[ν
 τί ποτέ με νύσ<σ>εις;” τῶ[ν
 ὄνον φιλοῦσα ἀλ-
 γ[ο]ῦντα, ὥς ποτε συν-
 εισέ]πεσ’ αὐτῶι· καὶ
 αἰ[το]υμένη λέγει
 “οὐῶ, παχε<ῖ>α καὶ μεγά-
 λη ἔστιν, ὡς δοκός. / μέ-
 νε, κατὰ μεικρόν· μὴ
 ὄλην ἔσω βάλῃς. τί ποτ(ε);
 οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο; ἀλλὰ
 τί; οὐ δὲ πᾶν τοῦτο.
 ἀλλὰ ἄλλοτε; ἀναι-

‘... I’m burning, terribly. A stream (or: dance?) comes on me... itching. Why ever do you prick me?’ as she kisses the ailing ass, since at length she had rushed in on him; and pleading for herself says: ‘Eee! It’s fat and big as a roof-beam. Wait! Gradually! Don’t put all of it in.’ ‘What then?’ ‘Isn’t it as I say?’ ‘But what else?’ ‘And that is not the whole thing.’ ‘But another time?...’⁵⁹²

The passage is clearly focalized through the female. It describes the woman’s thoughts and reaction to the ass’s sexual advances. The fact that she vocalizes her feelings strongly implies that she is not a passive object, to be looked at by the narrator and the reader, but has a subjectivity of her own.

⁵⁹²Text and translation: Obbink 2006, pp. 25–26.

It is possible to find a similar female voice within the text of the *Onos*, which belongs to the same narrative group as the fragment quoted above: the *Ass*-narrative tradition. The most obvious female to start with is Palaestra, who is both attractive and given a great deal to say. It is necessary to read against the ‘normative’ of women being ‘objects’ in order to find Palaestra’s voice and others’.

In the same way as it is in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* the female voice in this text is filtered very obviously through male ego-narration. Everything that Palaestra says and does, for example, is what the male narrator says that she says and does. Not only this, but it is also what he *perceives* her to be saying and doing.⁵⁹³ The tension between male narrator and female narrated character once again dominates the text, urging the reader to read more deeply, to pry into the narrative, and to find the hidden perspectives or voices.

Palaestra’s power and language

According to Hall, the fact that Palaestra cannot read (οὐδὲ γὰρ γράμματα ἔμαθον, 11) and therefore cannot enjoy the text “betrays the exclusivity of the shared male consciousness of author, hero and reader, collaborating in inspection of Palaestra as sex object.”⁵⁹⁴ Palaestra cannot read, and therefore can only be read. This analysis must be questioned, since Palaestra is revealed to be a great mistress of metaphor, and a skilful manipulator of language.⁵⁹⁵ She manipulates the condition of being looked at through what she says. She thus has great power through her ability to speak,⁵⁹⁶ and is definitely no passive object, as will become clear.

It is clear from the description of Palaestra that Lucius is objectifying her, viewing her as something to be looked at through male eyes:

⁵⁹³Cf. Morgan 2007a, p. 118: “as a young man sexually attracted to a young woman, [Cleitophon] wilfully misreads [Leucippe’s] behaviour as reciprocating his own desires.”

⁵⁹⁴Hall 1995, p. 51.

⁵⁹⁵Cf. Morales 2004, p. 230. Writing about Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Morales shows that Melite has similar linguistic control: “Melite’s appropriation of the tools of male agency, metaphor and the gaze...jeopardize[s] the illusion that control of language and sight are exclusively male prerogatives.” Melite therefore represents one of several ways of viewing or interacting (with)in the world.

⁵⁹⁶Once Lucius becomes an ass, he cannot speak and has no power over what happens to him.

κάγὼ εὐθὺς ἔνθεν ἑλών, Ὡς εὐρύθμως, ἔφην, ὦ καλὴ Παλαίστρα, τὴν πυγὴν τῆ χύτρα ὁμοῦ συμπεριφέρεις καὶ κλίνεις. ἡ δὲ ὀσφὺς ἡμῖν ὑγρῶς ἐπικινεῖται. μακάριος ὅστις ἐνταῦθα ἐνεβάψατο.

And I, immediately making a start from there, said, “how rhythmically, beautiful Palaestra, you turn and tilt your rump in time with the saucepan. And your waist is moved smoothly for me. He is happy, whoever dips in there.

Onos 6

Much of the vocabulary here serves to sexualize Palaestra. ἐνεβάψατο is a particularly striking word, as on one level it could refer to the food she is making (which Lucius will eat for dinner: ἡ δὲ Παλαίστρα τῆ ἐστία παρήδρευεν δεῖπνον ἡμῖν εὐτρεπίζουσα. 5), but it is obviously far more likely to refer to Palaestra herself, making it a sexual metaphor and reducing Palaestra to the status of sex-object.⁵⁹⁷ The short speech contains several other words that could be read as *double-entendres*, for example χύτρα, that strengthen the objectification of Palaestra. Bowls, dishes, pots, and so on are often used in *double-entendres* to mean the female genitals.⁵⁹⁸ According to Adams the word χύτρα has the secondary sense ‘pudenda’.⁵⁹⁹ In the Latin version *ollula* is used in the same way in the parallel passage (Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 2.7). χύτρα also turns Palaestra into a receptacle, which will become important when her speech is taken into account. συμφέρειν is used for “bodily cooperation between sex partners” in the *Lysistrata*,⁶⁰⁰ and can therefore be read as prefiguring Lucius’ sexual encounter with Palaestra. The word πυγή is a semi-respectable one, and refers to a “well-rumped or well-padded” woman.⁶⁰¹ The word ὀσφύς, which I have translated as ‘waist’ can also mean ‘penis’ (and is used twice in this text to mean ‘penis’, at 9 and 51). This brings a whole new meaning to ἡ δὲ ὀσφὺς ἡμῖν...ἐπικινεῖται, which then becomes the

⁵⁹⁷ κλίνεις was amended to κινεῖς (you arouse) by Jacobs (Macleod 1974, p. 279), which adds weight to the argument for eroticism here.

⁵⁹⁸ Henderson 1975, pp. 142–143.

⁵⁹⁹ Adams 1982, p. 86.

⁶⁰⁰ Henderson 1975, p. 161.

⁶⁰¹ Ibid., p. 150.

equivalent phrase to Apuleius' parallel passage, which otherwise does not appear in the Greek version. Lucius says: *steterunt et membra quae iacebant ante* (parts of me stood up which before lay dormant, 2.7). Reading ἡμῖν as an ethic dative works for both meanings of the word ἐπικινεῖται. ὕγρως is also an interesting choice of word, as τὸ ὕγρὸν does not have boundaries of its own, but can be bounded.⁶⁰² Women are often referred to using this terminology: they are unbounded by nature, and men must control them by giving them boundaries.⁶⁰³ Lucius is therefore using language that not only sexualizes Palaestra, but by using a word that implies that she needs boundaries he also attempts to control her.

The vocalization of the description of Palaestra by Lucius shows that he is less in control of himself, his narrative, or Palaestra than he wishes to be. Because Lucius says the description out loud, rather than just thinks it, he demonstrates his way of trying to assert his control: if he narrates her, she cannot get away or have control over herself. However, as we shall see, later on Palaestra resists this control by using language back at him. Through his *double-entendres*, Lucius is creating a 'text' for the intradiegetic 'reader', Palaestra, and this text can be interpreted in two ways. Either he is saying that she is attractive and he wants her, or he is saying that she is a receptacle and under his control. Palaestra, even though she cannot *physically* read, can not only read between the lines to find the subtext, but can also respond on this sub-textual level.⁶⁰⁴ That is, her speech will have a subtext, just as his does.

Despite the fact that Lucius uses language that indicates his status as watcher/objectifier, it also becomes clear from her speech that follows that Palaestra knows that she is being watched/objectified, and that Lucius desires her. This reverses the power structure of the scene, which is made clear by the fact that Lucius even admits to being in Palaestra's power.

⁶⁰²Carson 1999, p. 80.

⁶⁰³Ibid., p. 78.

⁶⁰⁴Leucippe understanding Cleitophon's erotic stories in the garden can be compared. Whitmarsh 2010a, p. 341 notes the fact that she appears to understand and respond on the same level as Cleitophon. However, I think there is an interesting difference — Leucippe does not speak, and Cleitophon therefore guesses at or imagines her response, whereas Palaestra does speak, and therefore betrays more of a subjectivity: Lucius cannot stop her talking.

διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ σὸν μὴ φαινόμενον πῦρ κάτω ἐς τὰ
σπλάγχνα τὰμὰ ρίψασα φρύγεις καὶ ταῦτα οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦντα·

you have sent your invisible fire down through my eyes into my innards
and you are roasting me even though I am doing nothing wrong

Onos 6

The passage is particularly important since it shows that Lucius recognizes that Palaestra is not just in control of him, but is also in control of his gaze.⁶⁰⁵ The *Onos* is seemingly written by ‘Lucius’ about Lucius, and so the reader takes Lucius’ perspective, but at this point Palaestra’s point of view can also be taken, as she knows she is an object of the gaze, and the perspective can be reversed: she can essentially take control of the reader, who is also rendered helpless, unable to escape the fact that s/he is viewing her. As Egger says, “The gaze on a desired female object does not always confer mastery on the male observer: it can also unsettle him and threaten his subjectivity and authority.”⁶⁰⁶ Women in the novels exert great power over the men who gaze upon them, sometimes inflicting them physically, for example Callirhoe’s effect upon men is often described in terms of paralysing or wounding in Chariton’s novel.⁶⁰⁷

This connection between vision, desire, and a fire getting inside the body of the ‘victim’, totally overpowering him or her, is reminiscent of Sappho fragment 31:

φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν
ἔμμεν’ ὄνηρ, ὅττις ἐνάντιός τοι
ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄδυ φωνεί-
σας ὑπακούει
καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, τό μ’ ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·

⁶⁰⁵See Bartsch 2000, p. 75 for the link between intromission and the eroticized notion of sight. Cf. Bychkov 1999 and Goldhill 2001, 169ff. See also Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon* 1.9.

⁶⁰⁶Egger 1994a, p. 39. See also Freedman’s theory of the gaze and power-reversal in her analysis of Albrecht Dürer’s ‘woodcut of a perspective artist’ (Freedman 1991, p. 2).

⁶⁰⁷For example 1.1.7, 2.3.4, 4.1.9 and 6.3.2.

ὥς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχε', ὡς με φώναι-
 σ' οὐδ' ἔν' ἔτ' εἴκει,
 ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα †ἔαγε†, λέπτον
 δ' αὐτικά χρωῖ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν,
 ὀπάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἔν' ὄρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-
 βεισι δ' ἄκουαι,
 κὰδε μ' ἴδρωσ ψῦχρος ἔχει, τρόμος δὲ
 παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
 ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω ἴπιδεύης
 φαίνομαι†
 ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον ἐπεὶ †καὶ πένητα

That man seems to me the equal of the gods, he who sits opposite you and hears near him your sweet voice and charming laughter; that indeed makes my heart beat fast in my breast. For when I see you even a little bit I am no longer able to speak, but my tongue is useless and immediately a delicate fire races beneath my skin, my eyes see nothing, my ears ring, sweat pours forth and a trembling takes hold of all of me. I am paler than grass and seem to be a little short of dead. But I must dare all. . .

The narrator says that a fire has run under her skin, just as a fire overtook Lucius. The narrator of the Sappho poem puts a good deal of stress upon the effect that seeing the beloved has on her. She says that even when she sees her beloved only a little, that short glimpse has the power to overwhelm her completely. Lucius has similarly fallen for Palaestra because she has sent her fire through his eyes (διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων) and he is now helpless. The woman in the *Ass*-narrative fragment quoted above also feels that there is a fire inside her: δεινῶς φλέγομαι. There is a clear link between vision and desire, and between fire and desire, and this theme of fire will become significant in an analysis of Palaestra's speech, since she exploits this literary tradition.

Palaestra's short speech at *Onos* 6 is the most important speech in the whole text when it comes to finding a female voice and perspective:

Ἡ δὲ — σφόδρα γὰρ ἦν ἰταμὸν καὶ χαρίτων μεστὸν τὸ κοράσιον — Φεύγοις ἄν, εἶπεν, ὦ νεανίσκε, εἴ γε νοῦν ἔχοις καὶ ζῆν ἐθέλοις, ὡς πολλοῦ πυρὸς καὶ κίνησης μεστά· ἦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ μόνον ἄψη, τραῦμα ἔχων πυρίκαυτον αὐτοῦ μοι παρεδρεύοις, θεραπεύσαι δέ σε οὐδεὶς ἄλλ' οὐδὲ θεὸς ἰατρός, ἀλλ' <ή> κατακαύσασά σε μόνη ἐγώ, καὶ τὸ παραδοξότατον, ἐγὼ μὲν σε ποιήσω πλέον ποθεῖν, καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς θεραπείας ὀδύνης ἀρδόμενος αἰεὶ ἀνέξῃ καὶ οὐδὲ λίθοις βαλλόμενος τὴν γλυκεῖαν ὀδύνην φεύξῃ. τί γελαῖς; ἀκριβῆ βλέπεις ἀνθρωπομάγειρον. οὐ γὰρ μόνα ταῦτα φαῦλα ἐδώδιμα σκευάζω, ἀλλ' ἤδη τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ καλόν, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἶδα ἔγωγε καὶ σφάττειν καὶ δέρειν καὶ κατακόπτειν, ἥδιστα δὲ τῶν σπλάγχων αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς καρδίας ἄπτομαι.

And she, for the girl was very eager and full of delights, said, “you would flee, young man, if you had any sense and wished to live, as it’s full of much fire and steam here. For if you only touch it, you will have a nasty burn, and will stay near me, and no-one will be able to cure you, not even the healing god, but only I who burnt you. And what is most strange, I shall make you yearn for more, and you will always submit to being refreshed with the pain of the cure, and you will flee the sweet pain not even when you are pelted with stones. Why do you laugh? You are looking at a consummate man-cooker. For I prepare not only these common snacks, but now I know about that great and fine dish, man, and I can slaughter him and skin him and cut him up, and the sweetest thing is that I can take hold of his innards and his heart.”

Palaestra’s speech is the most significant episode in the *Onos* in terms of understanding how female characters relate to the narrator. This passage has obvious sexual overtones: the verb δέρειν is used to refer to female masturbation in the *Lysistrata* 158,⁶⁰⁸ and the verbs ἀποδέρειν and ἐκδέρειν can be used of a woman masturbating a man.⁶⁰⁹ Palaestra also uses words that are to do with fire, which

⁶⁰⁸Henderson 1975, p. 133.

⁶⁰⁹Ibid., p. 167.

as we have seen is a traditional metaphor when it comes to obsessive love and desire.⁶¹⁰ πολλοῦ πυρὸς καὶ κνίσσης μεστά. Lucius will receive a τραῦμα πυρίκαυτον. As noted above, the woman in the *Ass*-narrative fragment uses language of fire to indicate her desire: φλέγομαι. This is not used in a threatening or controlling way like Palaestra's language of fire, but she still gives voice to her perspective and feelings, even if in context it is more comparable with the Sappho poem.

In the course of this speech, Palaestra takes the cliché of the 'edible woman' metaphor (that is, viewing woman as food to be consumed⁶¹¹) and deliberately inverts it, creating an 'edible man' metaphor. The 'edible man' metaphor that Palaestra uses is her own. The narrator does not compare her specifically with food before she starts talking about herself as a cooker of men. He does comment on how sexily she stirs the *saucepan*, as was discussed above (ὦς εὐρύθμως, ἔφην, ᾧ καλή Παλαίστρα, τὴν πυγὴν τῇ χύτρᾳ ὁμοῦ συμπεριφέρεις καὶ κλίνεις). However, although Palaestra may seem to take her cue from Lucius' metaphor, as will become clear she appropriates it and develops it for her own purposes. Crucially, this demonstrates that she has a narrative subjectivity: she has the skills to improvise upon a theme.

Melite, in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, provides a useful comparison with Palaestra. Melite is the rival to Leucippe for Cleitophon's affections, the novelistic 'other woman' and herself uses an 'edible man' metaphor when Cleitophon accuses her of not eating:

“Ποῖον γὰρ ὄψον,” ἔφη, “μοι πολυτελὲς ἢ ποῖος οἶνος τιμιώτερος τῆς σῆς ὄψεως;” καὶ ἅμα λέγουσα κατεφίλησέ με, προσιέμενον οὐκ ἀηδῶς τὰ φιλήματα· εἶτα διασχοῦσα εἶπεν· “Αὕτη μοι τροφή.”

“What sort of costly dish,” she said, “or what sort of wine would be more agreeable to me than the sight of you?” And while she was speaking

⁶¹⁰Erotic stories are/make the reader hot: τοῦτό μοι μάλλον ἄσθεν εἰς τέλος τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν· ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός· (*Leucippe and Cleitophon* 1.5.5–6). See above on Sappho.

⁶¹¹The edible woman metaphor is a very common one. See Henry 1992, Henry 2000, p. 508, and Morales 2005, p. 11 on Achilles Tatius.

she kissed me, and I received her kisses not without pleasure; then, tearing away, she said “this is my sustenance.”⁶¹²

5.13.5

There are variants in the manuscript tradition at this point: some manuscripts say τροφή, others τρυφή. I would argue that τροφή (nourishment) works better, as it fits in with the culinary theme (ῥῆσον and οἶνος), but τρυφή (pleasure⁶¹³) should remain in the back of the mind, as it implies a woman who is transgressive in some way. τροφή also has undertones of future generations or children, which could imply that Melite wishes to have children with Cleitophon. This would fit in with a metaphor she uses later, in which she describes the ship they are on in terms of fertility, which will be discussed in detail later.⁶¹⁴

Melite is a subversive woman who appropriates and reverses ‘male’ metaphors. Morales demonstrates this when she says that Melite:

breaks off the logic of female objectification by men; she gazes at Cleitophon. Moreover, her gaze is an objectifying one; she uses the two metaphors of commodification which are normatively, both in Achilles and other writings, used by men about women, thereby undermining the established polarity, and the gender hierarchy valorised by it.⁶¹⁵

Melite’s use of the metaphor of commodification (that is, the ‘edible man’) is, however, not one that threatens the order of the text. Her use of the ‘edible man’ metaphor is different to that of Palaestra. It is about consumption and satisfaction

⁶¹²See Morales 2004, pp. 222–223 for a discussion of Melite’s edible man metaphor: “At 5.13.5 [in Achilles Tatius], the linguistic play between *to opson*, ‘food’, and *he opsia*, ‘sight’, blurs the distinction between eating and viewing, thereby reinforcing the potency of the consuming gaze and Melite’s assumption of active spectatorship.” (223).

⁶¹³With undertones of wantonness.

⁶¹⁴See p. 248.

⁶¹⁵Morales 2004, p. 223.

(τροφή), and although it reverses the usual logic of the gaze, it is used in a non-threatening way.⁶¹⁶ Melite inverts a usual cliché, making her the desirer, as such taking the male role,⁶¹⁷ but Palaestra does something more with her metaphor than simply reversing it.

Palaestra describes herself as ἀνθρωπομάγειρον, literally a ‘man-cook’ or a ‘man-butcher.’ Although it is tempting to put a modern gloss on the word and translate it ‘man-eater’, Palaestra’s metaphor is one of cooking rather than eating, or even the gory preparation for cooking (LSJ gives ‘slaughterer’, ‘butcher’, and ‘cook’, specifically of fish or meat). The word ἀνθρωπομάγειρος therefore constructs Palaestra as a man-killer, a man-skinner, and a person who cuts men up. Barthiaume’s study of the roles of the *mageiros* in ancient Greece is divided into four sections that correspond with the different roles. The work demonstrates that the word encompasses elements of sacrifice, butchery, selling of meat, and cooking of meat.⁶¹⁸ The roles of sacrifice, butchery, and cooking in particular are difficult to separate.⁶¹⁹ It is these roles that Palaestra embodies when she calls herself a *mageiros* of men.

The process of preparing a man for being cooked is reminiscent of Oenothia in Petronius’ *Satyricon* (137–138). Oenothia is in the process of trying to cure Encolpius of erectile dysfunction, although this particular ‘spell’ appears to pardon him for killing a goose:

Infra manus meas camellam vini posuit et cum digitos pariter extensos porris apioque lustrasset, avellanas nuces cum precatatione mersit in vinum. . .

Profert Oenothia scorteum fascinum, quod ut oleo et minuto pipere atque urticae trito circumdedit semine, paulatim coepit inserere ano meo. Hoc crudelissima anus spargit subinde umore femina mea

* * *

⁶¹⁶If τροφή is read, I would argue that this is still not threatening, when considered with Melite’s other metaphors: she is simply a woman in control of her sexuality (although, as we shall see later, this is in itself threatening).

⁶¹⁷Morales 2005, p. 12.

⁶¹⁸Berthiaume 1982.

⁶¹⁹Ibid., p. 5. See also King 1998, p. 37.

Nasturcii sucum cum habrotono miscet, perfusisque inguinibus meis,
viridis urticae fascem comprehendit, omniaque infra umbilicum coepit
lenta manu caedere

She placed a goblet of wine under my hands and when at the same time
she had rubbed my outstretched fingers clean with leeks and garlic, she
threw some filbert nuts into the wine, with a prayer. . .

Oenothea brought out a leather dildo which, when she had smeared
with oil and ground pepper and crushed nettle seed, she began to insert
it gradually up my anus. The extremely cruel old woman then sprinkled
my thighs with the liquid

* * *

She mixed the juice of cress with southern-wood, and having soaked
my genitals in it, she took a bundle of green stinging-nettles and began
beating me everywhere below the navel with a persistent hand.

The whole section is (partly because of its fragmentary nature) a mix of magic,
sex and food. Encolpius appears to be being prepared to be cooked. Particularly
interesting is the use of the word *caedere*, as it is very similar to the language that
Palaestra uses, such as **κατακόπτειν**.

In the *Onos*, however, the man-cooking element runs deeper into the text. The key
to Palaestra's role within the *Onos* is the word **ἄνθρωπομάγειρος**. As I showed
above, it functions as part of the violent 'edible man' metaphor, and in extension
to this it also functions in two other intriguing ways: the word not only constructs
Palaestra as destructive but also as receptive and creative.

There is something very physical about Palaestra's cooking metaphor. It is defi-
nitely about totally overwhelming the man. **κατακόπτειν** means 'to cut up,' or 'to
dissect'. Palaestra is capable of taking him apart. Palaestra's language also implies
that man is something to be penetrated: **τῶν σπλάγχων αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς καρδίας
ἄπτομαι**. She is physically getting inside the man. This is what the active and curi-
ous reader does to a text when s/he reads it. As we have seen, reading (especially in
the ancient world) can be theorized as hermeneutic activity: a journey of discovery

that involves dissecting, deconstructing, getting inside and turning over (perhaps *digesting*) the text in the reader's mind. Palaestra's metaphor implies that a man can be treated not only as food, but also as a text. Lucius will essentially become a text, as his adventures in the body of an ass become a text. Palaestra's carefully chosen words here foreshadow this. Brooks argues that what drives narrative is often the desire to discover the body,⁶²⁰ and in the ancient novel there is often a link between body and text.⁶²¹ Palaestra threatens to do what we do as readers of the *Onos*: participate in the bodily disintegration of Lucius by reading about his metamorphosis. Palaestra cannot read, but with her cookery metaphor she foreshadows the conversion of Lucius' body into text (the *Ass*-narrative), essentially converting him into text with this speech. She is a mistress of metaphor, and as such has a powerful voice. Women are on the whole given a good deal of speech in the *Onos*, which problematizes the female voice, and makes the reader think about female power within texts. Male narrators create texts,⁶²² but female power is more subtle: women can create oral stories and even speak from behind the text like Leucippe. For example, the old woman in Apuleius is the creator of an oral tale.⁶²³ It is as if language that is non-literacy based (language beyond the text) becomes women's narrative, whilst men are confined to text.⁶²⁴

The potential cutting up of Lucius foreshadows his threatened castration in asinine form at 33,⁶²⁵ which is a violation of the man (/text). At 39 a mere cook's wife

⁶²⁰Brooks 1993, p. 8.

⁶²¹König 2008, p. 137: "The desire to know the individuals we encounter in reading, to see beneath the surfaces of the body and of the text, is a motivating force for readers and characters alike". See above, p. 131 ff.

⁶²²See DuBois 1988, pp. 165–166 on the metaphor of the wax tablet as female body: "the literate male . . . alone has the power to generate the marks of the text."

⁶²³All the tales told by men in Apuleius are along the lines of 'once upon a time my friend did such and such *in reality*', but the old woman tells Charite the myth of Cupid and Psyche, which is more creative.

⁶²⁴cf. DuBois 1988, p. 160: when in Euripides' *IT* Iphigenia tells Pylades from memory what is in the letter she is sending, because she cannot read "[i]t is as if there were one system of communication for women, one for men. Women are locked into the oral form". However, Barber 1994, p. 229 argues that in pre-literate societies men created oral stories whilst women documented it in textiles, which indicates that women are the original artisans.

⁶²⁵Cf. König 2008, p. 136: The dismembered bits of people and animals in Pamphile's magical store foreshadow the threats to bodily integrity that Lucius will suffer in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

nearly becomes Lucius' downfall: ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἢ τούτου, κακὸν ἐξαίσιον ἔμον. She threatens Lucius with the reality of Palaestra's metaphor. He is very nearly actually killed and cut into pieces:

τῶν κιναίδων τὸν ὄνον λαβὼν ἔξω εἰς ἔρημον χωρίον κᾶπειτα σφάξας
αὐτὸν τὸ μέρος μὲν ἐκεῖνο τὸν μηρὸν ἀποτεμῶν κόμιζε δεῦρο καὶ
σκευάσας τῷ δεσπότη ἀπόδος

having taken the ass of the catamites outside to a deserted place and
then having killed him and having cut off the part that is the leg, bring
it here and having prepared it, serve it to the master.

It is not an accident that some of the vocabulary recalls Palaestra's speech: σφάξας recalls σφάττειν, σκευάσας recalls σκευάζω, and ἀποτεμῶν reminds the reader that Palaestra threatens to κατακόπτειν men. It is a reminder to Lucius and the the extradiegetic reader just who is responsible for this narrative. Palaestra's speech thus foreshadows all the violence he will undergo when he has become an ass – the beatings he suffers, and so on. Palaestra's language also serves to remind the reader that vocabulary of violence and tearing apart (for example, σφάττειν and δέρειν) are used to signify a woman's loss of virginity. Later on Lucius is scared of tearing apart the women he has sex with while he is an ass and the vocabulary at that point recalls Palaestra's (διασπαζω is used at 32 and 51). Various details of Palaestra's vocabulary thus foreshadow episodes that will happen later, when Lucius is an ass. Palaestra is laying down some of his future narrative for him, dropping hints to the reader who will then read on to find out if this happens.

There is another dimension to ἀνθρωπομάγειρος that constructs Palaestra as receptive. The word μάγειρος can refer to baking as well as to butchery.⁶²⁶ As we have seen, in the ancient world, women were regarded as a space, or receptacle,⁶²⁷ a sort of absence of subjectivity on to which (male) impressions are stamped.⁶²⁸ Within this category, women are often considered to be ovens, specifically ovens for baking,⁶²⁹ and baking is a common metaphor for sex: the woman 'bakes' the

⁶²⁶It comes from the verb μάσσω: to knead dough.

⁶²⁷Sebesta 2002, p. 126.

⁶²⁸Lovibond 1994, pp. 93–94. Cf. Carson 1999, p. 79 and see above, p. 208.

⁶²⁹DuBois 1988, pp. 110–129. Cf. Adams 1982, 86–87: female sexual organs are firey.

penis.⁶³⁰ DuBois writes that “[i]n the representation of the woman’s body as an oven there is an assumption of passivity, the passivity of a receptacle.”⁶³¹ In a sense, therefore, Palaestra is acting as a woman should: as a receptacle for ‘loaves’ (/penis /semen).⁶³² However, when the rest of her speech is taken into account, this too can be threatening, as she is appropriating her own status as receptacle and turning it on Lucius, essentially making it active. An oven transforms its contents, and by using this language Palaestra threatens Lucius with transformation. In the Latin version, Photis’ equivalent speech is much shorter, but she actually says ‘get away from my oven’ (*a meo foculo discede*, 2.7), denying Lucius access (for the time being at least), resisting being a receptacle by turning the idea into a warning. The Greek version takes it further by incorporating both the receptive function and the idea of powerful transformation in one word.

Crucially, the same function that makes the word ἀνθρωπομάγειρος receptive also makes it creative. As I noted in the introduction to this chapter, a woman’s creativity is her power. In this speech Palaestra works on two levels: creative and destructive. Acting as Lucius’ oven and his butcher she performs the dual role of creating him as text and dissecting him, setting him up to be penetrated and digested by the extradiegetic reader.

On a similar (slightly tangential) note, texts can not only be penetrated, but can also penetrate. In Petronius’ *Satyricon*, the text is figured as a body to be consumed, like food. Rimell says that “readers are encouraged to associate the act of eating with the penetration of physical boundaries and hence with the feminization of the consumer”⁶³³ That is, whoever consumes food or text is penetrated in some way by that food or text. Food, text and penetration are all closely linked in this genre. For example, in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* book 2 food (supper) figures as foreplay to text (Lucius’ story about the Chaldaean) and sex (with Photis).⁶³⁴

⁶³⁰Henderson 1975, pp. 177–178; see also King 1998, p. 33.

⁶³¹DuBois 1988, p. 110.

⁶³²Ibid., p. 110.

⁶³³Rimell 2002, p. 54.

⁶³⁴Ibid., 22: “Literature is a currency that can be exchanged for dinner” in the *Satyricon*. This is what happens in the *Onos* in the episode with the story about the Chaldean: an exchange of ‘text’, or narrative, for food. On the parallel between food and literature as bodily experience more generally, see Gowers 1993, especially pp. 41–46 and Graverini 2001, p. 434.

The story of the Widow of Ephesus in the *Satyricon* also brings together food and sex. Food acts as foreplay in this tale: “By letting her sacred body be penetrated by food, the woman implicitly makes herself sexually available to the soldier, as satisfaction from eating precedes sexual arousal.”⁶³⁵ By turning Lucius into food and text, Palaestra appropriates her own receptacality and prepares Lucius to penetrate her, but on her terms, rather than on his own male, objectifying terms. This demonstrates that Palaestra is in control of her own sexuality, and foreshadows her control in the sex-scene that follows.

It is useful to compare Melite once again, as she also uses a metaphor to invite penetration on her own terms in book five of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. The metaphor is a remarkable one of female fertility and marriage and she uses it to describe (and essentially sexualize) the ship that she and Cleitophon are sailing on. She describes various parts of the ship using words associated with marriage in order to lure Cleitophon into sleeping with her: the yardarm is a yoke (ζυγός, 5.16.4), the cables she sees as the bonds of marriage (δεσμοί, 5.16.4). Fortune, she says, is the helmsman of their marriage (ἡ Τύχη κυβερνᾷ, 5.16.5); Poseidon and the Nereids make up the bridal escort (νυμφοστολήσουσι, 5.16.5), and the wind leads the wedding song (ὑμέναιον, 5.16.5). Finally, she says that the sails billow out like a pregnant woman’s belly: ὀρᾶς δὲ καὶ τὴν ὀθόνην κεκυρτωμένην, ὥσπερ ἐγκύμονα γαστέρα· 5.16.6.⁶³⁶ There is a slightly odd phrase in the middle of this metaphor. Whilst describing the ship Melite says that the rudder is near the *thalamos*: ἀλλὰ καὶ πηδάλιον τοῦ θαλάμου πλησίον (5.16.5). Morales writes:

Thalamos is a metaphor for the vagina (Melite’s) and, with its function as a place of containment, protection and, possibly even sanctuary, it can indeed be read as a ‘female metaphor of reception and enclosure’.⁶³⁷

However, the way Melite phrases what she says makes it seem more threatening. This seems more like a penetrative metaphor than an enclosing one as Morales argues. If the rudder and the *thalamos* were the other way round, prioritizing the

⁶³⁵Rimell 2002, p. 132.

⁶³⁶See Morales 2005, p. 9.

⁶³⁷Ibid., p. 10. See also Heffernan 1993, pp. 53–54.

thalamos, then it would emphasize the enclosing nature of the *thalamos*. However, Melite prioritizes *πηδάλιον*, and by using the vocabulary in this particular order here she is actively inviting penetration, but on her own terms, just as Palaestra invites penetration on her terms. The overwhelming power of female characters in both *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Onos* is demonstrated by a woman appropriating her own receptive nature and turning it into an active metaphor by inviting and controlling penetration. This is more alarming than a woman simply appropriating a ‘male’ metaphor like the ‘edible woman’: in the ancient world women’s bodies are mysterious domains inscrutable to men, and a woman who understands her own body is a dangerous one indeed.⁶³⁸

Lucius picks up Palaestra’s ‘edible man’ metaphor when he says that she is roasting his insides (διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ σὸν μὴ φαινόμενον πῦρ κάτω ἐς τὰ σπλάγχνα τὰμὰ ρίψασα φρύγεις καὶ ταῦτα οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦντα). This means that he has no means of creating his own metaphor and has to follow the example set by a female character. φρύγεις is noted in Henderson as a word for cooking that is also a sexual metaphor.⁶³⁹ Lucius also invites Palaestra to skin him (με... δεῖρε, 6⁶⁴⁰), which shows that although Lucius inserts new vocabulary, he has no imagination when it comes to creating a sexual metaphor, and that Palaestra is in control of both the metaphor and the situation. This is important, because it shows again that perhaps Lucius is not as firmly in control of his narrative as he would like to be. Palaestra uses the word ἀνθρωπομάγειρος both to turn Lucius into text in order to be penetrated by the curious reader of this novel and to take control of her own sexual experience: another way of asserting power over Lucius.⁶⁴¹

⁶³⁸For example, reports of knowledge of contraception apparently passed from woman to woman down the generations are most probably not true and are part of a wider fear of female knowledge about things that may be harmful to men: “[t]he myth of effective plant-based contraceptives may thus be a male expression of fear that women hold knowledge which could enable them to control the fertility of the household.” (King 1998, p. 156).

⁶³⁹Henderson 1975, p. 178.

⁶⁴⁰See above on masturbation: p. 240.

⁶⁴¹It is important to note that although Palaestra is in control of Lucius, she is not in control of her social situation, since she is a slave. Her name means ‘training ground’, and coupled with the tension between empowerment and disempowerment that she embodies she can be read as a testing-site for power relations. See Hunnings 2009, pp. 113–131 for the argument that Palaestra is not powerful.

Powerful female characters

Palaestra is not the only female character to have a powerful presence within the text. Both Hipparchus' wife and the woman with whom Lucius has sex while he is in the form of a donkey are shown to be very much in control of their sexuality.

Hipparchus' wife turns herself into a bird so that she can go to her lover, which implies that she is in charge of her own sexuality and sexual experiences. In the ancient world mindset, women are continuously seen to metamorphose:

In myth woman's boundaries are pliant, porous, mutable. Her power to control them is inadequate, her concern for them unreliable. Deformation attends her. She swells, she shrinks, she leaks, she is penetrated, she suffers metamorphoses.⁶⁴²

Carson argues that woman is a slippery character, and continuously changeable — she is τὸ ὑγρόν. Because of their changeable nature, women are always up to no good. Not only do they lack control of their own boundaries, but they also transgress or confound others' boundaries.⁶⁴³ Hipparchus' wife's story is a reification of this changeability. However, she chooses to metamorphose and in doing so she shows that she is in charge of her boundaries, which makes her even more subversive, whereas Lucius, a man, makes a mess of it.

The fact that Hipparchus' wife goes to her lover is unusual — the male adulterer more usually comes to the woman's house. In Chariton, for example, Callirhoe's 'adulterer' comes to her house, and her suitors leave evidence of revelling outside her door.⁶⁴⁴ The same theme can be found in Latin love poetry: it is always the (male) lover who pines outside his beloved's door. The word ἐρώμενος (11) to describe her lover implies that Hipparchus' wife is the *erastēs* of the relationship. In homoerotic relationships the ἐρώμενος was always the younger, passive partner, and the *erastēs* the senior, more dominant, and (significantly) the penetrative

⁶⁴²Carson 1999, p. 79.

⁶⁴³Ibid., p. 77.

⁶⁴⁴*Chaereas and Callirhoe* 1.3-4.

partner. Using this vocabulary constructs a scenario in which Hipparchus' wife is in control, to the point of subverting the normative, which adds to the argument for female subjectivity, or a layer of female narrative, within this text. It is, however, Palaestra who uses this language of power, which says a lot about her conception of a love affair. As we have seen, she is a woman in charge of her own sexuality and sexual experiences. Palaestra is projecting this idea on to Hipparchus' wife: the truth is filtered through her and the narrator. Hipparchus' wife, interestingly, never says anything, but her statement of independence is made clear by the fact that she *chooses* a lover and *chooses* to go to him: she, like Palaestra, is active in her sexuality and in control of her sexual experience.

Towards the end of the text Lucius has sex with a woman whilst he is in the form of an ass. To begin with, it seems as if Lucius has power over the women: εἰς ἔρωτά μου θερμὸν ἐμπίπτει, τοῦτο μὲν τὸ κάλλος ἰδοῦσα τοῦ ὄνου, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῶν ἐμῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν συνουσίας προελθοῦσα: ('She fell head-over-heels in love with me, partly because she saw the handsomeness of an ass, and partly because she came to a desire to sleep with me through the marvellousness of my affairs.' 50) It is therefore in part through seeing (ἰδοῦσα) Lucius' handsomeness that the woman falls in love with him, implying that he has some control over her. However, this woman is then described in terms that give a sense of her control over her sexual experience: διαλέγεται πρὸς τὸν ἐπιστάτην τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ μισθὸν αὐτῷ ἄδρὸν ὑπέσχετο, εἰ συγχωρήσειεν αὐτῇ σὺν ἐμοὶ τὴν νύκτα ἀναπαύσεσθαι: ('She spoke to my master and promised him a large reward if he would assent to her spending the night with me.' 50).

Like Hipparchus' wife, this lady goes to her lover, and like Palaestra, she is in control of the sex. Lucius is hesitant:

καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῦτό μ' εἰς δέος οὐχὶ μέτριον ἦγε, μὴ οὐ χωρήσασα
ἢ γυνὴ διασπασθείη. . . κἀγὼ μὲν ὁ δειλὸς ἐδεδοίκειν ἔτι καὶ ὀπίσω
ἀπῆγον ἐμαυτὸν ἀτρέμα

And indeed this immoderate fear came to me, that the woman would

not have room for me and would be torn apart...and I, the coward, was still afraid and I drew myself away gently...

51

The woman then takes charge:

ἡ δὲ τῆς τε ὀσφύος τῆς ἐμῆς εἶχετο, ὥστε μὴ ὑποχωρεῖν, καὶ αὐτὴ εἶπετο τὸ φεῦγον.

But she held on to my manhood, so that it could not withdraw, and she followed it as it retreated.

51

This again shows that this woman has a certain control over her own sexuality, and furthermore will not let Lucius do as he wants. Both the woman in this section and Hipparchus' wife demonstrate that they have a control over their own experience within Lucius' narration, but I think that this control goes further. The women in the *Onos* not only control their own experience, but they lie behind the entire structure of Lucius' narrative, since they direct and shape it. This sublayer of female narrative becomes a goal for which the curious reader can reach.

Choosing Lucius' narrative

Lucius does not get to choose what happens to him in this text, from the moment he sees Hipparchus' wife smear her metamorphosis-inducing potion on her body, to the indignities he suffers as a pack animal, to right at the end when his lover rejects him. It is significant, then, that he does not see which 'narrative' is chosen for him in Hipparchus' wife's room.

At 12 Lucius, looking through a crack in the door to her room, watches Hipparchus' wife transform into a bird. She takes a potion from a jar that is inside a box and

smears it on herself in order to effect the metamorphosis. The fact that the ‘potion’ is inside a *πυξίς*, which is inside a *κιβώτιον* (which is itself inside a room with a closed door) represents the very closed nature of Hipparchus’ wife’s narrative. It is telling that Lucius cannot see what is inside this woman’s box. He says: ἡ δὲ εἶχεν ἐμβεβλημένον ὅ τι μὲν οὐκ οἶδα. Women’s narratives are thus totally impenetrable to Lucius, and he should not try to experience them as he does when he begs Palaestra to get him a potion.

The idea of narratives inside boxes is one that can be found elsewhere in novelistic literature, for example, in Dictys’ *Ephemeris Belli Troinani* and Antonius Diogenes’ *The Wonders beyond Thule*:

Προσέταξέ τε τῷ Κύμβῳ δίχα ταῦτα τὰ διαμυθολογηθέντα ἀναγράψασθαι, καὶ θατέραν μὲν τῶν δέλτων αὐτὸν ἔχειν, τὴν ἑτέραν δέ, καθ’ ὃν ἀποβιώη καιρόν, τὴν Δερκυλλίδα πλησίον τοῦ τάφου κιβωτίῳ ἐμβαλοῦσαν καθεῖναι.

He ordered Cymbas to write this story twice, and to keep one tablet himself – but the other he ordered Dercyllis to put in a small chest and place near his tomb at the time when he died.

apud Photius *Bibliotheca* 166, 111a25–29

As we saw earlier,⁶⁴⁵ it is the woman, Dercyllis, who provides these tablets, which are a metaphor for women (being a blank space for men to fill).⁶⁴⁶ She is also the one who puts the narrative in the box.

Lucius has watched Hipparchus’ wife transform into a bird, and wants to become a bird himself, so he asks Palaestra to get him the jar (narrative) in question, but Palaestra picks the wrong one. There are many potential narratives within the box in Hipparchus’ wife’s room, but Palaestra chooses one that Lucius, once he is

⁶⁴⁵See p. 208

⁶⁴⁶See DuBois 1988, p. 28.

inside it, does not want to experience.⁶⁴⁷ He cannot just put the narrative down and step away from or out of it. Women's power, then, lies in directions other than text: Palaestra may not be able to read, but she does know how to construct a good tale. The woman who tells the tale of Cupid and Psyche in Apuleius also falls into this category — it is unlikely that she can read, given her status, but she tells a riveting story. Women in these texts certainly have creative and/or narrative powers.

The 'wrong box' motif found in both the Greek and Latin versions of the *Ass* narrative⁶⁴⁸ calls to mind the myth of Pandora who takes the lid from her jar and scatters all manner of evils into the world.⁶⁴⁹ Pandora's threatening jar can be read as a womb,⁶⁵⁰ turning Pandora herself into a container, much as Palaestra turns herself into a container that can wreak havoc.⁶⁵¹ Significantly for this chapter as a whole, Pandora is taught how to weave by Athena (Hesiod *Works and Days* 63–64),⁶⁵² and thus can be read as weaving a narrative for future mankind, just as the women who I have discussed shape narrative in the novels and direct the reader. In particular the evils that are released into the world resonate with the trials undergone by Lucius whilst he is an ass.⁶⁵³ With this in mind, I shall now show how integral the female characters in the *Onos* are to Lucius' narrative.

Shaping and framing Lucius' narrative

Very near the beginning of the text, before his conversation with Palaestra, Lucius meets a woman called Abroea. In a sense it is Abroea who begins Lucius' narrative. He has been looking for a narrative: ἐπεθύμουν δὲ σφόδρα μείνας ἐνταυθα

⁶⁴⁷Perhaps he should have taken Hesiod's advice in *Works and Days*: μηδὲ γυνή σε νόον πυγοστόλος ἐξαπατάτω... 'Never let a woman with an attractive behind trick you...' (373), something which Lucius himself has noted Palaestra does have: Ὡς εὐρύθμως, ἔφην, ᾧ καλὴ Παλαίστρα, τὴν πυγὴν τῆ χύτρα ὁμοῦ συμπεριφέρεις καὶ κλίνεις (*Onos* 6).

⁶⁴⁸Although Photis seems to know the recipe for the potion, she still picks the wrong box (Ap. *Met.* 3.23–24).

⁶⁴⁹Hesiod *Works and Days* 94–5.

⁶⁵⁰King 1998, pp. 26, 40; Zeitlin 1996, p. 65.

⁶⁵¹Above, p. 247.

⁶⁵²Barber 1994, p. 236.

⁶⁵³I owe thanks to Paula James for pointing this out to me.

ἐξευρεῖν τινα τῶν μαγεύειν ἐπισταμένων γυναικῶν καὶ θεάσασθαί τι παράδοξον, ἢ πετόμενον ἄνθρωπον ἢ λιθούμενον. ('But I wished very much, remaining here, to find one of the women accomplished in sorcery and to see something unusual, a man either flying or turning to stone.' *Onos* 4). Abroea lets him know that what he is looking for is in the house where he is staying: Φυλάττου... τὴν Ἰππάρχου γυναῖκα πάση μηχανῇ μάγος γὰρ ἐστὶ δεινὴ ('Guard against the wife of Hipparchus in every way, for she is a clever witch'. *Onos* 4). She also informs him that Hipparchus' wife has the ability to turn men into animals. Lucius then says Ἐγὼ δὲ πυθόμενος ὅτι τὸ πάλαι μοι ζητούμενον οἴκοι παρ' ἐμοὶ κάθηται, προσεῖχον αὐτῇ οὐδὲν ἔτι ('When I discovered that what I had been seeking for a long time was in the house with me, I had no more interest in her.' *Onos* 5). His curiosity and desire for a narrative are immediately activated by what a female character says. Abroea thus gives Lucius the tools with which to discover his narrative, and it is significant that she is a woman: she starts the whole adventure for him, indicating that women are more important in the *Onos* than Hall would contend.

Women are responsible for shaping Lucius' narrative, but they also form the frame to it, and I shall explore this in what follows.

The actions of Hipparchus' wife and the lady at the end of the narrative are similar:

ἡ δὲ λύχνον ἔνδον ἔκαιε μέγαν τῷ πυρὶ λαμπόμενον· ἔπειτα ἀποδυσαμένη παρέστη τῷ λύχνῳ γυμνὴ ὅλη καὶ μύρον ἔκ τινος ἀλαβάστρου προχεαμένη τούτῳ ἀλείφεται

Inside she lit a large, bright lamp. Then she stripped, stood naked next to the lamp, poured out an oil from an alabaster vase and anointed herself with it.

51

This extract picks up Hipparchus' wife standing naked by a lamp and smearing herself with oil at 12.⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁵⁴ ὁρῶ οἶν τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα ἀποδυομένην. εἶτα γυμνὴ τῷ λύχνῳ προσελθοῦσα... ἐκ τούτου λαβοῦσα χρίεται ὅλη, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνύχων ἀρξαμένη τῶν κάτω.

This similarity is significant, as it should warn Lucius that something (perhaps a change?) is going to happen — the first time he is in this situation, watching Hipparchus' wife through a chink in her door, he is just about to be turned into an ass. Shortly after the second 'smearing' scene he returns to human form.

Outside these 'smearing' scenes, two sex scenes frame Lucius' ass narrative: the scene with Palaestra and the scene with the woman at the end. The woman at end is not just like Hipparchus' wife, but is also similar to Abroea: they are both young, rich and attractive. She actually seems to be some kind of fusion of Abroea, Palaestra, and Hipparchus' wife and therefore signals the end of Lucius' ass-adventures that these three women at the beginning of the text set in motion between them.

It appears that in the text of the *Onos*, Lucius is in the wrong narrative. He is in a narrative entirely created for him and controlled by the female characters. He wanted to be in a narrative created and controlled by himself: a bird-narrative (13: ἐδεόμην τότε τῆς Παλαίστρας πτερῶσαι κάμῃ). He wanted someone to give him a narrative, and that was when he came across Abroea (4). At the beginning of the text, he is specifically looking for a woman so that she can show him τι παράδοξον — he thinks he can control a woman into giving him a narrative, but ends up with an narrative that is framed and shaped by the female characters.

In the *Onos*, then, women frame and control Lucius' narrative. It is a woman who is there at the beginning to point him in the right direction for the narrative he is seeking, and another woman who 'chooses' his narrative for him. His adventures are framed by two sexual encounters (in human form) with women. The one at the very end of the narrative does not even get started: the woman laughs at him and sends him away because he is no longer an ass. It is this that finally ends his tale, as he gives up and goes home with his brother.

Hall is right when she says that female characters in the *Onos* are all portrayed in a bad light, but this does not have to indicate, as she suggests,⁶⁵⁵ that they lack a narrative voice; rather it enhances the fact that they do have a voice within the narrative, even a control over the narrative, as they are the ones who frame and

⁶⁵⁵See p. 232.

shape it.

Conclusion

Female characters are found to impact upon the narrative in various different ways in the novel, by what they say, do, or write. They encourage the reader to follow their perspective, and because they are women they draw attention to the reader's going against the grain of the text by prying into what they are doing. The fact that the most famous female silent narrator, Philomela, is alluded to in two novels highlights female characters' subversive creativity and their leading of the reader. The omniscient narrator, by aligning himself with a female subjectivity, injects an extra, subversive, narrative layer for the reader to uncover.

There is a slippage between woman as writer and woman as written, which the *Aethiopica* and *Leucippe and Cleitophon* do not shy away from. The display of women's thoughts and feelings within a male-narrated text creates a tension between direct access to woman as writing subject and filtered access to woman as always-written object. In other words, there is a tension between women's direct readability and their inscrutability, and the novels deliberately exploit this by presenting female characters who speak through the narrative in some way and by having women's texts read by and narrated or interpreted by men. In the case of Palaestra in the *Onos*, it is even evident that her power lies outside the realm of literacy, but within the realm of narrative. The letters of Persinna and Leucippe are interpreted by, and through, Calasiris and Cleitophon respectively, and their representation and interpretation of female narrative problematize the idea of the woman as inscrutable. Whitmarsh writes that although the novels as a genre are more interested in women's subjectivity (that is, their speaking or thinking) than previous literature is, they confine them within interiors, or to women's work (e.g. Persinna's embroidery). This confinement makes women inscrutable and therefore fascinating or alarming to men.⁶⁵⁶ In turn, this inscrutability makes them powerful: "the most memorable women in Greek literature derive their power precisely from

⁶⁵⁶Whitmarsh 2004, pp. 193–195.

their inscrutability.”⁶⁵⁷ The women in the novels appropriate this inscrutability, challenging the reader to find them and their narrative voice.

Female characters in ego-narration lead the reader further astray: they effectively break the rules of focalization in narrative. They do not allow themselves and their point of view merely to be focalized through the male ego-narrator, but they resist him. It seems as if when Lucius and Cleitophon are focalizing through female characters, the focalization is just beyond their grasp. A resisting female character is more prominent in ego-narrative because the narrator is not omniscient: he cannot always be certain of what his characters think or feel. The female characters in the novels push the curious reader to his or her limit. It becomes increasingly difficult to ‘find’ female narratives and what they stand for because of their inscrutable nature.

⁶⁵⁷Whitmarsh 2004, p. 195.

Conclusion

This investigation set out to find a method for theorizing what kind of reader reads the Greek novel. More specifically it aimed to discover whether the novels themselves put forward a conceptual framework for how their readers might engage with the texts, based on their construction of the reader as one with the qualities of a *polypragmōn*. I have not tried to be exhaustive in my examples, but hope to have shown different ways in which the novels construct their reader as curious, involve this reader in becoming aware of the process of reading, and encourage him or her to analyse his or her encounter with the text. Some suggestions I have made, for example what Cleitophon's reading material is, go beyond the boundaries of what the reader can know, and that is the point of the novelistic narratives: the texts invite the reader to speculate and to innovate.

Chapter one demonstrated that the novels use episodes in which characters themselves are in the position of intradiegetic reader or interpreter to guide or misdirect the extradiegetic reader's interpretation, and to draw attention to the experience of reading as a process. Lessons can be learnt from how the characters within the text treat and react to their own narratives and those of others. These lessons not only teach the reader how to read that text, but they also highlight the curious nature of the reader by encouraging and playing to his or her desire to know more and to seek out the various storylines. Narratives that reflect upon themselves in this way shape a reader who is self-aware. The multiplicity of storylines in even the simplest of novelistic texts adds depth to the narrative, leading the reader to interrogate the text to find out as much as s/he can: the novels are not just about the main protagonists' stories, but include many and varied subplots that run counter

to, or complement, the main thrust of the narrative. In Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* Chloe's reaction to the inset tales provides for the reader a metanarrative lesson in how s/he can develop as a reader, and so the educational journey of the novel, mentioned in the Prologue, becomes twofold. Letters in particular, by dramatizing the reception of physical texts rather than just stories or dreams, encourage the reader to ask him or herself what kind of reader s/he is, by engaging with the process of reading, and thus to analyse his or her reading experience.

Chapter two concentrated on the experience of reading narrative as a spatial one: the reader is complicit with the characters in finding things out by looking through gaps in doors and entering interior spaces, sometimes even by force. Using interior space in this way to map the reader's encounter with the text brings to the reader's attention the fact that s/he is often allowed a privileged view into private matters. This makes him or her realize that the text is constructing him or her as curious, and as a reader who will engage with the text in an interrogative manner. The space of the ship symbolizes the narrative in 'adventure time', since it is found on the uncertain space of the sea, which is rife with narrative potential. The novel reader's ability to see into private interior spaces draws attention to the fact that the novels will only go so far in their description of a scene, particularly scenes of an erotic nature, and so the reader is encouraged to collaborate with the narrator, completing the narrative with his or her own fantasy. The reader who is curious will thus be led to self-analysis and so the novels become a vehicle for discovering what s/he is like as a reader.

The third and fourth chapters were similar in their aims: to explore the possibilities that can be found within the narratives of the novels once the curious reader's imagination has been ignited, and once s/he has realized that s/he can (and does) read in an interrogative and active way, which is shown in the first two chapters. The novels bring the reader through a process of self-identification as *polypragmōn*, and these two chapters demonstrated the effect of pushing this kind of reading further, and making the both the text and the reader work harder. They asked where the narrative can take the reader once s/he has identified him or herself as curious.

Chapter three asked what possibilities deception activates within (or beyond the end of) the texts. Deceptive narratives, whether they deceive the characters (as Anthia's fabricated stories do) or the reader (as does Cleitophon's narrative, if it is fraudulent), cause questions to arise. These questions are not ones that should be avoided, but rather explored by the reader, and the answers to them are not simple, and sometimes they are not evident within the texts themselves. In making the curious reader consider varying narrative possibilities the novels cause him or her to take note of the processes involved in the experience of reading and interpretation. Deceit in narrative tests the reader through encouraging him or her to explore alternative narrative paths.

The final chapter continued to ask where the narrative can take the reader once s/he is curious, this time within the specific framework of searching for the female voice within the novels, in particular the voices of women who are not the main protagonists. A layer of subversive female narrative can be found, as a female perspective can be grasped through the male narration. This female narrative makes use of women's creativity as a means of communication, aligning the female characters with the author — in Leucippe's case the hidden author — of the text. In taking this perspective on the author adds another nuance to the the multiple-layered narrative. Finding the female-based narratives within the texts pushes the curious reader to his or her limit as s/he searches within the fiction for the elusive female voice. Reading against the text, resisting the main thrust of the narrative, is the ultimate in active reading, and requires the reader to have identified as curious before s/he sets out to read in this way.

Once the reader has been through the process of reading a novel and has had his or her curiosity tempted and tested by this process, s/he will be in a position to analyse him or herself. The reader of a given novel may, on beginning to read, already be on a level at which s/he is aware of his or her reading experience, that is, aware of what the text is doing to him or her and how s/he is approaching it, and if this is the case s/he will interrogate the text, approaching it in an active way and exploring alternative narrative possibilities. If the reader is not already self-aware, the novel creates this experience for him or her, teaching him or her how to read the novel as the text unfurls, and taking him or her through the transformative

process of reading to the point at which s/he is aware both of what the text is doing to him or her and of his or her approach to the text. Thus, the Greek novels speak to many levels of reader at once. The texts also provide opportunities for the reader to create his or her own narrative, and that is the point at which the novels draw a veil over the events in the story, such as wedding nights. The reader realizes s/he is creating narrative and is collaborating with the narrator to complete the scene, as the novels draw attention to this fact by using euphemisms or showing the reader to him or herself.

The introduction to this thesis showed that Plutarch says that *polypragmosunē* should be directed away from other people's business towards one's own business.⁶⁵⁸ I have shown that the novels invite and provoke active and curious reading, reading by poking one's nose into the text, and that they bring the reader to the position of self-analysis, that is, the position of examining his or her reading process and experience. They thus fulfil Plutarch's suggestions for where to direct one's curiosity and how to turn it away from being a negative activity. The Greek novels reclaim *polypragmosunē*, making it a positive aid to interpreting the texts. The texts provide a short-cut to becoming self-aware, and in playing on the tension between the curious reader's *sōphrosunē* and his or her desire to know the whole story they show the reader to him or herself in such a way that s/he is led to analyse what kind of reader s/he is.

Curiosity thus becomes, through reading the novels in an active way, a tool for self-analysis: it is reframed as positive and put to good use by the novelistic texts, thus becoming *ὠφέλιμος* ('useful') and *σωτήριος* (a 'saving grace') as Plutarch suggests it will if directed towards the correct subject-matter (*Peri Polypragmosunēs* 515f).⁶⁵⁹ I set out to discover if the Greek novels themselves put forward a way for conceptualizing their readers: that is, do they provide a template for the kind of reader who read the Greek novels and his or her approach to reading, thus moving us closer to discovering a theory for reading ancient novels? I suggest that the reader that these novels promote from within themselves is one who can be understood as curious, interrogative, active and above all self-aware in his or her

⁶⁵⁸See p. 20.

⁶⁵⁹See p. 20.

reading strategies. Reading the novels is an explorative experience, and the more curious the reader is, the more questioning and searching his or her approach, the more s/he will get out of these multifaceted masterpieces.

Bibliography

Texts, Commentaries and Translations

- Babbit, F. (1936 repr. 1962). *Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. 5. Cambridge, Mass.
- Bain, D. (1983). *Menander Samia*. Warminster.
- Barsby, J. (1973). *Ovid Amores I*. Bristol.
- Bömer, F. (1976). *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphoses IV-V*. Heidelberg.
- Burnet, I. (1902 repr. 1978). *Platonis opera*. Vol. 4. Oxford.
- Carey, C. (1989). *Lysias: selected speeches*. Cambridge.
- Cunningham, I. (1971). *Herodas Mimiambi*. Oxford.
- Dalmeyda, G. (1926 repr. 2003). *Xénophon d'Éphèse: Les Éphésiaques ou Le roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia*. 3rd edition. Paris.
- Dover, K. (1971). *Theocritus: select poems*. Bristol.
- Ernout, A. (1958). *Pétrone: Le Satyricon*. Paris.
- Gaselee, S. (1917 repr. 1984). *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Goold, G. (1995). *Chariton Callirhoe*. Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Gow, A. (1952). *Theocritus, edited with a translation and commentary*. Second Edition. Vol. 2. Cambridge.
- Headlam, W. (1922). *Herodas: the mimes and fragments*. Cambridge.

- Helm, R. (1955). *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Leipzig.
- Helmbold, W. (1939 repr. 1970). *Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. 6. Cambridge, Mass.
- Henry, R. (1960). *Photius Bibliothèque*. Vol. 2. Paris.
- Hill, D. (1985). *Ovid Metamorphoses I–IV*. Warminster.
- (1992). *Ovid Metamorphoses V–VIII*. Warminster.
- Hude, C. (1991). *Herodoti Historiae*. 3rd edition. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. (1999). *Theocritus: a selection*. Cambridge.
- Keydell, R. (1959). *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca*. Vol. 1. Berlin.
- Kortekaas, G. (2004). *The story of Apollonius, King of Tyre: A study of its Greek origin and an edition of the two oldest Latin recensions*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 253. Leiden.
- Macleod, M. (1972). *Luciani opera*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- (1974). *Luciani opera*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
- (1980). *Luciani opera*. Vol. 3. Oxford.
- (1987). *Luciani opera*. Vol. 4. Oxford.
- Mastronarde, D. (2002). *Euripides Medea*. Cambridge.
- Melville, A. (1987). *Ovid Metamorphoses*. Oxford.
- Monro, D. and Allen, T. (1908–1912). *Homeri opera*. 3rd edition. Oxford.
- More, B. and Brewer, W. (1978). *Ovid's Metamorphoses: translation in blank verse by Brookes More*. Francetown.
- Morgan, J. (1989). “Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Story”. In: *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Ed. by Reardon, B. Berkeley, pp. 349–588.
- (2004). *Longus Daphnis and Chloe*. Warminster.
- Obbink, D. (2006). “4762 Narrative Romance”. In: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXX*. Ed. by Gonis, N, Thomas, J, and Hatzilambrou, R. London, pp. 22–29.
- Oldfather, C. (1933). *Diodorus of Sicily*. Vol. 1. London; New York.
- Page, D. (1955). *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Oxford.

- Rattenbury, R., Lumb, T., and Maillon, J. (1960 repr. 2003). *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes Théagène et Chariclée*. 4th edition. Vol. I, II and III. Paris.
- Reardon, B. (1989). “Chariton: Chaereas and Callirhoe”. In: *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Ed. by Reardon, B. Berkeley, pp. 17–124.
- Solmsen, F. (1970). *Hesiodi opera*. Oxford.
- Stephens, S. and Winkler, J. (1995). *Ancient Greek novels: the fragments. Introduction, text, translation, and commentary*. Princeton.
- Stramaglia, A. (2011). *Phlegon Trallianus*. Berlin; New York.
- Zanker, G. (2009). *Herodas Mimiambi*. Oxford.

Secondary References

- Adams, J. (1982). *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Alden, M. (2000). *Homer beside himself*. Oxford.
- Alvares, J. (2006). “Reading Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon* in counterpoint”. In: *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel*. Ed. by Byrne, S., Schmeling, G., and Cueva, E. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 5. Groningen, pp. 1–33.
- Anderson, M. (1997). “The *σωφροσύνη* of Persinna and the romantic strategy of Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*”. In: *Classical Philology* 92.4, pp. 303–322.
- Bakhtin, M. (1975 tr. 1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Holquist and Emerson. Austin; London.
- Ballengee, J. (2005). “Below the Belt: looking into the matter of adventure time”. In: *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative*. Ed. by Branham, R. B. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 3. Groningen, pp. 130–163.
- Barber, E. (1994). *Women’s work: the first 20,000 years. Women, cloth, and society in early times*. New York; London.

- Barthes, R. (1975 tr. 1990). *The Pleasure of the Text*. Trans. Richard Miller. Oxford.
- Bartsch, S. (1989). *Decoding the ancient novel*. Princeton.
- (2000). “The Philosopher as Narcissus: vision, sexuality and self-Knowledge in Classical antiquity”. In: *Visuality before and beyond the Renaissance: seeing as others saw*. Ed. by Nelson, R. Cambridge, pp. 70–97.
- Berthiaume, G. (1982). *Les rôles du Mâgeiros: études sur la boucherie la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 70. Leiden.
- Bing, P. (2009). *The scroll and the marble: studies in reading and reception in Hellenistic poetry*. Michigan.
- Bowie, E. (1996). “The ancient readers of the Greek novels”. In: *The novel in the ancient world*. Ed. by Schmeling, G. Leiden; New York, pp. 87–106.
- (2002). “The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B. E. Perry: revisions and precisions”. In: *Ancient Narrative* 2, pp. 47–63.
- (2003). “The function of mythology in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*”. In: *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperi*. Ed. by López Férez, J. Madrid, pp. 361–376.
- Branham, R. B. (2002). “A truer story of the novel?” In: *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Ed. by Branham, R. B. Evanston, pp. 161–186.
- Brooks, P. (1984). *Reading for the plot: design and intention in narrative*. Oxford.
- (1993). *Body Work: objects of desire in modern narrative*. Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Burton, J. (1995). *Theocritus’ urban mimes: mobility, gender, and patronage*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & Oxford.
- Bychkov, O. (1999). “ἡ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή: A note on Achilles Tatius 1.9.4-5, 5.13.4”. In: *Classical Quarterly* 49.1, pp. 339–341.
- Carson, A. (1999). “Dirt and desire: the phenomenon of female pollution in Antiquity”. In: *Constructions of the Classical body*. Ed. by Porter, J. Michigan, pp. 77–100.

- Chambers, R. (1984). *Story and situation: narrative seduction and the power of fiction*. Manchester.
- Cohen, M. (2006). “The chronotopes of the sea”. In: *The novel*. Ed. by Moretti, F. Vol. 2: *Forms and themes*. Princeton, pp. 647–666.
- Connors, C. (2002). “Chariton’s Syracuse and its histories of empire”. In: *Space in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1. Groningen, pp. 12–26.
- (Forthcoming). “Babylonian stories and the ancient novel: Magi and the limits of empire in Iamblichus’ *Babyloniaka*”. In: *Politics, social questions and history. Proceedings of ICAN IV: Crossroads in the ancient novel: spaces, frontiers, intersections. Lisbon, 21–26 July 2008*. Ed. by Pinheiro, M. Ancient Narrative Supplementum. Groningen.
- Conte, G. (1996). *The hidden author: an interpretation of Petronius’ Satyricon*. London.
- Cooper, K. (1996). *The virgin and the bride: idealized womanhood in late antiquity*. Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Cowan, R. (2010). “Virtual Epic: counterfactuals, sideshadowing, and the poetics of contingency in the *Punica*”. In: *Brill’s companion to Silius Italicus*. Ed. by Augoustakis, A. Leiden, pp. 323–351.
- Crosman, R. (1980). “Do readers make meaning?” In: *The reader in the text: essays on audience and interpretation*. Ed. by Suleiman, S. Princeton, pp. 149–164.
- Culler, J. (1997). *Literary theory: a very short introduction*. Oxford.
- de Jong, I. (1987). *Narrators and focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
- (2012a). “Introduction. Narratological theory on space”. In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 1–18.
- ed. (2012b). *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden.

- De Temmerman, K. (2012a). "Achilles Tatius". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 517–535.
- (2012b). "Chariton". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 483–501.
- (2012c). "Xenophon of Ephesus". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 503–516.
- Dollins, E. (2012). "Leucippe: chasing Achilles Tatius' disappearing heroine". In: *Rosetta* 12, pp. 35–48. URL: http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue_12/dollins.pdf.
- Dougherty, C. (1998). "Sowing the seeds of violence: rape, women and the land". In: *Parchments of gender*. Ed. by Wyke, M. Oxford, pp. 267–284.
- DuBois, P. (1988). *Sowing the body: Psychoanalysis and ancient representations of women*. Chicago; London.
- Duke, T. (1971). "Ovid's Pyramus and Thisbe". In: *The Classical Journal* 66.4, pp. 320–327.
- Eagleton, T. (1983 repr. 1996). *Literary theory: an introduction*. Second edition. Malden; Oxford.
- Eco, U. (2002 tr. 2006). *On literature*. Trans. Martin McLaughlin. London.
- Egger, B. (1994a). "Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe". In: *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*. Ed. by Morgan, J. and Stoneman, R. London, pp. 31–48.
- (1994b). "Women and marriage in the Greek novels: the boundaries of romance". In: *The search for the ancient novel*. Ed. by Tatum, J. Baltimore, pp. 260–280.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1947). "Polypragmosyne: a study in Greek politics". In: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 67, pp. 46–67.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004). *Tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry*. Cambridge.

- Felson, N. (1994). *Regarding Penelope: from character to poetics*. Norman; London.
- Fernández Garrido, R. (2003). “Los sueños en la novela griega: Caritón de Afrodiasias y Jenofonte de Éfeso”. In: *Habis* 34, pp. 345–364.
- Fetterly, J. (1977). *The resisting reader*. Bloomington.
- Fish, S. (1976). “Interpreting the “Variorum””. In: *Critical Inquiry* 2.3, pp. 465–485.
- Fletcher, J. (2009). “Weaving women’s tales in Euripides’ *Ion*”. In: *The play of texts and fragments: essays in honour of Martin Cropp*. Ed. by Cousland, J. and Rutherford Hume, J. Mnemosyne Supplementum 314. Leiden, pp. 127–139.
- Fowler, R. (2011). “Mythos and Logos”. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 131, pp. 45–66.
- Freedman, B. (1991). *Staging the gaze: postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and Shakespearean comedy*. Ithaca; London.
- Freudenberg, K. (2007). “Leering for the plot: visual curiosity in Apuleius and others”. In: *The Greek and Roman novel: parallel readings*. Ed. by Paschalis, M. et al. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8. Groningen, pp. 238–262.
- Fusillo, M. (1989 tr. 1991). *Naissance du roman*. Trans. Marielle Abrioux. Paris.
- (1997). “How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative”. In: *Classical Closure*. Ed. by Roberts, D., Dunn, F., and Fowler, D. Princeton, pp. 209–227.
- Gandelman, C. (1991). *Reading pictures, viewing texts*. Bloomington; Indianapolis.
- Genette, G. (1972 tr. 1980). *Narrative discourse*. trans. Jane E. Levin. Oxford.
- Giangrande, G. (2002). “A dream in Xenophon Ephesius”. In: *Orpheus* 23.1, pp. 29–31.
- Gill, C. (1973). “The sexual episodes in the *Satyricon*”. In: *Classical Philology* 68.3, pp. 172–185.
- Goldhill, S. (1991). *The poet’s voice: essays on poetics and Greek literature*. Cambridge.

- Goldhill, S. (1994). "The naive and knowing eye: ecphrasis and the culture of viewing in the Hellenistic world". In: *Art and text in ancient Greek culture*. Ed. by Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. Cambridge, pp. 197–223.
- (1995). *Foucault's Virginité: ancient erotic fiction and the history of sexuality*. Cambridge.
- (2001). "The erotic eye: visual stimulation and cultural conflict". In: *Being Greek under Rome*. Ed. by Goldhill, S. Cambridge, pp. 154–194.
- (2002). *Who needs Greek? Contests in the cultural history of Hellenism*. Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (1993). *The loaded table: representations of food in Roman literature*. Oxford.
- Graverini, L. (2001). "L'incontro di Lucio e Fotide. Stratificazioni intertestuali in Apul. *Met.* 6–7". In: *Athenaeum* 89.2, pp. 425–446.
- Griffiths, F. (1981). "'Home before lunch': the emancipated woman in Theocritus". In: *Reflections of women in antiquity*. New York, pp. 247–273.
- Gubar, S. (1985). "'The blank page' and the issues of female creativity". In: *The new Feminist criticism: essays on women, literature, and theory*. Ed. by Showalter, E. New York, pp. 292–313.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1998). *Poetic garlands: Hellenistic epigram in context*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London.
- Hägg, T. (1971). *Narrative technique in ancient Greek romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm.
- (1983). *The novel in antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Hall, E. (1995). "The ass with the double vision: politicising an ancient Greek novel". In: *Heart of the Heartless World*. Ed. by Margolies, D and Joannou, M. London, pp. 47–59.
- Hardie, P. (1998). "A reading of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* 3.4.1–5.2". In: *Studies in Heliodorus*. Ed. by Hunter, R. Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary volumes 21. Cambridge, pp. 19–39.

- (2002). *Ovid's poetics of illusion*. Cambridge.
- Haynes, K. (2000–1). “Power of the prude: configurations of the feminine in the Greek novel”. In: *Ancient Narrative* 1, pp. 73–92.
- (2003). *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel*. London; New York.
- Heffernan, J. (1993). *Museum of words*. Chicago; London.
- Henderson, J. (1975). *The Maculate Muse: obscene language in Attic comedy*. Oxford.
- Henry, M. (1992). “The edible woman: Athenaeus’s concept of the pornographic”. In: *Pornography and representation in Greece and Rome*. Ed. by Richlin, A. Oxford; New York, pp. 250–268.
- (2000). “Athenaeus the ur-pornographer”. In: *Athenaeus and his world: reading Greek culture in the Roman empire*. Ed. by Braund, D. and Wilkins, J. Exeter, pp. 503–510.
- Hilton, J. (1998). “An Ethiopian Prodigy: Heliodorus *Aithiopika* 4.8”. In: *Studies in Heliodorus*. Ed. by Hunter, R. Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary volumes 21. Cambridge, pp. 79–92.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext*. Cambridge.
- Hodkinson, O. (2003). “Sophists in disguise: rival traditions and conflicts of intellectual authority in Philostratus’ *Heroicus*”. MA thesis. Exeter.
- Hunnings, L. (2009). “Imagining the ancient Greek slave: death, social death, and resurrection”. PhD thesis. RHUL.
- Hunter, R. (1983). *A study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.
- (1996a). “C. Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*”. In: *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Ed. by Schmeling, G. Leiden, pp. 361–386.
- (1996b). “Mime and mimesis: Theocritus *Idyll* 15”. In: *Theocritus*. Groningen, pp. 149–169.
- (1996c). *Theocritus and the archaeology of Greek poetry*. Cambridge.

- Hunter, R. (2008a). "Ancient Readers". In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 261–271.
- (2008b). *On coming after: studies in post-classical Greek literature and its reception*. Berlin.
- (2009). "The curious incident...: *polypragmosyne* and the ancient novels". In: *Readers and writers in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M., Panayotakis, S., and Schmeling, G. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 12. Groningen, pp. 51–63.
- Hutchinson, G. (1988). *Hellenistic poetry*. Oxford.
- Iser, W. (1974). *The implied reader*. Baltimore.
- (1978). *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response*. London.
- (1980). "Interaction between text and reader". In: *The reader in the text: essays on audience and interpretation*. Ed. by Suleiman, S. Princeton, pp. 106–119.
- Johne, R. (1996). "Women in the ancient novel". In: *The novel in the ancient world*. Ed. by Schmeling, G. Leiden, pp. 151–207.
- Joplin, P. (1984 repr. 2002). "The voice of the shuttle is ours". In: *Sexuality and gender in the classical world: readings and sources*. Ed. by McClure, L. Oxford, pp. 259–286.
- Kasprzyk, D. (2001). "Théron, pirate, conteur et narrateur dans le roman de Chariton, *Chairéas et Callirhoé*". In: *Les personnages du roman grec: actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999*. Ed. by Pouderon, B. Lyon, pp. 149–164.
- Kerényi, K. (1927). *Die Griechisch-Orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen.
- Kim, L. (2008). "Time". In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 145–161.
- King, H. (1998). *Hippocrates' woman: reading the female body in ancient Greece*. London; New York.

- Klooster, J. (2012). "Theocritus". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 99–117.
- Knox, P. (1989). "Pyramus and Thisbe in Cyprus". In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92, pp. 315–328.
- König, J. (2008). "Body and text". In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 127–144.
- Konstan, D. (1994). *Sexual symmetry: love in the ancient novel and related genres*. Princeton.
- (2002). "Narrative spaces". In: *Space in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1. Groningen, pp. 1–11.
- (2009). "The active reader and the ancient novel". In: *Readers and writers in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M., Panayotakis, S., and Schmeling, G. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 12. Groningen, pp. 1–17.
- Lada-Richards, I. (2007). *Silent eloquence: Lucian and pantomime dancing*. London.
- Laird, A. (1993). "Fiction, bewitchment and story worlds". In: *Lies and fiction in the ancient world*. Ed. by Gill, C. and Wiseman, T. P. Exeter; Austin, pp. 147–174.
- Lalanne, S. (2006). *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*. Paris.
- LaPlace, M. (2010). *Les pastorales de Longos (Daphnis et Chloé)*. Bern.
- Larmour, D. (1997). "Sex with moonmen and vinewomen: the reader as explorer in Lucian's *Vera Historia*". In: *Intertexts* 1.2, pp. 131–146.
- Lauwers, J. (2011). "A *Pepaideumenois*' novel. Sophistry in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*". In: *Ancient Narrative* 9, pp. 53–76.
- Létoublon, F. (2003). "La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses". In: *The ancient novel and beyond*. Ed. by Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. Leiden, pp. 271–288.

- Liatsi, M. (2004). "Die träume des Habrokomes bei Xenophon von Ephesos". In: *Rheinisches Museum* 147, pp. 151–171.
- Lightfoot, J. (2000). "Romanized Greeks and Hellenized Romans: later Greek literature". In: *Literature in the Greek and Roman worlds: a new perspective*. Ed. by Taplin, O. Oxford, pp. 257–284.
- Liveley, G. (1999). "Reading resistance in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*". In: *Ovidian transformations: essays on the Metamorphoses and its reception*. Ed. by Hardie, P., Barchiesi, A., and Hinds, S. Cambridge, pp. 197–213.
- Lovibond, S. (1994). "An ancient theory of gender: Plato and the Pythagorean table". In: *Women in ancient societies: an illusion of the night*. Ed. by Archer, L., Fischler, S., and Wyke, M. New York, pp. 88–101.
- Lowe, N. J. (2000). *The classical plot and the invention of western narrative*. Cambridge.
- MacAlister, S. (1996). *Dreams and suicides: the Greek novel from antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*. London.
- MacQueen, B. (1985). "Longus and the myth of Chloe". In: *Illinois Classical Studies* 10.1, pp. 119–134.
- (1990). *Myth, rhetoric, and fiction: a reading of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe*. London.
- Marinčič, M. (2007). "Advertising one's own story: text and speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*". In: *Seeing tongues, hearing scripts: orality and representation in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Rimell, V. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 7. Groningen, pp. 168–200.
- Martin, R. (2002). "A good place to talk". In: *Space in the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1. Groningen, pp. 143–160.
- McIntosh Snyder, J. (1981). "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets". In: *The Classical Journal* 76.3, pp. 193–196.
- Merkelbach, R. (1962). *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. Munich.

- Meyer, D. (2007). "The act of reading and the act of writing in Hellenistic epigram". In: *Brill's companion to Hellenistic epigram*. Ed. by Bing, P. and Bruss, J. Leiden; Boston, pp. 187–210.
- Montiglio, S. (2005). *Wandering in ancient Greek culture*. Chicago; London.
- (2012). "The (cultural) harmony of nature: music, love, and order in *Daphnis and Chloe*". In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142, pp. 133–156.
- Morales, H. (1995). "The taming of the view: natural curiosities in *Leucippe and Kleitophon*". In: *Groningen Colloquia on the novel* 6, pp. 39–50.
- (2004). *Vision and narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge.
- (2005). "Metaphor, gender and the ancient Greek novel". In: *Metaphor and the ancient novel*. Ed. by Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S., and Harrison, S. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4. Groningen, pp. 1–22.
- (2008). "The history of sexuality". In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 39–55.
- Morgan, J. (1989 repr. 1999). "The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*". In: *Oxford readings in the Greek novel*. Ed. by Swain, S. Oxford, pp. 259–285.
- (1991). "Reader and Audiences in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus". In: *Groningen Colloquia on the novel* 4, 85–103.
- (1994). "*Daphnis and Chloe*: Love's own sweet story". In: *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*. Ed. by Morgan, J. and Stoneman, R. London; New York, pp. 64–79.
- (1996). "The ancient novel at the end of the century: scholarship since the Dartmouth conference". In: *Classical Philology* 91.1, pp. 63–73.
- (2007a). "Kleitophon and Enkolpius: Achilles Tatius as hidden author". In: *The Greek and Roman novel: parallel readings*. Ed. by Paschalis, M. et al. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8. Groningen, pp. 105–120.

- Morgan, J. (2007b). "Travel in the Greek novels: function and interpretation". In: *Travel, Geography and culture in ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East*. Ed. by Adams, C. and Roy, J. London, pp. 139–160.
- (2012a). "Heliodoros". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 557–577.
- (2012b). "Longus". In: *Space in ancient Greek literature: studies in ancient Greek narrative*. Ed. by de Jong, I. Mnemosyne Supplementum 339. Leiden, pp. 537–555.
- (Forthcoming). "Love from beyond the grave: the epistolary ghost-story in Phlegon of Tralles". In: *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Ed. by Rosenmeyer, P., Bracke, E., and Hodkinson, O.
- Most, G. (1989). "The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture". In: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, pp. 114–133.
- Murray, P. (1999). "What is a *Muthos* for Plato?" In: *From myth to reason? Studies in the development of Greek thought*. Ed. by Buxton, G. Oxford, pp. 251–262.
- Nakatani, S. (2003). "A re-examination of some structural problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*". In: *Ancient Narrative* 3, pp. 63–81.
- Neils, J. (2008). "Adonia to the Thesmophoria: women and the Athenian festivals". In: *Worshipping women: ritual and reality in Classical Athens*. Ed. by Kaltsas, N and Shapiro, A. New York, pp. 242–249.
- Newlands, C. (1987). "'Techne' and 'Tuche' in Longus' 'Daphnis and Chloe'". In: *Pacific Coast Philology* 22.1/2, pp. 52–58.
- Ní Mheallaigh, K. (2009). "Ec[h]oing the Ass-novel: Reading and Desire in *Onos*, *Metamorphoses* and *The name of the rose*". In: *Ramus* 38.1, pp. 109–122.
- Nimis, S. (1999). "The sense of openendedness in the ancient novel". In: *Arethusa* 32.2, pp. 215–238.
- Oikonomou, M.-E. (2011). "The literary context of Anthia's dream in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*". In: *Echoing narratives: Studies of intertextuality in Greek and Ro-*

- man prose fiction*. Ed. by Doulamis, K. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 13. Groningen, pp. 49–72.
- Osborne, R. (1994). “Looking on — Greek style: does the sculpted girl speak to women too?” In: *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*. Ed. by Morris, I. Cambridge, pp. 81–96.
- O’Sullivan, J. (1995). *Xenophon of Ephesus: his compositional technique and the birth of the novels*. Berlin.
- Payne, M. (2007). *Theocritus and the invention of fiction*. Cambridge.
- Perdrizet, P. (1932). “Légendes babyloniennes dans les *Métamorphoses d’Ovide*”. In: *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 105, pp. 191–228.
- Perkins, J. (1999). *The suffering self: pain and narrative representation in the early Christian era*. London.
- Perry, B. (1967). *The Ancient romances: a literary-historical account of their origins*. Berkeley; Los Angeles.
- Philippides, M. (1980). “The “digressive” “aitia” in Longus”. In: *Classical World* 74.4, pp. 193–199.
- Plastira-Valkanou, M. (2001). “Dreams in Xenophon of Ephesus”. In: *Symbolae Osloensis* 76, pp. 137–149.
- Reardon, B. (1994). “Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative”. In: *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*. Ed. by Morgan, J. and Stoneman, R. London, pp. 80–96.
- Repath, I. (2005). “Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: what happened next?” In: *Classical Quarterly* 55, pp. 250–265.
- (Forthcoming). *Achilles Tatius: playing with Plato*.
- Rimell, V. (2002). *Petronius and the anatomy of fiction*. Cambridge.
- Romm, J. (2008). “Travel”. In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 109–126.
- Rosenmeyer, P. (2001). *Ancient epistolary fictions: the letter in Greek fiction*. Cambridge.

- Sabnis, S. (2011). "Lucian's Lychnopolis and the problems of slave surveillance". In: *American Journal of Philology* 132, pp. 205–242.
- Scheid, J. and Svenbro, J. (1994 tr. 1996). *The craft of Zeus: myths of weaving and fabric*. Trans. Carol Volk. Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Schein, S. (1996). "Introduction". In: *Reading the Odyssey: selected interpretive essays*. Ed. by Schein, S. Princeton, pp. 3–31.
- Schmeling, G. (1980). *Xenophon of Ephesus*. Boston.
- Schmitz, T. (2002). *Modern literary theory and ancient texts: an introduction*. Oxford.
- Sebesta, J. (2002). "Visions of gleaming textiles and a clay core: textiles, Greek women, and Pandora". In: *Women's dress in the ancient Greek world*. Ed. by Llewellyn-Jones, L. Swansea, pp. 125–142.
- Segal, C. (1994a). "Philomela's web and the pleasures of the text: reader and violence in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid". In: *Modern critical theory and classical literature*. Ed. by de Jong, I. and Sullivan, J. Mnemosyne Supplementum 130. Leiden, pp. 257–280.
- (1994b). *Singers, heroes, and gods in the Odyssey*. Ithaca; London.
- (1998). "Ovid's metamorphic bodies: art, gender, and violence in the "Metamorphoses"". In: *Arion* 5.3, pp. 9–41.
- (2001). "Intertextuality and immortality: Ovid, Pythagoras and Lucretius in *Metamorphoses* 15". In: *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 46, pp. 63–101.
- Skinner, M. (2001). "Ladies' day at the art institute: Theocritus, Herodas, and the gended gaze". In: *Making silence speak: women's voices in Greek literature and society*. Ed. by Lardinois, A and McClure, L. Princeton, pp. 201–222.
- Slater, N. (1998). "Passion and petrification: the gaze in Apuleius". In: *Classical Philology* 93.1, pp. 18–48.

- (2003). “Spectator and spectacle in Apuleius”. In: *The ancient novel and beyond*. Ed. by Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. Mnemosyne Supplementum 241. Leiden, pp. 85–100.
- Stephens, S. (1994). “Who read ancient novels?” In: *The search for the ancient novel*. Ed. by Tatum, J. Baltimore, pp. 405–418.
- (2008). “Cultural identity”. In: *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Ed. by Whitmarsh, T. Cambridge, pp. 56–71.
- Sullivan, J. (1968). *The Satyricon of Petronius: a literary study*. London.
- Teske, D. (1991). *Der Roman des Longos als Werk der Kunst*. Münster.
- Thalman, W. (2011). *Apollonius of Rhodes and the spaces of Hellenism*. Oxford.
- Tilg, S. (2010). *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the invention of the Greek love novel*. Oxford.
- Trenkner, S. (1958). *The Greek novella in the Classical period*. Cambridge.
- Turner, P. (1960). “*Daphnis and Chloe*: an interpretation”. In: *Greece and Rome* 7, pp. 117–123.
- Van Hoof, L. (2010). *Plutarch’s practical ethics: the social dynamics of philosophy*. Oxford.
- van Mal-Maeder, D. (2007). *La fiction des déclamations*. Mnemosyne Supplementum 290. Leiden.
- Van Nortwick, T. (2009). *The unknown Odysseus: alternate worlds in Homer’s Odyssey*. Ann Arbor.
- Walden, J. (1894). “Stage-terms in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*”. In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5, pp. 1–43.
- Walsh, P. (1988). “The rights and wrongs of curiosity”. In: *Greece and Rome* 35.1, pp. 73–85.
- Watson, P. (1995). *Ancient stepmothers: myth, misogyny and reality*. Leiden.
- West, S. (2003). “*Κερκίδος παραμύθια*? For whom did Chariton write?” In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 143, pp. 63–69.

- Whitehorne, J (1995). “Women’s work in Theocritus’ Idyll 15”. In: *Hermes* 123.1, pp. 63–75.
- Whitmarsh, T. (1998). “The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism”. In: *Studies in Heliodorus*. Ed. by Hunter, R. Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary volumes 21. Cambridge, pp. 93–124.
- (1999). “The writes of passage: cultural initiation in Heliodorus”. In: *Constructing identities in late antiquity*. Ed. by Miles, R. London, pp. 16–40.
- (2001). *Greek literature and the Roman empire: the poetics of imitation*. Oxford.
- (2003). “Reading for pleasure: narrative, irony, and erotics in Achilles Tatius”. In: *The ancient novel and beyond*. Ed. by Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. Mnemosyne Supplementum 241. Leiden, pp. 191–205.
- (2004). *Ancient Greek literature*. Cambridge.
- (2005). “The Greek novel: titles and genres”. In: *American Journal of Philology* 126.4, pp. 587–611.
- ed. (2008). *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman novel*. Cambridge.
- (2009). “Desire and the end of the Greek novel”. In: *Plotting with Eros: essays on the poetics of love and the erotics of reading*. Ed. by Nilsson, I. Copenhagen, pp. 135–152.
- (2010a). “Domestic poetics: Hippias’ house in Achilles Tatius”. In: *Classical Antiquity* 29.2, pp. 327–348.
- (2010b). “The metamorphoses of the ass”. In: *Lucian of Samosata, Greek writer and Roman citizen*. Ed. by Mestre, F. and Gomez, P. Barcelona, pp. 133–141.
- (2011). *Narrative and identity in the ancient Greek novel: Returning Romance*. Cambridge.
- Winkler, J. (1982 repr. 1999). “The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodorus’ *Aithiopika*”. In: *Oxford readings in the Greek novel*. Ed. by Swain, S. Oxford, pp. 286–350.

- (1985). *Auctor and actor: a narratological reading of Apuleius's Golden Ass*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London.
 - (1990). *The constraints of desire: the anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece*. London.
- Zanker, G. (2004). *Modes of viewing in Hellenistic poetry*. Madison.
- Zeitlin, F. (1971 repr. 1999). “Petronius as paradox: anarchy and artistic integrity”. In: *Oxford readings in the Roman novel*. Ed. by Harrison, S. Oxford, pp. 1–49.
- (1990). “The poetics of Erōs: nature, art, and imitation in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*”. In: *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Ed. by Halperin, D., Winkler, J., and Zeitlin, F. Princeton, pp. 418–464.
 - (1994). “Gardens of desire in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*: nature, art, and imitation”. In: *The search for the ancient novel*. Ed. by Tatum, J. Baltimore; London, pp. 148–170.
 - (1996). *Playing the other: gender and society in Classical Greek literature*. Chicago; London.