A Commentary on Book 6 of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*

Berenice Bentel

Thesis Presented for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Classical Studies)

in the School of Literatures and Languages

University of Cape Town

April 2022

Declaration

I, Berenice Naomi Bentel, hereby:

a) Grant the University of Cape Town free licence to reproduce this thesis, in whole or in part, for the purpose of research.

b) Declare that:
   i. This thesis is my own unaided work, both in concept and execution, and that apart from the normal guidance from my supervisor, I have received no assistance except as acknowledged.
   ii. Neither the substance nor any part of the thesis has been in the past, or is being, or is to be submitted for a degree at this University, or any other university.

Signed by candidate

Signed

21 September 2021

Date

Abstract

Achilles Tatius' novel, *Leucippe and Clitophon* (2nd c. CE), is a product of the literary experimentation in prose fiction during the Greek intellectual renaissance under the Roman Empire known as the Second Sophistic. For all appearances, the story follows the usual narrative course of the ancient Greek erotic adventure novels: boy meets girl, love occurs at first sight, and Fate attempts to keep them apart, triggering an odyssey of bizarre escapades and daring exploits that reaches its inevitable happy conclusion with their reunion and marriage. Achilles Tatius, however, takes each of these tropes far beyond their usual scope, displaying a ludic (and at times ludicrous) panache for defying the genre. This thesis provides the first extensive literary and philological commentary devoted exclusively to the Sixth Book of the novel. I examine both Achilles' unconventional approach to genre and storytelling, and his play on prevailing theories of psychology, physiology, and philosophy to enrich and enliven his narrative.

Acknowledgements

In the writing of this dissertation, I have incurred a number of debts. First, to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Clive Chandler, for his enduring patience and encouragement. In the School of Languages and Literatures, I am indebted to my friends Dr Jeffrey Murray, Dr Matthew Shelton, and Dr Vanessa Everson, who have all contributed their time, wisdom, and much humour to this task. There have been several scholars that have helped me to source scholarship or shared their own with me, and I owe thanks to, *inter alia*, Dr Saundra Schwartz, Prof. John Hilton, Dr Daniel Jolowicz, Dr Jean-Philippe Guez, Prof. William Owens, Dr María de Lourdes Rojas-Álvarez, Dr Maria Recuenco, Prof. Giona Tuccini, India Sapsed-Foster, Dr Jo Norton-Curry, and Prof. G. Hutchinson. I would also like to thank Rosie Watson at Interlibrary Loans at the Chancellor Oppenheimer Library for going above and beyond the call of duty. This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Calvin, and my cat, Hobbes – "stick together; stick to the plan".

Funding Acknowledgement

The financial assistance of the National Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIHSS), in collaboration with the South African Humanities Deans' Association (SAHUDA), towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NIHSS and SAHUDA.

Table of Contents

Declaration..... **p. 1**
Abstract..... **p. 2**
Acknowledgments..... **p. 3**
Conventions and Abbreviations..... **p. 5**
Introduction..... **p. 10**
1. Achilles Tatius..... **p. 10**
1.1 Author & Date..... **p. 10**
1.2 Texts & Translations..... **p. 13**
1.3 Language & Style..... **p. 19**
1.4 Literary & Cultural Milieu..... **p. 21**
1.5 *Nachleben*..... **p. 26**
2. Book 6..... **p. 28**
2.1 Context & Narrative Timeline..... **p. 28**
2.2 Narrators & Narratees..... **p. 31**
2.3 *Dramatis Personae*..... **p. 36**
2.3.1 Clitophon..... **p. 36**
2.3.2 Leucippe..... **p. 38**
2.3.3 Melite..... **p. 42**
2.3.4 Thersander..... **p. 43**
2.3.5 Sosthenes..... **p. 45**
2.3.6 Supernumeraries..... **p. 46**
2.4 Influences & Intertexts..... **p. 47**
2.4.1 Prose Fiction..... **p. 47**
2.4.2 Drama..... **p. 55**
2.4.3 Rhetoric & Declamation..... **p. 60**
2.4.4 (Pseudo-)Science & (Quasi-)Philosophy..... **p. 69**
Sigla..... **p. 78**
Commentary..... **p. 80**
Works Cited..... **p. 186**

Conventions and Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient authors and works are given according to the LSJ[9] or the *OCD*[4], with the following exceptions:

AA	*Acta Alexandrinorum* Musurillo, H. ed. (1954) *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*, Oxford.
[Alex.] *Pr*.	Ps.-Alexander *Problemata* Ideler J. L. ed. (1841) *Physici et medici Graeci minores*, vol. 1, Berlin.
Anth. *Gr*.	*Anthologia Graeca* Beckby, H. ed. (1965-8) *Anthologia Graeca*, 4 vols., 2nd ed., Munich.
APTh	*Acts of Paul and Thecla* Lipsius, R. A. ed. (1891) *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, vol. 1, Leipzig.
Charit.	Chariton *Callirhoe* Blake, W. E. ed. (1938) *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo*, Oxford.
Const. *Apost*.	*Constitutiones Apostolorum* Metzger, M. ed. (1985-7) *Les constitutions apostoliques*, Paris.
Gal. *PHP*	Galen *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* De Lacy, P. ed. (1978-84) *Galeni De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, Berlin.
H&H	Eumathius Macrembolites *Hysmine and Hysminias* Jeffreys, E. transl. (2016) *Four Byzantine Novels*, Liverpool.
Heliod.	Heliodorus *Aethiopica* Rattenburry, R. M., Lumb, T. W., and Maillon, J. eds. (1960) *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée)*, 3 vols., 2nd edn., Paris.
Hist. Apoll.	*Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri (Redactio A)* Schmeling, G. ed. (1988) *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, Leipzig.
J&A	*Joseph and Asenath* Philonenko, M. ed. (1968) *Joseph et Aséneth*, Leiden.
Long.	Longus *Daphnis and Chloe* Dalmeyda, G. ed. (1934) *Longus: Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*, Paris.
M&P	*Metiochus and Parthenope* Sandy, G. transl. (1989) 'Metiochus and Parthenope', in B. P. Reardon ed. (1989) *The Collected Greek Novels*, Berkeley CA, pp. 813-815.

Olymp. *Comm. Pl. Alc.* Olympiodorus *In Platonis Alcibiadem commentarii*

Westerink, L. G. ed. (1956) *Olympiodorus: Commentary on the first Alcibiades of Plato*, Amsterdam.

Orig. *Dial*. *Heraclid*. Origen *Dialogus cum Heraclide*

Scherer, J. ed. (1960) *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide*, Paris.

Phld. *Ir*. Philodemus *De Ira*

Indelli, G. ed. (1988) *Filodemo: L'ira*, Naples.

Philostr. *Ep*. Philostratus Maior *Epistles*

Benner, A. R. and Fobes, F. H. eds. and transl. (1949) *Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus: The Letters*, Loeb Classical Library 383, Cambridge MA.

Plut. *De cap*. Plutarch *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate*

Babbit, F. C. ed. (1928) *Plutarch: Moralia*, vol. 2, Loeb Classical Library 222, Cambridge MA.

Plut. *De cohib*. *ir*. Plutarch *De cohibenda ira*

Helmbold, W. C. ed. and. transl. (1962) *Plutarch: Moralia*, vol. 6, Loeb Classical Library 337, Cambridge MA.

Sen. *Ir*. Seneca *De ira*

Basore, J. W. ed. and transl. (1928) *Seneca: Moral Essays*, vol. 1, Loeb Classical Library 214, Cambridge MA.

Syn. Phil. *De prov*. Synesius *Aegyptii sive De providentia*

Terzaghi, N. ed. (1944) *Synesii Cyrenensis opuscula*, Rome.

X. Eph. Xenophon of Ephesus *Ephesiaca*

Dalmeyda, G. ed. (1926) *Xénophon d'Éphèse: Les Éphésiaques ou le roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia*, Paris.

Modern works cited by author and date only are listed in the 'Works Cited'. Abbreviations of journals are those of the *L'Année philologique*, and of other modern works those of the LSJ[9] or the *OCD*[4], with the following exceptions:

BDAG	Montanari, F. (2015) *Brill's Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden.
CGL	Diggle, J. *et al*. eds. (2021) *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, Cambridge.
DELG	Chantraine, P. *et al*. eds. (1968-1980) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots,* Tome I–IV-2, Paris.
Denniston	Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn., Oxford.
Garnaud	Garnaud, J.-Ph. ed. and transl. (1991) *Achille Tatius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris.
Gaselee	Gaselee, S. ed. and transl. (1917) *Achilles Tatius*, Loeb Classical Library 45, Cambridge MA.
Goodwin	Goodwin, W. W. (1867) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, enlarged edn. (1965), London.
IEph	Wankel, H. *et al*. eds. (1979-84) *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, Ia-VIII, Bonn.
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1981-99), Zurich and Munich; Suppl. 2009.
MPG	J.-P. Migne (1854-85) *Patrologiae cursus completus: series graeca*, Paris.
MPL	J.-P. Migne (1844-64) *Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina*, Paris.
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., Stuart Jones, H., and Mackenzie, R. (1968) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edn., Oxford. Revised Supplement, P. G. W. Glare ed. (1996), Oxford
OCD	Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., and Eidinow, E. eds. (2012) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn., Oxford.
O'Sullivan	O'Sullivan, J. N. (1980) *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*, Berlin and New York NY.
PCG	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (1983-) *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin.
PMG	Page, D. L. (1962) *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford.
Rijksbaron	Rijksbaron, A. (2006) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 3rd edn., Chicago IL.

Smyth — Smyth, H. W. (1920) *Greek Grammar*, rev. G. M. Messing (1956), Cambridge MA.

SuppMag — Daniel, R. W. and Maltomini, F. eds. (1990-2) *Supplementum Magicum*, Papyrologica Coloniensia 16.1 and 2, Opladen.

Test. — *Testimonia* of Achilles Tatius collected in Vilborg (1955: 163-8).

Vilborg — Vilborg, E. ed. (1955) *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*, Stockholm.

Vilborg, E. (1962) *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Goteborg.

Whitmarsh — Whitmarsh, T. transl. (2001) *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, with introd. by H. Morales, Oxford.

Winkler — Winkler, J. J. transl. (1989) 'Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in B. P. Reardon ed. (1989) *The Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley, pp. 170-284.

The following abbreviations are used for grammatical terms:

acc.	accusative	mid.	middle
act.	active	neut.	neuter
adj.	adjective	nom.	nominative
advb.	adverb	opt.	optative
aor.	aorist	part.	participle
dat.	dative	pass.	passive
fem.	feminine	perf.	perfect
fut.	future	pluperf.	pluperfect
gen.	genitive	pl.	plural
imper.	imperative	pres.	present
impf.	imperfect	sg.	singular
indic.	indicative	subj.	subject
ind. obj.	indirect object	subjv.	subjunctive
inf.	infinitive	subst.	substantive
masc.	masculine	voc.	vocative

Introduction

1. Achilles Tatius

1.1 Author & Date

There is scant reliable evidence for the life of Achilles Tatius (hereafter, AT), and he makes no mention of himself in the text of his novel, *Leucippe and Clitophon* (hereafter, *L&C*).[1] For biographical hints we must turn to the 10th c. Byzantine encyclopaedia, the *Suda* (α.4695 = *Test*. V):

> Ἀχιλλεὺς Στάτιος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, ὁ γράψας τὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα καὶ ἄλλα ἐρωτικὰ ἐν βιβλίοις η′. γέγονεν ἔσχατον Χριστιανὸς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος. ἔγραψε δὲ Περὶ σφαίρας καὶ ἐτυμολογίας, καὶ Ἱστορίαν σύμμικτον, πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ θαυμασίων ἀνδρῶν μνημονεύουσαν. ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιος τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς.
>
> Achilles Statius (*sic*), of Alexandria, who authored the story of Leucippe and Clitophon and other erotic tales in eight books. In his final days, he became a Christian and a bishop. He also wrote *On the Sphere*, and etymologies, as well as an assorted history, which made mention of many great and admirable men. His style is the same in these as in the erotic tales.

From the outset, it is clear that not even our author's name is a certainty: the *Suda* reads Στάτιος, yet Photius, the 9th c. Patriarch of Constantinople, records it repeatedly as Τάτιος.[2] Modern critical consensus sides with the Byzantine scholars in its acceptance of Τάτιος, which appears slightly more frequently in the MSS; and, in all likelihood, the spelling of the *Suda* is an error of dittography.[3] For an ancient author to be named by both first and second name is unusual, and it has been suggested that Τάτιος, a transcription of the Latin name Tatius, could be a patronymic or even the name of a patron, which would suggest that AT is a freedman (or

[1] Unlike, Chariton (1.1.1), or Heliodorus (10.41.4); on the complications of identifying the narrator with the author, see Intro. 2.2.

[2] Phot. *Bibl*. 87.66a.14-15, 94.73b 25-6, 166.111b.34 (= *Test*. II, III, IV); also, Gregory of Corinth (*Test*. VIII; cf. Walz 1236).

[3] Vilborg 1962: 7; Laplace 2007: 3. The Roman name Tatius is less common than its counterpart Statius, however there is sufficient epigraphic evidence to attest to its use in the Imperial period (e.g. *AE* 1973, 0121; *AE* 1977, 0193; *AE* 1995, 1319).

perhaps the descendant of a freedman).[4] More recent scholars, however, propose that the name Tatius would seem to indicate that he was a "Greek with Roman citizenship".[5] At the same time, the MSS and Byzantine *testimonia* universally attest to his Alexandrian provenance, which has led to conjecture that Τάτιος is derived from Tat, the Greek rendering of the Egyptian god Thoth.[6] That AT is a native of Alexandria appears likely on the evidence of his intimate descriptions of Egyptian geography and curiosities, for neither Ephesus, Tyre, nor even Sidon are described in such lavish detail.[7] AT, then, could be called a "Greek Roman Egyptian",[8] or, as "culturally Greek but 'Egyptian by race'".[9] The claim that AT became a "Christian and a bishop" has been largely dismissed or explained as an attempt to justify reading *L&C* in Christian Byzantium (see Intro. 1.5).[10] The *Suda* refers to AT's novel as "τὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα, καὶ ἄλλα ἐρωτικὰ ἐν βιβλίοις η′", while the majority of the MSS give the title of the novel as "τὰ περὶ/κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα". Based on the topographical naming convention for the novels (e.g. *Aethiopica*, *Ephesiaca*, *Babyloniaca*), Henrichs (1972: 11) contends that the name of AT's novel had been lost and that *L&C* was merely an alternative title, positing that the novel was in all likelihood called "*Phoenicica*" because of Clitophon's Phoenician heritage.[11] While not impossible, the suggestion is unlikely, and Whitmarsh (2005a: 587-598) dismisses this supposition, arguing that although the novel may sometimes be

[4] Salmasius (1640), quoted from Vilborg 1962: 7 n. 2 and 3.

[5] Morales 2004: 4. Similarly, Morgan 1995: 137.

[6] Rohde 1914: 501 n. 2; Vilborg 1962: 7. This etymology, Whitmarsh (2011a: 75) reflects, "would be an excellent sobriquet for an author, given that Thoth was in some traditions the inventor of writing or 'father of letters'".

[7] For instance: Clitophon's awestruck experience of Alexandria (5.1); the marvel of the lighthouse at Pharos (5.6); the local Egyptian Herdsmen (3.9); the waters of the Nile and its crocodiles (4.11-12, 4.18-19); as well as the encounter with a hippopotamus and elephant (4.2-5). Nonetheless, these descriptions only serve as circumstantial evidence of our author's origin, and indeed his knowledge may have been garnered from elsewhere (Rommel 1923: 77-8; cf. Whitmarsh 2011a: 75).

[8] Morales 2004: 4.

[9] Whitmarsh 2011a: 75.

[10] Vilborg 1962: 8; Winkler 1989: 170; Morales 2004: 4-5; Robiano 2009: 159-160; Chew 2014: 63. Heliodorus was also said to be a Christian bishop (Soc. *Hist*. *Eccl*. 5.22, Phot. *Bibl*. 73.51b.40-41), who allegedly chose rather to renounce his bishopric than his novel (Niceph. Call. *Hist*. *Eccl*. 12.34; Futre Pinheiro 2014: 76-7).

[11] Cf. Holzberg (1995: 66) who states (without reference) that "the original title of the work [sc. *L&C*] was possibly *Phoenicica*", because of its initial Phoenician setting of Sidon.

referred to by the shorthand "Λευκίππη" by Byzantine scholars, evidence for the title of the novel is in favour of the dual name given in the MSS. Although the *Suda* does mention "ἄλλα ἐρωτικά", it is clear by its position in the sentence that these 'other erotic tales' are contained within *L&C* and not intended to indicate that AT authored further erotic novels. As for the other works named by the *Suda*, the fragments of "Περὶ σφαίρας" (*On the Sphere*) can be found in an introduction to Aratus' *Phaenomena* (an astronomical text), while the "Περὶ ἐτυμολογίας" and "Ἱστορίαν σύμμικτον" are not known. Whether AT is in fact the author of *On the Sphere* is not certain, for the Achilles of the *Sphere* is only ever mentioned by his first name. It appears that the *Suda* conflates the two on account of their supposed similarity in style ("ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιος τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς"), which is not supported by an actual comparison of the available texts.[12] The only other biographical detail we have for AT is that he has twice been described as a ῥήτωρ ('orator/advocate'),[13] perhaps in part due to his heavily rhetorical style, but potentially a plausible profession considering his flair for forensic speeches (see Intro. 2.4.3).[14] That said, considering the sources' Byzantine origin, even of this we cannot be certain.

Based largely on comparisons and value judgements of style and literary worth, AT was initially dated to variously the 4th, 5th, or 6th c. CE.[15] The advent of the 20th century brought a flurry of papyri discoveries that contradicted the established chronology of the novels, especially AT and Chariton. Henrichs (2011: 306-312) offers the most recent review of the state of AT's papyri,[16] showing how the dating of AT to the 2nd c. CE is now solely dependent on the evidence of Π^5 (see 'Sigla'). Noted palaeographer, Cavallo (1996: 16, 36), contends that the script of Π^5 places it in the first half of the 2nd c. CE, yet Henrichs (2011: 308-9) warns that "whether such meticulous precision is ultimately sustainable remains to be seen". Indeed, this last point proves the crux in the ongoing scholarly division of whether to date AT to the first or second half of the 2nd c. CE. On the one hand there are those that favour the palaeographic

[12] So Rohde 1914: 501-2; Whitmarsh 2020: 3-4, but cf. 246.

[13] Eust. *Comm. in Od.* 14.350 = 2.73.31 (= *Test*. VII), Thom. Mag. α.35 (= *Test*. XI).

[14] Cf. Rohde 1914: 505; Vilborg 1962: 8; Schwartz 2002: 94. Chariton (1.1.1) identifies himself as an undersecretary to an advocate (τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς).

[15] Respectively: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1907: 185; Rohde 1914: 503-4; Schmid 1894: 245.

[16] For an earlier review, see Conca 1969. Further on the papyrological evidence for the ancient novels, see e.g. Sandy 1994; Messeri 2010; Henrichs 2011.

evidence, dating AT in the early to mid 2nd c.;[17] on the other hand, a growing number of scholars link the revolt of the βουκόλοι (*Boukoloi*) from their stronghold in Nicochis (3.9-4.14) with the historical insurrection of the Nicocheans in the Nile Delta in the years between 166-172 CE on the evidence of *P. Thmouis* 1 (104.13, 116.5).[18] Proponents of the former theory dismiss the latter as improbably historiographic, the narrative of savage *Boukoloi* in northern Egypt having long preceded the Nicocheans' revolt;[19] while conversely, proponents of the latter theory argue that dating any earlier than mid-century based on palaeographic evidence remains dubious. This leaves us at something of an impasse, as in fact both sides are correct in their estimation of the other. Dating the novel based upon similarities to historical occurrences is always a tricky undertaking, and several apparent historic parallels have been proposed as temporal markers. For instance, Plepelits (1996: 388-90) proposes that the mention of the Gates of the Sun and Moon in Alexandria (5.1.2), as well as the apparent fashion for bearded men (2.18.3), gives a *terminus post quem* of mid 2nd c. CE, suggesting a likely date for the novel in the late 2nd c. While Whitmarsh (2020: 5) suggests that the tales of doomed homosexual love in *L&C* (1.12-14, 2.34) are linked to the equally tragic death of Hadrian's lover Antinous, thus positing a date between 131-138 CE for the composition of the novel. The text offers a variety of possible historical clues, however, even the most plausible of these remains unprovable. Yet, so too the palaeographic evidence of Π^5, which Parsons (1989a: 62-6), for instance, dates no more specifically than to the 2nd c. CE. In this matter I find myself able to agree only with Morales (2001: xiv-xv and 2004: 5) that, although frustrating, we are obliged to accept the vague date of somewhere in the 2nd c. CE until more compelling evidence presents itself.

1.2 Texts & Translations

Beyond the radical re-dating, papyrological evidence demonstrates both the remarkable popularity of the novels in their own time, as well as the curious fluidity of their textual state. Summarizing the current state of AT's papyri, Henrichs (2011: 309) encapsulates the first point neatly:

---

[17] E.g. Bowie 2019: 19; Whitmarsh 2020: 1-5. Cf. Henrichs 2011: 308-11, where he notes: "In the case of Chariton and Achilles Tatius, the earliest papyrus copies furnish merely a *terminus ante quem* for the actual date of composition. In theory both novels could be earlier".

[18] E.g. Bremmer 1998: 167; Laplace 2007: 8-19; Blouin 2014: 267-297; Hilton 2020.

[19] See e.g. Ormerod 1924: 270; Winkler 1980; Rutherford 2000.

> Written in seven different hands ranging in date from the early or mid-second to the late third century, the papyri of Achilles Tatius come from two codices and six rolls, which represent seven separate editions of the novel. All seven editions were produced within a time span of 150 to 200 years, namely between AD 100-150 and 300. Such a high concentration of papyrus copies in a single period would be exceptional for any genre of Greek literature other than the novel.

Indeed, Laplace (1993: 53-6) gives a cogent argument for the provenance of Π^4 from the library of a Christianised school in Panopolis, showing that *L&C* "est une œuvre étudiée et recopiée dans le milieu scolaire à l'égal des textes d'Homère et de Ménandre". Nonetheless, other scholars regard the relative paucity of papyri as indicative of a far smaller circulation for the novels.[20] The papyrological evidence reveals the degree to which the text has evolved over the years, evident in the discrepancies between the papyri fragments and the MSS. Differences between the papyri and the MSS, and between the MSS themselves, have led some to argue "that textual deviation may have been endemic to a genre as fluid as the Greek novel".[21] The amalgamation by Willis (1990) of the two papyri that make up Π^4, the most extensive set of fragments we have for *L&C*, showed a large deviation from the MSS, which Garnaud was happily able to incorporate into his edition of the text.[22] Π^1 transfers the account of the Dionysian origin of wine from its usual position in the MSS at 2.2.1-2.3.2, placing it between 2.8 and 2.9, a transposition that has divided editors, scholars, and translators alike. Vilborg (1955: xxxix-xlii) chooses to retain the MSS order, citing it as more reliable; Garnaud (1991: xxiii n. 62, 32-3) while acknowledging the new narrative order of Π^1, retains the traditional order with no extensive explanation. Reeve (1971: 538-9) finds Vilborg's treatment "careless in the extreme" and argues that while the insertion is clumsy in both MSS and papyrus, it is better in the papyrus; whereas Laplace (1983: 53-9) argues for the general superiority of the papyrus over the MSS. Winkler (1989) in his translation follows the order as recommended by Reeve and Laplace; Whitmarsh (2001), on the other hand, retains the traditional order set forth

[20] Cf. Morales (2004: 3): "Seven papyri of [*L&C*] have been found, more than any other Greek novel, but still far fewer than works by authors on school curricula". Also, Morgan (1995: 135): "papyri hardly support the notion either of a massive readership or of a large population of fictional texts".

[21] Henrichs 2011: 310. Similarly, Consonni 2006: 115. Cf. West (1973: 17) who notes, on the divergence of two primary MSS of Longus, that "copyists of this type... felt themselves at liberty to change the wording as they went along". See also, Sanz Morales 2006 and 2018.

[22] See also, Laplace 1993. Cf. Garnaud 1991: xxiv n. 68; Consonni 2006: 115-6; Henrichs 2011: 309.

by Vilborg and Garnaud.[23] Thus, even the modern-day reader with no knowledge of Greek would encounter two different versions of AT's novel, depending on the translation they happened upon. Papyrological evidence for Bk. 6 is scant and confined to a single papyrus find (Π^3, see 'Sigla'). Vilborg (1955: xliii-xliv) offers an overview of the variants offered by Π^3, of which he only adopts a single reading, finding it largely of "the same disposition" as the text offered by the MSS. Although the latter point may be true, Vilborg's choices when it comes to the readings of the papyri are far from definitive (on the more contentious variants in Bk. 6, see 6.16.6n., 6.17.1n., 6.17.3n.)

The text of *L&C* survives in twenty-five MSS, which range from the 12th to 17th c. (although the majority date from the 16th c.), only twelve of which contain the novel in complete form. The 20th c. has furnished us with three editions of AT's text.[24] The first, Gaselee's Loeb edition, was published in 1917 with an introduction and the usual facing English translation (revised by E. H. Warmington in 1969), in which he frankly admits that his text is but an "interim" work, and that a full conspectus of the MSS was still lacking (1917: xi-xv).[25] Following that is Vilborg's 1955 edition, whose introduction contains a methodical examination of the sources and transmission of the text, including the most detailed examination of the MSS thus far (1955: xvii-lxxii).[26] In his edition he also includes the various *testimonia*, indexes of both Greek names and words in the text, as well as a comparative table of the 19th c. editions (viz. Jacobs 1821, Hercher 1858, Hirschig 1885). His sigla have since become the standard for investigating the textual tradition, and he is the only editor to offer a

[23] Indeed, such are the differences that the suggestion has been made that two versions of AT's novel once existed (Grenfell and Hunt 1914: 136), see further Sanz Morales 2006: 132-3 and 2018: 185-78. While others argue rather that Π^1 represents an abridged version of the novel, with only select passages, see Russo 1955; Rattenbury 1956: 230-2; Conca 1969.

[24] The *editio princeps* of *L&C* was only published in 1601 in Heidelberg, despite translations in Latin and Italian having already been issued (see Intro. 1.5). In what follows I will focus on the modern (i.e. 20th and 21st c.) editors and translators of AT, largely to save space, but also because earlier editions and translations have already been covered by Vilborg (1955: lxxviii-lxxxiv). In the commentary itself, emendations and suggestions of earlier editors are incorporated from the critical apparatus of both Vilborg and Garnaud.

[25] He was nonetheless the first editor able to make use of the recently discovered *P. Oxy.* X 1250 (Π^1). Although his edition contains no critical apparatus, as is the case with most early Loeb editions, he does address textual points in footnotes.

[26] Prior to him, Jacobs (1821: lxviii-xcii) was the only rigorous assessment of the MSS.

stemma codicum. In this, Vilborg posits a single common archetype based on the general agreement of the MSS in comparison to Π^1, of which there are two main branches which he labels "α-family" and "β-family".[27] To these, Vilborg has added a third branch (φ) which contains only the MS F, this *codex mixtus* he uses as a "mediator" between the two main branches but advises caution in accepting its readings at face value. After Vilborg, although not an edition itself, O'Sullivan's (1980) lexicon is an invaluable tool for any scholar of AT, and often addresses textual points in its entries.[28] Most recent is Garnaud's (1991) edition with the *Collection Budé*, for which he had at his disposal two further MSS that were unknown to prior editors (as well as the more recent papyri discovery).[29] His edition includes a facing French translation with introduction, notes, a map of the couple's voyages, and an index of names; however, his prefatory remarks give little insight into his critical choices. Garnaud's version of the text was revised in 2013 with the addition of a lengthier, literary introduction, notes, and appendices by Frazier. Garnaud bases his text primarily upon seven MSS (WMD = α-family, VGE = β-family, and F = φ), occasionally making use of a further twelve (including the two previously unutilized MSS).[30]

As Gaselee's text is, by his own admission, merely provisional, the primary dichotomy between modern editions of AT's text is that established by Vilborg's edition and that of Garnaud, both of which have received their fair amount of criticism and praise.[31] Consonni

---

[27] These groups were initially identified by Dörrie (1935), terming the α-family, "*familia Orientalis*", and the β-family, "*familia Italica*", labels which Vilborg (1955: lxxxiv) rejects as misleading. I have unfortunately not been able to consult Dörrie, but cf. Vilborg 1955: xlvii n. 1; Rattenbury 1937 and 1956: 229-230.

[28] See also O'Sullivan 1978 on the text of Bk. 1.

[29] Cf. Consonni (2006: 113), who finds the contribution of the new manuscripts "hardly to be praised". The additional MSS are: Sinaiticus gr. 1197 (16th c.), which belongs to the β-family and contains 5.1.1-8.19.3 (see Hagedorn and Koenen 1970); and Olomucensis M 79 (15th c.), which contains excerpts from all Books except 7, and which Consonni (2006: 113 n. 7) finds similar to the MSS V and R, placing it in the β-family.

[30] Cf. Reeve (1981: 144) who offers an *eliminatio codicum* for five MSS, but this has not been taken up by Garnaud.

[31] E.g. on Vilborg: "Se ho ben letto, i miei dissensi sono numerosissimi e non lievi" (Russo 1958: 585), "The definitive scholarly edition is Vilborg..." (Chew 2014: 63); and on Garnaud: "the reader will not be prepared to part with his Vilborg" (Anderson 1992: 439), "Un ouvrage très utile, venant à point nommé" (Donnet 1993: 296).

(2006) offers the only rigorous, albeit concise, assessment of Vilborg and Garnaud's critical choices, where he notes that the "number of discrepancies" between the editors' apparatus leaves us "to guess who is telling the truth, if anyone" (2006: 114). While Vilborg (1955: xlvii-lxxi) openly acknowledges his preference for the "slight superiority" of the β-family (unless otherwise confirmed by F); in Garnaud "preference is constantly – but silently – granted to the α-family".[32] This dissension between the two main editors naturally leads to a somewhat disparate text in each edition. Largely, however, it comes down to a matter of choice, rather than conjecture, and both editors practise reserve when it comes to inserting their own emendations.[33] Furthermore, the discrepancies between the MSS and Π^4 draw into question the soundness of the MS tradition itself, but, as Consonni (2006: 115-6) observes, "the fragmentary nature of the papyrus' source should be properly acknowledged as having a limit in itself". It becomes clear, then, that the textual tradition of *L&C* is far from homogeneous, and that editing the text will always be a palimpsestic process. For the purposes of lemmatization in this commentary, I have chosen to use Garnaud's (1991) text, both because it is the most recent edition with recourse to the latest papyri and MSS, but also because it is the chosen text of the most recent English translation of AT (Whitmarsh 2001).[34] However, this is no reflection on Vilborg's editorial choices, as I employ his text in constant parallel with that of Garnaud's and have indicated in the commentary where I favour his edition.

While the novels were still considered low-brow literature, commentaries on them were naturally few. The seminal, but perfunctory, English language commentary of *L&C* in the 20th c. is Vilborg (1962), who handles mainly matters of philology and textual emendation. Lesser known, but equally useful, are Carney (1960) on Bk. 3, and his MA student, McLeod (1961) on Bk. 4. Happily, renewed interest in the literary aspects of the novels, means that scholarly attention has finally turned to in-depth commentaries. Whitmarsh's (2020) introduction, edition, and commentary on Bks. 1-2 fills the void and sets the standard for commenting on AT, as Hilton (*forthcoming*) will soon do likewise for Bks. 3-4. I have already made mention of several translations of *L&C*, but here I would examine them a little closer. The first English

[32] Consonni 2006: 116. Vilborg (1955: xlix n. 1) mentions that Dörrie (1935: 70), in a small-scale examination (2.2-2.14), finds the α-family superior.

[33] Cf. Russo (1958: 587), who remarks on the establishment of AT's text: "si tratta più di scegliere che di emendare".

[34] Naturally, the 1991 edition is used in tandem with the 2013 edition revised by F. Frazier.

translation of the 20th century was in fact by an anonymous author and ran for a limited number of one thousand copies,[35] meaning that Gaselee's Loeb edition provided the first widely available modern translation. It was well received at the time;[36] but is now naturally rather dated for modern readers, and indeed the Latin bowdlerization of some of the seemingly racier passages was only revised by Warmington in 1969. Gaselee, as with his text edition, openly admits to being overwhelmed by AT's prose; see, for instance, his comment on 6.19: "It is difficult to translate into any English that does not appear to us ludicrous, and I have departed more than usual from a closely literal rendering of the Greek" (1917: 341 n. 2). Although it is natural enough for any translator to have to depart from the strict letter of the text from time to time, this avoidance tactic of Gaselee's seems somewhat injudicious. Thus, in 1989, when Winkler's translation appeared in *The Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (ed. Reardon), it was greeted with much enthusiasm, and made more impactful by his untimely death early the following year. Winkler's translation proved a lively upgrade to Gaselee's stolid (and at times inexact) Loeb, and the literary flair it displays is perhaps closest in spirit to AT's own prose, as Anderson (1997: 2297) describes: "seldom have scholar and ancient author been more sympathetically matched".[37] Nonetheless, there was still a need for a contemporary English translation that aimed more for precision than panache, and this niche was filled aptly by Whitmarsh with his 2001 *Oxford World's Classics* translation, accompanied by an informative introduction by Morales, as well as Whitmarsh's own notes. This is not to say that Whitmarsh's translation is without its own animated style, but it has the distinction of being "the most accurate translation [of AT] ever made".[38] Although, as a first-language English speaker, I cannot comment on the accuracy or style of the modern European language translations, I have consulted a number of them in the course of writing this commentary, both for comparative translation purposes and for the information contained in the accompanying introductions and notes. Plepelits' (1980) German translation includes an extensive introduction and copious notes that are particularly useful. Ciccolella's (1999) translation serves a similar task in Italian and appears with a facing Greek text based on Garnaud's with minor alterations. Garnaud (as mentioned) also offers a French translation with his text with sparse literary notes, which were

[35] See Vilborg 1955: viii.

[36] See Heseltine 1918.

[37] Cf. Mason (1990: 384): "Winkler's Achilles alone makes the collection worth purchasing".

[38] Nakatani 2004: 84. Keep in mind the difference (mentioned above) of the order of the text in Bk. 2 in Winkler's and Whitmarsh's translations.

updated by Frazier in 2013. The most recent French translation is that of Guez (2016), which appears with a proficient introduction as part of an edited collection of both the Greek and Latin novels. Yatromanolakis (1990) offers a modern Greek translation with his edition of the text and a concise commentary on the novel. In Spanish, Brioso Sánchez (1982) provides a competent introduction and translation with frequent, brief notes.[39] It is apparent from the above examination and compilation of both texts and translations that modern interest in AT is flourishing. However, two observations for the future can be drawn: first, although Vilborg and Garnaud have done much competent and unenviable work on establishing a working text for AT, which has recently been enhanced by Whitmarsh's (2020) edition of the text of Bks. 1 and 2, the task is by no means over and there is still much to be clarified; second (and perhaps a partial solution to the first point), an updated 21st c. Loeb edition is still a scholarly desideratum.

1.3 Language & Style

While criticism of AT's work has centred around his flamboyantly digressive style of narration (cf. Intro. 2.4.3), the succinctness of his diction generally has been praised.[40] The only detailed analysis of AT's language and style is given by Sexauer (1899) and the lack of a contemporary study on the topic is sorely felt. Commentators such as Whitmarsh (2020: 46-52), Carney (1960 *passim*), and Vilborg (1962: 12-16) have gone some way in tackling this task. In what follows I attempt something similar, but briefer, as for the most part comments of a philological nature are kept to the commentary itself. Like his literary contemporaries of the Second Sophistic (see Intro. 1.4), AT shows the usual educated Atticizing tendencies in his text but with a particular flair for variation and innovation.[41] These have been examined most recently by Gammage (2018 and 2019) who finds that Atticism is applied unevenly albeit deliberately throughout the novel, with only a slight preference for Attic forms, another

[39] I have not had the opportunity to work with the French translation of Grimal (1958), nor the text and facing Spanish translation of Rojas Álvarez (1991). All the above-mentioned editions and translations (including those to which I have not had access) are listed under the first section of 'Works Cited'.

[40] Cf. Dunlop 1888: 44; Plepelits 1996: 399; even Photius praises his diction and composition (*Bibl.* 87.66a.17-20 = *Test.* II).

[41] Further on the vagaries of Atticism in the Second Sophistic, see e.g. Whitmarsh 2005b: 41-56; Kim 2010 and 2017.

reflection of our author's eclectic style (e.g. 6.4.4n., 6.9.4n., 6.10.4n.).[42] A variance can likewise be detected in his lexis: although for the most part AT's choice of words shows Classical grounding, he has no qualms about employing more contemporary vocabulary and constructions (e.g. 6.10.5, 6.10.6, 6.11.3, 6.20.1 with nn.), or even apparent hapax legomena (e.g. 6.4.4, 6.7.4 with nn.).[43] In particular, AT enjoys tweaking or enhancing verbs with the addition of prefixes. In Bk. 6 it is κατά- compounds that proliferate, a prefix that often gives "an intensive force that cannot be translated" (Smyth §1690; e.g. 6.4.4, 6.19.6, 6.22.4 with nn.; cf. also the formation of ἀντι- compounds at 6.18.5n.). Use of the optative was also particular to the Atticizing trend, and AT shows a similarly flexible approach, confining his use of the mood mainly to "to purple passages, speeches and certain set formulae" (cf. 6.1.3n., 6.3.6n.).[44] The conditional force is often employed to expand on sententious statements made by both the narrator and characters within the text (e.g. 6.7.1, 6.7.4, 6.19.3 with nn.; see further, Intro. 2.4.3), or to expand upon some imagined conceptualization: Leucippe, for instance, makes consistent use of conditionals in the rhetorical visualisation of her self-defence (e.g. 6.20.3, 6.22.2, 6.22.3, 6.22.4 with nn.). Hybrid conditionals are also not uncommon to AT,[45] and are not necessarily an irregular construction as speakers may alter the course of their thought mid-sentence (Smyth §2355; cf. 6.9.7 with n.). AT tends to avoid hiatus through both crasis and elision, but most of all, pauses.[46] While it is perhaps not necessary to emend or explain away every single instance of hiatus in the novel, Reeve's (1971) findings on the novelists' general antipathy for hiatus are compelling enough that it is always recommended to consider the possibility (cf. 6.6.3n., 6.13.3n.). AT's style of prose can be deceptively simple, and often the conciseness of the diction belies the complexity of the comparisons employed, at times rendering meaning rather opaque (e.g. 6.7.2, 6.20.3 with nn.).[47] Yet, it becomes apparent through the course of the novel that the seeming simplicity is in no part due to a lack of skill, as his prose verges on the poetic in both its rhythm and its pithy elaborateness, particularly in the more florid digressions. In this respect AT is a paragon of the so-called Gorgianic or Asianic

[42] Cf. also Santafé Soler 2005. Compare Michael Psellus who finds that AT fails to Atticize consistently (τῆς Ἀττικῆς ὀρθοεπείας πόρρω που βάλλειν, *De Heliodoro et Achille Tatio iudicium* 76-7 = *Test*. VI)

[43] Cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 50 on ὑπο- compounds in Bks. 1 and 2.

[44] Carney 1960: 37.

[45] Whitmarsh 2020: 51.

[46] Carney 1960: 33.

[47] Something that is warned against by the rhetorician Nicolaus (*Prog*. 14.9-13).

embellished rhetorical style, regularly implementing the various figures of speech that make up both the poet and the rhetorician's arsenal – especially homoioteleuton, alliteration, assonance, isocolon, asyndeton, polyptoton, and anaphora – often lending a repetitious rhythmic nature to his prose. Rhythm in ancient prose has become something of a hot topic, evinced by Hutchinson's (2018) latest monograph, which devotes a chapter each to the rhythmic patterns of *L&C* 6.7.3-7 and 7.4.3-6 (cf. 6.7.3n.).[48] Whitmarsh (2020: 38-40), too, has gone some way in elucidating the patterns of rhythm that AT employs in his prose, and in particular, shows how the cretic is "the heart of Greek prose rhythm".[49] In Bk. 6 AT leverages instances of cretic rhythm chiefly in moments of emotional turmoil for Leucippe (e.g. 6.16.1-2, 6.21.1, 6.22.3, 6.22.4 with nn.). In addition, he employs poetic meters, such as possible tragic trimeters (cf. 6.2.5 with n.) and apparent paroemiacs (cf. 6.7.1 with n.). It is clear from this brief conspectus that AT's prose can be both wittily succinct and flamboyantly elaborate.

1.4 Literary & Cultural Milieu

AT's audacious engagement with the romantic tropes is but a symptom of the general preoccupation with innovation and ingenuity that characterised the era of literary and cultural diversification during the early Imperial period known as the Second Sophistic. The Second Sophistic, which spanned roughly the first three centuries of the common era, was a period of literary and cultural reinvigoration for speakers of Greek living under Roman Imperial rule. This cultural zeitgeist was marked in particular by "its abundant and frequently exuberant prose literature", which showed a nostalgic flair in its Atticism.[50] This literature was born from the many schools of declamation run by the intellectual orators of this period, known as sophists.[51] The primary features of their oeuvre were expertise in discourse, displays of erudition, a flair

[48] Accompanying his book is a wonderful series of videos in which Prof. Hutchinson reads the selections aloud to convey the rhythm of the text (URL: http://fdslive.oup.com/www.oup.com/booksites/uk/booksites/content/9780198821717/video/toc.html; Accessed On: 17 July 2021).

[49] See esp. the list of prose patterns at Whitmarsh 2020: 38. On Longus' prose rhythms, see Hunter 1983: 84-98; also, Bowie 2019: 14-17.

[50] Quote from Whitmarsh 2001: 1.

[51] The name of the movement was coined by Philostratus (*VS* 1.481) who identified it as a not a 'new' sophistic, but a 'second' sophistic, following the classical sophists.

for innovation, as well as a deep allusivity to the prior Greek literary canon.[52] Although the art of declamation and romance novels may at first glance appear incongruent – the former a public performance guided by precise rules of composition and the latter a written text for individual consumption with far less definitive compositional dictates – the worlds of the sophists and novelists nonetheless reflect a similar preoccupation with the display of rhetorical *paideia* and the enlivening of their literary product through *enargeia*. The appreciation of the novels' sophistic elements, however, was not always so keenly felt. When scholars still considered the novels rather low-brow melodrama, they conjectured an ancient audience made up of juvenile readers and women.[53] Egger (1999) rehabilitates this out-dated opinion, showing how the concerns and characterisation of the women depicted in the novels reflect, to a certain extent, that of women in contemporary society.[54] For the most part, the audience of the novel was the educated male elite, particularly for the more salacious authors such as AT.[55] Nonetheless, a reader need not understand every instance of intertextuality or allusivity in order to read (and enjoy) a text and Miguélez-Cavero (2009) posits both an erudite reader (*lector scrupulosus*) as well as a more popular reader (*lector curiosus*).[56] She further argues that the anonymous primary narrator in *L&C* gives us an insight into who the assumed reader of the novel might be, postulating that he is an example of the *lector curiosus*.[57] AT also gives us a unique example of an actual reader within his novel: Clitophon uses a book as a prop when wandering around the house to catch a glimpse of Leucippe (1.6.6). The inclusion of a young, elite, educated man

[52] For a more extensive examination of this period and its nuances, see, *inter alia*, Reardon 1971; Bowersock ed. 1974; Anderson 1993; Bowersock 1994; Goldhill ed. 2001; Whitmarsh 2001 and 2005b; Borg ed. 2004; Richter and Johnson eds. 2017.

[53] This view has been rightly criticised as "indicative of scholars' own prejudices" (Morales 2004: 2; cf. Bowie 1994: 440).

[54] Also, tentatively, Hägg 1983: 95-6. Cf. Ormand (2010: 169): "Barring some overwhelming internal evidence, all the objective data that we have point against a primary audience of middle-class literate women".

[55] Bowie 1994: 438; cf. Stephens 1994: 405-9.

[56] Similarly, Hägg 1994: 55. On the dangers of inventing readers for the novel, see Vessey 1991-93: 158-160. Cf. Bowie (1987: 694): "Readers of some erudition (not all of whom need have been endowed with comparable taste or intelligence) might well have taken a pleasure in Achilles' deployment of conventions that savoured the art rather than scorned the artificiality".

[57] Miguélez-Cavero 2009: 190-203; cf. Jones (*forthcoming*) who also posits the anonymous narrator as a "cipher for the reader".

reading (or at least pretending to read) a book is indicative of the deep self-reflexivity of AT's work, as well as a veiled comment on potential readership, and it is easy to imagine that Clitophon may be holding a romance novel at the beginning of his own romantic adventure, a type of metafictive *mise en abîme*.[58]

These novels display a "syncretism of generic features" that is quite unlike other works of ancient literature.[59] To speak of the 'origins' of the novel, or to use familial metaphors of literary predecessors tends to posit an overly straight-forward development of one of the most multifarious of ancient (and modern) genres. Whitmarsh (2011a: 12) cautions against seeing "the relationship of history to genre as one of cause and effect", as "[e]ach of the romances is itself a distinctively creative working-through of contemporary identity politics".[60] In this study, Whitmarsh rightly emphasises the *Weltanschauung* of the Imperial period and the so-called Second Sophistic movement as key to understanding the novelists' innovation and engagement with both genre and themes. The key, then, when assessing the emergence of narrative prose fiction, and thence the Greek romances, is the act of negotiation between the lengthy and complex literary milieu that preceded them, and the accelerated societal and cultural transformation of the Imperial period that prompted them. The ancient novels combine the prose narrative of historiography with the fictitious inventiveness of poetry and drama, incorporating philosophical and rhetorical musings, while remaining personalised to the accounts of private individuals. AT's amalgamation of fictional styles – comic, novelistic, rhetorical, melodramatic – allows for a sophisticated comment on the ideal novel, not quite a parody, not necessarily a comedy, but nonetheless a complex and witty engagement with the genre that offers both intellectual and irreverent insights into novelistic and narrative conventions.

More recently, scholars have observed the nuances of such a cultural and literary renaissance under Imperial hegemony, as Burrus (2005: 50) argues, the romance novels are a "quintessentially colonial literary product… at once disputing and colluding with the

[58] See Goldhill 1995: 70; Morales 2004: 79; Morgan 2007: 117; cf. Whitmarsh 2003: 199.

[59] Bakhtin 1981: 89; see further Intro. 2.4.1.

[60] Similarly, Morgan 1995: 134-5; Burrus 2005: 50-1. Cf. Selden (1994: 39): "All ancient genres originated in important and recurrent real-life situations, and their institutionalization as a pattern of regular response supplied part of the fundamental architecture (θέμεθλα) for the social order".

universalizing aspirations of empire".[61] Despite this, the Greek novels display a curiously "Roman-less" mise-en-scène and there are no explicit references to Roman rule in *L&C*.[62] Nonetheless there are a number of implicit elements of Romanization that give the novel a contemporary 'feel' (cf. 6.2.5n., 6.5.3n.).[63] For instance, Leucippe's rhetorical performance of her own vivisection (6.21-22) plays into the larger discourse of the (amphi)theatrical viewing of bodies in trauma in the Imperial period.[64] The performative nature of violence in *L&C* chimes with the very real-world brutality of the "fatal charades" of the Roman arena in the first centuries CE.[65] This is borne out by the reverberation of Leucippe's vocabulary of defiance and spectacle with roughly contemporaneous martyrological texts. The scholarly literature on the similarities between the Christian (and Jewish) martyrs and the Greek novels is extensive,[66] and *L&C* offers several instances of possible Christian contact.[67] However, not all martyrs were necessarily religious in the 1st-3rd c. CE, and it is possible to identify shared vocabulary of violence and spectacle with Leucippe's confrontation in Bk. 6 and the so-called 'Pagan Martyrs' of the *Acta Alexandrinorum* (c. 1st-3rd c. CE). This collection of anonymous tracts effectively constitutes a propagandist 'semi-historical fiction' in the form of dialogues (with

[61] See also Whitmarsh 2013b.

[62] Whitmarsh 2011a: 5. Cf. Vilborg 1962: 11; Konstan 1994: 223; Goldhill 2001: 156. As Swain (1999: 5) points out, this is an act of deliberate ignorance.

[63] See esp. Hilton 2009.

[64] See King 2018: 193-215 and Jolowicz 2021: 221-54; with Liviabella-Furiani 2002; cf. also the excellent MA thesis of Sapsed-Foster (2021) that explores the medico-theatrics of *L&C* 3.15-6.

[65] So Connors 2008: 169-72; on the "fatal charades", Coleman 1990. These pantomimic enactments of violent mythological tableaus by condemned criminals bear a striking resemblance to Leucippe's disembowelment (3.15-6), as well as the painting of Prometheus' evisceration (3.8), both of which may be predicated upon mimes (Jolowicz 2021: 240-1; with Mignogna 1997; see Intro. 2.4.2).

[66] See e.g. Shaw 1996 (Jerome *Ep*. 1, 4 Macc., Ignat. *Rom*., Euseb. *Hist*. *eccl*.); Cooper 1996: 20-44; MacAlister 1996: 84-114; Chew 2003a and 2003b (on the martyrs Agatha, Juliana Euphemia, Anastasia and Menodora); Morales 2004: 203-5 (*passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, Prudent. *Perist*. III (Eulalia) and XIV (Agnes)); Burrus 2005 (*APTh*); King 2012: 154-7 (*passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, 4 Macc.); Bossu 2015 (*inter alia*, *passio Luciae* and *passio Rufinae et Secundae*); Harland 2017 (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*).

[67] For a general overview, Ramelli 2001: 81-101; Konstan and Ramelli 2014. Both Bremmer 1999 and Ramellli 2009:164-5 argue for intertext between Bardaisan and AT; Schwartz (2007: 284-6) suggests a possible "dialogue" between AT and the Apocryphal Acts in the typical jailhouse scene where Clitophon is seduced; and Friesen (2014) expands on the potential allusion to the Eucharist in AT's description of the festival of the vintage (2.2.5) (cf. Winkler 1989: 192 n. 25; Bowersock 1994: 125-6).

some minor narrative) between representatives of elite Greek-speaking Alexandrians and the Emperor of the day.[68] These Alexandrian Martyrs display a similar appreciation for the melodramatic, influenced by mime in elements such as the "caricature" of the emperors, but instilled with a tragic zeal in their virtue signalling.[69] In these pamphlets they made their case in strident rhetorical fashion (usually against Alexandrian Jews),[70] confronting the tyranny of the Emperor and asserting their noble birth (εὐγένεια) before being inevitably led off to torture and/or death. Similarly, Leucippe establishes her εὐγένεια, albeit overheard, in the rhetorical heights of her lament (6.16.4-6);[71] and, in dialogue with the 'tyrannical' Thersander (6.20.3 with n.), she defends herself with the sheer force of her oratory, emphasizing her intrinsic autonomy in the face of torture (6.22.4 with n.). A key element of the *Acta Alexandrinorum* was the biting repartee of the Alexandrian envoy and the offence and incredulity expressed by the emperor at their insolence (e.g. *AA* IV *Rec*. *B* col. i 19-20, VIII *P*. *Oxy*. 1242 col. iii 40-50), much like Thersander's incredulity at Leucippe's audacious claims to virginity and her corresponding fiery response (cf. 6.20.3n., 6.21.2n., 6.22.3n.). Coupled with the tradition of AT's Alexandrian roots (Intro. 1.1), and such examples as Clitophon's ardent admiration of the city of Alexandria (5.1), it may be possible to posit a whiff of nationalism lurking beneath Leucippe's defiant indignation (or, considering our author's continually subversive approach, a hint of derision at the demagoguery of such documents). Given the relative uncertainty of dating both AT and the Alexandrian martyrs, I believe it is fair, as Morales (2004: 204) does with the Christian martyrs, to assume "a fairly symbiotic relationship of influences", in which each may be read in light of the other. While several parallels are noted in the commentary, the possible connection deserves a more in-depth analysis which the current study simply cannot accommodate. It is testimony to our author's stromatic approach to the contemporary literary and social milieu that such a kaleidoscope of readings can be made.

[68] For a brief comparison of themes between the Greek novels and the *Acta Alexandrinorum* (*AA*), see Musurillo 1954: 252-8; also, Harker 2008: 166-7 (although neither mention 6.20-22).

[69] Musurillo 1954: 248.

[70] Despite the pronounced anti-Semitism of the Alexandrians, "the major theme of the work [was] the clash between the Alexandrians and Rome" (Tcherikover and Fuks 1960: 57).

[71] On the *topos* of the εὐγένεια of the *Liebespaar* in the Greek novels, see e.g. Létoublon 1993: 81-6, 124-26; Whitmarsh 2011a: 214-220.

1.5 *Nachleben*

AT experienced a varied and prolonged *Nachleben* until about the 19th c. when his work appears to have fallen out of favour. Given the conspectus of modern translations given above (Intro. 1.2), it is evident that this position too is changing. If we date AT to the first half of the 2nd c. CE, then *L&C* could be considered "the single most significant literary text written in Greek" of that century,[72] as echoes can be found with several contemporary authors (e.g. 6.1.1n., 6.12.4n.). In Bk. 6, there are several intertextual reverberations to be found between Lucian's *Calumniae non temere credendum* (*Slander*), a declamation on the dangers of too readily believing Slander (Διαβολή), who is personified as a fearsome woman, and Melite's harangue against the personified mother-daughter team of Slander (Διαβολή) and Rumour (Φήμη) (6.10.4-6 with nn.). As with the thematic and textual parallels with the Pagan and Christian martyrs (Intro. 1.4), it is difficult to know at times if we can draw specific parallels with another text or should rather speak of a shared vocabulary and thematic discourse. Nonetheless, in the case of Lucian's *Slander*, the similarities are too many and too similar to be merely contextual.[73] Beyond his more immediate context, AT's influence is naturally felt in fellow novelist Heliodorus in the 4th c. CE (see Intro. 2.4.1). From the 5th-6th c. CE, echoes of AT's descriptions of the erotic experience can be found in Aristaenetus, a writer of love-letters,[74] while a host of intertextual echoes can be found in Nonnus' epic, the *Dionysiaca*;[75] and so too in Musaeus' epyllion *Hero and Leander*.[76] In the 7th c. Maximus the Confessor appears to enjoy quoting sententious remarks from *L&C* (cf. 6.11.1n.). In the Byzantine Middle Ages the Greek romance novels experienced a massive resurgence, in particular, the four 12th c. romance novels of *Rodanthe and Dosikles* by Theodore Prodromus, *Aristander and Callithea*

[72] Whitmarsh 2020: 1.

[73] On possible intertexts between Lucian and AT, see Lehmann 1910: 56-68 and Schwartz 1967 (under the assumption that Lucian influenced AT); Anderson (1976: 87-9) finds Schwartz's argument for a connection between AT and Lucian tenuous. Cf. Whitmarsh (2020: 13): "a generation later, Lucian makes some use of Achilles".

[74] Compare, for instance, *L&C* 5.27.1 and Aristaen. 2.5.13; 6.1.3 and Aristaen. 2.5.6-7; 1.4.5 and Aristaen. 2.5.15-20 (cf. also fn. 305). Further on Aristaenetus' 'plagiarism' of AT and others, see Arnott 1973, though he does not mention these instances.

[75] See Shorrock 2001: 192-4; Miguélez-Cavero 2016. Prior to the re-dating of the novel, Rohde (1914: 504, 512 n. 4) thought that AT had imitated Nonnus.

[76] See Montiglio 2020: 8-10.

by Constantine Manasses, *Drosilla and Charicles* by Nicetas Eugenianus, and *Hysmine and Hysminias* by Eumathius (also known as Eustathius) Macrembolites.[77] Eumathius' novel in particular is remarkable for incorporating the style and themes of *L&C*.[78] Even the Byzantine epic *Digenes Akritas* (Bk. 6 of the Grottaferrata version) is noted for its intertextual engagement with AT's novel.[79] The scholar Michael Psellus famously wrote a comparison of Heliodorus and AT, in which he found AT's novel sorely wanting (*De Heliodoro et Achille Tatio iudicium* = *Test*. VI). Even Christians such as Photius, although scandalised by AT's novel, were reading it.[80] As mentioned (Intro. 1.1), AT apocryphally became a Christian and a bishop, and Metaphrastes gives a "Christian sequel" to AT's novel in which Leucippe and Clitophon become parents to Saint Galaktion, converted to Christianity by the miracle of his birth to the apparently sterile Leucippe.[81] The Greek Anthology contains an epigram that praises the novel's approach to virginity and marriage but warns against the diverting nature of AT's digressive style (*Anth*. *Gr*. 9.203).[82] In western Europe AT rose to popularity with the publication of the Latin translation of his novel in 1544. This edition of Annibale della Croce contained only Bks. 5-8 and thus the Italian translations it spawned were equally incomplete (his translation was completed a decade later).[83] From then AT's novel enjoyed some popularity and was translated into a variety of European languages, and finally into English in 1597.[84] This popularity was sustained through the 16th to 18th c. as is evinced in the continued appearance of new translations, especially in French.[85]

[77] See MacAlister 1991; Nilsson and Zagklas 2017; and introductions to each novel in Jeffreys 2012.

[78] See Nilsson 2001: 166-260 with refs. Compare, also, the description of Leucippe's grief-stricken beauty (6.6.3-7.3) and the florally effulgent description of the heroine Hysminias (*H&H* 3.6).

[79] Dyck 1987.

[80] Cf. Phot. *Bibl*. 94.73b 25-32: "Ἔστι δὲ τῇ αἰσχρολογίᾳ τοῦ μὲν Ἀχιλλέως τοῦ Τατίου ἧττον ἐκπομπεύων… αἰσχρῶς δὲ καὶ ἀναιδῶς ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀποχρώμενος".

[81] MacAlister 1996: 110-1.

[82] The author is given as either Photius or Leo – Plepelits (1996: 412 n. 42) suggests that the author is likely Leo considering Photius' apparent outrage at AT's licentiousness. See Morales 2004: 227-231 and Whitmarsh 2020: 15-16 for insightful readings of this epigram.

[83] Plepelits 1996: 413.

[84] For the general popularity of the Greek novels in the Renaissance, see e.g. Hägg 1983: 192-213.

[85] On AT's popularity in this time, see Nakatani 2005.

2. Book 6

2.1 Context & Narrative Timeline

Bks. 1-2 of *L&C* are concerned with the elaboration of Clitophon's erotic strategy for Leucippe's seduction; Bks. 3-4 narrate a travelogue of spine-chilling adventures; Bks. 5-6 recount an adulterous comedy of errors; Bks. 7-8 feature a forensic focus, seguing from legal to supernatural trials, with only a perfunctory epilogue for their marriage. The division of *L&C*'s eight books into thematic pairs is not a new premise;[86] yet, Hägg (1971: 77 n. 2), for instance, finds the failure of the end of the Books to coincide with significant fictional time breaks (especially the flash-forward at 5.8.1) as reason to be suspicious of the Books as a "compositional unit in the author's planning". While strictly we cannot say if this was the case or not, it is very attractive to judge that the Book divisions are "(probably) the choice of the author".[87] The final scenes of Bks. 5 and 6 offer a natural dramatic culmination of their main concerns – the seduction of Clitophon and Leucippe's claims to virginity respectively.[88] Bk. 6 opens somewhat bathetically – the act of sex between Clitophon and Melite having already happened – and yet ends on a rhetorical climax, with Leucippe defending herself from Thersander's sexual assault. With the parallel action in Bk. 6 the narrative reaches the point where it most represents a staged theatrical performance (see Intro. 2.4.2), capitalising on the amorous entanglements set up by the cross-currents of the combined couples – Melite/Clitophon, Thersander/Leucippe, Melite/Thersander, and Leucippe/Clitophon.

The following analysis outlines the fictional time of Bk. 6 and owes much to Hägg's (1971) seminal study on narrative technique in the novels of Chariton, Xenophon, and AT, where he adumbrates the narrative chronologies of the novels in precise detail. Here, the focus is on Bk. 6 and how it fits into the overall time configuration of *L&C*, as well as the manifold narrative threads that interweave through Bk. 6 itself. The fictional time covered within the novel is structured around "consecutive days of continuous action, interrupted by short

[86] See Sedelmeier 1959: 113; cf. Nimis 1998: 107-9.

[87] Whitmarsh 2001: xxxiv; cf. Morales 2004: 41; Whitmarsh 2009a: 44 n. 32.

[88] Cf. Fusillo 1997: 225-6: "AT uses book divisions to stress the dissonance in the relations of his leading couple".

intervals of a specified number of days".[89] The actual narrative covers approximately four months with the interruption of a six month flashforward about half way through the novel, when Clitophon is mourning Leucippe in Alexandria (5.8.1), giving a total time estimate of 10 months.[90] Shortly after Melite and Clitophon's arrival in Ephesus the fictional time decelerates as the remainder of the novel spans a period of around nine days (5.17.1-8.19.1). Nonetheless, there is an increase of narrative tempo on account of the contemporaneous nature of the unfolding events and more time is spent on the intricacies of simultaneous intrigue. Parallelism of narrative action is ubiquitous in the novels as the main action centres around the separation and reunion of the hero and heroine (often multiple times). As a result of Clitophon's role as first-person narrator (Intro. 2.2), Leucippe's experiences are naturally focalised through his own recounting and her point of view remains largely unexplored. In Bk. 6, however, due to the emphasis on contemporaneous action, we are given a unique narratorial window into Leucippe's experiences. Previously, when the couple had been separated, Clitophon relates what happens to Leucippe from afar – such as with her 'disembowelment' (3.15), or her 'beheading' (5.7) – and her actual experience of the event is given in a later recounting by others (3.19-22), or herself (8.16). Naturally this delay in information also serves to heighten the suspense and dramatic effect of these gruesome episodes.[91] In Bk. 6, however, Leucippe's experiences while away from Clitophon are related simultaneous to his own, that is, in *current* fictional time, with Clitophon's knowledge of these events explained later (8.15). Thus, in Bk. 6 we are given a uniquely concurrent view of Leucippe's experiences, marking a shift to more narratively "equivalent conditions" between our hero and heroine, and bringing into focus the affirmation of her virginity, a *topos* that increases with importance as the novel progresses.[92]

The narrative synchronism in Bk. 6 is not merely a case of alternating between the hero and heroine, but extends to various secondary characters as well, whose paths converge and diverge on several occasions over the same night/day period of fictional time. Through a series of temporal and transitional markers, AT maintains a sense of logical progression in his

[89] Hägg 1971: 66. Cf. Bakhtin (1981: 86-91) who argues that, on account of the lack of character development, the fictional time in the Greek novels "lacks any natural, everyday cyclicity", terming this unchanging, "extratemporal" period, "adventure time".

[90] Hägg 1971: 76-82.

[91] Reardon 1994: 83.

[92] Hägg 1971: 182-5; cf. Reardon 1994: 87; see further Intro. 2.3.2.

narrative thread, which might otherwise appear disjointed as a result of the sudden multiple points of view in what is ostensibly a first-person story. Bk. 6 opens on the evening of the day that began with Melite sending Leucippe in search of a love-potion to cure Clitophon's seeming lack of sexual appetite (5.22). Nightfall is heralded (ἦν δὲ πρὸς ἑσπέραν, 5.25.1) when Thersander (newly returned) leaves to visit a friend, and Melite seizes the opportunity to visit Clitophon in the chamber where he is being held. This evening phase runs continuously from the end of Bk. 5 into the beginning of Bk. 6 with only a brief interlude that decorously omits the act of sex between Melite and Clitophon. Clitophon then makes his escape with the aid of Melite's servant Melantho (6.2), but once he is left at the backdoor the narrative continues with Melantho returning to Melite and the guard's subsequent surprise at their ruse, which is an "organic [narrative] transition but [a] neglect of first-person view".[93] The narrative switches back to Clitophon, who hints at his unexpected encounter with Thersander and Sosthenes that is to come (6.3.1-2), but then breaks off to recount the latter duo's plotting and abduction of Leucippe (6.3.3-6.4.4). Thus, Leucippe's kidnapping and Clitophon's escape (and subsequent re-capture) occur on that same evening, events made possible (and plausible) by the all-night festival of Artemis (ἦν δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερομηνία, 6.3.2; παννυχίδος οὔσης, 6.4.4). Clearly, we are meant to understand that Sosthenes and Thersander's scheming occurred concurrently with Melite and Clitophon's tryst and breakout, allowing for their narratives to converge naturally with their coincidental meeting in the street (ἐν τούτῳ, 6.5.1). After their altercation in the streets, the narrative thread leaves Clitophon in jail and follows Thersander to Leucippe (6.6.1), where he is so overcome by her display of grief that he leaves Sosthenes to commend him to Leucippe, instructing his steward to call upon him at daybreak (ἕωθεν δὲ ἥκε πρός με κατορθώσας, 6.7.9).

Following this, but still on the same evening (ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπράττετο, 6.8.1), we take a brief step back in time to follow what has occurred with Melite since her encounter with Clitophon (μετὰ τὴν πρός με ὁμιλίαν εὐθύς, 6.8.1). The narrative remains with her as Thersander arrives home (ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, 6.9.1), having left Leucippe with Sosthenes. When Melite's attempt at convincing Thersander fails, he retires to bed, and she to her worry (6.11.2). Although ostensibly mid-section, another break allows the narrative to resume with Sosthenes (ὁ δὲ Σωσθένης…, 6.11.3), who now endeavours to fulfil his instructions from Thersander to woo Leucippe on his behalf (6.7.9). The abrupt change in

[93] Hägg 1971: 183.

narrative perspective in the middle of 6.11, from Thersander and Melite (6.11.1-2) to Sosthenes and Leucippe (6.11.3-4), shows how "the subdivisions are at times fairly arbitrary".[94] Night, nonetheless, is not yet over, as the focus switches from Leucippe and Sosthenes (τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ Λευκίππην εἶχεν οὕτως, 6.13.4) to Clinias and Satyrus on their way to visit Clitophon (Κλεινίας δὲ καὶ ὁ Σάτυρος… τῆς νυκτὸς εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὸ οἴκημα σπουδῇ παρῆσαν, 6.14.1). The μέν… δέ construction that bridges these two sections allows for a clear link and "retrospective summary" to be established between the two narrative phases, while still remaining non-specific as to the exact timing of each event (cf. 6.2.6n., 6.5.5n.).[95] Clinias and Satyrus also receive instruction from Clitophon to return at dawn (περὶ τὴν ἕω, 6.14.2), a reiteration of the same temporal marker given to Sosthenes (6.7.9). Thus, when day finally breaks (ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης, 6.15.1), the separate narratives are primed to set off simultaneously once more (ὁ μὲν Σωσθένης ἐπὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον… οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Σάτυρον ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ, 6.15.1). Here, finally, the rapid simultaneity is relinquished (for this Book at least) as the narrative leaves Clitophon incarcerated but in the company of his friends and instead follows Sosthenes and Thersander to eavesdrop on Leucippe and eventually confront her (6.16-20). Bk. 6 breaks off directly after Leucippe's defence of her virginity (6.21-22), and no time passes between Bk. 6 and 7, which opens with Thersander's emotional reaction to her impassioned speech (ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ Θέρσανδρος παντοδαπὸς ἦν, 7.1.1). The new day, which began at 6.15.1, continues into Bk. 7 with Thersander's plan to deceive Clitophon and concludes with Clinias visiting Clitophon once more (ἐκείνην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν…, 7.6.6). The following day begins with Clitophon being led to court and the ensuing courtroom drama (τῇ δ᾽ ὑστεραίᾳ ἀπηγόμην ἐπὶ τὸ δικαστήριον, 7.7.1).

2.2 Narrators & Narratees

Distinguishing the various levels of narration at play in *L&C* has diverted much scholarly attention and analysis; since, as De Temmerman (2014: 152) points out, it is "probably the most hermeneutically challenging of all extant ancient Greek novels".[96] The

[94] Whitmarsh 2001: xxxiv.

[95] Hägg 1971: 184.

[96] On various aspects of narration and narratology in *L&C*, see Hägg 1971; Most 1989; Fusillo 1991: 168-186; Reardon 1994; Anderson 1997: 2282-4; Lowe 2000: 246-9; Puccini-Delbey 2001; Morales 2004: 53-

novel opens with a description of the city of Sidon by an anonymous first-person internal narrator.[97] After giving thanks at the temple of Astarte for surviving a storm at sea, this narrator observes a votive painting depicting the rape of Europa, which inspires an elaborate and erotically charged ekphrasis of the picture (1.1).[98] Opining aloud at the great power of Eros, he draws the attention and commiserations of a nearby young man (our hero, Clitophon), whose adventures the narrator is keen to hear (1.2.1-2).[99] They retire to a grove of plane trees (1.2.3) and the narrator introduces Clitophon's tale (ὁ δὲ ἄρχεται λέγειν ὧδε, 1.3.1).[100] At this point, Clitophon takes over as a first-person internal narrator. Beginning with customary introductions of provenance and name, he then launches into the story of his ill-omened betrothal to his half-sister Calligone (1.3.1-2). The anonymous primary narrator is not mentioned or alluded to again.[101] Thus, technically speaking, Clitophon is the secondary narrator of his own tale, as it is embedded in the introductory frame narrative, while the unidentified primary narrator, as Clitophon's ostensible audience, becomes the secondary narratee.[102] Perry (1967: 109-112) argues that the tactic of deflecting narratorial authority is specific to the sophistic novelists, namely Longus and AT, and takes for granted that the initial

6; Morgan 2004 and 2007; Marinčič 2007; Whitmarsh 2003 and 2011a: 77-93; Novikov 2014; De Temmerman 2007a, 2009 and 2014: 152-205; Repath 2015.

[97] For definitions of the narratological terms used here, see e.g. the 'Glossary' in de Jong *et al*. 2004: xv-xviii.

[98] Scholars have noted the metaliterary connection between this ekphrasis and Clitophon's embedded narrative, see Harlan 1965: 94-106; Bartsch 1989: 48-55; Selden 1994: 50-2; Martin 2002; Morales 2004:38-48; Reeves 2007; De Temmerman 2009.

[99] A character's experience of a painting that leads to an encounter with a stranger "seems to be common in the ancient novel" (Schmeling 2011: 353). In Petronius' *Satyricon* (83-4), it is the narrator Encolpius who views a painting and bemoans the effects of love, leading to his encounter with the stranger Eumolpus. Longus (p.1.1-4) also introduces his novel with the description of a painting which inspires the narrator to recount the love story.

[100] As scholars have often noted, this *locus amoenus* as a setting for amatory discussion invites comparison with Plato's *Phaedrus* 228e-230e, see Trapp 1990: 155; Fusillo 1991: 168; Marinčič 2007: 172-4; Ní Mheallaigh 2007: 232-9; De Temmerman 2014: 157; McHugh 2020: 10-11. On Platonic elements in the preface, see Repath 2001: 136-152; Morales 2004: 50-6; Laplace 2007: 77-87; further on Phaedran elements in Bk. 6, see Intro. 2.4.4.

[101] See Intro. 2.4.1 on the failure to return to the frame narrative at the end of the novel.

[102] Morgan 2004: 493-4 and 2007: 107 n. 7. The primary narratee (the addressee of the primary narrator) is "more or less invisible" in the short space of time devoted to the initial frame (Morgan 2004: 493).

narrator is identifiable with the author himself.[103] On the one hand, this cannot strictly be supported as the primary narrator is never named;[104] on the other hand, ancient readers were likely to associate the 'I' of the primary narrator with "the author's own voice".[105]

Framing the first-person narration as a reported account allows for an exploration (and exploitation) of narrative boundaries that might not otherwise have been possible. Thus, although initially faithful to the limits of homodiegetic narration, it becomes apparent that Clitophon's narrative approach fluctuates on a sliding-scale between strict first-person verisimilitude and almost authorial omniscience.[106] This variegated narrative strategy means that in times of dynamic parallel action, as in Bk. 6, a less restrictive point of view can be employed, allowing for a more immersive experience of the other characters' motivations and escapades. For the most part, the narration tends to hover somewhere in the middle: Clitophon is the apparent ego-narrator but has access to information that defies the logic of a strict first-person narration.[107] To this end Clitophon makes use of both paralipsis – suppression of knowledge, usually to create suspense – and paralepsis – inclusion of information to which he should not strictly have access at that point in the narrative.[108] In Bk. 6, he relies mainly on the latter technique in order to portray several simultaneous narrative threads in which characters rotate in a "veritable amatory fugue" of chance encounters and emotionally charged clashes.[109]

---

[103] Likewise, Hägg 1971: 124-5; Konstan 1994: 65; Plepelits 1996: 400. Cf. Most (1989: 133) who considers the initial narrator as "of course, a stand-in for the reader". AT's use of first-person internal narration is a unique measure amongst the Greek Romances (Hägg 1971: 125; Morgan 2004: 493; Whitmarsh 2011a: 91). That is, "if we restrict the corpus to the canonical five", as *The Ass*, Lucian's *True Histories*, and Antonius Diogenes' *Marvels Beyond Thule* also utilise first-person narration (Whitmarsh 2003: 191 n. 1).

[104] Unlike, the narrators of *Callirhoe* (Charit. 1.1.1) or the *Aethiopica* (Heliod. 10.41.4) who 'identify' themselves as the author – naturally bearing in mind the established narratological principle that the "narrator cannot automatically be equated with the author, even when he bears the same name; rather, he is a creation of that author" (de Jong 2004: 1).

[105] Whitmarsh 2011a: 78; see also Whitmarsh (2009c), where he argues (convincingly) for caution when applying modern narratological approaches to ancient works. Cf. Morgan (2007: 107) who describes the primary narrator as "not biographically identical to the author".

[106] Thus, Hägg 1971: 127-8, 318-322; Reardon 1994: 81-4; Morgan 2004: 499; Marinčič 2007: 176.

[107] On this point, see especially, Hägg 1971: 126-136; Fusillo 1991: 166-181; Reardon 1994.

[108] Thus, Morgan 2004: 496-7.

[109] Quote from Reardon 1994: 88.

Sometimes these apparent excursions from strict ego-narration are accounted for later in the novel. In Bk. 6, for example, Sosthenes' full confession when faced with torture explains Clitophon's knowledge of the private exchange between Thersander and Sosthenes outside Leucippe's hut (οὐ παρέλιπε δὲ οὐδὲ ὅσα ἰδίᾳ πρὸ τῶν τῆς Λευκίππης θυρῶν διελέχθησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ αὐτῆς, 8.15.1); likewise, his knowledge of Leucippe's struggles and confrontation with Thersander is briefly and conveniently explained (ἡ Λευκίππη δέ… τὰ συμβάντα μετὰ ἡδονῆς διηγεῖτο, 8.15.3). However, this explanatory strategy is unevenly applied, and at other times we are left to surmise that a similar exchange must have happened, such as in the case of his knowledge of Melite's plans (6.8) or the private conversation she shared with Thersander (6.9-11.2). One conspicuous contravention of the first-person narration in Bk. 6 is Clitophon's apparently unique window into Thersander's psychological motivations and emotional upheavals (6.7.7, 6.11.1-2, 6.17.5-6.18.2, 6.20.1).[110] In these cases it is not possible to cite Sosthenes' confession as an explanation since, as Reardon (1994: 85) points out, the steward "cannot be credibly represented as reporting Thersander's unspoken thoughts".[111] Indeed, Thersander's emotional state becomes the excuse for a digressive pseudo-physiological excursus on psychological affects that is a self-conscious reminder of Clitophon's nebulous narratorial presence (6.19; see Intro. 2.4.4). A similar effect is achieved by Clitophon's persistent interruption of his own narration with sententious remarks (see Intro. 2.4.3).[112]

The inevitable enigma posed by AT's unconventional approach to first-person homodiegetic narration is the degree to which Clitophon – or even the anonymous primary narrator – has coloured or customised the tale to his own ends. Much recent scholarship on AT focuses on examining the slippage between Clitophon's idiosyncratic portrayal of himself and the actual, deeply ironic, depiction that emerges from the narrative.[113] This 'Contean' approach examines the influence of the "hidden author" who, through various hints and signposts (both covert and overt), draws attention to the narratorial dissonance inherent in Clitophon's tale.[114]

[110] Cf. Morgan 2004: 499 and 2007: 106.

[111] Also, Hägg 1971: 134-5 and Morgan 2007: 106

[112] See Whitmarsh 2003: 193; Morgan 2004: 496.

[113] See Núñez 2019: 300.

[114] Conte, in his renowned treatment of Petronius' *Satyricon*, describes the "hidden author" as "the implied self-image that Petronius creates as author of his text" who operates behind his ego-narrator's back to

Morgan (2007: 105-110) adumbrates how Clitophon, through his rendition of the direct speech of other characters, attempts to curate an approved self-image. While Whitmarsh (2003: 193) concentrates on how the proliferation of narrators creates a "crisis of focalisation", exacerbated by the incongruity between the seeming worldly experience of Clitophon 'the narrator' (as depicted in the prologue) and the naive ignorance of Clitophon 'the agent' (as depicted in the body of his story).[115] On the other hand, Marinčič (2007) finds the notion of the "hidden author" an unnecessary addition, pointing out that since Clitophon's first-person narration is presented as a speech in his own words, it is Clitophon-as-narrator who is in control of revealing his own posturing and pomposity in the narrative. While Morales (2004: 55-6) argues that Clitophon's Phoenician heritage, which he reveals to us in the very first words of his tale (ἐμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος, 1.3.1), plays upon the stereotype of Phoenician mendacity, which, coupled with Clitophon's own admission of doctoring the account of his liaison with Melite (8.5.2-3), suggests "the possibility that Clitophon has fabricated his account". The play between truth and fiction is palpable, and, as *L&C* is in fact a fictional tale, Clitophon's untrustworthy narration becomes a kind of metonym for the fictionality of the novel itself. Narratological nuances notwithstanding, it becomes apparent that Clitophon's ego-narration increasingly emerges as a sort of fictitious, sophistic exhibitionism that relies on half-truths and rhetorical grandiloquence to camouflage the less heroic elements of his personality and conduct. Consequently, at times I refer to Clitophon as Clitophon-*auctor* versus Clitophon-*actor* to distinguish (on some level) between Clitophon, the narrator of the tale, and the projection of himself that he narrates.

"[ensure] that the protagonist and narrator reveals himself and his own naïveté and then leaves him without the protective illusions that the narrator has constructed for himself" (1994: 22).

[115] In this analysis, Whitmarsh (2003: 193) takes the 'Contean' approach to its logical narratological conclusion, identifying the primary narrator with the "hidden author", thus making the initial anonymous character the secondary narrator, which, presumably, would mean that Clitophon is the tertiary narrator. Although this represents the most technically correct narratological paradigm, it may well be an unnecessary over-complication, since, as laid out above, most of the scholarship identifies the anonymous narrator as the primary narrator, and indeed, in a later study, Whitmarsh does the same (2011a: 81-93).

2.3 *Dramatis Personae*

2.3.1 Clitophon

At the beginning of his tale Clitophon, the (ostensible) hero and (secondary?) narrator states that he is a Phoenician from Tyre (1.3.1), and at the time of the events of the novel he is about nineteen years old. In comparison to the lavish renditions of Leucippe's beauty there is very little personal description of Clitophon. Clitophon is Phoenician by nationality, if not by name, and his Phoenician heritage is another way in which AT subverts novelistic tropes, marking Clitophon as 'other' to the paradigm of elite Greek citizen, a role which is instead (ironically) given to Thersander (Intro. 2.3.4).[116] In Bk. 6 we are given more information to work with as Melite finds him as handsome as a young Achilles (6.1.3 with n) and describes him to Thersander as 'preeminent amongst the Tyrians' (6.9.2 with n.). Claims which, given both speaker and narrator, may well be false. Although other novels portray the heroine as besotted by the hero's handsomeness (cf. Long. 1.24.1, X. Eph. 1.3.2, 1.4.6), the one-sided narration of *L&C* does not give any insight into Leucippe's appreciation of Clitophon. Rather, his handsomeness is focalised through Melite (e.g. 5.13.3, 6.1.3);[117] outside of Melite's infatuation, however, there is no indication that Clitophon is generically good-looking (cf. the description of Callisthenes, 8.17.4).

The name Κλειτοφῶν means 'famous-voiced' and its primary association is with the eponymous interlocutor of Ps.-Plato's *Clitophon*, who also appears in the first book of the *Republic*.[118] Given Clitophon's rhetorical inclination (Intro. 2.4.3), it may be a specific reference to the character, who is associated with rhetoric both via Lysias and Thrasymachus and in his own "harangue" against Socrates;[119] or it may be merely 'Platonic-sounding', given the patchwork of Platonic allusions made throughout the novel (Intro. 2.4.4). Plutarch lists Plato's Clitophon among the dilletantes who refused to 'take the bit' of Platonic reasoning

[116] Cf. Morales (2004: 48-50) who also argues that Clitophon's Phoenician heritage is programmatic for the "ostentatious salaciousness" in the novel.

[117] Compare Arsace's preoccupation with Theagenes' good looks (Heliod. 7.6.1, 7.9.2).

[118] *Clitophon* may well be spurious, nonetheless it was associated with the Platonic corpus (cf. Diog. Laert. 3.50).

[119] See Nails 2002: 102-3; cf. [Pl.] *Clit*. 406a, 410c-d, Pl. *Resp*. i.340b.

(ὥσπερ χαλινὸν τὸν λόγον ἐκπτύσαντες, ἄλλῃ πη παρετράπησαν, Plut. *De Alex*. *fort*. 328c3-4), an apt description given Clitophon-*auctor*'s repeated references to the Phaedran allegory of the soul divided into charioteer and horses (see 6.18.3, 6.20.1 with nn.). In addition, Clitophon's erotically charged role as romance hero has led scholars to compare him to the male lovers of New Comedy,[120] and the name Clitophon appears in Menander (fr. 821 *PCG*) and Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos* (as the young lover Clitopho). In addition, his handsomely effeminate appearance after sleeping with Melite (6.1.3 with n.) aligns him with the *cultus adulter* of mime (see Intro. 2.4.2).[121]

Clitophon's characterisation is inextricably linked with his role as narrator and the slippage between Clitophon's justifications of his actions and the actions themselves is where the emergence of his character takes place. Bk. 6 entails the least amount of fictional time spent with Clitophon-*actor*; despite this, it also contains some of his most problematic exploits as hero of a romantic novel, namely sleeping with Melite and cross-dressing to escape. While Clitophon has not exactly distinguished himself in the preceding narrative as a gallant leading man, with these two acts, which follow quickly one after the other, he proves himself an anti-generic anti-hero.[122] Clitophon's passivity in the face of physical harm or threat marks him out from the other romantic heroes, and the number of instances where Clitophon fails to defend himself or others (e.g. 3.15.5-6, 5.23.6-7, 7.14.3, 8.1.3-5) far outweigh the few in which he attempts to retaliate (e.g. 5.7.2, 7.15.3-4). On the one hand, Clitophon's yielding acceptance of ill-fortune may be seen as the kind of "virtuous" Stoic phlegmatism displayed by many other novelistic heroes (see Intro. 2.4.1),[123] yet on the other, a purely Stoic reading of the novel would fail to appreciate the over-the-top nature of Clitophon's engagement with the generic tropes of heroism.[124] Before Bk. 6 Clitophon refuses three times to consummate his marriage with Melite out of respect for the 'dead' Leucippe (5.12.2, 5.16.1, 5.21.6-7). That he and Melite should complete the act now that both their respective partners have appeared alive and well in Ephesus is heavily ironic. Clitophon's infidelity has long divided scholarly opinion and has

[120] Brethes 2012: 127, 131; cf. Konstan 1994: 185.

[121] Marinčič 2007: 195.

[122] See Anderson 1982: 30-1 and 1984: 63; Fusillo 1991: 101; Brethes 2001 and 2007: 202-12.

[123] Perkins 1995: 91-2.

[124] Morales 2004: 59-60; cf. Konstan 1994: 34.

been characterised variously as relatable realism,[125] a subversion of the conventions of fidelity,[126] a "sophisticated variation" for introducing the trial scenes that follow,[127] or merely an "honourable minor lapse".[128] Earlier in the novel, Clitophon claims to be relatively inexperienced with sex but to have had encounters with prostitutes (2.37.5). He then proceeds to describe the act of sex and the female orgasm in such detail that Menelaus jokes he must be an old hand in the ways of Aphrodite (2.38.1). Later, in his letter to Leucippe, Clitophon assures her that he has 'mimicked' her virginity (μαθήσῃ τὴν σήν με παρθενίαν μεμιμημένον, 5.20.5), while still rather acerbically acknowledging the absurdity of 'male virginity' as a concept (εἴ τις ἔστι καὶ ἐν ἀνδράσι παρθενία, 5.20.5).[129] After sleeping with Melite, however, Clitophon is still careful in his choice of words in his recapitulation of their adventures to Sostratus, Leucippe's father (εἴ τις ἄρα ἔστιν ἀνδρὸς παρθενία, ταύτην κἀγὼ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος πρὸς Λευκίππην ἔχω, 8.5.7). This statement, while technically correct, nonetheless highlights the discrepancy in the tale between the reader and his listeners.[130] Something in Clitophon suspects that his listeners would not appreciate the full extent of his relationship with Melite, and he admits that he glosses over their sexual encounter (8.5.2). Although he does briefly come to regret his liaison with Melite when he suspects her of murdering Leucippe (7.5.4), on the whole he shows no real feelings of self-reproach, only the nous not to mention it to his father-in-law and fiancée.

2.3.2 Leucippe

In Bk. 6 Leucippe defines herself in her own words as a daughter of a general of Byzantium and affianced to Clitophon (6.16.5 with n.). She is of a similar age to Clitophon, perhaps a few years younger (1.9.6). Like all the heroines of the romance novels, Leucippe is stunningly beautiful, with blonde hair, gleaming dark eyes, fair complexion, blushing cheeks, and rosy lips (1.4.3). Her beauty, however, is focalised through Clitophon and there is no telling

[125] Perry 1967: 123; Reardon 1971: 363-4 and 1994: 88; Rojas Álvarez 1989: 89-90.

[126] Anderson 1982: 23-4; Fusillo 1991: 100.

[127] Schwartz 2002: 93-110.

[128] Foucault 1986: 231.

[129] Clitophon's speculation on 'male virginity' is "unparalleled in the whole of Greek literature" (Brethes 2012: 143); see further discussion in Bird 2020: 76-80. Compare the case of Joseph (καὶ ἔστιν Ἰωσὴφ ἀνὴρ θεοσεβὴς καὶ σώφρων καὶ παρθένος, *J&A* 4.9.1) whose *parthenia* is endowed with religious overtones.

[130] Cf. Ormand 2010: 175; De Temmerman 2014: 167.

how much of this is fantasy, fabrication, or fact (see Intro. 2.4.4). Λευκίππη means 'white horse' and primarily indicates nobility given the association of horse ownership with the aristocratic classes, however there are a number of secondary meanings and associations: it may be a reference to the colloquial and comedic use of ἵππος ('horse') for 'penis';[131] there is likely a connection with the virtuous, white horse in the Phaedran chariot myth (see 6.7.1n.); and it could allude to the customary use of white horses as sacrificial victims given Leucippe's own 'sacrifice' (3.15).[132] In addition, as Morales (2004: 135) conjectures, her name might also have some echo of Leucippus, the atomist, considering the (pseudo-)scientific visual motif sustained through the novel (see Intro. 2.4.4). Leucippe introduces herself to Melite as 'Lacaena from Thessaly' (ὄνομα Λάκαινα, Θετταλὴ τὸ γένος, 5.17.5). The name, Sosthenes explains, was given to her by the slave-trader Callisthenes (5.17.9), a realistic detail, as slavers often gave Greek names to slaves in the Roman Empire.[133] Leucippe expresses great anxiety at this 'piratical plundering' of her real name (6.16.5 with n.).

As part of her transformation into a slave Leucippe's hair was shorn (τὴν κεφαλὴν κεκαρμένη, 5.17.3), an act that (possibly) connects her to both mime (Intro. 2.4.2) and ritual initiation (6.1.1n.). She also bears the marks of Sosthenes' mistreatment on her back (5.17.6). Λάκαινα means 'Spartan maiden' and casts her in the same tragic role as Helen of Sparta (e.g. Eur. *Hec*. 441, *Tro*. 34, *IT* 806, *Or*. 1439) something of which she is almost metafictively self-aware (6.16.6 with n.; see Intro. 2.4.2). Most scholars draw analogy with Euripides' *Helen*, which has all the appearance of a prototypical romance story with themes of doubling, abduction, and romantic reunion that are particularly apposite in Leucippe's case.[134] The association with Helen may have a dual metafictive function as it can also be read as a refraction of Callirhoe's character (see Intro. 2.4.1), who is continually associated with Helen, and who "[a]s a Syracusan... is famously Laconian in origin".[135] The Thessalian origin story may well be Leucippe's own invention and the association it creates with magic working puts her in the awkward position of having to help Melite seduce Clitophon (5.22.2-3). Thessalians

[131] Whitmarsh 2001: 164; see Henderson 1991: 127; cf. Hsch. ι.845.

[132] Cf. Henderson 1987: 92-3 on Ar. *Lys*. 191-2; Hdt. 7.113.2.

[133] Billault 2019: 102.

[134] See e.g. Segal 1984: 55; Reardon 1991: 131; Laplace 1991: 36-47 and 2007: 579-82; Baker 2016: 120-22; Lefteratou 2018: 256.

[135] De Temmerman 2014: 192.

were also well-known in antiquity for horse-rearing, and there may be some connection to Leucippe meaning 'white horse'.

Naturally, due to the first-person narration, Leucippe's character plays a somewhat subordinate role to that of Clitophon's.[136] The fact that our experience of Leucippe is always mediated through Clitophon's perspective means that we are given only a window into her character. For instance, Morales (2004: 201-2) finds that Leucippe's monologue at 6.16 "shows her to be strong and determined", although the presence of the eavesdroppers ultimately "undermines the agency afforded to her through speech". While on the surface this may be true, perhaps more nuanced is Morgan's (2007: 108) argument that her soliloquy is "less a literal repetition of her words than his (*sc*. Clitophon's) version of what he thinks she might have appropriately said", something that is literally represented in Thersander and Sosthenes' eavesdropping. Indeed, later in the novel Clitophon admits freely to embellishing his account of the events in Bk. 6 (κἀν τῷδε κατὰ τὸν Σωσθένην καὶ Θέρσανδρον γενόμενος ἐξῆρον, 8.5.5).[137] A similar narrative conundrum is found in Leucippe's letter to Clitophon. This letter, with its catalogue of abuses and postscript affirming her virginity (5.18.2-6), acts as a written defence that prefigures the one she gives *viva voce* at 6.21-22. Long maintained by scholars to be the only instance of 'authentic' speech from Leucippe,[138] it is only Repath (2013: 257-9) who has (rightly) shown how this letter forms part of the larger pattern of narratorial manipulation by Clitophon-*auctor*. In fact, whenever Clitophon reports on Leucippe's speech to which he was not a direct witness, she is expressing one of three sentiments: her fidelity to Clitophon, the defence of her honour, or an account of her trials and tribulations.[139]

The climactic final scene of Bk. 6 between Thersander and Leucippe (with Sosthenes as co-conspirator and witness) in which she delivers a dramatic and rhetorical defence of her virginity plays on the syncrisis of Leucippe's sexual availability and inviolability that is at the heart of the erotic tension in the novel (6.20-22).[140] Initially, Leucippe is apparently happy to

[136] Cf. Fusillo 1991: 193. On this dissymmetry making the heroine an "object of display", see Konstan 1994: 64-6; more in-depth, Morales 2004: 156-165.

[137] Cf. Morgan 2007: 110; Repath 2013: 257.

[138] Rosenmeyer 2001: 149; Létoublon 2003: 288; Morales 2004: 202-3; even, Morgan 2007: 119.

[139] See Repath 2013: 259 with refs.

[140] See esp. Morales 2004: 199-22; Ormand 2010: 166-79; with Segal 1984.

engage in premarital sex with Clitophon (2.19.1-2), and it is not until Artemis herself intervenes in a dream that she commits to remaining a virgin until dutifully wed to Clitophon (4.1), admitting to both chagrin at the delay and pleasure in the anticipation (4.1.5). From then on, she is forced to defend her virginity from a horde of assailants, culminating with Thersander. This bivalent approach to virginity is borne out in the two contrasting *apologiae* she delivers: the first, an impassioned prevarication to convince her mother that she knew nothing of her nocturnal visitor (viz. Clitophon) (2.25.1-2); the second, a veracious averment in which she must defend not only her prior conduct but also her physical integrity from Thersander (6.20-22). The 'recalibration' of virginity that takes place during the course of the novel, Reardon (1994: 86-7) argues, is a return to the "main structural beam of such a story, namely the impregnable virtue of the heroine"; however, the ambivalence surrounding her virtue is not so easily forgotten, for instance, Chew (2000: 64) reads the chastity test as a parody of romance conventions, pointing out that "when the tests are announced the reader's first concern is that Leucippe and Melite should fail!". Indeed, the subtle loophole that Melite exploits in her supernatural test to 'prove' her fidelity plants a small seed of doubt that Leucippe may have passed her own by some similar clever evasion.[141] Even in the rhetorical acme of her virginity, emphasis is placed on the numerous opportunities she has had to lose it (6.21.3, 6.22.2 with nn.). Leucippe's commands for Sosthenes and Thersander to bear witness (6.20.3, 6.21.1-2) resound through the text itself, positioning the reader as 'eyewitness' to the rhetorical description of her own torture. The dynamics of viewing Leucippe's body as a metonym for spectacular violence both enacted and resisted has been extensively explored by recent scholars: some emphasise its androcentric voyeurism,[142] others its disruption of the patriarchy and/or Roman imperialism,[143] while others explore the individual experience of identity and self-hood.[144] Leucippe's bodily integrity comes under constant scrutiny and threat: her mother dreams that she is cleaved in half from her genitalia to her stomach by a brigand's blade, a symbolic warning that Clitophon is entering her chamber about to 'deflower' her (2.23); she

[141] Cf. Cresci 1978: 80; Goldhill 1995: 118.

[142] See Morales 2004: 156-65, on the more gender-typical scopic order; Ballengee 2009: 65-90, for a more gender-ambivalent reading, highlighting male masochistic anxiety; and Bird 2020: 82-92, who highlights how it is nonetheless still possible to read elements of the 'real' Leucippe through "the space created by her obscuration".

[143] E.g. Haynes 2003: 60-1; Burrus 2005; Frilingos 2009; Connors 2008: 169-72; King 2012.

[144] See Zeitlin 2012; with, Shaw 1996: 271; Haynes 2003: 59-60.

acts as a virgin sacrifice in the gruesome staging of her disembowelment (3.15); she is driven temporarily insane by a botched love-philtre and has to be restrained after exposing herself (4.9); she is kidnapped by bandits (on behalf of Chaereas) and apparently beheaded (5.7); and she strips bare her scourged back to Melite and Clitophon, testimony of Sosthenes' assault on her chastity (5.17.6). Although Leucippe's speech in Bk. 6 invites us to consider rape as the unrestrained transgressive behaviour of tyrants (6.20.3 with n.) and the rapist as someone beneath even the roughest brigands (6.22.3 with n.), that same rhetoric also invites us to envisage her body part by part, highlighting her corporeal vulnerability (6.21.1-2, 6.22.4 with nn.). On one level, then, Clitophon's narration of the sexual violence enacted upon Leucippe, and her vigorous response, can be read with a suggestion of "rape fantasy".[145]

2.3.3 Melite

In her role as the principal seductress and threat to our hero's fidelity, one might expect Melite to be characterised by the same wicked wantonness as Heliodorus' Arsace or Chariton's Manto and Cyno; instead, she is portrayed with such sympathy and charm that she "becomes something close to a secondary, or even simply a second, heroine".[146] Melite is introduced as a near substitute for Leucippe: in the same moment that Clitophon learns Sostratus had betrothed (the now apparently dead) Leucippe to him, he resolves to accept Melite's offer of marriage (5.10-11). Like Leucippe, she is described as sublimely beautiful, with gleaming eyes, long flaxen hair, and rosy cheeks (5.13.1-2). Μελίτη means 'honeyed', "implying both allure and persuasion".[147] For instance, her persuasive harangue of Thersander (6.9-10) shows a skilful amalgamation of rhetorical strategies (see Intro. 2.4.3) and it may be possible to detect paronomasia between Μελίτη and μελέτη, the technical term for an advanced rhetorical exercise.[148] Given the significance of διαβολή ('slander') in her peroration (6.10.4-6), there could be some link intended with the Platonic character Μέλητος who believed the διαβολή against Socrates and brought the charge against him (Pl. *Apol*. 19b). An additional possible

[145] See Whitmarsh 2011a: 157-9.

[146] Reardon 1994: 87. In particular, see Perry 1967: 106; Cresci 1978; Egger 1990: 75-79; Haynes 2003: 103-106.

[147] Whitmarsh 2001: 164.

[148] Cf. Russell 1983: 10.

echo can be found in Lucian's character of Μέλιττα a courtesan who, like Melite, seeks the aid of a Thessalian witch to induce her lover to sleep with her (Lucian *DMeretr*. 4.1).

A wealthy, desirable widow from Ephesus, Melite's character resonates with several literary parallels. In the background is the prototypical libidinous 'Widow of Ephesus' of Petr. *Sat*. 111-12 that reflects both the *callida nupta* of adultery mime and the lubricious *matrona* of New Comedy (see Intro. 2.4.2).[149] By dressing Clitophon in her own clothes (6.1.1-3), she becomes reminiscent of Plutarch's Ismenodora, a wealthy widow who dresses her kidnapped young suitor in a wedding dress (Plut. *Amat*. 754e-755a);[150] while the gold she gifts him after sex aligns her character with Longus' Lycaenion and her sexual exchange with Daphnis (6.1.4 with n.).[151] As a woman who displays an intimidating sexual agency scholars have compared her to the tragic Phaedra, epic Dido, and comic Palaestra.[152] As widow(er)s and "sympathetic love rival[s]", Melite and Chariton's Dionysius share much in common;[153] yet it is indicative of AT's subversive take on his own genre that Melite's husband is not in fact dead and she finds herself forced to account for her actions. Melite is depicted as far more of an independent agent, particularly through her command of language and speech; in counterpoint to Leucippe, whose words are "intercepted or overheard".[154] As Webb (2007: 534-5) adumbrates, "rhetorical *paideia* [is]… a masculine domain, so its use by characters is significant as a marker of masculinity or, in the case of female characters of transgression". Correspondingly, Melite's diverse rhetorical engagement is an inherent part of her characterisation as a sexually transgressive cipher, both an obstruction and a helping hand to the couple.

2.3.4 Thersander

Thersander is Melite's husband who was presumed drowned at sea (5.23.4), thus 'widowing' Melite and making way for her marriage to Clitophon (5.11.6). He comes crashing back into the scene mid-way through a drinking-party, bent solely on avenging himself against

[149] On this literary lineage, see Karakasis 2016. On Ephesians as wealthy, see Strelan 1996: 43 n. 42, 119.

[150] So Winkler 1989: 239 n. 61; Brethes 2012: 136.

[151] For a comparison of Lycaenion and Melite, see Robiano 2002.

[152] Respectively, Lefteratou 2018: 143-151; Jolowicz 2021: 191-202; Dollins 2015: 16-7.

[153] Bird 2019: 474-7; see also Anderson 1984: 65-6.

[154] Morales 2004: 224-6; cf. Dollins 2015: 27.

Clitophon. With no greeting to his wife, or explanation for his absence, he falls upon Clitophon, beating our docile hero so savagely and unexpectedly that he likens it to initiation into a mystery cult (5.23.3-6). Thersander then orders Clitophon bound and detained (5.23.7) and departs to visit a friend, (conveniently) leaving the house empty for Melite's seduction of Clitophon (5.25.1, 5.26.13). At face value Thersander appears "drawn largely in black-and-white".[155] Clitophon-*auctor* relies heavily upon *gnomai* and generalisations in order to characterise Thersander, revealing of both how little he really knows about Thersander and Clitophon's own narratorial narcissism (e.g. 6.7.7, 6.11.1, 6.18.3 with nn.; see Intro. 2.4.3). In Bk. 6 Thersander acts out two archetypal roles: initially that of the clueless cuckolded husband of adultery mimes (see 6.11.1n.); but also, as an aristocrat who poses the principal threat to our heroine's chastity, he becomes aligned with characters such as Chariton's Dionysius and the Great King Artaxerxes (Intro. 2.4.1).

Within AT's novel Thersander's character acts as a foil to both Callisthenes and Clitophon. On hearing of Leucippe's beauty, both Callisthenes and Thersander respond inappropriately to their aural-based fantasies (see 6.3.5n., 6.4.4n.), both are driven to anger at the frustration of their desire (2.13.2, 6.20.1), and both resort to kidnapping in their attempts to possess Leucippe (2.16, 6.4.1). By the end of the novel, however, Callisthenes' character undergoes a volte-face, proving himself temperate, respectful and a worthy suitor to Calligone (8.17-18); Thersander, on the other hand, remains recalcitrant to the end, absconding rather than facing the consequences of his actions (8.14.4-5). The example of Callisthenes' redemption highlights Thersander's inherent baseness and incorrigibility. In Bk. 6 the primary dichotomy is between Thersander's sordid behaviour and his elite status, which is highlighted by his continual contrast to Clitophon, the 'foreign philanderer' (e.g. 6.3.5, 6.17.1 with nn.). A curious paradox emerges that Clitophon, the exotic Phoenician, is the hero, whereas Thersander, the native (Ephesian) Greek, is the villain, an inversion of the "barbarian stereotype".[156] Even Thersander's name gives him away in this respect: at face value Θέρσανδρος means "manly-courage", a fitting name for a notable citizen and philanthropist (6.12.2, Sosthenes' hyperbole notwithstanding); however, his brutish behaviour toward

[155] Reardon 1994: 89.

[156] See De Temmerman 2014: 155 with refs.

Leucippe transfigures him into the "beast-man/wild-man" also implicit in his name.[157] This animalistic etymology and imagery reflects his ignominious reversal of status and associates him with bandits such as Chariton's Theron ('The Beast') or Apuleius' Thrasyleon ('Bold-lion') (cf. Apul. *Met*. 4.15);[158] while his inability to check his lust makes him no better than his slave Sosthenes (6.18.6 with n.). That Thersander, an elite citizen, attempts to rape Leucippe, an act of social and moral transgression from which even the bandits, *Boukoloi*, and his own slave Sosthenes have refrained, and that in Bk. 6 he is lambasted for this debasement by Leucippe/Lacaena, a foreigner and (ostensibly) a slave, are indicative of how AT continually "dims the bright line between society and anomie" in his novel (see further 6.22.2-3 with nn.).[159]

2.3.5 Sosthenes

Sosthenes is Leucippe's initial abuser in Ephesus and her fellow slave. He resorts to whipping Leucippe when she refuses to have sex with him for which Melite strips him of his supervisory position on the estate (5.17.3-10). Σωσθένης means 'safe/sound strength' and is perhaps meant to give a bathetic quality in the slippage between his valiant name and his cowardly character and position as a slave (cf. 7.10.4-5). Sosthenes' only strong point, it would seem, is his power to persuade Thersander, driven entirely by his prolix performances (e.g. 6.3.4, 6.4.4 with nn.). In this respect, Sosthenes acts as both *servus callidus* and *praeceptor amoris* to Thersander, coaching him in his 'seduction' of Leucippe (cf. 6.17.2n., 6.22.4n.), much like Satyrus does with Clitophon (Intro. 2.3.6).[160] On the other hand, though, Sosthenes appears very much the *servus stultus*, as his bombastic verbosity falls flat with Leucippe, who easily outsmarts him (6.12.1 with n.).

[157] Translations respectively, Whitmarsh 2001:164; Morales 2004: 83; Schwartz 2002: 99; see further Morales 2004: 83-4.

[158] See Hopwood 1998: 202; Dowden 2013: 50.

[159] Quote from Frilingos 2009: 838.

[160] Frazier 2013: 281 n. 5.

2.3.6 Supernumeraries

Melantho is one of Melite's maidservants who acts as accessory to their cross-dressing escape plan (6.1-2). In the role of trustworthy slave aiding her mistress (6.1.4), she becomes aligned with the *fidissima ancilla* of the 'Widow of Ephesus' narrative (Petron. *Sat*. 111.4; cf. Intro. 2.3.3), which is itself an echo of the stock comic character of trusted servant and romantic go-between.[161] She shares her name with Penelope's own infamous handmaiden who "was the disloyal slave of Odysseus' faithful wife", whereas in *L&C* Melantho "is the loyal slave of Thersander's disloyal wife".[162] Both heroes appear in disguise to their respective 'Melanthos': in Clitophon's case, Melantho is in on the subterfuge and aids him, whereas Odysseus' Melantho does not know his true identity and abuses him quite discourteously (Hom. *Od.* 18.321-336, 19.65-9).

Pasion is the guard who unwittingly releases Clitophon and is compensated by Melite for his troubles (6.2.3-5). Melite originally made a deal with Pasion, to pay Clitophon a clandestine visit (5.25.1). That instance and this are the only mentions of him in the novel. The most famous Pasion of antiquity is the ex-slave turned Athenian banking tycoon, father to Demosthenes' infamous Apollodorus (of Acharnae). Owens (2020: 166) suggests that the reader would be aware of this fact and hence Melite's gift of gold could be read as a "learned joke (the start of Pasion's fortune?)".

The anonymous young freedman appointed by Melite to lead Clitophon to safety is not mentioned before, yet Clitophon reports that he was familiar with him from the voyage to Ephesus (6.2.2). It can only be assumed, then, that he was a member of Melite and Thersander's household and was manumitted by them. In this case it may seem odd that he should remain nameless when a point is made to name Melantho and Pasion. As a freedman in what we might assume is a semi-contemporary setting (Intro. 1.1), it is possible that he would have taken Thersander's family name and come under a patron/client relationship; therefore, perhaps Clitophon does not wish to highlight the young man's association with Thersander. This young

[161] See Karakis 2016: 511-2.

[162] Owens 2020: 166. Cf. Laplace (1991: 51-6) who identifies this reference as one of several that establish Clitophon as analogous to Odysseus on his return to Ithaca, and Thersander to the suitors and Arneus/Irus.

freedman finds himself in an awkward position when they run into Thersander and Sosthenes in the agora and chooses to flee without warning rather than face them (6.5.2 with n.).

Clinias and Satyrus, the former Clitophon's cousin, the latter his *servus callidus*, both act as *praeceptores amoris* to him at various points in the novel, however their role in Bk. 6 is much diminished and they appear only briefly as concerned confidants that visit Clitophon while he is incarcerated (6.14.1-15.1). Clinias, like Clitophon, shares his name with figures from both Plato and Comedy; while Satyrus' name can be read as a reference to the ribald comedy of satyr plays.[163]

2.4 Influences & Intertexts

2.4.1 Prose Fiction

Classifying ancient Greek prose fiction within the genre of 'novel' or 'romance' is a precarious undertaking: no specific generic term existed for it in its own time and seeking to define a strict literary lineage can often result in procrustean theories of pedigree.[164] A number of scholars have expressed a valid scepticism of the use of these terms as catch-all designations for ancient prose fiction. The primary criticism is that defining these texts within certain categories invites a subsequent discernment of their worth in comparison to each other that borders on discrimination. Nonetheless, these terms are widespread and, if only for the sake of discussion, "we must be allowed the anachronism of working with modern [designations]".[165]

---

[163] Whitmarsh 2001: 162.

[164] One oft-cited potential reference is in a letter from the Emperor Julian (331-363 CE) to a priest, warning against the reading of fictitious stories: "ὅσα δέ ἐστιν ἐν ἱστορίας εἴδει παρὰ τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἀπηγγελμένα πλάσματα παραιτητέον, ἐρωτικὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ πάντα ἁπλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα" (*Ep*. 89b 346-9 Bidez). Most scholars are not convinced he is referring to the Greek romantic novels here, but rather romantic historical narratives (e.g. Ruiz-Montero 1996: 34; Whitmarsh 2005a: 607-8; Bowie 1994: 446); but, cf. Henrichs (2011: 304 n. 9) who suggests that it could be a reference to "historical novels such as Chariton". Byzantine scholars referred to the novels variously as "ὑπόθεσις" ('story/plot'), "πλάσματα" ('fiction'), or "δραματικόν" ('dramatic plot'); however, these terms largely refer to the concept of 'plot', rather than a category of genre.

[165] Quote from Holzberg 1996: 1. On the problematic nature of this type of generic labelling, see e.g. Vessey 1991-3: 146-158; Selden 1994: 41-47; Morales 2009.

The five complete novels, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, AT's *L&C*, Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, form the so-called romance canon.[166] The three novelists that are generally held up as prime 'sophistic' examples are AT, Longus, and Heliodorus.[167] Beyond the usual suspects, are the fragmentary novels, such as the *Ninus* romance, our earliest example of the genre (~1st c. BC), or Lollianus' *Phoenicica*, which seems to engage with the macabre and erotic in a way similar to AT;[168] the summaries of the romantic adventure novels of Iamblichus and Antonius Diogenes recorded by Photius (*Bibl*. 94.73b-78a, 166.109a-112a); as well as the bizarre science-fiction adventure of Lucian's *True History*, the satirical picaresque of *The Ass*, or the semi-historiographical *Alexander Romance*, to name only a selection.[169]

The variance in narration, ambition, and approach in this miscellany of prose fiction is such that only the broadest of definitions could encompass them all. Even if restricted to the five renowned romances, there is no guarantee of homogeneity. In essence, they are all concerned with a pair of heterosexual lovers who undergo a number of trials and adventures before they are able to unite in marital bliss.[170] From there, however, it becomes more a variation on a theme: sometimes the couple are married at the beginning of the tale (Charit., X. Eph.) and sometimes at the end (Long., Heliod., AT); sometimes sexual fidelity is maintained (X. Eph., Heliod.), sometimes not (Charit., Long., AT); most include lengthy sea voyaging (Charit., X. Eph., AT, Heliod.), but not always (Long.).[171] Before the current timeline was established by the papyri finds, AT's unorthodox approach to novelistic conventions was viewed largely as an inferior imitation of previous novelists, in particular Heliodorus. However, once it was established that the date of his novel was at least two centuries earlier

[166] On the problematic nature of defining the 'canon' of novels, see e.g. Holzberg 1996: 13-28; Swain 1999: 3-12; Whitmarsh 2013a: 35-48.

[167] Largely, scholars agree that Longus follows (and hence reacts to) AT, although the precise dating remains uncertain (Whitmarsh 2018: 125-9; Bowie 2019: 5). On correspondences between AT and Longus, see further Zeitlin 2017.

[168] On the fragmentary novels, see Stephens and Winkler 1995; on the papyri, Kussl 1991 and Morgan 1998.

[169] For an overview see, e.g. Hägg 1983; Reardon 1991; Holzberg 1995 and 1996; Ruiz-Montero 1996; more generally, Whitmarsh ed. 2008; Cueva and Byrne eds. 2014.

[170] The romantic relationship of these couples is marked by a parity that is seldom evinced in previous literature, see e.g. Winkler 1994: 29-36; Konstan 1994.

[171] For Daphnis and Chloe's 'voyage' as one from innocence to experience, see Chalk 1960; Turner 1960.

than previously conjectured, scholars began to appreciate our author in his own right, prompting a drastic rehabilitation from "insufferably tiresome" to "an accomplished litterateur".[172] AT's unconventional approach to the traditional literary tropes of the romance novels has created the most scope for scholarly engagement, and he has been charged with conducting "a prolonged guerrilla war", "if not outright sabotage", against his own genre.[173] This comically irreverent approach to the tenets of the 'ideal' novel has led to his work being described variously as a pastiche, a parody, an "erotic picaresque", and even "close to burlesque".[174]

When examining the ways in which AT 'pushes the limits' of the genre, what is meant is his place among the so-called canon of 'ideal' romance novels, rather than a comparison with the complete miscellany of ancient prose fiction. In this respect, AT subverts several fundamental generic expectations, the most notable of which is the novel's 'open-ended beginning'. Although the novel concludes in the usual, albeit perfunctory, way of romances, with the reunion and happy marriage of the couple (8.19.2-3), it is Clitophon's solitary and seemingly lovelorn appearance in the opening narrative that raises the most questions (1.2.1). Where is Leucippe, and why is Clitophon now in Sidon when the story closed with their return to Byzantium? Since the framing narrative is not resumed at the end of the novel, none of these questions are answered.[175] This lack of closure was yet further reason for scholars to accuse AT of authorial incompetence or even suggest that the work was incomplete.[176] More recently, however, the failure to return to the frame narrative is viewed as a deliberate narrative technique and a number of theories have been proposed as a solution.[177] Most convincing (and

[172] Respectively, Dunlop 1888: 41 and Chew 2014: 62.

[173] Respectively, Morgan 1995: 142 and Anderson 1982: 23; cf. Brethes' (2012: 130) "urbane guerrilla".

[174] Respectively, Fusillo 1991: 97-108; Chew 2000; Marinčič 2007: 196; Perry 1967: 106. Durham (1938), still under the erroneous timeline, proposed that AT was parodying Heliod. Others have allowed that parts of the novel can verge on parody, but refrain from labelling the entire work as such, cf. Rattenbury 1933: 254-7; Reardon 1971: 365.

[175] Guez (2012: 47-8) suggests that Leucippe's absence is because of the loss of her virginity at the end of the novel, foreshadowed by the ordeal in the cave of Pan and Syrinx where a woman vanishes if she is no longer a virgin (8.6.14): "elle est symboliquement effacée du texte une fois mariée et déflorée".

[176] See summary of scholarship in Rabau 1997: 142-3; Repath 2005: 251-2.

[177] For instance: Bartsch (1989: 168-170) argues that the "intentional omission" could act as a type of metonym for the "often unintegrated" digressions contained in the novel; Hunter (1983: 40) and Winkler

comprehensive) is that of Repath (2005) who situates it squarely as part of AT's general generic non-conformity: "a Greek novel with a non-happy non-ending".[178] A further conspicuous contravention of the established conventions is AT's utilization of first-person narration from the perspective of the hero. This technique is more in keeping with the comic picaresque novels of Lucian's *True Histories* and Ps.-Lucian's *The Ass* in Greek, or Petronius' *Satyricon* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in Latin, than the canonical romances, which are all narrated in the third person.[179] This personal mode of narration naturally imposes limitations on the author's ability to represent the heroine's point of view. Such a restricted perspective is unique among the romances, which are renowned for the congruity with which the lovers are generally portrayed. This lack of mutuality is borne out in the lopsided portrayal of one of the romances' principal *topoi*: love at first sight (e.g. Charit. 1.1.6, X. Eph. 1.3.1-2, Heliod. 3.5.4; see 6.6.3n.). Clitophon falls in love (lust?) at his first glimpse of Leucippe (1.4.2-5), but the heroine takes some wooing before she acquiesces to his advances. The first time Leucippe reciprocates any affection is their first kiss, which Clitophon must coax from her under the pretence of being stung on the lip by a bee (2.7), but even then Clitophon admits he is unsure of her feelings (2.8.1). Really it is only once Leucippe agrees to sleep with him that the reader can be sure that she is equally enamoured (2.19). These rather human, even mundane, elements of the subjective first-person narration contribute to the comic overtones.

In Bk. 6 there are a few ways in which AT transgresses the usual narrative modes of the romances. Foremost is Clitophon's adultery with Melite (5.27-6.1). Although stringently observed in Xenophon and Heliodorus, AT, Longus, and Chariton take a somewhat laxer approach to their protagonists' chastity: Daphnis sleeps with Lycaenion as part of his sexual education (Long. 3.15-19); Callirhoe, in dire straits, chooses to marry Dionysius and pass her

(1989: 284 n. 72) propose that it channels the similar lack of return to the frame in Plato's *Symposium*; Reardon (1994: 94 n. 15) suggests that AT wished to avoid the pedantry of closing the frame; Nakatani (2003: 74-9) that the lack of return leaves open "the possibility of the continuation of the frame story"; and Morales (2004: 143-151) that lack of closure is a recurring theme in the novel and that the unsatisfactory ending is part of his strategy of "encouraging but thwarting desire". For a comprehensive summary of scholarship, see Repath 2005: 250-8; Chew 2012: 75 and 2014: 72-3.

[178] Cf. similarly Fusillo 1997: 220-1; Guez 2008: 341-6. Nimis (1998: 104 and 1999: 215-7) argues against taking a teleological approach to the composition of the Greek novels.

[179] Cf. Jones 2012: 168 n. 239; Chew 2014: 66. See Graverini 2009 on the possible literary interaction between Apuleius and AT.

unborn baby off as his own (Charit. 2.10-11); while Clitophon finds himself obliged to Melite.[180] Although these three have sexual liaisons with other characters for various reasons, they never falter in their ultimate fidelity to their partners, nevertheless Clitophon appears to garner the most criticism for his liaison. No other novelistic hero is referred to as a μοιχός ('adulterer') with the frequency, or vehemency, that Clitophon is. The term μοιχός appears 29 times in the novel and 27 of those instances are with reference to Clitophon.[181] Rather significantly it is he who first brands himself as such, however erroneously (5.19.6).[182] In fact, the frequency with which Clitophon is branded a μοιχός stands in direct contrast to the rate at which παρθένος ('virgin/maiden') is applied to Leucippe (cf. 6.22.1n.).[183] While the latter is to be expected in the novels, the former is a drastic subversion of convention, and in submitting to Melite's wishes Clitophon becomes guilty of the "crime *par excellence* of the Greek novels".[184] The vast majority of novelistic trial scenarios revolve around adultery in one way or another, whether it is the act of adultery itself, or a murder that has somehow resulted from adulterous intrigues. AT subverts the usual novelistic emphasis on the sanctity of marriage by casting his hero as an adulterer, and indeed, there is no real question of Clitophon's guilt, no matter his excuses (cf. 6.1.1n., 6.5.3n.).[185] Despite this, both in the ensuing trials and the mystical tests that follow, Clitophon and Melite are exonerated from all charges of μοιχεία

[180] As Perry (1967: 122-3) points out, the seemingly strict convention of the fidelity and chastity of the *Liebespaar* in the novels is more a suggestion than a stricture.

[181] The term is used of Clitophon in the following instances: 5.19.6, 5.23.5, 6.3.5, 6.5.1, 6.5.3, 6.5.4, 6.9.1 *bis*, 6.9.2, 6.17.1, 6.17.3, 6.20.2, 6.21.2, 8.8.3, 8.8.10 *bis*, 8.8.11, 8.8.13, 8.10.1, 8.10.3, 8.10.4, 8.10.5, 8.10.11 *bis*, 8.10.12 *bis* (cf. Schwartz 2002: 102 and n. 7, who only counts 20 instances in reference to Clitophon). The term is used once to refer to Melite (8.8.13) and once to Thersander (6.21.2). For comparison: μοιχός appears 11 times in Charit., 8 in Heliod., and not once in X. Eph. or Long. Cf. a similar rate of occurrence for μοιχεία (AT 14 instances, Charit. 8, Heliod. 2, Long. and X. Eph. 0) and μοιχεύω (AT 5, Charit. 2, Long. 1, Heliod. and X. Eph. 0).

[182] Compare Chaereas who refers to himself as a μοιχός with respect to his own wife, on learning that Callirhoe has married Dionysius (κινδυνεύσω τάχα καὶ ὡς μοιχὸς τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς ἀπολέσθα, Charit. 3.6.8).

[183] De Temmerman 2014: 170.

[184] Schwartz 2002: 93. Schwartz (2002, 2007, 2016) comprehensively tackles the adultery type-scenes in the romance novels and their ensuing trials.

[185] Schwartz 2002: 98-104.

('adultery') due to Thersander's poor wording of his challenge to his wife (8.11.2).[186] While perhaps to be expected with the anticipation of the usual novelistic 'happy ending', their joint acquittal is nonetheless both heavily ironic and a profound undermining of the apparent pre-eminence of marriage in the novels.

Although AT shows a variegated engagement with other novelists and novelistic convention, conspicuous in Bk. 6 are the intertextual connections with Chariton. One such example is Melite's exposition on the personified Rumour (Φήμη) and Slander (Διαβολή) (6.10.4-6), which, Tilg (2010: 256) proposes, is the "single most extensive passage on Rumour not only in the ideal novels, but in the whole of ancient Greek literature". Of the romance novelists Chariton shows the most engagement with Rumour, which only appears briefly in Longus (p.1.1, 4.25.3) and not at all in Xenophon or Heliodorus.[187] Mostly recently, scholars have argued that Virgil's ekphrasis on Rumour (*Fama*) (*Aen*. 4.173-97) forms the base for the depiction of Φήμη in both Chariton and AT (see 6.10.4-6nn.).[188] The predisposition to disavow Greek interest in Latin literature during the Imperial period means that past scholarship has overlooked the evident allusive interaction between the Greek novels and Latin literature.[189] While the historical milieu of the novel may be curiously 'Roman-less', it does not appear that the same can be said of AT's metaliterary engagement.[190] Tilg (2010: 270) argues for AT's

[186] For a detailed analysis of the trials in Bks. 7 and 8, see Schwartz 2002: 104-9 and 2016: 107-133; see also Webb 2007: 532-7. On the supernatural ordeals, see e.g. Segal 1984; Schwartz 2016: 134-42.

[187] See Bowie 2019: 6.

[188] Tilg 2010: 240-70; also, Jolowicz 2021: 201-2. Hardie (2012: 114-5) finds Tilg's case for Chariton "plausible, if falling short of final proof", but admits that the parallels in AT are "intriguing". But Jolowicz (2021: 188-220) finds much evidence in favour of AT's knowledge of Virgil, as well as that of Chariton (2021: 91-120), and Longus (2021: 255-325).

[189] See Tilg 2010: 271; Jolowicz 2021: 1-16. F. Cairns (2005: 204), for instance, argues that "there is no question of Vergilian influence upon Achilles Tatius: all the sources of this second-century AD Greek novelist are Greek, and there is no reason to think that he knew Latin"; similarly, Reardon 1991: 161.

[190] For instance, AT shares a number of features with the Latin elegists: a penchant for the erotic and ironic, a proclivity for literary allusiveness and innovation, but in particular the first-person, rather self-centred, contemplation of the beloved by a lover of rather dubious masculinity (Jones 2012: 168-172, 261-2). Brethes (2017) explores how AT exploits the discursive erotic strategy (as well as the self-reflexive literariness) of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Amores* particularly in Bks. 1 and 2 in connection with the seduction of Leucippe (similarly, Jones 2012: 227-9). For a fuller examination of AT's engagement with Latin elegy, see Jolowicz (2021: 121-187), who also examines Chariton in this regard (2021: 35-90).

engagement with Rumour as a "cheeky parody" of Vergilian *Fama*, finding that in both Rumour acts "to crush a romantic relationship" (that of Dido and Aeneas in Vergil and Melite and Clitophon in *L&C*). Rumour, however, is not responsible for terminating Clitophon and Melite's dalliance, but rather the unexpected return of their respective partners. It seems unlikely that a fully-fledged parody is intended, rather, like Chariton, Vergilian imagery forms part of the matrix of innovative allusions and intertexts that AT exploits to signal the *paideia* in his novel.

Leucippe's encounter in Ephesus with Sosthenes and Thersander shows a marked parallelism to that of Chariton's Callirhoe, both in Miletus and Babylon.[191] In the Milesian episode, Leonas buys Callirhoe from the pirate Theron to cheer his master Dionysius who is in mourning for his wife, taking her to his country-estate (Charit. 1.12-14). Immediately infatuated by her beauty, Dionysius grows lovesick and turns to his maidservant Plangon to ingratiate him with Callirhoe (Charit. 2.6). While in Babylon, when the Great King Artaxerxes must decide upon Callirhoe's rightful husband, he too succumbs to a great passion for her and turns to his eunuch slave, Artaxates, to win her over for him (Charit. 6.3). In Bk. 6, Leucippe becomes aligned with Callirhoe, Thersander with Dionysius (and to a lesser extent Artaxerxes), and Sosthenes with the various servant go-betweens, such as Plangon and Artaxates (cf. 6.4.1n., 6.11.1n., 6.12.1n., 6.15.2n., 6.18.5n.). Leucippe's alignment with Callirhoe, De Temmerman (2014: 193-4) shows, comes at the same time as her sudden and overt characterisation as "a proper Greek novel heroine", fending off unwanted admirers and declaring her love for the hero. This, he argues, poses the tantalising hermeneutic question of whether it is Clitophon-*auctor* who chooses to characterise Leucippe this way, drawing on his "generic knowledge" of romance novels,[192] or whether it is Leucippe herself (who logically speaking must have filled Clitophon in on events to which he was not witness) who chooses to depict herself as such. Aligning Leucippe with Callirhoe at this stage of the narrative poses a further ominous undercurrent for our heroine, for in the episode in Miletus Callirhoe does in fact marry and (appear to) bear the child of Dionysius. The possibility is thus raised that Leucippe might find herself in some similar position, in which she finds herself obliged to sleep

[191] De Temmerman 2014: 190-4; cf. Owens 2020: 169-70.

[192] Recall the book Clitophon read in the beginning of the novel (1.6.6; Intro. 1.4), which scholars have posed could even be that of Chariton (Morales 2004: 79; cf. Morgan 2007: 117).

with Thersander in order to be reunited with Clitophon (much like Clitophon himself has just done with Melite).

The culmination of Bk. 6, Leucippe's passionate defence of her virginity, demonstrates a return to, and affirmation of, the hallowed novelistic trope of chastity (6.20-22); yet, even this righteous declaration is not without its own irony, evident both in Thersander's derisive disbelief, as well as the implicit exhibitionism of Leucippe's body (Intro. 2.3.2). In the fraught interaction between Thersander and Leucippe, there are a number of echoes with the other romance novelists. Thersander becomes the antithesis to the noble Dionysius or the Great King Artaxerxes, both of whom display the self-control (σωφροσύνη) not to exert their authority over Callirhoe (e.g. Charit. 2.4.1, 2.5.12, 2.6.5, 2.10.1, 6.3.7-8). In contrast to the 'tyrannical' Thersander (6.20.3 with n.), Dionysius scruples over appearing to 'tyrannise' the free Callirhoe (ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλευθέρου…, Charit. 2.6.3). Characters of the novel display a particularly Stoic phlegmatism in the face of torture, rape, sacrifice, or suicide;[193] and Leucippe's predicament here echoes episodes such as Habrocomes' torture due to Manto's false accusation (X. Eph. 2.5-6), Anthia's murder of her attempted rapist (X. Eph. 4.5), and Callirhoe's protestations at being married off (Charit. 7.6.7-9) (the *topos* reaches its apogee in Charicleia's resoluteness to prove her chastity on the burning gridiron, making herself eligible for human sacrifice, Heliod. 10.9). Leucippe's soliloquy, and in fact her entire situation, bear much in common with Anthia's words to herself when she is held captive in the brigands' cave,[194] with Sosthenes and Thersander playing the role of the bandits (6.22.1-3 with nn.). While Thersander's mocking incredulity that the beautiful Leucippe remained a virgin after spending time in the company of pirates (6.21.3 with n.) reflects Rhenaea's mockery of Anthia before she cuts off her hair and sells her to a brothel out of jealousy of her husband's feelings (X. Eph. 5.5.3). And, perhaps ironically considering Leucippe's comment that Thersander 'mimics' his slave (6.18.6 with n.), his own turn of phrase (ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μὴ θέλεις ἐραστοῦ μου πεῖραν λαβεῖν, πειράσῃ δεσπότου, 6.20.2) is found echoed by the slave Cybele, urging Arsace

[193] Perkins 1995: 77-103. Cf. the argument for Clitophon's own Stoic nature, Intro. 2.3.1; and his own appeal for a 'noble death' (μή μοι φθονήσητε θανάτου καλοῦ, 3.17.3); see also 6.22.3n.

[194] Compare: "Οἴμοι, Κλειτοφῶν" (τοῦτο γὰρ ἔλεγε πολλάκις), 6.16.1; ἄνερ Κλειτοφῶν, Λευκίππης μόνης ἄνερ…, 6.16.3; πολλάκις ἀνεβόα εἴποτε λαθεῖν ἠδύνατο, "Ἀβροκόμου μόνον γυνὴ μεῖναι <θέλω>…", X. Eph. 4.5.3.

to have her way with Theagenes (ἐπειδὴ δὲ κατεξανίσταται ὡς ἐρωμένης, λαμβανέτω πεῖραν ὡς δεσποίνης, Heliod. 8.5.10).

2.4.2 Drama

The proliferation of theatrical terms within the text of the novels is indicative of the preoccupation with performance and performativity that so characterized the Imperial Age.[195] The term δρᾶμα has come under particular scrutiny on account of its polysemy: it is used interchangeably of the general plot of the novel, of a story or intrigue within the novel, of a pretence or role assumed by a character, or of an actual theatrical production.[196] As Clitophon tells the anonymous narrator in the preface, it is Tyche (Τύχη) who sets the dramatic action of his story in motion (ἤρχετο τοῦ δράματος ἡ Τύχη, 1.3.3). Unlike Chariton (1.1.4), Xenophon (1.2.1), and Longus (1.7.2, 1.11.1) where Eros initiates the plot, in AT it is Tyche that marshals events.[197] Clinias, in his role as *praeceptor amoris* to Clitophon, urges him to play the role of stage-manager (*khoregos*) to manage the dramatic art of seduction (χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς σου τὸ δρᾶμα, 1.10.7). These remarks are indicative not only of the deep irony with which AT handles the theatricality of his plot and characters, but also of Clitophon's own masquerade as a narrator well-versed in the role of love and its ways. In Bk. 6 the term takes on particular significance as the boundaries of Clitophon's homodiegetic narration begin to blur and the intricate parallel action comes to resemble a staged drama. Indeed, the Priest of Artemis, when addressing Thersander in court, refers to the episode with Leucippe in Bk. 6 as a drama (τὸ γὰρ δρᾶμά σου τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἠκούσαμεν, 8.9.13); and Clitophon tells us that

---

[195] Marini 1991: 242-3; see also Létoublon and Genre 2014: 361.

[196] Cf. Hermog. *Prog*. 2.12-13 "τὸ δὲ πλασματικόν, ὃ καὶ δραματικὸν καλοῦσιν". See Walden 1894; Bartsch 1989: 109-43; Marini 1991: 236-243; Paulsen 1992: 21-41.

[197] Nakatani (2003: 65-6) argues that the influence of Eros and Tyche in the novel wane as it progresses for the story to achieve closure; whereas Chew (2012: 76-9) finds Eros subordinate to Tyche, who is in control of bringing the novel to its culmination. The disagreement can be ascribed to AT's intentionally ambiguous employment of Tyche-personified and tyche-abstracted in the novel. In the modern text this is distinction is differentiated by the capitalization of the first letter, however this is an editorial choice and not all editors agree. In Bk. 6 Tyche appears six times (6.3.1, 6.3.6, 6.9.3, 6.13.1, 6.13.2, 6.16.1), and in a survey of AT's primary editors (Vilborg and Garnaud), English translators (Gaselee, Winkler, and Whitmarsh), O'Sullivan's lexicon, and Nakatani's (2003) review, universal agreement is only reached in three cases (abstract concept: 6.9.3, 6.16.1; personification: 6.13.2).

Tyche had a new drama in store for him (ἐμοὶ δὲ ἡ συνήθης Τύχη πάλιν ἐπιτίθεται καὶ συντίθεται κατ' ἐμοῦ δρᾶμα καινόν, 6.3.1), anticipating the sudden turn of events when Thersander and Sosthenes recognise him despite his feminine disguise (καί με ὁ Σωσθένης πρῶτος γνωρίσας, 6.5.1).

Recognition (*anagnorisis*) is a pivotal dramatic convention that is inextricably linked to good or bad fortune and AT appears to follow Aristotle's definition of the 'best kind' of tragic recognition in that it leads to a change of fortune for Clitophon (Arist. *Poet*. 1452a29-33).[198] Clitophon's recognition scene, however, shows both tragic and comic elements. New Comedy portrayed its heroes as continuously persecuted by the vicissitudes of fate, but usually recognition leads to a happy ending (e.g. Men. *Epit*. 1121).[199] AT uses dramatic terms to emphasise both the theatricality inherent in the various characters' speeches and the bombast with which they are delivered.[200] For instance, Sosthenes' dramatic embellishment of Leucippe's beauty to Thersander is described as 'declaiming in a tragic style' (κατατραγῳδοῦντος αὐτῆς τὸ κάλλος, 6.4.4). Derived from the word τραγῳδία ('tragedy'), both κατατραγῳδέω and its counterpart τραγῳδέω are used of embellished oratorical speech that is meant to be persuasive, whether in seduction or in the courtroom (e.g. 5.25.4, 6.4.4, 8.1.5, 8.9.7, 8.10.4; see 6.4.4n.). Extremely important is the notion of persuasion, as these characters are constantly engaged in a performance to convince their listeners of their own version of events (cf. 6.3.4n., 6.10.2n.). As Morales (2004: 61-2) describes, AT's novel "emphatically tropes its world as a play and its characters as assuming roles and donning disguises". This is rather literally depicted in Leucippe's choice to resume her dramatic role (ὑπόκρισις) as Lacaena the Thessalian slave-girl in order to protect Clitophon (6.16.6 with n.).

AT revels in the layered metatheatricality of his novel, exploiting the reverberations of mythological scenarios from highest tragedy to lowest pantomime. When Clitophon dresses in in Melite's clothing there are several oblique references to episodes of disguise and escape depicted in drama. First, Melite compares him to Achilles on Skyros, the topic of a fragmentary play, *The Skyrioi* (*TrGF* 5 64), by Euripides (6.1.3 with n.); then the guard's surprise at his

[198] On interpreting Aristotle, see MacFarlane 2000: 371-80.

[199] See Montiglio 2013: 225-31.

[200] Cf. Michael Psellus, who describes AT's diction as "δημοτικωτάτην οὖσαν καὶ θεατρικωτάτην παντάπασιν" (*De Heliodoro et Achille Tatio iudicium* 71 = *Test*. VI).

disappearance is likened to the substitution of "the deer in place of the maiden", alluding to Iphigenia switched at the altar as depicted in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (6.2.3 with n.); and finally, when he is discovered by Thersander and Sosthenes, the latter decries him as "playing the bacchant", a reference to Pentheus' similar appearance when attempting to infiltrate a gathering of maenads in Euripides' *Bacchae* (6.5.1 with n.). Euripides' tragedies were better suited to the novelists' literary approach in that their stories were more realistic, more emotionally centred, more focused on individual characters and their adventures, and showed a world ruled more by Fate than divine fiat.[201] Tragedy is a precarious genre for the novelists to engage with, since they have "to avoid too close an imitation that could dangerously approach the tragic end".[202] Thus, largely, specific textual references tend to be avoided in favour of an engagement within a more general matrix of tragic allusion.[203]

The mythological and dramatic allusions are focused through multiple lenses, and the rather ludicrous nature of Clitophon's escape lends the comparisons a bathetic affect, bringing the theatrical reference closer to comedy than tragedy. AT shows a familiarity with the genre of comedy as it is depicted on stage, in particular the New Comedy of Menander.[204] The influence of New Comedy in the novels is detectable on a number of levels: the focus on private individuals and their domestic complications, the portrayal of young love and the challenges it faces to come to fulfilment, concerns with identity and recognition, chastity assailed, and matrimonial strategy.[205] The considerable parallel action in *L&C* brings AT closer to New Comedy than any of his fellow novelists.[206] As shown (Intro. 2.3), New Comedy's stock characters are easily seen reflected in the personalities of the Greek novels: the tricky slave, the blushing virgin, the young hero, the hero's friend, the provocative older woman, and the parental figure that serves as an obstacle to the young couple's love.[207] Clitophon in particular

[201] Fusilllo 1991: 31. Cf. Intro. 2.3.2, on Leucippe's connection with Euripides' *Helen*.

[202] Létoublon and Genre (2014: 353). Cf. Konstan (1994: 176) who attributes it to the "relatively limited role assigned to *erōs* in Greek tragedy".

[203] Fusillo 1991: 38.

[204] Cf. e.g. Reardon 1994: 92; Konstan 1994; 141; Smith 2014: 344. Also, May (2006: 26) who points out the proliferation of archaeological evidence for appreciation of both Menander and Euripides during the 2nd c. CE.

[205] See Reardon 1974: 23; Fusillo 1991: 41-51; Létoublon and Genre 2014: 354-5; Smith 2014: 323-5.

[206] Reardon 1994: 90.

[207] Thus, Heiserman 1977: 129; Létoublon and Genre 2014: 354; Smith 2014: 325.

seems modelled along the lines of Menandrean heroes, who "are more hapless than bold, and… depend to a great extent on luck, which manifests itself through the brilliantly contrived coincidences".[208] Tyche as instigator of the drama in *L&C* may also reflect New Comedy's similar emphasis of the role (take the example of Tyche's prologue to the drama in Menander's *Aspis*).[209] The choice of homodiegetic narration in *L&C* seems to play into a number of tropes present in New Comedy: the story is given from the hero's perspective, leading to a more muted role for the heroine;[210] this in turn also allows for the depiction of asymmetrical love at first sight;[211] in addition, the realism of a first-person perspective in the novel lends itself to the same comic play on human sentiments as seen on the stage.[212] It may also be possible to view Clitophon's narration of events that happened while he was not present as a narrative representation of the dramatic technique of having a character report what is happening off-stage. Bk. 6 with its farcical recognition scenes, comical mad dashes, and rapid switches between characters comes closest to the action of the comic plot.

While Euripidean tragedy and Menandrean comedy form part of the background to AT's dramatic appreciation, the performing arts of mime and pantomime were the theatrical works *du jour* of the Imperial Age.[213] Alexandria was often looked upon as the 'home' of mime,[214] and we might imagine AT was particularly familiar, even fond of this theatrical genre (cf. Intro. 1.1). The novelists engage with mimic performance in a number of ways, such as Dryas' pantomime of the grape harvest in *Daphnis and Chloe* (Long. 2.36), or the mention made in *L&*C of a performer who gives dramatic Homeric re-enactments (3.20.4). Mignogna, in particular, has shown the profundity of AT's interaction with both mime and pantomime.[215]

---

[208] Quote from Konstan 1995: 4.

[209] Cf. Fusillo 1991: 41; Brethes 2007: 39-45; Traill 2008: 130; Smith 2014: 324. See further refs. in Fusillo 1991: 113 n. 58. For an in-depth study of Tyche in Menander (including the problems of capitalization), see Vogt-Spira 1992: 1-74, and 75-88 on Tyche in the *Aspis*.

[210] Chew 2000: 60.

[211] Létoublon and Genre 2014: 325.

[212] Cf. Fusillo 1991: 47; Reardon 1994: 92.

[213] See Perry 1967: 55-7; Mignogna 1997: 226; May 2006: 11; Webb 2013: 285. Pantomime was the performance through choreographed dance of mythological scenes by a single dancer; mime, on the other hand, was a riotous and slapstick scripted stage play with several mask-less actors.

[214] Reynolds 1946: 77; Wiseman 2008: 147; cf. Cic. *Rab. Post*. 35.

[215] Mignogna 1996a proposes a connection between the shorn Leucippe as she appears in the final books of the novel (5.17.3 onwards) and a papyrus that describes a mime in which a character called Leucippe is in a

Bk. 6 offers several links between AT and pantomime's staging of transvestite myths, such as the tale of Achilles on Skyros,[216] as well as the cross-dressing Pentheus, a favourite topic of mimic performers.[217] On a larger scale, the extramarital shenanigans and overt sexuality of the interactions between Melite, Clitophon, and Thersander that occupy the end of Bk. 5 and the beginning of Bk. 6 show an unmistakable intertext with the adultery-themed mimes.[218] Unlike New Comedy, mime could depict citizen woman as taking part in the licentious affairs portrayed on stage,[219] and the adultery mime was made up of three main characters: the wanton wife, the hood-winked husband, and the adulterer with whom the wife was invariably caught in the act and who would need to be concealed from the husband in some way (see 6.3.5n., 6.11.1n.).[220] As Webb (2013: 295-7) shows, AT's engagement with mimic adultery displays his usual irregular approach to generic paradigms: Thersander's initial attack on Clitophon happens before any adulterous sex has taken place, and in any event, Melite assumed herself a widow when she embarked on her relationship with Clitophon. Ironically, the actual act of adultery is postponed until after Thersander has accused him of the crime. What follows, such as Clitophon's rollicking escape and re-capture, as well as Melite's complicated re-working of the truth for her husband's benefit, shows further affinities with the adultery mimes.

Leucippe and Sosthenes' verbal sparring (6.11.3-13.4) is marked by a series of ripostes and rejoinders in which the respondent picks up on a word or phrase of the previous speaker, amplifying, emphasizing, or subverting the initial meaning. This kind of agonistic exchange is very close in spirit to the stichomythia of drama, in which alternating characters duel in brief

---

barber's shop with all the implements of haircutting present (*P. PBerol* inv. 13927). While Mignogna 1997 links the scene of Leucippe's disembowelment (3.15-22) with the *Charition* mime (*P. Oxy*. III 413) which itself drew on Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Attempts to link novels with discrete mimes are attractive, yet a paucity of literary evidence hinders any firm connections (cf. Konstan 1994: 167; Morales 2004: 71; Webb 2013: 287-6).

[216] Morales 2004: 73; cf. Lucian *Salt*. 46.11, Lib. *Or*. 64.

[217] Cf. Hunt 2008: 175, 183; Slater and Cropp 2009: 75.

[218] See esp. Mignogna 1996b, who argues that the final books of the novel closely resemble adultery mimes, although in mime it is the husband who is vindicated (cf. Morales 2004: 71-2; Webb 2013: 290). Further on the adultery mime in general, see Reynolds 1946; Kehoe 1984.

[219] Konstan 1994: 162-6.

[220] Cf. Panayotakis 2006: 128; Webb 2008: 105-7 and 2013: 287.

lines of dialogue frequently marked by repetition and antithesis.[221] The repartee between Leucippe and Sosthenes leads up to her own dramatic monologue (6.16; see Intro. 2.4.3). Bk. 6 features by far the most direct speech allocated to Leucippe in the novel[222] and it is revealing of Clitophon-*auctor*'s inherent fascination with performativity that he should turn to dramatic modes of dialogue when giving voice to his heroine. In fact, Sosthenes appears to be taking on the role (usually associated with women) in mime of the προκυκλίς/μαστροπός ('procuress/pimp') that talks up the attractiveness of a potential lover to a respectable woman, just as is depicted in Herodas' first mimiambus. The same mimiambus gives a lavish encomium to Egypt (1.26-35), and we know that Herodas was still circulated there in the 2nd c. CE,[223] and so it may be that AT had this trope in mind. Mimiambi were performed by a single actor who played and voiced all the roles, and perhaps it is possible to find some analogy with Clitophon-*auctor* (and indeed the novelist himself) who must alone give voice to each of his characters. It is also worth noting that Chariton's novel has been singled out as being made up in a large part of direct speech, containing passages of "lively and rapid dialogue", leading Hägg (1983: 16) to observe that the novel "stands closest to the comedies of Menander". Considering that in the scenes with Sosthenes in Bk.6, Leucippe is refracting the character of Callirhoe (Intro. 2.4.1), and given the emphasis on dramatic guises and techniques, attention is drawn to the theatrical masquerade inherent in her assumption of this role.

2.4.3 Rhetoric & Declamation

AT is well-known for his rhetorical predilection, and he intersperses his novel with an assortment of discursive digressions.[224] The 'function' of these descriptive tangents has been much conjectured and forms a large part of the literary scholarship on AT. Initially, these inserts were viewed at best as incidental ornamentation and at worst as needless divagations that detracted from the thrust of the narrative.[225] Recent scholars have argued that the various

[221] See Hancock 1917: 26-49; cf. also Goldhill 1997: 127-35.

[222] See Repath 2013: 246 n. 30 for a full list of the instances of direct speech attributed to Leucippe.

[223] See Cunningham 1971: 1-17.

[224] As noted above (Intro. 1.1), he may indeed have been a professional sophist (cf. Bowie 1994: 448).

[225] Cf. Perry 1967: 119; Gaselee 1917: 341; McDermott 1989: 33. See further summary of 'negative' scholarship at Hägg 1971: 108-9; Whitmarsh 2011a: 239 n. 141.

digressions serve a more complex narrative function: as proleptic indicators,[226] as structural partitions,[227] as programmatic of male sexual fantasy,[228] as displays of encyclopaedic knowledge,[229] as compositional pauses while the author generates narrative,[230] or as metonymic of novelistic composition.[231] These narratorial asides read almost as a compendium of sophistic declamations, including paradoxographical accounts, ekphrases on places and paintings, lengthy monologues in character, as well as captious forensic speeches. Although initially scholars argued that the novels were a product of the declaimers' canon,[232] most agree that both came to be as a shared product of the general context of the Second Sophistic.[233] The intrinsic connection between *eros* and rhetoric is confirmed at two critical moments in the novel: first by Clinias counselling Clitophon on his strategy for wooing Leucippe (αὐτοδίδακτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σοφιστής, 1.10.1); and then again after Melite's articulate protestation at her lack of sexual satisfaction from Clitophon (διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ λόγους, 5.27.1; αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστὴς, 5.27.4).[234] The link between seduction and sophistic persuasion is clear, and Eros, unlike the rhetoricians, does not appear to need any formal training in declamation in order to achieve his ends. While Eros may not need instruction in the sophistic ways, AT, on the other hand, has been charged with "[setting] himself the task of making the whole rhetorical curriculum relevant to romance".[235] AT's inclusion of elements found in the *Progymnasmata*, however, must be considered within the broader narratorial context of the novel, as Webb (2007: 536) shows:[236]

> Is Achilles Tatius' use of progymnasmatic forms simply the result of the author's technical incompetence and the dead hand of rhetorical training? Or is there more to it? One reason may be the characterisation of the narrator: Cleitophon's use of undigested exercises may be read as a sign of his youth and inexperience. But a further effect of the visible rhetorical

[226] Bartsch 1989: 40-79.

[227] Nakatani 2003: 67-73.

[228] Morales 2004: 96-151. Cf. Whitmarsh 2011a: 243-6.

[229] Fusillo 1991: 67-76; cf. Bakhtin 1981: 88.

[230] Nimis 1998: 100-4 and 1999: 215-7.

[231] Whitmarsh 2009a: 45-7.

[232] Rohde 1914: 336-60.

[233] Russell 1983: 38; Webb 2007; Laird 2008: 212-6.

[234] Cf. Pl. *Symp*. 203d, Xen. *Cyr*. 6.1.41, Long. 4.18.1.

[235] Anderson 1982: 43.

[236] Cf. also Hock 1997: 454-65; Anderson 1993: 162.

> nuts and bolts in Achilles Tatius' text is to make us aware of the artifice underpinning the narration. Technical rhetoric thus serves a self-reflexive purpose, not allowing us to forget that we are reading a verbal representation.

Although I have been referring to these various asides generally as digressions, this in itself implies a value judgement on their worth in comparison to the 'main' narrative.[237] It is clear from the brief conspectus above that much of AT's engagement with sophistic declamation forms part of his broader approach to novelistic narrative. As mentioned (Intro 2.2), Morgan (2007) argues that Clitophon's attempts at oratory reveal his character to be rather feeble; Miguélez-Cavero (2010) expands on this argument, identifying AT's portrayal of Clitophon's oratorical ineptness as a subtle jab at the reader, likely a similarly educated and oratorically trained man (Intro. 1.4). Billault (2006), on the other hand, takes a milder approach, arguing that in intertwining his narrative with rhetoric, AT is sharing his deep fondness with oratory with his reader. These two viewpoints do not necessarily preclude each other, and it is entirely characteristic of AT's erratic approach to convention that he should both undermine, and affirm, sophistic oratory at the same time. As Whitmarsh (2011a: 243) puts it: "Digressivism in AT is not just an authorial tic, but a narratorial mode that is carefully theorised".

Of the digressions in *L&C*, those that have diverted the most scholarly attention are the descriptions of paintings: Europa and the bull (1.1), Andromeda and Perseus (3.6-7), Prometheus and Heracles (3.8), and the Rape of Philomela (5.3). It has long been argued that these works of art have an allegorical and proleptic function within the narrative.[238] Although Bk. 6 does not contain a description of an artistic work, it does incorporate an allusion to an act of literary 'viewing' in Melite's comparison of Clitophon to Achilles in a painting that could potentially be interpreted along similar lines (6.1.3 with n.). Bartsch (1989: 40-79) famously contends that the elements of foreshadowing intimated by the descriptions of paintings are often not met in the way we might expect, contributing a bathetic effect to the mythic allegory. It may be possible to read Melite's comparison of Clitophon to a painting of Achilles on Skyros in a similar way: first, that an unmasking of Clitophon's transvestite disguise is imminent, as artworks of this episode in Achilles' life often depict him in the process

[237] Cf. Morales (2004: 98): "It is not sufficient to lump them all together under the label 'digression'. They engage the reader in a variety of ways, with differing functions and pleasures".

[238] See e.g. Harlan 1965; Mittelstadt 1967; Anderson 1979; Bartsch 1989; Zimmerman 1999; Laplace 2007: 107-146; Repath 2015; McHugh 2020. *Contra*, Garson 1978: 85; Hägg 1971: 239-41.

of unveiling; and second, that Clitophon is on the verge of returning to the action of the narrative as an active agent, just as Achilles reclaims his heroic destiny by continuing on to Troy. The first of these expectations is quickly fulfilled, as Clitophon is recognised despite his feminine attire, with Sosthenes and Thersander playing the role of Odysseus and Diomedes (6.5.1). The second expectation, however, is completely deflated, as Clitophon does not rise to his heroic calling in the manner of a young Achilles, but instead is immediately and unceremoniously re-imprisoned (6.5.3).

More recently, the paradoxographical digressions have come under similar scholarly treatment, for instance: the accounts of the phoenix (3.25), the elephant and the hippopotamus (4.2-5), the Nile crocodile (4.19), the peacock (1.16), and the Nile River (4.11-12).[239] Through these studies, as with the scholarship on paintings within *L&C*, it has emerged that there is a complex network of *topoi* and allusions throughout the narrative. In Bk. 6 the ekphrasis of Leucippe's tearful eye (6.7.1-3) has not received much scholarly attention in this respect, despite its elaborate intratextual engagement with previous descriptions (cf. 6.7.1n., 6.7.2n.). The significance of an ekphrasis – a rhetorical exercise centred on viewing – that describes the eye – the organ for viewing – is immense in a novel that is itself so preoccupied with sight and the power of the gaze.[240] The *Progymnasmata* uniformly emphasise the importance of vividness (ἐνάργεια) in the composition of ekphrasis so that what is described is made manifest as if it is actually being seen.[241] AT takes this to its most absurd logical conclusion and brings vividly before the eye the eye itself. This ekphrasis represents the culmination of a series of recurring *topoi* that reach their apogee in the locus of Leucippe's eye. In particular, the flowers that garland her eye connect this ekphrasis with several previous ekphrases that form part of the larger motif of the 'floralizing' of Leucippe (see 6.7.2n.). McHugh (2020) has argued convincingly that the name of the fictional artist of the Andromeda/Perseus painting, Euanthes, is a means to connect the "visual and rhetorical" in *L&C*, an "in-joke" for the reader, as εὐανθής ('flowery/rich in flowers') was used by rhetoricians to describe florid diction, coming to be connected with the art of ekphrasis in the Imperial period (e.g. Ael. Theon *Prog*. 119.31-120.1, Lucian *Dom*. 9.4-8). McHugh's insight can be extrapolated to include the continual floral imagery throughout the text. Not only, then, are the flowers important as a symbol of feminine

[239] See e.g. Baker 2018; LeVen 2018; Hilton 2018; Fredericksen 2018.

[240] See esp. Morales 2004: 136-140; further, Intro. 2.4.4.

[241] Ael. Theon *Prog*. 119.28-9, Aphth. *Prog*. 10.36.22-3, Hermog. *Prog*. 10.1-2, Nic. Rhet. *Prog*. 68.8-12.

sexuality, but they are a quite literal indicator of AT's florid prose. After Bk. 6, the flowery allusions diminish dramatically, as elaborate ekphrases make way for the forensic oratory of Bks. 7 and 8. That the eye should be the site for the concluding encapsulation of this predominant and pervasive imagery seems entirely fitting in this visually engrossed (and engrossing) novel.

It is indicative of AT's multivalent approach to rhetoric that in the same oratorical climax of erotic vision Clitophon indulges in two lengthy *gnomai*.[242] The first introduces the ekphrasis of Leucippe's disembodied tearful eye; while the second *gnome* picks up the notion of the Phaedran stream of beauty (6.6.4; see Intro. 2.4.4), bringing it into syzygy with the stream of tears. De Temmerman (2007a) gives a succinct yet thorough study of Clitophon's sententious narration, providing an analysis of the *gnomai* in *L&C* and the specifics of their categorisation if considered under the labels provided in the *Progymnasmata*.[243] Thus, the two *gnomai* might be subcategorised: the statement that the eye is made more prominent by crying (6.7.1 δάκρυον γάρ…) is followed by a *paraphrasis* ('paraphrase/rewording') that qualifies the statement in a conditional (6.7.1 κἂν μὲν ἄμορφος…), and the corresponding *aitia* ('reason' for its legitimacy) further embellishes the description of the eye (6.7.2 χεομένης δέ…); while the statement that a woman's tears are more likely to elicit pity from onlookers (6.7.4 ἔστι μὲν γάρ…) is also paraphrased in a conditional (6.7.4 ἐὰν δέ…), with an *aitia* that relies on Platonic imagery (6.7.5 ἐπειδὴ γάρ…). In the case of the latter *gnome*, Clitophon-*auctor* builds upon the sententious statements with a syllogistic argument: if the woman is beautiful, and the onlooker her lover, the sight of her crying will elicit sympathetic tears that the lover attempts to use as evidence of his true love, just as, he concludes, Thersander is doing now (6.7.6-7). As De Temmerman (2014: 180) shows in a later study:

> Clitophon seems to adopt maxims as heuristic devices: he bridges a gap in his factual knowledge by using deduction on the basis of what he considers to be general truths. Because of the (supposedly) universal nature of these axioms, Clitophon can (or believes he can) reconstruct the inner emotions of the subjects of his narrative.

[242] *Gnomai* are axiomatic statements that either clarify the topic at hand or, more generally, are designed to counsel for or against a thing or action (e.g. Hermog. *Prog*. 4.1-3, Aphth. *Prog*. 10.7.2-7). Several scholars have compiled lists of *gnomai* in AT, De Temmerman (2007a: 17-21) identifies 83; Morales (2000: 73-4) 37, later revised to 40 (2004: 109-10); and Scarcella (1987: 269) 58.

[243] See De Temmerman 2007a: 3, 18, his categories are based on the subheadings in Hermog. *Prog*. 4 and Apth. *Prog*. 10.8.

Clitophon uses sententious statements as an extension of *ethopoeia* (ἠθοποιία), that is, the creation of a speech in character meant to embody the person in question.[244] Considering, Melite and Sosthenes' preoccupation with persuasion in Bk. 6, it is only natural that *gnomai* would form part of the hortatory injunctions that make up much of their speech.[245] Both Sosthenes and Melite walk a fine line between credibility and contrivance in their speeches aimed at convincing Thersander (the same fine line, it could be argued, that the novelist must negotiate in the creation of his own work of fiction). In his role as go-between, Sosthenes resorts to *gnomai* to persuade both Thersander and Leucippe (e.g. 6.13.4, 6.17.4 with nn.); while Melite's peroration on Slander and Rumour (6.10.4-6) is considered a *gnome* employed to convince Thersander (see *infra*). Some scholars have argued that the inclusion of *gnomai* lends the novel a sense of realism,[246] but this can also be taken as an extension of De Temmerman's argument for *ethopoeia*, as the more realistically engaged the speech of the character is, the more believable the character.

As has been established, all instances of characters' speech throughout Clitophon's narrative need to be read through the focalization of Clitophon as narrator (Intro. 2.2). This consideration is important in Bk. 6 when the conventions of first-person narration are stretched to their limits and characters are depicted as giving lengthy speeches outside of Clitophon's presence. One such example is Leucippe's lament (6.16), overheard by Thersander and Sosthenes outside the hut in which she is held captive. While this may at first glance appear as a unique opportunity to give the heroine voice, as Morgan (2007) warns us, it is also likely to be an example of what Clitophon imagines she would have suitably said at the time; and this narratorial manipulation of character and persona is made implicitly manifest in the theatrical metaphors with which Leucippe concludes her soliloquy (6.16.6 with n.). Leucippe's lament, like many such speeches in the novel, provides further opportunity for the display of rhetorical accomplishment.[247] The multiplicity of *Scheintoden* in *L&C* mean that Clitophon is a repeat

[244] De Temmerman 2007a: 5-6; cf. Hermog. *Prog*. 9.1-2, Aphth. *Prog*. 10.34.2-10.35.14, Nic. Rhet. *Prog*. 63.11-2.

[245] The term πιθανός and its cognates appear most frequently in Bk. 6 (five of eleven instances in the novel), demonstrating the orientation toward rhetorical strategies of persuasion.

[246] Morgan 1993: 202; Morales 2004: 108. Cf. Scarcella (1987: 269) who views them as embellishments.

[247] Cf. Birchall 1996: 1-4; Webb 2007: 530. The most thorough study of lament in the Greek tradition is Alexiou (2002 = 1974), while Birchall (1996), with the aid of Alexiou's findings, analyses the lament in the Greek novels (although not this speech).

offender (3.10, 3.16.3-5, 5.7.8, 7.5), which he himself ironically acknowledges (μὴ γὰρ θρηνῶν ἀνεπαυσάμην;, 7.5.2);[248] while Charicles' death inspires a 'competition of lamentations' (θρήνων ἅμιλλα, 1.14.1) between his father and Clinias (1.13-14).[249]

Although Leucippe's lament is inspired by her ill-fortune rather than a death,[250] her rhetorical strategy remains close to the expected forms of lamentation. She makes use of the usual rhetorical figures of lamentatious speech, such as apostrophe, anaphora, assonance, asyndeton, and rhetorical questions (see 6.16.1-6nn.).[251] Furthermore, as Alexiou (2002: 131-50) shows, laments follow a tripartite construction of A) (direct) address; B) narrative; A) (renewed) address, usually modified by the intervening narrative. Leucippe begins her lament with an address to Clitophon (6.16.1-2), then recounts the difficulties she faced in enquiring after him (6.16.2-3), this forms the springboard for two imagined speeches: one aimed at Clitophon (6.16.3-4), followed by one aimed at Thersander (6.16.4-6). She closes with a direct address, but this time to Thersander rather than Clitophon (ἀλλ' οὐδέ…, 6.16.6), concluding that she should maintain her disguise. By shifting in addressee from Clitophon to Thersander, the A-B-A structure is also utilized as a means to accentuate the "balance of opposites", another intrinsic hallmark of laments.[252] In particular the contrast is that of past and present, which can be seen in Leucippe's two imagined addresses: the first detailing what she wishes she had said to Clitophon in the past, and the second what she wishes she could say to Thersander now (cf. 6.16.4n.). Her formation of past versus present is constructed in such a way as to foreground the antithetical nature of the two men and her feelings towards them.

Leucippe's manner of speaking shows a similar rhetorical capacity in her tirade against Thersander (6.21-22). Her theatrical defiance of the aspersions that Thersander casts upon her virginity plays on the histrionic courtroom mimesis of declamation, especially as illustrated in Seneca's *Controversiae*.[253] In Sen. *Contr*. 1.2, for instance, a virgin priestess is kidnapped by

[248] On this lament, see Webb 2007: 531; Whitmarsh 2011a: 208-9.

[249] On which, see Alexiou 2002: 152; Whitmarsh 2020: 164, 167-71.

[250] The lament need not be inspired by another's death, but also one's own fate or troubles, cf. e.g. X. Eph. 4.6.6-7, 5.7.2, 5.8.7-9, Charit. 1.14.7-10, 5.1.4-7, 5.5.2-4, Heliod. 5.2.7-10; and in tragedy, Eur. *Med*. 96-130, *Hipp*. 669-79, *Andr*. 384-420, Soph. *Phil*. 782-805.

[251] See Birchall 1996: 9-12; Webb 2007: 531.

[252] Quote from Alexiou 2002: 185, see 165-184; also, Birchall 1996: 9-10.

[253] The following draws from both Morales 2004: 200, 213-4 and van Mal-Maeder 2007: 141-2.

pirates and sold to a brothel; despite murdering a soldier to maintain her chastity, the arguments made against the girl emphasise the taint on her chastity by mere association. While Leucippe's injunctions that she be tortured one body part at a time are strikingly like that of Sen. *Contr*. 1.7.9, in which the declaimer takes the role of an estranged father, offering his body for the same tortures that his son suffered at the hands of pirates (cf. 6.21.1-2 with nn.). In comparison with the wordless mime of Leucippe's ritual slaughter (3.15), here she describes a mimed display of her own body, offering it for torture through the "deictic forms" of Senecan declamation.[254] Leucippe's imperturbability when faced with the threat of torture echoes the forbearance of such characters as, 'The Woman who was Tortured by the Tyrant for her Husband's Sake' (*Torta a Tyranno Pro Marito*, Sen. *Contr*. 2.5), and, in this respect, "Leucippe's speech conforms to good Roman – and Stoic – values".[255]

The adulterous liaisons of wives and the furore that follows are a familiar topic of courtroom declamation (esp. Lysias' famous oration *On the Murder of Eratosthenes*), and AT draws on the themes and vocabulary of the lawcourts to give his narrative a juridical verisimilitude. Due to the "cultural prohibition of women from speaking in court", Melite's private petition to Thersander (6.9-10) acts essentially as her *apologia* on the charge of adultery.[256] Although the initial charge of the trial in Bk. 7 is that of adultery (see 6.5.3n.), Clitophon's surprising self-accusation means that it becomes a trial for the 'murder' of Leucippe and, as such, the charge of adultery is never formally addressed. In her astute analysis of the trial scenes in Bks. 7 and 8 of the novel, Schwartz (2016: 105-7) includes Melite's monologue in defence of herself here as part of a "tetralogy" of speeches from the first trial (7.7-16).[257] She divides Melite's "formal oration" into "proem (6.9.2), argument (6.9.2-6), short narration (6.9.6-7), and lengthy peroration (6.10.2-6)".[258] Nonetheless, it is possible to delve a

[254] On which, Corbeill 2020: 130-1; on the blurring of the lines between 'orator and actor', see Webb 2006: 40-1 (cf. Lucian *Salt*. 65).

[255] Morales 2004: 203; cf. Bouffartigue (2001: 137): "Leucippé est (ou devient) une stoïcienne".

[256] Schwartz 2016: 105; similarly, van Mal-Maeder 2007: 140.

[257] There other three are: Clitophon accusing himself (7.7), Clinias speaking in Clitophon's defence (7.9), and Thersander's accusation (7.11) (see Schwartz 2016: 107-114).

[258] Schwartz 2016: 109. There are many headings and sub-headings for the classification of Greek and Roman declamations, nonetheless, the fundamental parts are usually divided into four: the *prooimion*/*exordium* (introduction), the *diegesis*/*narratio* (statement of facts, or account of what happened),

little deeper into the narration and argument portions of the speech since, as de Brauw (2007: 193-5) shows, in legal declamation the narration is often combined with the argument portion of the speech and can function "as a form of proof in and of itself". Thus, Melite's speech could be divided as follows: proem (ἔν οὖν… ἄκουσον, 6.9.2), narration/proof (ὁ νεανίσκος… τῆς θαλάσσης, 6.9.2), argument (6.9.3-5), narration/proof (6.9.6), proof (6.9.7), peroration (6.10.2-6). In this way Melite carefully incorporates the verifiable parts of her narration within her argument to lend credibility to her version of events. Leucippe's *apologia* in defence of her virginity to her mother Pantheia (2.25.1-2) shows a similar blend of fact and fiction.[259] In this respect, both women are portrayed as having the rhetorical nous to defend their sexual escapades, and it is worth noting that Clitophon-*auctor* recounts these speeches in their 'own words'. Once more it is not clear how Clitophon has knowledge of this private exchange between Melite and her husband and it may be that Clitophon has a vested interest in continuing to portray Melite as highly skilled in persuasive declamation, considering his own earlier submission to her entreaties (5.25-27). There is a kind of droll deflection in the decision to have Melite give the only formal defence for their adultery, whereas Clitophon, in his telling, modestly bypasses the issue (8.5.2).

Melite concludes her mendacious *apologia* with a persuasive peroration meant to arouse *pathos* in Thersander (6.10.2-6). She employs a variety of rhetorical techniques, and accordingly scholars have also classified her peroration as variously a *psogos* or an extended *gnome*.[260] It is indicative of the extensive engagement with rhetorical exercises and techniques throughout the novel that Melite's address fits easily into either of these categories. She delivers her personification of Rumour (Φήμη) and Slander (Διαβολή) with a practiced rhetorical hand that foreshadows many of the techniques employed in the much lengthier discourse given by Clitophon-*auctor* on the war between Desire (Ἔρως) and Anger (Θυμός) that takes place within Thersander (6.19) (see Intro. 2.4.4). Both duos are envisaged existing in close concert (6.10.4, 6.19.1), although not exact equals (6.10.5, 6.19.1-2), which invites a balanced consideration of their dispositions described in a catachrestic mixture of metaphors that includes images of fire, flood, and weaponized attack (6.10.4-5, 6.19.2-7), while

---

the *pistis*/*confirmatio* (logical arguments and/or proofs given), and the *epilogos*/*peroratio* (conclusion) (see de Brauw 2007: 187).

[259] Cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 238.

[260] As a *psogos*, Anderson 1982: 30; as *gnome*, Morales 2004: 110, 113; De Temmerman 2007a: 6, 20.

ultimately, they fight together for their cause (6.10.6, 6.19.7). In fact, if the reader did not know better, it might be concluded that Clitophon has 'plagiarised' Melite's entire rhetorical strategy. Whereas previously Melite's persuasiveness might be credited to Eros (διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ λόγους, 5.27.1), here she is depicted as a seasoned orator in her own right, worthy of imitation, able to deliver a nuanced rhetorical defence on short notice – a cipher for all the attractive qualities in rhetoric (cf. 6.8.4n.).

In the embodiment of Rumour as a personified force, AT joins a lengthy literary lineage of both Greek and Roman authors.[261] While Rumour is famously included as a deity by Hesiod (*Op*. 760-4), Melite's handling of the subject bears a closer resemblance to that of the Attic orators who employed φήμη either as reliable 'common report' or malicious and false 'rumour' depending on the exigencies of their argument (cf. Dem. 19.244, Aesch. 2.145).[262] Later handbooks of rhetoric gave direction on employing rumour as a factor in arguments (e.g. Quint. *Inst*. 5.3, *Rhet*. *Her*. 2.6.9, 2.8.12), and it could also be included as a "variety of proof".[263] The incorporation of Slander as progenitor and peer to Rumour echoes the personification of that vice as it appears in Attic legal declamation (cf. 6.9.2n, 6.10.4n.).[264] It may also be possible to draw an analogy with that other renowned *apologia* that deals with διαβολή, Plato's defence of Socrates; where, although Socrates does not personify slander per se, the false accusations of his slanderers are a theme throughout (e.g. Pl. *Ap*. 18d, 19b, 20d-e, 23e-24a, 37b; cf. 6.9.5n., 6.10.6n.). Melite shows both a practiced grasp of legal rhetoric and an erudite appreciation for literary *topoi*, and her deft engagement with these masculine elements of *paideia* is indicative of her character's continual subversion of literary and gender norms (Intro. 2.3.3).

2.4.4 (Pseudo-)Science & (Quasi-)Psychology

In general AT appears to take an eclectic approach to incorporating theories of sense perception in the novel rather than espousing a single school of thought, and what emerges in his admixture of the language is closer to a "pseudophilosophical *vulgata*" that plays on the

[261] See esp. Ogle 1924; Gotteland 1997; Hardie 2012; Guastella 2017.

[262] Further on φήμη in Attic oratory, see Gotteland 1997; Hardie 2012: 238-40; Guastella 2017: 67-75. There is also evidence of a cult to Φήμη at Athens (e.g. Aesch. 1.128, Paus. 1.17.1; see Guastella 2017: 157-63).

[263] Hardie 2012: 240.

[264] Further on slander in Attic oratory, see e.g. Worman 2008: 213-274; Carey 2004.

scientific and rhetorical theories *du jour*.[265] For instance, in the face of Sosthenes' theatrical embellishment of Leucippe's beauty, Thersander finds himself subsumed by a kind of 'waking reverie' (φάντασμα, 6.4.4 with n.). The rhetorical arousal of Thersander's imagination is particularly reminiscent of Ps.-Longinus' explication of *phantasia* (φαντασία) and its effects ([Long.] 15.1).[266] *Phantasia*, commonly translated as 'visualization(s)', but also variously 'imagination', 'vision', or 'fantasy',[267] is a term that forms part of the theories of sensory perception found primarily in the works of Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, the Epicureans, and the Stoic philosophers; however, it is by no means a unified theory and by the time Ps.-Longinus gives his account (ca. 1st c. CE), its use in scientific and philosophic contexts had broadened to encompass the rhetorical as well.[268] In the Imperial age it is largely the Stoic's conception of *phantasia kataleptike* that prevails, that is the reception of impressions from the outside world that enter the mind and produce an emotional reaction there.[269]

Rhetorically speaking, *phantasia* is closely linked with *enargeia*, in as much as it involves inducing a vivid mental image through the production of speech and thereby arousing the emotions of the listener (or reader).[270] As Goldhill (2007: 6) describes, "it is a rhetorical weapon to get around the censor of the intellect, to cut the listener off from the facts". Sosthenes, in his aggrandizing of Leucippe's beauty to Thersander, proves himself a εὐφαντασίωτος orator ('gifted in the art of imagination'), and is self-consciously aware of the effects of his vivid rhetoric (ἐγὼ γάρ σου πρὸς αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ κάλλους πολλὰ ἐτερατευσάμην καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ φαντασίας ἐγέμισα, 6.11.4).[271] Thersander proves extremely susceptible

[265] Quote from Pizzone 2013: 75; cf. also Goldhill 2001: 169; Morales 2004: 130-5.

[266] Pizzone 2013: 75-9.

[267] Cf. Russell 1964: 120.

[268] Some essential studies on the subject of *phantasia* include, *inter alia*, Imbert 1980; Watson 1988; Silverman 1991; Webb 1997; Sheppard 2014. On the dating and authorship of Ps.-Longinus' *On the Sublime*, see Russell 1964: xxii-xxx.

[269] See Goldhill 2001: 162-176 and 2007: 4-7; on defining *phantasia kataleptike*, see Sedley 2002. Note, also, the similarity to intromissive theories of vision, discussed below.

[270] Cf. [Long.] 15.2; Morales 2004: 90; Goldhill 2007: 7; Webb 2009: 100-6.

[271] Cf. Quint. *Inst*. 6.2.29-32; Russell 1964: 121. As Webb (2009: 102) points out, Quintilian does include the important proviso that the *phantasia* should be "in accordance with truth" (*secundum verum*, *Inst*. 6.2.30.3), but this is more a reservation than a restriction, as he goes on to observe that otherwise someone

to the imaginative arousal, losing himself in his fantasies of Leucippe and immediately deciding to alter his course of action based on this reaction (6.4.4). In this respect he is linked with Callisthenes and his misinterpretation of sight (Intro 2.3.4; cf. 6.3.5n.), who similarly fantasized visions of Leucippe based solely on oral reports (φανταζόμενος τὰ ἀόρατα, 2.13.2). Both Callisthenes and Thersander display the type of reaction that the Stoics warn us against, allowing themselves to be engrossed by fantasy and emotion and letting vivid description bypass their critical faculties (cf. [Long.] 15.9-11). In doing so, both characters act as cautionary examples to the reader of investing too much in a mere report of beauty.[272] However, they are not the only ones filled with fantasies of Leucippe, Clitophon, who has had the benefit of seeing Leucippe first, also finds himself overcome with visions (πάντα Λευκίππην φαντάζομαι, 1.9.1).

It is revealing of Clitophon's general misapplication of sight when it comes to Leucippe that he too should succumb to imagined fancies. Despite the continual emphasis on the faculty of sight and the erotic power of the gaze throughout the novel, Clitophon time and again fails to recognize or identify Leucippe, even when she is right in front of him (see 6.5.1n.).[273] Indeed, Clitophon appears to be projecting his own fixation with *phantasia* onto Thersander and Callisthenes, and even Sosthenes, depicting their visualisations as untampered, seemingly unaware of the implications that has for his own sensory failures.[274] The secondary characters are merely another way in which Clitophon-*auctor* deflects the reader's vision and they stand in as warnings for his own manipulation of the narratee's perception, especially as it relates to Leucippe. From his initial disjointed description of her physical appearance (1.4.3) to his failure to identify her body (5.7.8), culminating in his embarrassing inability to recognise her when confronted face to face (5.17.3-7), Clitophon's faculties of perception appear more and more questionable. As Whitmarsh (2013c: 287) describes: "Readers of Achilles are aware simultaneously of Clitophon's fetishizing narrative gaze and of the 'real' woman who lies behind it, a woman capable of eluding and deceiving his limited vision". Indeed, in a compelling article, Kauffman (2015) has argued that Clitophon's attempted portrayal of

could use this imaginative ability to some personal advantage (*ad utilitatem*, *Inst*. 6.2.31.1), such as Sosthenes does to ingratiate himself with his master.

[272] Morales 2004: 94 on Callisthenes; Pizzone 2013: 76-78 on Thersander.

[273] Montiglio 2013: 69-72.

[274] Cf. Montiglio 2013: 74-5 on Callisthenes; Kauffman 2015: 52 on Sosthenes.

Leucippe's beauty is reliant on verbal constructs (and possibly even cosmetic ones); rather it appears that Clitophon is "in love with an image of beauty, not the *real* Leucippe" (emphasis my own).[275] What emerges, then, is the slippage between Clitophon's description of beauty and its realistic depiction, which bears much in common with the concept of the 'failure' of ekphrasis; that is, "the gulf between representation and reality".[276] The phantasmagorical reaction to Leucippe's beauty experienced by the various characters, Clitophon included, forms a network of metafictivity throughout the novel that prompts the reader to both a critical and humorous engagement with the basic tenets of fictionality.

AT shows a particular proclivity for visual perception and its narrative portrayal, a topic consummately handled by Morales in her 2004 monograph, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius*. Theories of vision in Greek thought are many and varied, with philosophical, physiological, and mathematical approaches often overlapping each other.[277] The principal dichotomy in these explanations of vision is between intromission (the eye as receptacle of effluences or rays from an external object) and extramission (the emission of rays or effluences from the viewer's eyes that then interact with the external object). Canonically, the former theory is espoused by the Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, whose theories of vision are later reflected in the works of Epicurus and Lucretius; whereas the latter finds its roots in Empedoclean notions of sight, which appear echoed later by the mathematicians Euclid and Hero of Alexandria (c. 10-70 CE). Still others took a complementary approach, admitting both intro- and extramissive elements, evident in in the works of Plato, as well as in the Stoic notion of optical *pneuma* that interact with external light, a notion which was borne out in the theories espoused by Ptolemy (c. 100-170 CE) and Galen (c. 129-210 CE), contemporaries of AT.[278] It is also worth noting that Alexandria was something of a centre for the study of optical theory and physiology, both Ptolemy and Hero were natives of the city, and even Galen came to study there.[279] The 2nd c. CE was a time of heightened interest in theories of optical transmission and

[275] Quote from Kauffman 2015: 58.

[276] Quote from Whitmarsh 2011a: 174.

[277] Concomitantly, modern scholarship on the topic is just as extensive and complex, useful overviews include, Beare 1906: 9-92; Lindberg 1976: 1-17; Smith 1999: 23-49; Morales 2004: 15-8; Bartsch 2006: 57-67; Lehoux 2007: 450-2; Darrigol 2012: 1-15; Smith 2015: 23-75; Squire ed. 2016: 36-84.

[278] Cf. Smith 1999: 28-32; Morales 2004: 15-16; Bartsch 2006: 66.

[279] Cf. Nutton 1973: 162; Smith 1999: 37-8.

prevailing visual thought was notably syncretistic in approach.[280] In fact, on closer examination, the seemingly strict divide between intro- and extramissionists appears less and less precise, as all theories of vision have "some physical mediation between eye and object".[281] This interactionist element means that sight was conceived as having a haptic quality,[282] which, coupled with the fact that both intro- and extramissionist theories can be read as penetrative, adds an inherently erotic element to the act of seeing (cf. 6.6.4n.).[283] In the Imperial Age, the co-mingling of erotic and optic visual theories was deemed a mark of *paideia*,[284] and thus AT's amalgamation of visual theories for his own literary contrivance shows both his attunement to the prevailing trends of his time, as well as his ludic engagement with the novelistic trope of love at first sight. The *topos* of liquid beauty entering through the eyes is incorporated a number of times in the novel: at Clitophon's first sight of Leucippe (κάλλος… διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ, 1.4.4); when Clinias explains Clitophon's luck at having Leucippe constantly visible (ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή, δι' αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέουσα, 1.9.4); when Melite indulges in a languid erotic gaze at Clitophon across the dinner table (ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροὴ δι' ἀφανῶν ἀκτίνων ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρωτικὴν ἑλκομένη καρδίαν ἐναποσφραγίζει κάτω τὴν σκιάν, 5.13.4); and in Thersander's request that Leucippe return his gaze (τί δέ σου τὸ κάλλος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς γῆν καταρρεῖ; ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μᾶλλον ῥεέτω τοὺς ἐμούς, 6.6.4). These instances of optical transmission, both Bychkov (1999) and Morales (2004: 131-5) argue, are closer in theory to the Atomist school of vision, whereas Goldhill (2001: 169-

[280] Morales 2004: 16; cf. Bartsch 2006: 66.

[281] Smith 1999: 23. To be sure, there is still not complete consensus on who falls into which camp, for instance, Rudolph (2016: 44-52), finds evidence to identify Empedocles with the intromissionists, and Democritus with the extramissionists. On the difficulties of interpreting Democritus' account of vision, see e.g. Burkert 1977: 102-9.

[282] Cf. Lindberg 1976: 3; Morales 2004: 15-16, 29-31; Cairns 2011: 40.

[283] Morales 2004: 31-2. The connection between sight and *eros* is a commonplace in ancient thought and literature (e.g. Hes. *Theog*. 910-1, Ibycus fr. 287, Aesch. *Supp*. 1003-5, *Ag*. 741-2, Soph. *Ant*. 795-9, Eur. *Hipp*. 525-6, Arist. *NE* 1167a3-4; and in the novel, e.g. Long. p.1.4, X. Eph. 1.9.7-8, Heliod. 3.5.4-5), and contemporary scholarship on the topic is vast (e.g. Cline 1972: 267-76; Frontisi-Ducroux 1996; Cairns 2011; Skinner 2014: 106-8; Calame 2016). This association is also borne out in the attempts to trace a shared etymology for ὁρᾶν ('to see') and ἐρᾶν ('to love/desire') (e.g. Agathon fr. 29 Nauck, on which Walker 1993: 132; Squire 2016: 25; cf. Pl. *Crat*. 420a-b, on which Morales 2004: 17-8; Cairns 2011: 43-4).

[284] Cf. Goldhill 2001: 170-2; Morales 2004: 21-2; Bartsch 2006: 68-70.

179) reads a Stoic influence in them; and the diversity of opinion is indicative of AT's variegated approach to incorporating theories of sense perception into his narrative.

Nonetheless, when it comes to the flow of beauty from lover to beloved (and back), the language and theory of optic transmission is heavily reliant on Plato's *Phaedrus*. The *Phaedrus* was a particularly influential text for authors of the Second Sophistic,[285] and AT's engagement with it goes beyond merely referencing the flow of beauty (cf. the setting of the prologue, Intro. 2.2). Still the most thorough examination of the Phaedran flux of beauty in AT's novel is Repath (2001: 201-60),[286] who demonstrates how this *topos* appears at significant narrative points, each time through the mouthpiece of a different character, stretching the allusion to its limits, poking fun not only at Clitophon's attempts at erudition, but also, potentially, AT's own contemporaries.[287] Exploiting the tension between philosophical insight and visual titillation inherent in the Phaedran allegory, AT infuses the text with an ironic twist on the optic and erotic.[288] In Bk. 6 Clitophon takes the opportunity to indulge voyeuristically once more in the favourite novelistic encounter of the *coup de foudre* (although in Thersander's case it might be considered infatuation at first sight). It would seem, as with the proliferation of *Scheintoden* in the novel, AT revels in multiplying the conventional novelistic tropes, indicative of his ludic metafictivity. In the ekphrasis of Leucippe's tearful eye (6.7.1-3), we are treated to a curious reversal (mirror image?) of the process of viewing, as "the organ that enables a subject to see is transformed into an object that is seen".[289] The conceit of arresting the eye with another eye is also reminiscent of Socrates' allegory in Plato's *Alcibiades* (1.132d-133b), where "the paradigm of self-knowledge is an eye seeing itself in the eye of the other and a lover seeing his soul in the soul of a beloved";[290] thus 'know thyself' becomes 'see thyself' (ἰδὲ σαυτόν, Pl. *Alc*. i.132d6).

[285] See Trapp 1990; Hunter 2012: 223-7; Fowler 2017: 245-8.

[286] I have not had the opportunity to see his forthcoming monograph on the topic.

[287] See also Morales 2004: 50-60 on further Platonic intertexts in the novel.

[288] See Repath 2001: 259; Goldhill 2001: 179; Bartsch 2006: 57-8. Cf. Heliod. 3.7.3-5 for Calasiris' "finely nuanced scientific account [of vision] … [where] Heliodorus is utilizing a parodic, veiled, and tricky discourse of science for rhetorical and comic effect" (Goldhill 2001: 170-1; cf. also Hunter 2012: 226-7).

[289] Morales 2004: 139, see further 137-40.

[290] Wohl 2012: 45.

At 6.19 the narrating Clitophon once again resorts to sententious generalisations that appear to give a portrayal of Thersander's internal landscape (Intro. 2.4.3). Morales (2000: 80-6 and 2004: 117-21) offers the most in-depth analysis of this section in terms of its form and sententiousness, showing how the digressiveness is an intentionally humorous tactic of 'deferred desire' (a key trope in the romantic novels), but in this case for the reader. On the one hand, our narrative desire is thwarted in the perfunctory switch "from romantic diegesis to physiological and psychological exegesis",[291] but even this exegesis is its own deferral in that we are not granted intimate character knowledge of Thersander but instead are treated to a convoluted rumination on human impulses. She rightly places emphasis on the wryly humorous nature of the "hackneyed lessons", however, as Repath (2001: 242) points out the 'joke' is really at Clitophon's expense, parading once more his own brand of euphuistic intellectualism. The discourse moves between the analogy and antithesis of the personified Anger and Desire: they are both envisioned as lamps, however Anger's fire is of another kind, opposite in nature but equal in force (6.19.1); while situated in different parts of the body, the source of the fire lies close to both (6.19.2); and although they battle ruthlessly for supremacy, they ultimately rely on the other's force to achieve their ends, whether through coercion or alliance (6.19.3-7). The experience of a medley of emotions is a well-established *topos* in the Greek romantic novels and there are many such examples in *L&C* (cf. 6.6.1n.), several of which stand in apposition with 6.19 through shared imagery and vocabulary. First, the waves of feelings Leucippe experiences in reaction to her mother's chastisement (2.29), in which her anger is likened to a flood that occludes reason (2.29.2), an image that prefigures the seething flood that submerges Desire (6.19.5). The description of Leucippe's psychological deluge reflects and refracts both Clitophon's earlier emotional inundation at their first meeting (1.4.5),[292] and the variety of feelings that wash over Thersander after their confrontation (7.1.1-2). Second is the emotional rollercoaster Melite undergoes on discovering that Leucippe is in fact Clitophon's wife, where she too is gripped by both anger and desire (5.24.3), and resorts to personifying the two to explain her mixed reaction (5.26.1), an allusion that emphasises the mixed parallels of the two couples. Clitophon-*auctor* describes his own divided feelings as if held in counterpoise on a scale (6.14.2), an image he redeploys at 6.19.3 (with n.) to explain the fluctuating ascendancy of either Desire or Anger. The accumulation of the metaphors and

[291] Morales 2004: 120; cf. Owens 2020: 171.

[292] So Whitmarsh 2020: 242.

tropes of emotional turmoil in 6.19 represents a rather absurd rhetorical climax to Clitophon's 'armchair psychology'.

In the above examples ὀργή and θυμός are treated synonymously as 'anger', however ancient Greek is notorious for its diversity of terms for anger and their semantic gradation (e.g. θυμός, ὀργή, χόλος, μῆνις, etc.).[293] That being said, as Harris (2001: 54) shows, "in the educated Attic Greek prose of the high Roman Empire… *orgē* and *thumos* can hardly be said to refer to different kinds of anger". Thus, instances such as Callisthenes' θυμός at Sostratus (2.13.2) or Thersander's θυμός-filled assaults on Clitophon (5.23.5, 8.1.3) can be treated the same as Melite's plea that her husband rid his heart of ὀργή (6.9.2) or his continued departures in ὀργή (5.25.1, 5.26.13). Indeed, although the excursus at 6.19 focuses solely on θυμός, when Thersander leaves the hut after Leucippe's tirade he is said run out as if due to ὀργή (7.1.2). A survey of both words in *L&C* shows that θυμός is chiefly concentrated to 6.19, whereas ὀργή is distributed more equally. This is an intentional strategy: sandwiched between allusions to the Phaedran image of the soul as charioteer driving two horses (6.18.3, 6.20.1), the excursus on Anger (θυμός), Desire (ἔρως), and Desire's ally, Appetite (ἐπιθυμία), makes explicit reference to Plato's tripartite division of the soul into the spirited part (τὸ θυμοειδής), the rational part (τὸ λογιστικόν), and the appetitive part (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) (Pl. *Resp*. iv.439d-441a). Although he does not give a detailed analysis of 6.19, Repath (2007: 74) shows how with "desire and appetite on the one side, and anger on the other, [there is] no role for the third Platonic part of the soul: reason", an element "crucial in the portrayal of Thersander as the villain of the piece".[294] Besides this, scholars have also noted the parallels between 6.19 and the discussion on desire and pleasure at Pl. *Resp*. ix.586c-e,[295] as well as the physiological topics of Pl. *Tim*. 69d-71d.[296] Thus, Whitmarsh's translation of ἔρως as Desire and ἐπιθυμία as Appetite, rather than the usual Love and Desire (so Winkler, Gaselee, Garnaud) is the better choice: first because of the clear allusion to Plato's 'appetitive part' of the soul (as depicted in *Resp*. iv), and second because of the implicit sexual overtones of both words (cf. Pl. *Phdr*. 238b7-c4).

[293] Cf. Sen. *Ir*. 1.4.2; for discussion of terminology, see Harris 2001: 50-70.

[294] Repath (2007) offers an excellent examination of the Greek novelists' (mis)use of Platonic psychology to depict the emotional turmoil of their characters.

[295] Morales 2004: 117.

[296] Noted by both Whitmarsh 2001: 159 and Repath 2007: 74 n. 84.

While Platonic elements abound, further insight can be gained from several other texts. As Morales (2004: 119) shows, with regards to Desire, 6.19 comes across as a "remarkable pastiche of erotic *topoi*", including fire, slavery (*servitium amoris*), and war (*militia amoris*). The same effect is achieved with the catachrestic imagery of Anger as both a roiling flood of feeling and a strategic force in conflict, imagery found in both Seneca and Plutarch's treatises on anger (e.g. 6.19.1n., 6.19.4n.). It may even be possible to draw some analogy with Philodemus' fragmentary *De ira*, where he bifurcates anger into 'natural' and 'empty': the former (ὀργή) is seen as an appropriate and temperate expression of anger in the face of wrongdoing; whereas the latter (θυμός) is the intemperate and vindictive rage of one not controlled by reason (e.g. Phld. *Ir*. col. 40-5).[297] As with AT's theories of sense perception, there does not appear to be only one reference overtly intended, but rather the effect is of a 'pseudo-psychological *vulgata*'.[298]

[297] On 'natural' and 'empty' anger, see Armstrong and McOsker 2020: 40-5; also, Tsouna 2011: 194-6; see further, Tsouna 2011 for an incisive comparison of the three treatises on anger.

[298] To modify Pizzone's phrase quoted above; similarly, Repath 2007: 76.

Sigla

1. Papyri

Π^1 = *P. Oxy*. X 1250, 3rd c. (Parsons 1989b: 66-9; Cavallo 1996: 16), early 4th c. (Grenfell and Hunt 1914: 135). *L&C* 2.2.1-2.3.2 and 2.7.7-2.9.3.
P. Oxy. LVI 3837 (also Π^6), 3rd c. (Parsons 1989b: 66). *L&C* 8.6.14-8.7.6.

Π^2 = *P. Schubart* 30/*P. Berol*. inv. 16971, 3rd c., once considered lost (Vilborg 1955: xvi), recently republished by Poethke (2002: 1-5). *L&C* 2.2.4-2.2.5 and 2.14.5-2.14.7.

Π^3 = *P. Mil. Vogl*. III 124/*P. Med*. 124, 2nd c. (Vogliano 1938: 123-30), cusp of 3rd c. (Willis 1990: 75), late 3rd c. (Cavallo 1996: 37-8). *L&C* 6.14.1-6.15.2 and 6.16.6-6.17.3.

Π^4 = *P. Colon*. inv. 901, late 3rd c. (Henrichs 1968: 211) + *P. Duk*. inv. 722 (formerly *P. Rob*. inv. 35), early 3rd c. (Willis 1990: 75). *L&C* 3.17.2-3.25.6.

Π^5 = *P. Oxy*. LVI 3836, 2nd c. (Parsons 1989a: 62-6), mid 2nd c. (Cavallo 1996: 16, 36). *L&C* 3.21.4-3.23.3.

Π^6 = *P. Oxy*. LVI 3837, cf. Π^1.

Π^7 = *P. Oxy*. VII 1014/*P. Brux*. inv. E 5977, only correctly identified as AT by Gronewald (1976: 14-7), early 3rd c. (Cavallo 1996: 37), 4th c. (Willis 1991: 76). *L&C* 4.14.2-5.

Π^8 = *P. Oxy*. LXXIII 4948, 3rd c. (Obbink and Trnka-Amrhein 2009: 119).
L&C 2.37.8-2.38.4.

2. MSS

α-family:

W	Vaticanus gr. 1349 (12th c.)
M	Marcianus gr. 409 (13th c. *in.*)[299]
D	Vaticanus gr. 114 (14th/15th c. *in.*)[300]

β-family:

V	Vaticanus gr. 114 (13th c. *ex.*)
G	Marcianus gr. 607 (15th c.)
E	Ambrosianus gr. 394 (15th/16th c.)
Ol.	Olomucensis M 79 (15th c.)
Sin.	Sinaiticus gr. 1197 (16th c.)

φ:

F	Laurentianus conv. Coppr. 627 (13th c.)

[299] Cf. Colonna 1994: 179-81, who posits an earlier date of the second half of the 11th c.

[300] Vilborg (1955: xvii) gives the earlier date, whereas Garnaud (1991: xxvii) posits the later date. Cf. Consonni 2006: 112, who follows Vilborg.

Commentary

6.1-5: Clitophon's Drag Race

Bk. 6 opens post coitum, Clitophon having just 'healed' Melite of her passion. Their sham marriage has been consummated on the floor of the chamber where Clitophon is being held for the very same adulterous charge. His immediate concern is safe passage for himself and Leucippe, which Melite assures him will be forthcoming (6.1.1). She explains her stratagem to him as she dresses him in her own clothes and gifts him with a hundred gold pieces, giving him into the trust of her maidservant, Melantho, to convey him to safety (6.1.4). Clitophon is led through the empty house to a backdoor where he is met by a freedman with whom he is already familiar (6.2.2). Melantho returns to the cell and orders the guard to readmit her; the guard, Pasion, is astounded at the last-minute substitution (6.2.3). Melite offers Pasion a gift of ten gold coins, advising him to make himself scarce until matters with her husband can be resolved and his rage subdued (6.2.6). Thersander returns, urged by his friend not to spend the night away from home (6.3.1). Sosthenes, who was previously demoted by Melite for his ill-treatment of Leucippe (5.17.8-10), seizes the opportunity for revenge. He now offers Leucippe (still in her guise as the slave-girl Lacaena) to Thersander, hoping to drive a wedge between his master and mistress (6.3.4). Thersander approves the plan and Sosthenes sets off immediately to the country estate in order to waylay Leucippe (6.4.1), who is currently there on Melite's orders (when she still believed her a Thessalian slave-girl) to procure an aphrodisiac herb to cure Clitophon's apparent celibacy (5.22.2-7). He charges two workmen to cause a distraction by flirting with the maids accompanying Leucippe and instructs another two to help him abduct her in the opposite direction (6.4.2). Sosthenes spirits Leucippe away to a secret shed; and she, dumbstruck with dismay at this turn of events, voices no protest (6.4.3). He then intercepts Thersander before he can return home and lavishly embellishes Leucippe's loveliness; Thersander, captured by this caricature, chooses to pay her a visit (6.4.4). Paths converge as Clitophon, still arrayed in Melite's clothing, rushes headlong into Thersander and Sosthenes on their way to Leucippe. Despite the disguise, Sosthenes immediately identifies Clitophon (6.5.1), and they cause an uproar amongst festival-goers, seizing Clitophon in a summary arrest and delivering him into custody on the charge of adultery (6.5.3). Clitophon remains unfazed at the verbal and physical assault, certain that the charges will prove false as he is openly married to Melite (6.5.4); however, his fear for Leucippe turns his mood morbid as he contemplates the worst (6.5.5).

6.1.1 Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὴν Μελίτην ἰασάμην, λέγω πρὸς αὐτήν…: The particles can be translated as some combination of 'now/so then/when', implying a connectivity with what has just been described (in this case, sex with Melite, 5.27.3; cf. e.g. 3.10.1, 3.13.4, 3.14.1; Denniston, 416-7). The 'healing' performed here is a reference to Clitophon's earlier justification of sleeping with Melite as like a remedy for a disease (φάρμακον ὥσπερ ψυχῆς νοσούσης, 5.27.2), he also claims that he felt a 'natural human response' (ἔπαθόν τι ἀνθρώπινον, 5.27.2), and was 'genuinely afraid of Eros' (ἀληθῶς ἐφοβήθην τὸν Ἔρωτα, 5.27.2). This pile-up of excuses has been read variously as realistic, hypocritical, cynical, or not to be taken seriously (e.g. Reardon 1994: 88; Cresci 1978: 79; Robiano 2002: 369-70; Goldhill 1995: 96; Ormand 2010: 174-75). Considering that each of these observations is valid in its own turn, perhaps the last is the most applicable. The trope of sex as a cure for the pangs brought on by love is not uncommon in the novels (e.g. Charit. 6.3.7, Long. 2.7.7, 2.9.2, 3.14.1) and it forms part of a larger *topos* of love as a sickness or affliction and the various therapies available (*remedia amoris*) (e.g. Charit. 1.1.7-10, 2.4.1, 6.3.8, X. Eph. 1.4.6, 1.5.9, Long. 1.13.6-14.2, 1.18.2, 1.22.3, Heliod. 3.9.1, 4.7.7, 4.10, 7.23.2). In *L&C* this *topos* is taken "much further and in both pseudo-mystical and pseudo-medical language gives evidence of the increased concern with the suffering self in the grip of desire and with therapies of cure" (Zeitlin 2012: 109; e.g. 1.4.4, 2.7.6-7, 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 5.22.3, 5.26.2, 8.12.7); further on this *topos*, see Toohey 1992: 273-5 (on the novels) and 2004: 59-103 (more generally). Philostratus offers an ironic refutation of this trope (οὐ τὸ ἐρᾶν νόσος ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ἐρᾶν, Philostr. *Ep*. 52.1, on which, Walker 1993: 132-3). See the mystical/medical play on Clitophon's success with women at 6.17.1n.; cf. also the sexual innuendo at 6.7.9n. **Ἀλλ' ὅπως μοι… περὶ Λευκίππης:** 'Now, see to it that you grant me safe passage and all the other things you promised regarding Leucippe'. The aor. subjv. παράσχῃς (cf. παράσχοις WM VE : παράσχεις G) ('to furnish/supply/grant') was proposed by Jacobs, and is confirmed by the MS Sin. The "elliptical idiom" of ὅπως (μή) + subjv. = 'see to it that' (cf. 2.23.3, with Whitmarsh 2020: 234) is a more common construction in the negative (e.g. 6.4.2). The principal clause has been suppressed, therefore something like σκόπει/ὅρα ('see to it (that)') must be understood (cf. 6.13.3); the obj. clause (after a verb of effort/contriving) that remains may take either the fut. indic. or the subjv. (cf. Rijksbaron §21; Smyth §2213; Goodwin §364). Clitophon's immediate concern with escape and reunification with Leucippe may appear altruistic, but in all likelihood is merely another excuse to "lessen the appearance of wrongdoing" (Schwartz 2002: 104). His demands emphasise the transactional nature of their exchange which, coupled with the money Melite offers him, borders on prostitution (cf. 6.1.4n.). **σὺ δὲ ἔνδυθι… τῷ πέπλῳ:** 'As for you, put on my clothes and hide your face with

the mantle'. Jacobs points out the parallel with Hdt. 4.146, in which the Minyae, who have been imprisoned by the Spartans, escape by swapping clothes with their wives during a conjugal visit. Clitophon's easy compliance with Melite's stratagem also suggests a lack of concern for the implications for his masculinity that cross-dressing entails. He has previously been described in sexually ambiguous terms by Melite (e.g. 5.22.5, 5.25.8), so to have her dress him up seems fitting. It is a common ancient trope that a man whose appearance was overly effeminate, either through cosmetics, depilation, or exaggerated care, was considered liable to commit adultery or be guilty in some way of sexual excess (cf. Charit. 1.4.9, Arist. *Soph. El.* 167b9-11, Cic. *De offic*. 1.129-30, Juv. 6.O.17-25; see Marinčič 2007: 195; Olson 2017: 145-9). Clitophon's transvestism also opens him up for accusations of homosexual licentiousness and Thersander's lawyer Sopater accuses him of playing a man amongst women but posing as a woman when with men (8.10.9), a common rhetorical vilification (e.g. Suet. *Jul*. 52.3, Cic. *Dom*. 139; Dover 1989: 103-5; Jones 2012: 245-7; *contra* Schwartz 2012: 181-2, who argues that Clitophon's exchange of clothing "does not necessarily imply a transition from active to passive sexual roles or vice versa"). Earlier in *L&C* cross-dressing as a disguise technique was used by the band of men employed by Callisthenes to abduct Leucippe, who in fact turns out to be Calligone (2.18.3; cf. Apul. *Met*. 7.8). As part of his approach to the novel as *Mysterientext*, Merkelbach (1962: 145) interprets the exchange of clothing and Clitophon's veiling of his face as elements familiar from the Eleusinian mysteries (cf. 5.26.10). Seeing a similar transformation for Leucippe in having her hair shorn (5.19.2), Morales (2004: 62 n. 84) suggests that "in ritual, cross-dressing may form part of an ephebic *rite de passage* which marks incipient adulthood". Although the overtly religious reading of the novels has generally been rejected, Whitmarsh (1999: 19), in his discussion of initiatory elements in Heliodorus, warns against throwing out the baby with the bath water, advocating for an appreciation of this motif as a "narrative pattern"; see further on the topic, Lalanne 2006.

6.1.2 Μελανθώ: See Intro. 2.3.6. **ᾧ προστεταγμένον ἐστίν…:** The perf. mid. part. of προστάσσω with the auxiliary εἰμί serves as the finite (Goodwin §45; LSJ s.v. εἰμί II 2), a common periphrastic construction in AT (Whitmarsh 2020: 48); the verb, when coupled with dat. of person (ᾧ) and inf. (κομίσαι), renders an impersonal pass. construction (i.e. 'it was commanded of him to do…'; see LSJ s.v. προστάσσω B 2). **τὴν οἰκίαν:** The house on the country estate where Melite has sent Leucippe, still in her guise as Lacaena the slave-girl, to procure an aphrodisiac (5.22.7; cf. 6.4.4n.).

6.1.3 Ταῦθ' ἅμα: Garnaud prefers the apocopic form (α-family) over Vilborg's "ταῦτα ἅμα" (β-family). Cf. 2.28.3, where the editors are faced with the same choice over the same phrase; there Garnaud is supported by α- and β-family, whereas only F upholds Vilborg's choice. This prior instance would seem to confirm Garnaud's choice here. **καὶ καταφιλοῦσα:** The pres. part. could imply more than one kiss. **Ὡς εὐμορφότερος, ἔφη, παρὰ πολὺ γέγονας τῇ στολῇ:** 'Oh how much more handsome you are in this attire!' εὔμορφος ('good-looking/attractive') is more usual to Attic poetry than prose, but is not uncommon in the novels (e.g. Long. 1.18.2, on which Bowie 2019: 138 with refs.; cf. also Moeris *Att*. ε.39). Melite's exclamation is a reversal of the usual trope that the heroine's beauty is evident despite her disguise (cf. Charit. 2.2.4, 5.9.7; Montiglio 2013: 85), which is perhaps made more ironic by Clitophon's failure to recognise Leucippe in her 'disguise' (5.17.7); although admittedly even Theagenes struggles to identify Charicleia in her beggar's rags (Heliod. 7.7.6). Hilton (2009: 106) compares this instance with Petron. *Sat*. 110.1-4 where Giton is so beautified after depilation and donning a woman's wig that Tryphaena is moved to tears. On the trope of effete men appealing to licentious women, cf. also Petron. *Sat*. 126.1-5, Epict. 3.1.27-35. **τοιοῦτον Ἀχιλλέα ποτὲ ἐθεασάμην ἐν γραφῇ:** 'I once saw just such an Achilles in a painting'. Melite is referring to the story of Achilles on Skyros, where Achilles' mother Thetis, reluctant to have him called up to war in Troy, sent him to live at the court of King Lycomedes disguised as a maiden. Odysseus and Diomedes, tasked with finding him, arrive in Skyros bearing gifts, an assortment of both weaponry and feminine regalia; Odysseus sounds the alarm and Achilles seizes the arms instantly. Thus revealed, he agrees to go to Troy and fulfil his destiny. Heroes in the novel are usually compared to Achilles in order to emphasise their handsomeness and heroic prowess (e.g. Heliod. 2.34.4, 2.35.1, 4.3.1, 4.5.5, Charit. 1.1.3). In Clitophon's case, however, the comparison is to emphasise his feminine good looks and to foreshadow his impending reveal and capture, a reversal of the usual heroic image that suits our hero's rather antiheroic characterisation (Morales 2004: 65-6; Laplace 2007: 128-132; Montiglio 2013: 82, 223; Intro. 2.4.3). See accounts of Achilles time on Skyros in, e.g., Hyg. *Fab.* 96, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.8, *Schol*. *in Iliadem* (*schol*. *vet*.) 19.326, [Bion] 2, Ov. *Ars am.* 1.682-704, Stat. *Achil.* 1.20-926. The tale of Achilles' transvestism on Skyros is decidedly absent from Homeric epic (Heslin 2005: 202-5; cf. Hom. *Il*. 9.666-8, 19.326-7, *Od*. 11.504-9). The unveiling of the transvestite Achilles was popular in both Greek (e.g Paus. 1.22.6, Pl. *HN* 35.134, Philostr. Jun. *Imag.* 1) and Roman art (e.g. Beard and Henderson 2001: 26-9; Ling 1991: 132-4; and discussion in Cameron 2009: 5-11; see also, *LIMC* s.v. Achilleus II C). This is not the first time Clitophon has been compared to a figure in a painting by Melite (ἀλλ' ἔοικας τοῖς ἐν γραφαῖς ἐσθίουσιν,

5.13.5), nor his first association with a cross-dressing hero as he earlier likens himself to Heracles enslaved to Omphale (2.6.2), a similarly gender-bent story. **Ἀλλά μοι, φίλτατε, σώζοιο:** 'But please, my beloved, stay safe for my sake!' The mid. of σῴζω ('save/keep alive (oneself)') in the opt. (of wish) + dat. (of interest). Melite regularly addresses Clitophon with the superlative endearment (e.g. 5.15.6, 5.26.1, 5.26.2), and only does so for Thersander when trying to inveigle him (6.9.5 with n., 6.10.2). **καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα ταύτην φύλαττε μνήμην:** 'and keep my clothes as a memento'. Interestingly, there is no indication in the novel that Clitophon ever changes out of Melite's clothing, unless we assume that he is given the customarily gendered clothing in prison or before he goes to trial. Indeed, her suggestion here may very well prompt the reader to imagine that "Clitophon did keep Melite's dress after his reunion with Leucippe and if he sometimes dressed up as a reminder of his former benefactor" (Smith 2014: 344). **ἐμοὶ δὲ τὴν σὴν κατάλιπε, ὡς ἂν ἔχοιμι ἐνδυομένη σοι περικεχύσθαι:** 'Leave me your clothes, so that I may feel your embrace when putting them on'. The usual construction of opt. after the secondary tense (κατάλιπε) in final clauses, however, ὡς ἄν + opt. occurs rarely in Attic prose (Smyth §2202); the d. obj. ('your clothes') is understood; pass. of περιχέω + dat. = 'to embrace' (LSJ s.v. II; cf. 5.15.5, 6.18.2). On the one hand, Melite's appropriation of Clitophon's clothing makes perfect literal sense (she needs to wear something if she is to give him her clothes), on the other hand, it underscores the reversal of gender norms inherent in their exchange. Compare Chloe donning Daphnis' clothes while he bathes (Long. 1.24.2; so Laplace 2007: 129 n. 170), on which Bowie (2019: 149) comments that the "exchange of apparel is a common lovers' game".

6.1.4 Δίδωσι δέ μοι καὶ χρυσοῦς ἑκατόν: While Clitophon's demands for safe passage immediately after sex hinted at the transactional nature of their sexual intercourse, Melite's grant of a hundred gold coins essentially 'seals the deal' (cf. Cresci 1978: 79; Jones 2012: 245; Lefteratou 2018: 148-9). Sandy (1979: 373-374) draws parallels here with Lollianus' *Phoenicica* (A2 recto, 9-11) where a girl, Persis, offers the hero Androtimus, first jewellery, and then money "for the loss of his maidenhood" (also Brethes 2001: 191).[301] Another analogous instance is that of Lycaenion who plans to win Daphnis' affections with gifts, successfully bribing him with the knowledge of the sex act itself to help him consummate his

[301] Sandy (1989: 811 n. 1) later notes that "it is not clear whether it is the virginity of Persis or of the man [i.e. Androtimus] that is meant". Nonetheless, the direction of compensation for the sexual act remains the same.

union with Chloe (Long. 3.15-19). The implicit nature of Clitophon's prostitution here becomes explicit when Thersander's lawyer, Sopater, accuses Melite outright of hiring Clitophon as a prostitute (8.10.9, 8.10.11). Later, when Clitophon delivers his self-incrimination for Leucippe's apparent murder, he claims to have paid the 'hit-man' 100 gold pieces, which is also the same amount the planted inmate in the jail claimed to have been paid by Melite (7.3.5). It is not clear what happens to the money he receives here, especially once he is imprisoned (6.5.3). On a possible currency, see 6.2.5n.

6.2.1 τινα θύραν οὐκ ἐν ὁδῷ κειμένην: A somewhat unusual expression, it is not, as Gaselee has it, "a door which did not open onto the street", but rather, as Winkler puts it, "a certain door that did not lead onto the main street" (Whitmarsh's "backdoor" is perhaps the most succinct).

6.2.2 Ἀπελεύθερος δέ… κεχαρισμένος: 'He was a freedman, one of those who had sailed with us, and of whom I was already fond'. The term ἀπελεύθερος ('freedman') persists as the standard Greek equivalent to the Latin *libertus* (e.g. Cic. *Att*. 6.4.3.2, *Dig*. 27.1.10.7.1). On the character, see Intro. 2.3.6.

6.2.3 Κἀκεῖνος… ἔστη σιωπῇ: 'And he, as one might expect, on seeing this totally paradoxical spectacle of the deer in the place of the maiden (as the saying goes), was astonished and left speechless'. **ὡς τὸ εἰκός:** The neut. part. of ἔοικα ('to be like/likely') is a common insertion in the narrative (e.g. 3.2.1, 6.7.7, 7.1.6). An admission that he was not present to witness events, this interjection serves as a means of indicating not only Clitophon's continued latent narratorial presence, but also his proclivity to project feelings or intentions upon other characters (Morgan 2004: 498 n. 16; cf. Goldhill 1995: 92-3; cf. 6.7.9n.). **θέαμα ἰδὼν παραδοξότατον:** The superlative emphasises Pasion's surprise and it was precisely these episodic narrative shocks and twists that the ancient reader was most likely to relish (Whitmarsh 2003: 79-80 and 2011a: 205-6; cf. Plut. *Quomodo adul*. 25d). The reader can savour Clitophon's astonishing escape once more, this time vicariously through the guard, however, our enjoyment here at the success of Clitophon's cross-dressing conceit is but a counterpoint to the bathos of his almost immediate identification and recapture by Sosthenes and Thersander (6.5.1 with n.). **τῆς κατὰ… παροιμίας:** Cautadella (1960: 175) suggests that the text here be emended to "<τοῦτο δὴ τὸ> τῆς παροιμίας". The usual construction is the acc. "κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν" (e.g. Pl. *Symp*. 222b6-7, *Soph*. 261b8-c1, [Plut.] *De lib*. 6c5-6, Plut. *De garr.* 512e9, Ath. 14.47.16, Arist. *Pol*. 1255b29, Lucian *Demon*. 4.6), but this is by no means

the only construction. The phrasing is certainly "grammatically difficult" (Vilborg) however, we need not go to the extremes of Hercher (1858: 157) and expunge it entirely. Indeed, the paradoxical nature of the spectacle is seeing a proverb come to life: you might expect to *hear* it, but not actually *see* it unfolding in front of you.Vilborg's suggestion that it is a qualitative gen. with θέαμα is perhaps the best, thus he translates literally: "a sight that answers to the proverb of the hind instead of the girl" (*contra* Yatromanolakis 1990: 680, who believes the superlative makes this supposition less likely). **τὴν ἔλαφον ἀντὶ παρθένου:** The reference is to Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*, where Iphigenia, who is to be sacrificed to ensure favourable winds for the Achaeans' expedition to Troy, is rescued by Artemis who replaces her with a deer on the altar (see Eur. *IA* 1540-1612, also, Ov. *Met*. 12.29-38; cf. Hyg. 98, where she is sacrificed). The proverb itself is attested three other times in Greek, twice by Libanius (*Epist*. 785.1.2-3, 1509.3.3), and once in *P*. *Erl*. 4.52-3 (an anonymous Socratic dialogue from the 2nd-3rd c. BCE; see Morel 1963: 546-7; Luz 2014: 161-8). The adage was "used generally for any unexpected windfall" (Luz 2014: 168 n. 32), but came to mean an unexpected switch of places (e.g. Apul. *Met*. 8.26.9, Mart. *Ep*. 3.91.11). It is a windfall certainly for Clitophon, who escapes, but given as it is from Pasion's perspective, it emphasises the shock of the onlookers at the substitution. The dramatic irony is furthered by the implication that Clitophon is the maiden that has miraculously survived being sacrificed when it is usually Leucippe in this unenviable role. Compare, also, Ambrosius' description of how a young Christian virgin, detained for martyrdom, is saved by a soldier who swaps clothes with her, allowing her to escape (*Ecce non fabulosum illud cerva pro virgine, sed quod verum est, miles ex virgine*, *De Virg*. 2.4.31 = 16.215.25-7 *MPL*). Mignogna (1997) argues that Leucippe's first *Scheintod* (3.15) is based on a mimic rendition of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Tauris* (the sequel to *Iphigenia at Aulis*); see further Baker 2016: 116-8 and Lefteratou 2018: 63-78 on the similarities between Leucippe and the Iphigenia myth. **ἐξεπλάγη:** On the verb, see Leucippe's reaction at 6.4.3 with n.

6.2.4 Οὐκ ἀπιστοῦσά σοι… οὐ συνεγνωκότι: 'It is not because I distrusted you to release Clitophon willingly that I made use of this deception, but rather to absolve you from any blame in the eyes of Thersander, since you were not a co-conspirator'. A rather convoluted sentence: ἀπιστέω + dat. = 'disbelieve/suspect'; μή οὐκ + subjv. (ἐθελήσῃς) + indic. (ἐδεήθην) is used for negative fears (Smyth §2751); ὡς is causal ('on the grounds that') with perf. part. of συγγιγνώσκω ('to think/agree with'), which in later texts takes on the meaning 'to plot/conspire with' (LSJ s.v. I 2). By concealing her plan from Pasion, Melite has ensured his unimpeachability when confronted with Thersander's inevitable reprisal.

6.2.5 Χρυσοῖ δέ σοι οὗτοι δῶρον δέκα… ἐφόδιον: ‘And these ten gold pieces are a gift for you, if you wish to remain here, a bonus from Clitophon; but if you think it better to absent yourself, consider it a travelling-allowance’. AT does not appear to specify a currency in his novel referring only to ‘gold (*sc*. pieces)’ (e.g. 4.6.2, 4.15.5, 5.17.5, 6.1.4, 7.3.5), unlike other novelists (‘minas’, X. Eph. 3.5.9; ‘obols’, Long. 2.12.4, [Lucian] *Asin*. 37.15; ‘drachmas’, Long. 3.27.4-5, 4.33.1, Heliod. 7.8.4, [Lucian] *Asin*. 35.15, 37.15). It may be that AT is imitating the language of tragedy when it comes to coinage in order to remain inexact about the dramatic date of his novel (cf. Mastronarde 2002: 256 on Eur. *Med*. 516); however, he may be referring to the golden Roman *aureus*, a coin regularly issued from the 1st c. BCE - 4th c. CE and worth 25 silver *denarii* (cf. Buttrey 1961, who shows how the adj. χρυσοῦς (‘gold’), Attic of χρύσεος, was used to denote the *aureus*; e.g. Cass. Dio. 55.12.5, Lucian *Pseudol*. 30.15, Plut. *Galb*. 20.4.5). The Greek drachma and the Alexandrian tetradrachm were worth one *denarius*, and therefore had an equivalent aggregate value with the *aureus* (Rathbone 2009: 301-3). If the *aureus* is the coin AT does have in mind, then it would provide further evidence for a semi-contemporary setting of the novel (Intro. 1.1). On Charmides’ offer of gold for sleeping with Leucippe (4.6.2-3), Hilton (2009: 104) argues for the historicity of “gold coins” as “the favoured method of paying Roman troops” but does not mention the aureus. Cf. also 4.13.4 where the *Boukoloi* attempt to bribe Charmides with 100 talents of silver, “an enormous amount” (Whitmarsh 2001: 157; cf. Hilton 2009: 104). **τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ φύλακι:** On Pasion and his name, see Intro. 2.3.6. **τὸ σοὶ δοκοῦν κἀμοὶ δοκεῖ καλῶς ἔχειν:** ‘whatever seems best to you is fine by me’. This alliterative elliptical avowal from Pasion is his only line in the drama and adds an air of melodrama to the proceedings in that it forms an iambic trimeter. AT’s theatrical turn of phrase means that there are several instances where he employs trimeters, but because of Greek’s “intrinsic propensity for the iambic rhythm”, there is no guarantee that these trimeters are from any one particular tragedy (Liapis 2006: 222-8). Incidentally, it need not be assumed that the source of all trimeters be tragic, AT might just as well be referencing some comic work (cf. 6.7.1n.).

6.2.6 ὅταν δὲ ἐν καλῷ θῆται… τότε μετιέναι: ‘and whenever matters with her husband were rectified and his anger turned to calm, to return then’. The reading θῆται (mid. aor. subj.) is Cobet’s emendation of θῇ (act. aor. subj.) given uniformly in the MSS. Both Vilborg and Garnaud follow Cobet, Vilborg insisting that the “passive is necessary”. However, as Plepelits (1980: 69) points out, θῆται is not pass. but mid. (the pass. aor. subj. would be τεθῇ). Furthermore, the change from act. to pass. is not strictly recquired for meaning, but rather to

parallel the following clause. It is better, as others have already noted, to retain the act. voice of the MSS (so Plepelits 1980: 69; O'Sullivan s.v. τίθημι 2; Kanavou 2022: 6-7). γαλήνη means metaph. 'calmness of the mind' (lit. 'the stillness of the sea', LSJ s.v.). This aside subtly anticipates the excursus on Anger and Desire (6.19) and Thersander's subsequent angry eruption at Leucippe (6.20.1). **ὁ μὲν οὕτως ἔπραξεν:** The μέν finds its corresponding δέ in the next section (*infra* 6.3.1). The novelistic equivalent of a cinematic cross-fade, this construction, when used to bridge parallel action, mitigates the abruptness of the transition of narrative points of view (cf. Hägg 1971: 184). See further Intro. 2.1; cf. 6.5.5n.

6.3.1 Ἐμοὶ δὲ ἡ συνήθης Τύχη… δρᾶμα καινόν: 'My familiar friend Fortune set upon me once more, plotting a novel drama for me'. Tyche is a key catalyst in numerous novelistic adventures and can be perceived as both an ordinary stroke of luck or fate, or as the personified deity (as here) (see Intro. 2.4.2), and her capricious nature means that she can be both an agent of ill (e.g. 1.13.4, 5.7.9, 5.17.3) or good (e.g. 1.9.2, 2.4.2, 3.22.3, 5.26.9). Often what initially seems to be good luck leads to more adverse outcomes, and Clitophon self-consciously reflects on these reversals of fortune as practical jokes or games played by Tyche at his expense (e.g. 4.9.5-7, 5.2.3, 5.11.1-2, 7.5.2; cf. Heliod. 2.6.2, 5.4.1, 5.6.3.). The notion of Tyche as director/producer of the drama that is the human life is common in the novels, especially Heliodorus (e.g. Heliod. 2.29.4, 6.8.5, 10.16.3, 10.38.3; see further Walden 1894 and Paulsen 1992), but is also found elsewhere (e.g. Lucian *Sat.* 19.20-1). Clitophon's attribution of his recognition and recapture to Fortune chimes with that of Lucius while he is an ass (Apul. *Met.* 7.25.8-10; so Montiglio 2013: 83); on the irony of Clitophon's recognition, see 6.5.1n. The description of Tyche as συνήθης ('habitual/customary') displays a wry reflexivity of the novelistic convention of Tyche as plot motivator. The irony in this epithet is confirmed by its use later of Leucippe's returning sense of hope when she discovers that the door to her hut has been left unlocked and Sosthenes is nowhere to be found (ἐλπὶς ἡ συνήθης ἐπεισέρχεται, 7.13.1). Her hope is inspired by an almost metaliterary perspicuity, where she reflects on her continued ability to escape dire situations, and which prompts her to take full advantage of her 'T/tyche' in the situation (μνήμη γὰρ αὐτῇ τοῦ πολλάκις παρὰ δόξαν σεσῶσθαι πρὸς τὸ παρὸν τῶν κινδύνων τὴν ἐλπίδα προὐξένει ἀποχρῆσθαι τῇ Τύχῃ, 7.13.1). **ἐπιτίθεται καὶ συντίθεται:** Jackson (1935: 109) would amend συντίθεται to the act. συντίθησι, however no editor has taken this up, and Vilborg happily accepts the "middle for the active", conjecturing that it is influenced by ἐπιτίθεται. Likely, it is deliberate paronomasia meant to play on the homoioteleuton of the verbs, which is itself enhanced by the alliteration with συνήθης (note

though, that this alliteration is not lost if Jackson's emendation is accepted). **δρᾶμα καινόν:** That the drama should be described as καινός ('novel/new') is of course an allusion to the novelists' preoccupation with novelty and innovation (Intro. 1.4). AT's proclivity for originality and unconventionality beyond the usual measure is borne out by the excessive frequency with which he employs the adj. καινός throughout his narrative (21 times; Charit. 13, in which I have included the compound φιλόκαινος; Heliod. 11; Long. 8; and X. Eph. only once). The inclusion of the term here is not merely to introduce some 'new' peripeteia in Clitophon's story, but also to draw attention to the novelty of AT's take on the final instalments of his romance novel. Specifically, Tilg (2010: 190-1) argues that the phrase δρᾶμα καινόν here is a metaliterary indication that the tale of Clitophon's adultery is an "original variation" of the adultery plot that instigates Callirhoe and Chaereas' adventure (ἡ φιλόκαινος Τύχη δρᾶμα σκυθρωπὸν ὑμῖν περιτέθεικε, Charit. 4.4.2; cf. Schwartz 2016: 95, who finds more generally that AT "responds" to Chariton's adultery scenario). This may be supported by the use of this phrase in later rhetoricians' declamations on adulterous misdeeds (e.g. Sopat. Rh. 8.312.22-4 Walz, Lib. *Decl*. 40.2.39). See further on καινός, 6.7.3n. and 6.21.2n. **ἐπάγει γάρ μοι τὸν Θέρσανδρον εὐθὺς παρελθόντα:** 'She (*sc*. Tyche) introduced to the scene Thersander, who at that very moment was passing by'. ἐπάγω ('bring on/into a place/situation') can also be used of leading on an attack (LSJ s.v. A 2). Scholars have taken issue with the part. παρελθόντα (β-family) agreeing with Thersander, for if we translate 'arriving' (LSJ s.v. III), it appears that Thersander has returned to the house when the fateful encounter occurs, but the following text suggests they met some way from the house (6.3.2, 6.5.1-3). Thus Jackson (1935: 108-9) suggests "προελθόντι" relying on the μοι (i.e. just after Clitophon had left the house; so too O'Sullivan). However, if translated as 'passing by' (LSJ s.v. I), emendation of the part. into the dat. does not appear necessary, and still conveys the general narrative simultaneity. **Μεταπεισθεὶς γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ φίλου:** This friend is first mentioned as the destination of Thersander's abrupt, but convenient, departure after his tumultuous reappearance (5.25.1), and now serves again as the pretext for Thersander's unexpected return. **μὴ ἀπόκοιτος γενέσθαι:** 'not to sleep away from home'. Plepelits (1980: 248) identifies ἀπόκοιτος with the formal language of Greek marital contracts in Egypt from the 1st-2nd c. BCE, in which the husband is legally obliged not to live apart from his wife and the wife not to be absent from her household without the permission of her husband (e.g. *P*. *Tebt*. III.974, *P*. *Tebt*. I.104; cf. Men. *Epit*. 136, Lucian *Bis Acc*. 27.25-6, *DDeor*. 14.2.3-4, *DMeretr*. 10.2.2-5; see also, Gomme and Sandbach 1973: 297). Should it be read this way, Thersander is hurrying home on the advice of his friend in order that he not be found in breach of his marital contract, which could jeopardise his case

of adultery against Melite and result in possible forfeiture of her not inconsiderable dowry (cf. 8.8.13, 8.10.7). That being said, it could merely be a variation on the so-called adultery type-scene in which the husband is generally out of house on some business, usually at night, when the adulterous affair takes place, and his untimely return finds the couple *in flagrante* (cf. Schwartz 2007: 273). **ἀνέστρεφεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν:** Despite the above observations, Thersander does not return home immediately, but is instead waylaid by Sosthenes (6.4.3-4), and they change course to visit Leucippe at the country estate. Thersander eventually does make his way home before dawn after his first unsuccessful attempt at wooing Leucippe (6.7.9).

6.3.2 Ἦν δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερομηνία… πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων: 'It was the festival of Artemis and there were drunkards all over the place, so that all night long the whole marketplace was occupied by a large crowd of people'. Public festivals are a common and useful narrative tool for unexpected encounters in the novels; usually, however, it is a synchronous meeting of the lovers (e.g. Charit. 1.1.4, X. Eph. 1.2.2, Heliod. 3.5), thus Clitophon's unforeseen encounter with Thersander and Sosthenes takes on a somewhat bathetic effect. The festival at which Habrocomes and Anthia meet (X. Eph. 1.2.2-4) is also a festival for Artemis at Ephesus and it may be that AT is alluding to it here (Whitmarsh 2018: 125). There were two main festivals to Artemis held annually in Ephesus to which the festival here could correspond: the Artemisia, a month-long festival in the month of Artemision (March/April); and the Mysteries of Artemis, which celebrated her nativity on the 6th Thargelion (May/June).[302] Both festivals were comprised of festivities which were social, such as feasts, theatre, and sports, as well as religious, such as processions and sacrifices/libations (Oster 1990: 1708-10; Immendörfer 2017: 169-174; cf. *IEph* Ia24, Ia27, on which see Oster 1987; translation, Rogers 1991: 152-85). We know from Clitophon's description that there was a social element (μεθυόντων πάντα μεστά). During the festivals and holy days to Artemis no judicial business could be conducted (Oster 1987: 77), and it may be possible to find a correspondence with Clitophon's later stay of execution by the arrival of the Priest of Artemis leading the embassy with Sostratus (7.12.3-4); however, if it were not for their arrival the legal proceedings would have continued uninterrupted (cf. Whitmarsh 2001: 160 on the arrival of the sacred embassy as an allusion to the delay of Socrates' execution, e.g. Pl. *Phd*. 58a-c). The question of which Artemis festival

[302] A third festival, the Daitis, which involved transporting a statue of Artemis to the harbour and ritually washing her in seawater does not appear to bear any resemblance to what Clitophon describes here (Strelan 1996: 63-5; Immendörfer 2017: 170-1).

Clitophon finds himself at is unanswerable; some scholars have assumed the Artemisia (Strelan 1994: 58; Immendörfer 2017: 170), while others the Mysteries (Rogers 2012: 185). Hägg (1971: 64 n. 1), conjecturing the Mysteries, points out that the date of late spring would be incongruous with the chronology of the novel as the decision to winter at Tyre comes but a few weeks later (8.19.3). The same argument can naturally be made for the Artemisia, which has a date in early spring. Nonetheless, there were a number of smaller festivals to Artemis throughout the year at Ephesus at which Clitophon could be present (cf. Arnold 1972: 17-22, although her reference to AT appears to be erroneous). It appears that AT is exploiting a basic general knowledge of Ephesus and her customs, rather than aiming for any real specificity or historicity. Although Clitophon suffers this initial misfortune at Artemis' festival, the goddess does later appear to favour him (7.14.6, 8.2.2). Indeed, Clitophon swears, with Artemis as his witness, to his celibacy with Melite (8.5.2), "an irony not to be missed" (Anderson 1982: 31; see further Montiglio 2013: 76-7). Further on Artemis' role, see 6.21.2n. **τὴν ἀγοράν:** The agora in *L&C* is a convenient communal place for chance encounters (5.8.2) and displays of social importance (8.17.8). Ephesus had two agoras, the State (Upper) Agora, situated within the city and used for political and religious affairs, and the Commercial (Tetragonos) Agora, situated near the harbour and used for matters of trade; the two were connected by the Embolos (Curetes Street), a main arterial route in the city (Immendörfer 2017: 93-108; cf. Rogers 2012: 70, 97 on the construction of the agoras, also pp. xv-xxii for maps showing both). The State Agora would be the most likely location, both for its function as religious public space, and its location at the heart of the city; nonetheless, it is equally likely that AT has no specific knowledge of Ephesus' urban plan and is merely banking on the ubiquity of the town square. See further Saïd 1994: 222-3 for a general comparison of the communal space of the agora in the romance novels. **Κἀγὼ μὲν ἐδόκουν τοῦτο μόνον εἶναι τὸ δεινόν…:** 'And I thought this was my only danger…'. Clitophon harbours some concerns over the drunken crowd, whether it is of discovery or physical assault is not immediately apparent, although when identified by Thersander and Sosthenes the crowd are quick to coalesce (6.5.2). It is possible that sexual assault is implied here, based on such examples as Seneca's fictitious case of a young man in women's clothing who is sexually assaulted by a gang of men at night (Sen. *Controv*. 5.6, so Brethes 2012: 135), or Pamphila's rape at the all-night Tauropolia festival that precedes the action in Menander's *Epitrepontes*. As Pierce (1997: 164) describes the scene in New Comedy: "Crowds of people celebrating, alcohol, the darkness of night and headiness of the festivities could have provided ample opportunity for sexual misdemeanour", a description that practically mirrors the one here. A further reason to admit the fearful undercurrent of sexual

violence is that it establishes a dark, yet ironic, foreshadowing of the sexual abuse that Leucippe is soon to face at Thersander's hands. **ἐλελήθει δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τεχθέν μοι χαλεπώτερον:** 'little did I know something far worse was in store for me'. Another prompt from Clitophon-*auctor* that reminds us we are hearing the tale with the advantage of his hindsight (e.g. 5.23.1). Sometimes Clitophon's foreknowledge is explained later (cf. 6.17.1n.), other times it is merely a parenthetic remark, as in this case (see Intro. 2.2).

6.3.3 Ὁ γὰρ Σωσθένης…: This brief aside is a reminder both that Sosthenes is Leucippe's abuser and that he has an axe to grind with Melite. The former foreshadows Sosthenes' eagerness to torture Leucippe (6.20.4); the latter is crucial corroboration for Sosthenes' continued persecution of both the lovers and Melite, and hence fundamental to his and Thersander's collaboration. This aside heralds the lengthier insert of his meeting with Thersander and abduction of Leucippe that occurs while Clitophon and Melite are engaged in their tryst and escape plan. The thread of the 'current' narrative is resumed when Sosthenes rejoins Thersander (after the abduction) who is on his way home from his friend (6.4.3; see Intro 2.1).

6.3.4 Καὶ πρῶτον μέν…: Naturally, it turns out to be Sosthenes who had forewarned Thersander of Melite and Clitophon's relationship and, in all likelihood, fanned the flames of his earlier fury (5.23.3-7). **περὶ Λευκίππης λέγει πάνυ πιθανῶς πλασάμενος:** 'fabricating an entirely feasible fiction regarding Leucippe'. πλάσσω (lit. 'to form/mould/fabricate') in its metaph. sense, especially when coupled with λέγειν, takes on the meaning 'to speak from invention', i.e. 'to lie' (so Kauffman 2015: 47-8, who suggests translating the verb as "fictionalizing"; cf. LSJ s.v. V; e.g. Hdt. 8.80.8, Aeschin. 2.20.7-8, Plut. *Luc*. 9.6.7, Diod. Sic. 9.30.1.5-6). It is also connected with the subst. πλάσμα ('a moulded figure/form'), from whence πλάσματα, the term for 'fiction' that was sometimes applied to the novel (cf. fn. 164). Here the verb is emphasised as the final word of the three, which form an alliterative crescendo of syllables. Describing Sosthenes' 'fiction' as 'credible/plausible' is not merely a comment on his characterization as the 'tricky slave' (Intro. 2.3.5), but, for the *lector scrupulosus*, could be read as a metafictive comment on Clitophon-*auctor*, who is here himself indulging in a bit of 'plausible fictionalising' in narrating an exchange at which he was not present. A similar phrase introduces Melite's own elaborate exposition on Rumour (Φήμη) and Slander (Διαβολή), and perhaps the inclusion of διαβαλών here is meant to allude to that fact (cf. 6.10.2n.). The description of Sosthenes' fictionalisation of Leucippe's beauty recalls

Callisthenes' own powerful imaginings of her (ἀναπλάττων γὰρ ἑαυτῷ τῆς παιδὸς τὸ κάλλος, 2.13.2), which is borne out in Thersander's similar reaction to the hearsay (Kauffman 2015: 46-59; *infra* 6.3.5n.). **Ἐπεὶ γὰρ αὐτός… τῆς Μελίτης ἀπαγάγοι:** 'Since he had given up hope of having her to himself, he pimped her instead to his master, so as to estrange him from Melite'. μαστροπεύω 'to act as go-between/pimp/pander', cf. Lucian *Tim*. 16.9, Xen. *Symp*. 4.57.3. Sosthenes' demotion is not the only source of his resentment, he has also missed out on the opportunity to take Leucippe for his own pleasure (5.17.4). In offering her now to Thersander, Sosthenes can reap a double revenge by both alienating Melite's husband from her affection and exacting his own retribution on the recalcitrant Leucippe. **χρῆμά τι κάλλους ἄπιστον:** 'a thing of such unbelievable beauty!' Sosthenes' hyperbole here is not only an indication of his own rhetorical pomposity, but also part of a sustained allusion to the indefinability of Leucippe's beauty (cf. 6.4.4n.; see Intro. 2.4.4).

6.3.5 οὕτως αὐτὴν πιστεύσειας ἀκούων, ὡς ἰδών: 'So much so that you must believe the hearsay as if you were actually seeing it'. On Sosthenes' urging, Thersander commits the ultimate *faux pas* of novelistic convention: giving into a desire that is based not on sight, but on hearing. In this respect he resembles Callisthenes who, on hearing of Leucippe's beauty, indulges in an obsessive desire, a definitive sign of his lubriciousness (καὶ ἦν ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἐραστής· τοσαύτη γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολάστοις ὕβρις, ὡς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν εἰς ἔρωτα τρυφᾶν, 2.13.1; see further, Morales 2004: 90-5; Montiglio 2013: 73-4; Intro. 2.3.4). Compare Heliod. 8.2, where Oroondates is similarly filled with passion for the heroine Charicleia based on hearsay alone. Ancient consensus generally esteemed the sense of sight over that of hearing (e.g. Heraclit. B101a DK, Hdt. 1.8.10-1, *Anth. Gr.* 5.130.6, Lucian *Dom*. 20, Hor. *Ars P*. 180-2, Cic. *De Orat*. 2.357; on the "supremacy of sight", see e.g. Squire 2016: 10-14), however the ability to fall in love on report alone is also attested (e.g. Philostr. *Her*. 54.4, on which, Whitmarsh 2009b: 224-5; Philostr. *Ep*. 41, on which, Walker 1993: 134-5). **ἠκηκόειν ζῶντά σε:** Sosthenes claims to have had word that Thersander lived, whereas Melite says the report was of his death (6.9.3); both are manipulating the vagaries of rumour to persuade Thersander of their ploy. **καὶ ἐπίστευον, ὅπερ ἤθελον:** 'and believed (*sc.* it to be true), as I yearned (*sc*. it to be so)'. A rather brachyological expression, which Plepelits (1980: 249) identifies as a common proverbial saying, along the lines of "what a man wishes, he believes to be so" (cf. Dem. 3.19, Charit. 6.5.2). **Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξέφαινον, ἵνα τὴν δέσποιναν ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ καταλάβοις:** 'But I did not produce (her), so that you could catch the mistress in the act'. The phrase ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ is common especially in legal contexts, meaning '*in flagrante delicto*' (e.g. Lys. 13.85, Isoc.

18.53, Dem. 19.132, 19.293; see discussion in Harris 1994). The legalistic vocabulary looks forward to the capture and imprisonment of Clitophon on charges of adultery, which is itself but a precursor to the ubiquitous courtroom drama that follows (see Intro. 2.4.3; 6.5.3n.). An intrinsic part of the adultery type-scene is the husband catching the wife and lover in the act, an occurrence familiar from a number of genres, including mime where it often led to slapstick (Schwartz 2002: 99; cf. e.g. Lys. 1.23-6, Charit. 1.4.10; see also Intro. 2.4.2). In this case however, unlike in usual depictions, Thersander interrupts Clitophon and Melite at dinner and not in the bedroom, the couple yet to even consummate their union (5.23). This departure from the usual order of events is part of AT's unconventional approach to generic expectations, forming part of the supreme irony that allows Melite to be cleared of all charges, as she did not have sex with Clitophon while Thersander was abroad, nor when he 'caught them in the act', but rather after he had already locked Clitophon away. To further the irony, before even Thersander's return, Clitophon does have a moment of guilty conscience where he *feels* like the adulterer caught in the act, inspired by the reproachful words of Leucippe's letter and the memory of the abuse inflicted on her by Sosthenes (ὥσπερ ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ μοιχὸς κατειλημμένος, 5.19.6); however, legally speaking there is no precedent for a man being found guilty of adultery for cheating on his wife or fiancée (Schwartz 2016: 101-2). Later at the trial, Thersander, in his haste to see Clitophon executed, declares that a confession is tantamount to, if not better than, catching someone in the act (εἰ φονέα ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ λαβόντες (μεῖζον γὰρ τῆς φωρᾶς τὸ αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ κατειπεῖν) οὐ δὴ κελεύετε τῷ δημίῳ, 7.11.1), on which Schwartz (2016: 112) notes that in both Athenian and Roman law "the purpose of a trial was to determine culpability; a confession obviated the need for a formal verdict" (cf. Dem. 24.65). **μή σου καταγελᾷ μοιχὸς ἄτιμος καὶ ξένος:** 'and (so) that the dishonourable foreign adulterer could no longer laugh at you'. καταγελάω + gen. = 'laugh at/mock'; on the force of the preposition, cf. Smyth §1384a. Sosthenes' xenophobia is perhaps a reference to the Phoenicians' supposed wanton ways (Intro. 2.3.1).

6.3.6 ἡ Τύχη δὲ ἐτήρησέ σοι, ὥστε τοσοῦτον κάλλος λαβεῖν: 'Fortune has preserved her for you so that you can take possession of such a beauty'. Tyche works in mysteriously capricious ways, and in this case has appeared to favour Thersander in delaying Leucippe's departure. **Ἔστι δέ γε ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς:** Garnaud has γε (W), while Vilborg has νῦν (om. α-family). In this instance Vilborg's appears the better choice, since the combination of δέ γε is more usual in the "retorts and lively rejoinders" of dialogue, and even in continuous speech usually has "some tinge of repartee" (Denniston, 152-6), which is not the case here. The temporal immediacy of

νῦν also corresponds with χθές (i.e. *yesterday* she was sent away, and *now* she is on the estate). **οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως πρὸς αὐτῆς ἀπεσταλμένη:** 'I know not on what mission she has been dispatched for her (*sc*. Melite)'. A reminder to the narratee of the assignment given to Leucippe by Melite, while still unaware of her true identity, to help provide her with a love philtre to rouse Clitophon's desire (5.22). The supreme irony, of course, is that in the meanwhile Clitophon has performed to Melite's satisfaction with no recourse to magic potions of any kind, and indeed his seeming irresistibility to women has Thersander later label him a 'wizard' in love (φαρμακεύς, 6.17.1 with n.). **ὡς ὑπὸ σοὶ γένοιτο:** 'so that she may come under your sway'. γίγνομαι + ὑπό + dat. = 'to be subject to/fall into the hands of' (LSJ s.v. II 3 c). The opt. after a primary tense in final clauses is very rare (cf. Smyth §2200, 2205; Rijksbaron §22 n. 3; Goodwin §323), and the examples in the reference works cited above do not satisfactorily explain this instance, in which case it may appear better to correct it to the aor. subj. γένηται (cf. Goodwin §322). On the other hand, given AT's tendency to use the opt. in moments of euphuism (Intro. 1.3), it could be that we are meant to pick up on Sosthenes' solecism as indicative of his own verbosity.

6.4.1 ἐκέλευσε τοῦτο ποιεῖν: Thersander's pliability to his servant's words and his quick ardour for a slave-girl are indicative of his inherent baseness (Intro. 2.3.4). Compare Chariton's Dionysius who is reluctant to take on a slave girl, nor so easily persuaded by his steward's words (Charit. 2.1.5; cf. Intro. 2.4.1). **Ἔρχεται δὲ σπουδῇ μάλα ὁ Σωσθένης εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς…:** 'So Sosthenes left with all haste for the country-estate…'. Historic pres. to add vividness to the tale of Leucippe's kidnapping. **τὴν καλύβην:** 'hut/cabin', used of the rough shelters of the *Boukoloi* (4.12.7-8, cf. Heliod. 1.5.3) and of a ship's cabin (5.15.3). **περιελεῖν δόλῳ… ἐφ' ὁμιλίᾳ:** 'to divert (the maids who accompanied Leucippe) with some ploy and, calling them over, to distract them with conversation somewhere out of the way'. περιαιρέω ('to remove/strip off') is not common in the novelists and AT tends to use it in reference to some deception, e.g. 3.18.3, 8.16.2 (even, possibly, 2.1.2).

6.4.2 ἀγαγών: α-family (Garnaud), versus β-family's "διάγων" (Vilborg). Although there is not much difference in meaning between ἄγω ('lead') and its compound διάγω ('lead aside') in this context, there is perhaps an argument to be made for both options: while διάγω makes sense as Sosthenes is diverting two of the workmen away and leading them to another task, however, it would be the only instance of this verb in the novel, in other similar instances of leading a person away only ἄγω is used (e.g. 1.2.3, 2.2.6, 2.27.1). Furthermore, the aor. part.

seems a better fit than the pres., given that it conforms to the sequence of events and the tense of the other verbs (i.e. 'Having led… then saw… then leapt upon…). **τὸ στόμα ἐπισχών:** On the narrative 'silencing' of Leucippe, see 6.16.3n. **ἁρπάζει:** A similar variance as above, Garnaud (α-family), over Vilborg's "συναρπάζει" (β-family). The argument is much the same, ἁρπάζω appears to be the preferred verb in AT for carrying off a woman (e.g. 2.13.3, 2.23.5, 7.7.3), whereas, if we follow Vilborg, this would be the only instance of συναρπάζω in the text. Either way, their meaning is synonymous ('abduct/carry off'). Coupled with the similar case above, it would appear that meaning is not much affected in the choice between verb and its prefixed counterpart, and that on the evidence of the examples from elsewhere in the text that Garnaud's choice is to be preferred; however, it must be noted, that the addition of a prefix to a verb can give it a telic effect (Allan 2017: 101-2), which in this case, could highlight the inevitability of Leucippe's abduction. It is evident that arguments can be made for both cases, and it seems then to come down to the personal preference of the editor involved (Intro. 1.2). **κατὰ θάτερα τῆς τῶν θεραπαινίδων ἐκτροπῆς χωρεῖ:** 'he went in the opposite direction to (where) the maids (had gone)'. **τι δωμάτιον ἀπόρρητον:** The diminutive of δῶμα ('house'), usually a room or chamber (e.g. 1.6.2, 2.1.1), but also used of a small shed or hut where someone is locked away (e.g. 3.9.3). The meaning of ἀπόρρητος is usually more esoteric ('ineffable/forbidden', e.g. 5.15.6, 8.6.1), but it also takes the more mundane meaning of 'secret' in both adj. and subst. form (e.g. 2.14.9, 7.11.8; cf. Charit. 3.9.10, 3.9.12, Long. 3.32.3, X. Eph. 5.9.12, Heliod. 7.12.6); perhaps it is used here to yield a more sensational effect (cf. Bowie 2019: 255). **Ἥκω σοι φέρων σωρὸν ἀγαθῶν· ἀλλ' ὅπως εὐτυχήσασα μὴ ἐπιλήσῃ μου:** 'I come to you bearing a bounty of blessings! See that you do not forget me in your time of fortune'. Sosthenes appears to be hoping for some solidarity amongst slaves, perhaps that Leucippe, as Thersander's new concubine, might have some sway in regaining him his administrative position on the estate. He persists in depicting Leucippe's abduction as beneficial to her (6.11.3), and his words here echo those of Artaxates, who attempts to procure Callirhoe for the Great King (μεγάλων… ἀγαθῶν, ὦ γύναι, θησαυρόν σοι κεκόμικα· καὶ σὺ δὲ μνημόνευέ μου τῆς εὐεργεσίας, Charit. 6.5.1; thus, De Temmerman 2014: 192; see Intro. 2.4.1).

6.4.3 Μὴ γὰρ φοβηθῇς… σοι προξενεῖ: 'Do not be afraid of this kidnapping, nor think that it means any harm to you; in fact, it has procured my master as your lover!' προξενέω 'to procure *x* (acc.) for *y* (dat.)' (LSJ s.v. II 1). Note the careful antithesis of master/lover, a promise that is later inverted in Thersander's threat to Leucippe (6.20.3 with n.). Sosthenes frames the

kidnapping as a matchmaking, which links this instance with a pattern of 'bridal abductions' throughout the novel. The theme has its precursor in the opening ekphrasis where Europa is carried away by the bull (1.3-13) but reaches its height in Callisthenes' botched plot to abduct Leucippe, which, despite the mix-up, still ends in a successful marriage to Clitophon's half-sister Calligone (2.13-18, 8.17-18). Technically, by eloping with Leucippe without her parents' permission, Clitophon is also guilty of a type of bridal abduction (cf. 5.11.3), perhaps why he includes the point that it was ratified by (apocryphal) law in Byzantium (2.13.3; cf. Whitmarsh 2001: 150 "no such law is known of"); see further Whitmarsh 2020: 65; with Evans-Grubbs 1989. Like her *Scheintoden*, then, Leucippe is involved in a series of bridal abductions: one bungled by Callisthenes, one consensual with Clitophon, and one totally against her will with Sosthenes and Thersander. **Ἡ μὲν δὴ τῷ παραλόγῳ… ἐσιώπησεν:** 'And she, astounded at this contrary turn of events, was speechless'. ἐκπλήσσω ('to dumbfound/strike with shock') is used a number of times of shocks both welcome (e.g. 1.4.5, 5.8.3) and unwelcome (e.g. 3.17.2) and, as with Pasion (6.2.3n.), we are being invited to bask in a character's surprise as a way of vicariously enjoying the narrative twists. Leucippe's inability to react, as explained by Clitophon in the very beginning of his narrative, is common to any sudden and unexpected turn of events (1.3.3). Compare Sosthenes' shocked forgetfulness when he fails to shut the door to Leucippe's hut (allowing her to escape), explained by Clitophon in one of his many gnomic interjections (ὡς ἔοικεν, ὁ λόγος, ὅτι μνήμην ἐκπλήσσειν πέφυκε φόβος, 7.10.4; cf. Thuc. 2.87.4, thus Whitmarsh 2001: 160). **ἐπανιὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν:** A reiteration of Thersander's earlier decision to return home (πάλιν ἀνέστρεφεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν, 6.3.1) that signals to the reader that we are soon to rejoin that same narrative thread (Hägg 1971: 184 n. 1).

6.4.4 Τοῦ δὲ Σωσθένους αὐτῷ μηνύσαντος… φύσει καλοῦ: 'When Sosthenes disclosed to him how things stood with Leucippe, theatrically over-elaborating her beauty, Thersander was filled by his words as if by a beautiful phantasm, by its nature beautiful'. The narrator has spared himself the task of having to render Sosthenes' speech directly and in full, nonetheless the few choice phrases provided give the gist of what would have been an (undoubtedly) bombastic masterpiece (cf. 6.5.3n). Note the polyptotonic play on the operative word καλός/κάλλος ('beauty/beautiful') and the general assonance. κατατραγῳδέω ('to declaim in tragic style/exaggerate elaborately'), unattested elsewhere in Greek literature, is used only here and by the Priest of Artemis describing Thersander's courtroom declamation (τύραννον ἀποκαλῶν με καὶ ὅσα κατετραγῴδησέ μου, 8.9.7; cf. LSJ s.v.). The verb is implicitly theatrical in etymology (Intro. 2.4.2) and it appears that Sosthenes is engaging in a poetical form of

exaggerated *phantasia* here (cf. [Long.] *Subl*. 15.3; Intro. 2.4.4). There are several similar compounds with much the same meaning: ἐπιτραγῳδέω, Lucian *Tox*. 12.4, Heliod. 2.29.4; ἐκτραγῳδέω, Polyb. 6.15.7, Lucian *Tox*. 11.9; προστραγῳδέω, Strab. 17.1.43.28-9, Joseph. *BJ* 7.443; ἐντραγῳδέω Lucian *Sat*. 19.21 (also a hapax) is usually translated along the lines of 'to come the hero over' (LSJ s.v.), but 'to behave tragically' elsewhere (*BDAG* s.v.). The addition of the prefix κάτα- exaggerates a verb of over-exaggeration (see Intro. 1.3). Compare Achaimenes' rhapsodizing of Charicleia's beauty to Oroondates (Heliod. 8.2.1); elsewhere, however, her beauty cannot be put into words, only shown (Heliod. 5.10.2-11.1). Translating φάντασμα as 'phantasm' may seem an evasion, but it nonetheless encapsulates the vagaries of this shadowy term: primarily, φαντάσματα appear as visions experienced in dreams or as dreams themselves (e.g. 2.24.4, 4.10.6; cf. Aesch. *Sept*. 710, Theoc. *Id*. 21.30), however these apparitions can also refer to ghosts (e.g. Long. 2.26.5, Pl. *Phd*. 81d1-4, Plut. *Oth*. 4.4), or even a daemon (e.g. Plut. *Dio*. 2.3; on daemons, see 6.13.1n.). Here, however, AT is exploiting the language and ideas of Stoic sensory perception, where a φάντασμα is an imagined vision or mental picture that could be likened to a daydream or fantasy (cf. [Plut.] *Plac*. 900d-901a, Diog. Laert. 7.50). It may even be possible to detect the beginnings of the Phaedran echo that resonates through 6.6-7, when Socrates depicts the perfect Forms as "εὐδαίμονα φάσματα" (Pl. *Phdr*. 250c3; LSJ s.v. A: "φάντασμα = φάσμα"; cf. Yunis 2011: 150; see Intro. 2.4.4). Later Sosthenes boasts to Leucippe of the effect he has had on Thersander here (6.11.4 with n.). Compare also the story of Odatis and Zariadres who fall in love with each other solely based on *phantasiai* of each other seen in dreams (Ath. 13.35.15-17), theirs, however, is an evenly matched love as both experience visions of each other. **φύσει καλοῦ:** A phrase that has puzzled editors and translators alike (e.g. Gaselee "instinct with beauty"; Whitmarsh "a natural beauty"; Winkler omits the phrase). Vilborg suggests it may "be ascribed to AT's circumstantial style", but ultimately leans the same way as O'Sullivan, proposing that it is a corruption of ὡσεὶ κάλλους; Garnaud admits to the awkwardness but finds this suggestion unconvincing. The chiasmus with the previous phrase offers a suggestive contrast between φάντασμα and φύσις, which may indicate a play on beauty as it appears in one's imagined vision and as it exists in nature (Frazier 2013: 283 n. 6), or of "the effectiveness of artifice in creating an illusion of reality" (Montiglio 2013: 73 n. 33). **παννυχίδος οὔσης:** The festival of Artemis also serves as a plausible pretext for Thersander and Sosthenes to be out and about at night-time (cf. 6.3.1-2nn.; Plepelits 1980: 249), and mentioning it again here indicates a realignment with Clitophon's narrative thread that we have been anticipating since 6.3.1 (Hägg 1971: 184 n. 1; Intro. 2.1). **τεττάρων σταδίων:** A *stade* can be understood as approximately 200 metres in

distance (a unit of measure based on the length of a sports stadium); thus, the estate is roughly 800 metres to one kilometre away (just over half a mile). The distance between the townhouse and estate has already been mentioned (5.17.2) but is reiterated here as a natural supplementary detail to enhance the realism of the urgent simultaneous action: the relatively short distance makes the constant back-and-forth and coincidental meetings more plausible. **τεττάρων:** α-family (Garnaud), whereas β-family has τεσσάρων (Vilborg). AT shows an inconsistent application of Atticizing forms (see Intro. 1.3). This is one of four instances in the text where the MSS disagree on the form of τέσσαρες/τέτταρες, the remaining thirteen instances are invariant, but are split: 8 τέσσαρες, 5 τέτταρες. Of the four instances that show variation (4.15.5, 4.16.2, 5.17.2, 6.4.4), α-family reflects τέτταρες and β-family τέσσαρες. In the introduction to his edition of the text, Vilborg states his certainty that the archetype "vacillated" between -σσ-/-ττ- forms throughout the text, but that "-σσ-forms preponderate", contrary to Gammage's (2018: 62-3) findings that "-ττ- takes precedence over -σσ-". Vilborg uses F as the determiner in most cases where the families are split, however since F is only extant as far as 4.4, in the remaining instances he follows the β-family, which shows a clear favouritism for the -σσ- form. Garnaud, on the other hand, is less transparent in his choices, and indeed in the four instances of τέσσαρες mentioned above, does not include the possible variation in his *app. crit*. Of the four, he sides with α-family three times (as we have come to expect), but surprisingly once with β-family (4.15.5). This means that in his text the variation on τέσσαρες is split almost equally (9 -σσ-; 8 -ττ-), whereas Vilborg shows a definite preference (12 -σσ; 5 -ττ-). See further Santafé Soler 2005: 46-52; Gammage 2018 : 61-66. **χωρεῖν ἤθελεν:** α-family (Garnaud) in place of ἔμελλεν (β-family, Vilborg). Unlike above (6.4.2n.), there is no precedent from the text to guide us, as both verbs are used with almost equal frequency with the pres. inf. In which case, I would argue Vilborg's choice serves AT's simultaneous narrative better (cf. O'Sullivan s.v., who also prefers μέλλω). When in the impf. μέλλω with the inf. suggests an unrealised past intent (Goodwin §428a; Smyth §1960), thus highlighting the synchronous nature of the meeting, i.e. Thersander and Sosthenes are on the point of leaving when Clitophon unluckily chances upon them (6.5.1). Thus: '…ordering Sosthenes to lead the way, Thersander was on the verge of setting off'.

6.5.1 Ἐν τούτῳ δέ: Clitophon now returns to where we left him at 6.3.1, where he broke off to recount what occurred between Sosthenes and Thersander and then Sosthenes and Leucippe while he was 'detained' with Melite. **καὶ ἀπερισκέπτως ἐμπίπτω… γνωρίσας:** 'and, totally unawares, I bumped headlong into them; it was Sosthenes who recognised me first'. The advb.

of ἀπερίσκεπτος (‘unobservant/thoughtless’) is often found in a martial sense of recklessly engaging in battle or underestimating the adversary forces (e.g. Thuc. 4.10.1, 6.57.3, Plut. *Comp*. *Pel*. *Marc*. 3.6.4, *Artax*. 10.2.4, Cass. Dio 37.4.3, 39.45.3), which is likely the sense aimed for here in light of Sosthenes’ military comparisons that follow. Jones (2012: 247 n. 204) suggests that Clitophon’s heedlessness here is perhaps indicative that he is so accustomed to female dress (i.e. that he has cross-dressed before) that he has now become “*blasé*” toward it; the very opposite may well be true, i.e. that Clitophon is so focused on not tripping up in his unfamiliar dress that he fails to look around. Nonetheless, the fact that the inference can be made is further emblematic of Clitophon’s general subversion of gender norms. Sosthenes’ instantaneous identification of Clitophon here stands in wry contrast with Clitophon’s earlier failure to recognise Leucippe on the estate (5.17.7; see Intro. 2.4.2). **Ἀλλ᾽ ἰδού… λάφυρα:** ‘Hey, look! … The adulterer is playing the bacchant and attacking us while wearing spoils plundered from your wife’. The discovery of Clitophon’s cross-dressing at a festival to Artemis is reminiscent of Clodius’ discovery at the rites of the Bona Dea in 62 BCE (Marinčič 2007: 195 n. 118). Clodius was smuggled in and out of the house by a maidservant (like Clitophon) and attended (allegedly) to conduct an affair with Caesar’s wife (e.g. Cic. *Att*. 1.12.3, 1.13.3, Cass. Dio 37.45, Plut. *Caes*. 10); however, while Clodius is in disguise in order to infiltrate, Clitophon has dressed in order to escape. It was not unknown for “Saturnalian elements” to be present at the festivals to Artemis in Ephesus (Oster 1987: 77), so perhaps Clitophon’s transvestism is not entirely inappropriate in the situation. **βακχεύων:** βακχεύω means both ‘to perform the mysteries/join in the revelry of Bacchus’ (e.g. Cass. Dio 79.18.1, Eur. *Hel*. 1364, *Bacch*. 313, 343) and ‘to act like one stricken by frenzy or madness’ (e.g. Eur. *HF* 966, 1122), and the two meanings are usually implied at the same time (e.g. Hdt. 4.79, Pl. *Ion* 534a4, Eur. *Bacch*. 251). The verb and its variants appear infrequently in the novels, used only by AT and Heliodorus, who employs it of spontaneous religious enthusiasm (Heliod. 7.8.5) and a potentially disturbed mind (Heliod. 10.22.4). As mentioned (Intro. 2.4.2), this episode is likely an allusion to Pentheus’ transvestism in Euripides *Bacchae*: Pentheus is persuaded by Dionysus (in disguise as an itinerant priest) to dress as one of the Theban women to spy on their bacchic worship. He becomes a victim of a grisly sparagmos at the hands of his mother and the other maenads, who discover him spying and mistake him for a mountain lion in their madness. It has been argued that Pentheus’ transvestism in the myth is a Euripidean innovation, but this is difficult to prove (Rutherford 2005: 124). The humour lies in the implicit contrast between the two mythical transvestites: Melite is reminded of the handsome young Achilles (6.1.3 with n.), whereas Sosthenes sees a mad Pentheus, a bacchic aberration. There may also be an element

of ritual initiation detectable in this allusion: earlier in the novel Clitophon regales us with an aetiological tale of the Dionysiac festival, where Dionysus first visited a Tyrian shepherd, bestowing upon him (and all humans) wine for the first time, which, on drinking, sent him into a bacchic ecstasy (ὁ δὲ πιὼν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς βακχεύεται, 2.2.4). At this festival and under the influence of the wine and the aegis of both Eros and Dionysus, Leucippe and Clitophon share their first 'shameless' glances (2.3.3). The implication there is that the couple are initiated into the ways of Eros with the aid of Dionysus; similarly, here we may take the reference to 'playing the bacchant' as a continuation of the initiatory transvestism alluded to in the comparison with Achilles on Skyros, as the Bacchic mysteries also included elements of cross-dressing (see Seaford 2006: 52-7; cf. Stat. *Achil*. 1.594-674 where the transvestite Achilles covertly attends a women-only Bacchic festival; see further Heslin 2005: 250-5 for a comparison of Statius' Achilles and Euripides' Pentheus). This is by no means a solemn engagement with mystery initiation, rather AT plays with the language and expression of religious and erotic mystery throughout the novel (e.g. 1.2.2, 1.9.7, 5.26.3, 5.26.10), in the same unconventional and humorous way that he approaches most other institutions. **ἡμῖν ἔπεισι:** It is also possible to see an inversion of the *Bacchae* reference here, that Clitophon is the frenzied maenad about to fall upon and tear apart Thersander and Sosthenes, who stand in for Pentheus (Jones 2012: 248). **λάφυρα:** 'spoils taken in war', cf. 4.13.4. From the point of view of the reader, Clitophon's liaison with Melite has been characterised by passivity and necessity, from Sosthenes and Thersander's, however, he appears to be the conquering adulterer (cf. Charit. 8.1.2, Eur. *HF* 416-7). Clitophon's appearance in Melite's clothing raises some awkward questions and it is only natural that Sosthenes should conflate Clitophon's success as an adulterer with his cross-dressing. Compare the young adulterer in Tibullan elegy who, wandering the city at night, fears lest *his* garments be seized as some 'prize' (*Nec sinit occurrat quisquam, qui corpora ferro | Volneret aut rapta praemia veste petat*, Tib. 1.2.25a-6).

6.5.2 Ὁ μὲν οὖν νεανίσκος… προμηνῦσαι: 'The young man who was leading the way fled at the sight of them, not even taking the opportunity to forewarn me on account of his fear'. This incident is indicative of the slippage between Clitophon's attempted self-portrayal and the more realistic image that our author allows to emerge (Montiglio 2013: 80-2; Intro. 2.2). His recognition and recapture while in drag, as well as his attempt here to place the blame on the young man who was his escort to the estate (6.1.2; cf. Intro. 2.3.6), is anything but heroic and defies his efforts at narrating it to the contrary. Clitophon does not seem to take the realities of a freedman's status into account (which could perhaps be read as further evidence of his selfish

narration) – a freedman was not allowed to cause any harm or damage to his *patronus*' physical being or reputation and could be re-enslaved as a *libertus ingratus* (cf. Tac. *Ann*. 13.26-7; Mouritsen 2011: 53-9). It is easy to imagine, then, that this young man would be quite anxious not to be caught by his former master abetting the escape of the man who has debauched his wife. **καὶ ὁ Θέρσανδρος βοᾷ, καὶ πλῆθος τῶν παννυχιζόντων προσέρρεεν:** παννυχίζω 'to celebrate an all-night festival' (cf. παννυχίδος οὔσης, 6.4.4); the paratactic construction emphasises the quick succession of events. It is also common to the adulterer trope that they are to be found out and about at night-time (cf. Arist. *Soph*. *El*. 167b9-11). Garnaud adopts προσέρρεεν (α-family) in place of συνέρρεεν (β-family; Vilborg); however, as Laplace (1991: 54) suggests, this incident stands in counterpoint to a later event when, at the temple of Artemis, it is Clitophon who draws a crowd with his imprecations against Thersander (ταῦτά μου βοῶντος <ὁ> ὄχλος συνερρύη τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ παρόντων, 8.3.1). Taking this into account, συνέρρεεν appears the better editorial choice here in order to highlight the parallels in the reversal of circumstance (similarly Consonni 2006: 126).

6.5.3 Ἔτι μᾶλλον οὖν… τὸν λωποδύτην: 'Thersander continued to bewail his sufferings, shouting things both repeatable and unrepeatable: adulterer! clothes-thief!' δεινοπαθέω ('to complain loudly of one's sufferings'), more common in later authors, is generally used in criminal instances where an injured party deplores their treatment (e.g. Dem. 40.53, Diod. Sic. 12.24.4, Polyb. 12.16.9, Lucian *Syr.D*. 24.9). Again, we are given a sort of narratorial shorthand of what abuses Thersander might have voiced (cf. 6.4.4n.), note the repetition of βοάω (6.5.2) as well as the staccato alliteration of ῥητὰ μὲν καὶ ἄρρητα. In the latter phrase, Frazier (2013: 284 n. 7) finds an allusion to Soph. *OC* 1000-1; however, in the current context of criminal procedure, it is more likely familiar from legal oratory (e.g. Dem. 18.122, 21.79, 22.61; cf. Jebb 1885: 158-9). Nonetheless, this does not exclude the possibility of a Sophoclean allusion (cf. Soph. *OT* 464-5), which gives a melodramatic flavour to Thersander's imprecations. Clitophon's humiliation here in front of a crowd is "typical treatment of adulterers" (Schwartz 2016: 104-5); it may also be comparable to the public display made of Lucius at the *Risus* Festival (Apul. *Met*. 3.1-12, on which, May 2006: 182-207). **τὸν λωποδύτην:** Frazier (2013: 284 n. 7) suggests that the Sophoclean allusion is continued here, recalling an epigram attributed to him in Athenaeus: after a tryst with a boy Sophocles finds the boy has swapped their cloaks, for which Euripides scoffs at him for 'paying' for the encounter. In the epigram Sophocles rebukes Euripides for describing Eros as a clothes-thief, when he (Eur.) is in fact an adulterer (σὺ δ' οὐ σοφός, ὃς τὸν Ἔρωτα, ἀλλοτρίαν σπείρων, λωποδύτην ἀπάγεις, Ath.

13.82.19-20; it is doubtful that Sophocles is the author of the epigram, see Tyrrell 2005: 22). As with the first instance, there is also a connection with Athenian law-courts: λωποδύτης was a charge often included amongst a litany of others when accusing someone of ill-behaviour (e.g. Dem. 4.47, Antiph. 5.9, Isoc. 15.90, Aeschin. 1.91, Lys. 10.10; cf. Poll. *Onom*. 6.151.1). A λωποδύτης in its more specific sense, and as intended here, means 'clothes-thief', but is also be used more generally for robbery, much like mugging (Todd 2007: 674 n. 30). The λωποδύτης was one of the categories of malefactors (κακοῦργοι) who were liable to summary arrest (ἀπαγωγή) (Todd 2007: 674; Fisher 2001: 225), precisely what Thersander does next. If caught red-handed (as Clitophon is), it could mean the death penalty for either charge (cf. Dem. 4.47, Lys. 13.68, Xen. *Mem*. 1.2.62, Pl. *Leg*. ix.874c; see Fisher 2001: 225; Tyrrell 2005: 23). It is very likely that AT is exploiting his general knowledge of juridical phraseology gained from training in declamation and other court-room mimesis to add authenticity to the beginnings of the legal debacle that is the focal point of Bks. 7 and 8. **ἄγει δέ με… ἐπιφέρων:** 'He escorted me to the prison and handed me over, laying a charge of adultery against me'. Narratively speaking the prison is a useful transitory placeholder for Clitophon, removing him from the stream of action for the rest of Bk. 6 and allowing the storyline to focus on Leucippe's kidnapping. The prison also acts as a convenient springboard for much of the action in Bk. 7: Clitophon is duped by a planted inmate into believing that Melite has murdered Leucippe, causing him to falsely accuse Melite and inculpate himself in the hopes of ensuring both of their deaths (7.1-9). It is not exactly clear where the prison lay in Ephesus, the structure commonly called the Prison of St. Paul is now known to be a simple guard tower (Immendörfer 2017: 102 n. 90). **ἔγκλημα μοιχείας:** A formal punishment for adultery is evident even as early as the *Odyssey* (τὸ καὶ μοιχάγρι᾽ ὀφέλλει, Hom. *Od*. 8.332) and in classical Athens a number of avenues were available to the cuckolded husband, who could, given the correct circumstances, kill the adulterer (cf. Lys. 1.30). There were also various physical humiliations he could impose, such as inserting a (large) radish into their anus (e.g. Ar. *Nub*. 1083, Lucian *Peregr*. 9.5, Catull. 15.19; see Carey 1993); he could also (in Athenian law) impose a fine or ransom, or a charge of adultery (*graphe moicheias*), of which the penalty is not known (Carey 1995: 410). The precedent of sexual violation of an adulterer by the wronged husband intensifies Clitophon's peril in this situation and raises the possibility that Thersander might do the same to him here (Jones 2012: 248; cf. 6.3.2n.). Given the contemporary nature of AT's novel, as well as Thersander's demand in the court that the punishment of death should be imposed for adultery (8.8.13), scholars have conjectured that Roman law is being applied (e.g. Hilton 2009: 108). The *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis* that prescribed death for adulterers

was introduced by Augustus in 18 BCE as part of sweeping regulations on private Roman family life; it also dictated that a cuckolded husband who did not pursue a case against the adulterer should be prosecuted in turn (cf. Apul. *Met*. 9.27; see further Langlands 2006: 20-25). However, this law is over a century old by the time AT is writing his novel and, what is more, was promulgated largely for the Roman elite; it was more likely that such statutes would be emulated rather than legislated by provincial Greeks in the Imperial period. As Schwartz (2016: 5-10, 95) adumbrates, the judicial proceedings displayed in the Greek novels represents a reception and subversion of Roman law (cf. *infra* 6.5.4n.). The irony here, of course, is that while Thersander was away Clitophon has committed the crime for which he was initially incriminated; in sleeping with Melite while her husband is verifiably alive, Clitophon is acting *mens rea* (ἐκών), and in doing so has also turned the usual novelistic trope that the hero be falsely accused on its head (Schwartz 2002: 104 and 2016: 104-5). The specific phrase (ἔγκλημα μοιχείας) does not appear often but is clearly in contemporary usage in AT's time (e.g. Lucian *Eun*. 13.3-4, App. *Hann*. 234.6-7, Lib. *Decl*. 6.2.56).

6.5.4 Ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλύπει… αἰκία: 'None of this concerned me in the least, neither the affront of the restraints, nor the insult of his words'. Clitophon seems confident in his legal standing, perturbed neither by the outrage of the physical fetters nor by the slanderous defamations, which are given equal weight in a neat parisosis. Both ὕβρις and αἰκία can mean generally 'outrage/affront', but naturally their function as legal procedural terms ('(grievous) assault' *vel. sim.*) continues the general impression of forensic vocabulary (cf. 6.19.6n., 6.20.3n.). Again, α-family prefers the apocopic οὔθ'… οὔθ' versus οὔτε… οὔτε in β-family (cf. 6.1.3n.), likely to avoid hiatus (Intro. 1.3). **καὶ γὰρ ἐθάρρουν… ἐμφανῶς:** 'for I was confident that I would succeed with the argument that I was no adulterer, but rather openly married'. Clitophon depicts his marriage with Melite entirely as it suits him from situation to situation. Schwartz (2002: 101-4 and 2016: 94-102) tackles the issue with specific focus on the amalgamation of acts that make up Clitophon's and Melite's wedding, which she judges a "pastiche of Greek, Roman and Demotic wedding customs" (2016: 96). From 5.11.4, where Satyrus acts as a go-between on behalf of Melite to Clitophon, a number of activities take place that sanction their nuptials: first, a pre-wedding feast is held (5.13), followed by oaths at the temple of Isis the next day (5.14.2), they then hold a wedding banquet in Alexandria (5.14.3), followed by yet another feast on their arrival in Ephesus (5.17.2). When Leucippe re-enters the drama, she sarcastically congratulates him on his 'new' marriage (ὄναιο τῶν καινῶν γάμων, 5.18.6; cf.

Schwartz 2016: 100 who translates it as "unorthodox", but she perhaps infers too much in this instance). Until this point, and as Clitophon claims here, it appears that he and Melite are 'openly married'; however, Clitophon has been careful to leave some doubt open as to the validity of the marriage (Schwartz 2002: 102 interprets this as AT's doing; cf. De Temmerman 2014: 169 n. 60). At the oath giving ceremony, he is careful to attach the proviso that they do not sleep together until they reach Ephesus (5.14.3), and at their wedding feast Melite famously puns that their marriage is 'empty' (κενοτάφιον μὲν γὰρ εἶδον, κενογάμιον δὲ οὔ, 5.14.4). Clitophon's plans to defend himself to Leucippe on this fact, claiming to Satyrus that he is not really married (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγημα, 5.20.2); however, as Satyrus has already pointed out the whole city is now aware of their marriage (τῆς εὐηθείας· ὅλη γὰρ ἡ πόλις οὐκ οἶδε τὸν γάμον;, 5.20.2). Thus, much like his narration, Clitophon's defence of his actions is riddled with contradictions, to "Leucippe, [he] claims that the marriage is not valid because it was not sexually consummated; to Thersander, [he] plans to claim that the marriage is valid because it was openly contracted" (Schwartz 2016: 102). Fortunately for Clitophon the legality of his marriage never becomes a topic of judicial enquiry as he chooses instead to incriminate himself as an accomplice to the murder of Leucippe, derailing his trial for adultery (7.7). **Δέος δέ με περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης… ἀπολαβόντα:** 'But fear for Leucippe seized me, as I had not yet definitively recovered her'. Clitophon depicts himself as concerned only with Leucippe, who mirrors his fear in her lament (6.16.1-2 with nn.).

6.5.5 Ψυχαὶ δέ… εὐτυχοῦμεν: 'Our souls are by nature prophets of ill-fortune since we are hardly ever successful in our prophecies of good fortune'. Clitophon espouses an essentially pessimistic worldview, perhaps looking forward to the next grim turn of fate when he believes (falsely) that Leucippe has been murdered (7.4; cf. De Temmerman 2007a: 8). Slipping into the perf. with a gnomic flourish enhances the alliteration, while the chiasmus counterpoints the unlikelihood of good prophecy coming true with the gloomy inevitability of ill omen manifesting. **Οὐδὲν οὖν ὑγιὲς ἐνενόουν… δείματος:** 'However, my conscience was not so clear with regards to Leucippe, rather I harboured many misgivings and was full of fear'. lit. 'I was reflecting nothing sound in my mind about Leucippe'. The messy alliterative rhyme of the final clause adds to the image of emotional/mental upheaval. **Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν… κακῶς:** 'And so, really, I was sick at heart'. Another example of a correspondent μέν… δέ transitional construction that is picked up in the next section (6.6.1) with the continuance of the narrative action in another direction by another character (Hägg 1971: 184; cf. 6.2.6n.; Intro. 2.1). The repetition in τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς adds a rhythmic finality to the grim mood.

6.6-7: Beauty & the Beholder

With Clitophon safely out of the way, Thersander sets his sights on Leucippe, making straight for the hut where she is being held. There he finds her prone on the ground, her fear and grief illumined by the lamplight (6.6.1-3). Thersander is totally overwhelmed by his first glimpse of her and begs her to return his gaze and reverse the 'flow' of her beauty from the floor to his eyes (6.6.4). In response to his request, Leucippe's eyes fill with tears and the thread of the narrative breaks to observe this phenomenon in resplendent detail. The unattractive eye is only further marred by the act of crying, but if the eye is beautiful, then it becomes like a gravid floral fountain effulgent with unshed tears (6.7.1-2), an unearthly beauty (6.7.3). Captivated by this lachrymose loveliness, Thersander's own eyes fill with sympathetic tears (6.7.4); which are nonetheless revealed to be nothing more than an orchestrated display (6.5-7). With apparent solicitude, he elects to withdraw so that she may regain her composure, but not before bidding Sosthenes to advocate on his behalf (6.7.8-9).

6.6.1 ὡς εἶχεν ὁρμῆς: 'with all the effort he could muster' (*vel sim*.), a phrase used frequently of militaristic or animal-like effort, e.g. App. *B Civ.* 4.14.111.5, Polyaenus *Strat*. 8.56.1.20, Ael. *NA* 6.62.9, 7.11.10, 9.8.10. **ἐπὶ τὴν Λευκίππην ἴεται:** ἵημι + ἐπί + acc. continues the idea of an animalistic attack (cf. Arist. *Hist. an.* 629b24, where it used of the lion); the language here is of the pursuer and the pursued. **αὐτὴν χαμαὶ κειμένην:** The careful positioning of Leucippe makes a "spectacle of the female body, graceful and tormented", essentially giving the description of Leucippe prone and grief-stricken an 'ekphrastic feel' (Briand 2018: 140-1). **ἐν νῷ καθεστηκυῖαν ὧν ἔτυχεν ὁ Σωσθένης εἰπών:** 'brooding on what Sosthenes had said'. The perf. part. of καθίστημι, which, when intransitive, can mean 'to come into a certain state/to be or exist in a condition' (LSJ s.v. B 5); thus, more literally, 'her state of mind was occupied with respect to what Sosthenes had said'. **λύπην ὁμοῦ καὶ δέος:** The admixture of feelings is common in the novels (e.g. 1.1.7, 2.29.1, 3.23.1, 5.19.1, 5.21.1, Charit. 1.9.3, 4.5.10, X. Eph. 2.5.5, *J&A* 9.1, Heliod. 1.30.7, 7.29.1, 10.13.1; see further on the topic, Fusillo 1999 and Kytzler 2003; Intro 2.4.4.). The mingling of grief and fear echoes exactly Clitophon's own emotions on being incarcerated (6.5.4) indicative perhaps of the relative symmetry of lovers in the romance genre; but, considering the proximity of these sentiments, it could also be that Clitophon-*auctor* is projecting his own feelings on to Leucippe. In the following section the focus becomes the contrast between Leucippe's grief and beauty (6.7.3 with n.).

6.6.2 Ὁ γὰρ νοῦς… τῷ προσώπῳ: ‘That “one’s mind is totally concealed” does not seem to me particularly well said, in fact it appears in one’s face just as clearly as on a mirror’. Clitophon-*auctor* doubles down on his sententious narration, interrupting one *gnome*, in order to counter with one of his own (οὔ… καλῶς brackets his interjection). Clitophon’s sententiousness interrupts the narrative “process of viewing”, rendering the scene “pictorial and static” (Morales 2004: 140); coupled with ‘ekphrastic feel’ of the *mise en scène*, it becomes clear that Clitophon’s narration of the encounter between Leucippe and Thersander is concerned chiefly with rhetorical display, rather than the actual lived experience of his lover. The ease of reading one’s internal state from one’s appearance has already been expressed a number of times by a variety of characters (e.g. 1.2.2, 1.7.3, 5.13.2, 5.25.2; cf. Heliod. 3.5.6). It has been argued that the sentiment expressed here is similar to one found in Euripidean tragedy which expresses a wish that there was some way to know a person’s inner workings (e.g. Eur. *Hipp*. 925-7, *Med*. 516-9; so Whitmarsh 2001: 159; Morales 2004: 135 n. 107); yet these instances bear little lexical resemblance. Much closer is Vilborg’s suggestion of a parallel with Philostratus (πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἠθῶν ἑρμηνεύουσι… ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ εἴδωλα, τοὺς νοῦς τῶν ἀνθρώπων διαθεῶνται, *VA* 2.30.28-32); however, while there is an element of physiognomy in Clitophon’s axiom, the focus here is on revealing Leucippe’s current mood, rather than her innate character (cf. D. Cairns 2005: 127-8). Compare, also, Quintilian’s observations on the eyes’ epideictic qualities (*Inst*. 11.3.75; thus Morales 2004: 139-40). Quintilian goes on to recommend tears as a means of eliciting emotion from onlookers, just as Clitophon does (6.7.4 with n.). **ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ τῷ προσώπῳ:** With rhythmic parechesis this phrase reflects the themes of mirrored sight and imagery that are incorporated into previous visual encounters (ὡς ἐν κατόπτρῳ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ εἴδωλα, 1.9.4; ἐναπομάσσεται τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς κατόπτρῳ, 5.13.4). Mirror imagery is also reflected in the entwined *topoi* of female sexuality and blooming flowers (ἐγίνετο τοῦ σώματος κάτοπτρον ὁ χιτών, 1.1.11; τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ τῶν ἀνθέων ἦν κάτοπτρον, 1.15.6), which find their visually symbolic zenith in the ekphrasis of Leucippe’s eye (see Intro. 2.4.3). **Ἡσθείς τε γάρ… τῆς συμφορᾶς:** ‘For, when pleased, it beams forth an image of joy through the eyes, and when grieved it contorts one’s countenance into a vision of adversity’. On συστέλλω (lit. ‘draw together/contract’) as a contorting physical response to pain, cf. 3.8.3, Long. 2.8.1 (with Bowie 2019: 181). The subj. is still the mind (ὁ νοῦς). The vocabulary of sight here reflects theories of extramission, in particular the Empedoclean analogy of the eye beaming like a lamp (cf. Arist. *Sens*. 437a22-6, Emp. Fr. 88 Wright 1981 = 84 DK, Theophr. *Sens*. 7). This observation serves as a summary paraphrase of the *gnome*, confirming that it is mutable emotions, rather

than essential qualities, that are in question (see De Temmerman 2007a: 18; Intro. 2.4.3). While the eyes and face appear to be weighted equally here as a means to convey sentiment (note the almost equal cola), it is interesting that the eyes should be the site for joy since what follows is a rumination largely concerned with grief. The physiognomists highlight the "importance of looking, eye-contact, and face-to-face orientation in social interaction" (D. Cairns 2005: 127); however, it is the eyes that are famously the 'windows to the soul' (e.g. Polemo 1.168.1-2 Foerster, Arist. [*Phgn.*] 814b3-5; see D. Cairns 2005: 144 n. 16; Hartsock 2008: 58-60). Although the initial *gnome* may not be strictly physiognomic in nature, this (pseudo-)science was common currency in the Second Sophistic and its influence on AT cannot be discounted (see further, Gleason 1995: 55-81; Swain 2007: 126-131).

6.6.3 Ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν Λευκίππη ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν: O'Sullivan (1977: 238) recommends that "<τὸν ψόφον>" ('sound') should be inserted here after Λευκίππη: (a) to avoid hiatus; (b) because in all other instances of ἀκούω + gen. of the source of sound + part., the part. is a verb of speaking; and (c) because of the phrasing at 2.23.6 (ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ τὸν ψόφον ἀκούσας ἀνοιγομένων τῶν θυρῶν). As for (a), Reeve (1971: 521-5) shows (using this phrase as an example) that although AT tends to avoid hiatus (Intro. 1.3), he does admit it in a few instances, one of which being before participles. Yatromanolakis (1990: 681-2) is the only one of AT's subsequent editors to have incorporated O'Sullivan's suggestion (without explanation), while others remain silent on the proposed emendation. Although without the justification of (a) there is no pressing stylistic reason that requires its addition to the text, the reasoning behind (b) and (c) is logical, even attractive, and its addition is worth considering (cf. similar phrasing at Heliod. 7.17.1). However, Whitmarsh (2010: 335-6) has convincingly argued for a sexual link between Leucippe's virginity and the image of the locked door (e.g. 4.1.7; cf. Henderson 1991: 137), with this in mind it may be possible to read a subtle sexual threat in the detail of the door opening here, and so there may be cause to omit "<τὸν ψόφον>" in order to highlight this. **ἦν δὲ ἔνδον λύχνος:** In erotic literature the lamp plays a variety of symbolic roles, the most prominent however, being as a witness to sexual encounters (e.g. *Anth. Gr.* 5.4, 5.5, 5.165.5-6, 5.166.7-8, 5.197.3-4; cf. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 1-13; see Kanellou 2013). **τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κατέβαλεν:** Here Leucippe displays the correct sense of *aidos* ('modesty') by averting her gaze downwards, clearly reluctant to interact with Thersander (Morales 2004: 161-2; with Cairns 1993: 217-8); were she to return his gaze it would position her as a willing participant in the romantic exchange (see D. Cairns 2005: 131-3). It is rare that the glance of the beloved actively expresses a reciprocal desire, rather it "incite[s] desire whether the beloved

is actively seeking to ensnare the lover, modestly resisting his advances… or entirely unaware of or indifferent to the lover's intentions" (Cairns 2011: 42-3; cf. Price 1989: 242; e.g. Ath. 13.16.14-7, *Anth. Gr.* 12.99). Compare earlier in the novel, where *aidos* is conceived of as flowing in through the eyes as beauty usually does (ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἰδὼς διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων εἰσρέουσα τὴν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐλευθερίαν καθαιρεῖ, 2.29.2). **Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς ὡς ἁρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς:** 'And Thersander, glimpsing her beauty with a glance like a lightning strike'. παραδρομή (lit. 'running beside') is here 'a glance/glimpse'. Love at first sight in the novels is a common enough trope, usually the look is reciprocated, but in *L&C* the scopic order is extremely one sided (e.g. 1.4.2-5; see Intro. 2.4.1). ἁρπάζω in the mid. is not unusual in Attic (LSJ s.v.) and AT uses it with no alteration to the usual meaning of 'to snatch/carry off' (cf. 2.35.5, 2.36.1, 3.2.2). If we read the phrase in the gen. absolute, Thersander's glance could be read as somehow itself rapacious (cf. LSJ s.v. ὡς C I 3); however, O'Sullivan (s.v. ἀστραπή and 1978: 238-9) suggests emending the phrase to the acc. "ὡς ἁρπαζομένην ἀστραπήν", arguing that it has been assimilated into the gen. because of its proximity with ἐκ παραδρομῆς. Accepted by Yatromanolakis (1990: 681-2) and Repath (2001: 178), it does appear to make more sense, as it would be τὸ κάλλος ('her beauty') that is received like a lightning strike and not Thersander's glance (thus: 'And Thersander, catching a quick glimpse of her beauty, like a lightning strike'). The proposed emendation is supported by similar examples from within the text where beauty's effulgence is evident, such as Clitophon's first sight of Leucippe (καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ, 1.4.2), or his erotically visceral response to viewing the city of Alexandria (εὐθὺς τῆς πόλεως ἀστράπτον τὸ κάλλος, 5.1.1). This reception of the beloved's lightning-like beauty would presuppose a degree of intromission in the viewing process (see Intro. 2.4.4). Fulguration is also associated with beauty blooming in the natural world (e.g. 1.15.6, 1.19.1, 2.1.2), an image that is closely linked to Leucippe's radiant beauty (cf. 6.7.2n.). Beauty or desire like a lightning strike is a metaphor that invokes an electric carnal response and is a common reaction to the heroines of the novels (e.g. Charit. 8.6.8, Heliod. 1.21.3, 10.9.3), but sometimes even of the hero (e.g. Heliod. 7.10.3; cf. elsewhere, Soph. fr. 474, *Anth. Gr.* 5.56.3, 12.110.1, Mosch. *Eur.* 86, Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 3.1017-9). The image of beauty flashing like lightning may also contain a Phaedran echo of the beloved's radiant countenance (εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν τὴν τῶν παιδικῶν ἀστράπτουσαν, Pl. *Phdr*. 254b4-5), which Yunis (2011: 161) argues "suggests the unique power of sight to trigger recollection of the Form of beauty" (cf. 6.7.5n.). The meteorological nature of the metaphor, Cioffi (2014: 27-8) contends, recalls the language and imagery of religious epiphany. **μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος:** 'for it is most of all

in the eyes that beauty resides'. This parenthetic *gnome* plays on the ubiquity of *eros*, beauty, and eye-contact, and is a convenient generalization to introduce Thersander's adaptation of the Phaedran flow of beauty that follows (see Intro. 2.4.4). AT uses ὀφθαλμός and ὄμμα interchangeably (cf. 2.29.1-2), whereas in the *Phaedrus* only ὄμμα is employed (e.g. Pl. *Phdr*. 251b2, 255c6; Repath 2001: 221). Beauty is also described as blooming from Andromeda's eyes (ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀνθεῖ τὸ κάλλος, 3.7.3), an image that reverberates with the 'floralisation' of Leucippe's eye (6.7.2 with n.). **ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτήν:** 'He abandoned his soul to her'. The active, viewing lover depicted as the passive slave of the beloved can be read as an attempt by the lover to disguise the "hierarchical and self-centred nature of these relationships" (Cairns 2011: 43-7; e.g. 1.4.4-5, 2.16.2, 6.20.1 with n.; cf. Heliod. 1.2.5, 5.26.4, X. Eph. 1.3.2, Xen. *Sym*. 1.9). Similarly, in the *Phaedrus* the soul of the lover becomes entirely enslaved to, and obsessed by, the beauty of the beloved (πάντων καταφρονήσασα δουλεύειν ἑτοίμη, Pl. *Phdr*. 252a5-6). Compare also the usually violent Thersander's apparent submission and the description at Heliod. 5.7.3 of beauty's power to subjugate even the most savage barbarians (cf. 6.22.3 with n.).

6.6.4 Τί κάτω βλέπεις… ῥεέτω τοὺς ἐμούς: 'Why are you looking down, lady? Why let the beauty of your eyes flow down to the ground? Let it flow rather into my eyes'. The Platonic notion of the flow of beauty has previously been incorporated into the narrative through observations made by Clitophon (1.4.4-5), Clinias (1.9.4), and Melite (5.13.4), now Thersander takes it to its absurd logical conclusion: crying over spilt beauty (cf. [Lucian] *Am*. 53.16-17; see Intro. 2.4.4). In the Phaedran allegory, the liquid flow of beauty enters the eyes of the viewing lover and 'waters' the wings of his soul, having a strangely erotic effect (Pl. *Phdr* 251b-d; cf. Lebeck 1972: 273; du Bois 1985: 97; Frontisi-Ducroux 1996: 95; Morales 2004: 32). This flow is seen as reciprocal and, overflowing from the lover's eyes, it returns to the eyes of the beloved, where it also animates the soul's feathers and stimulates desire (οὕτω τὸ τοῦ κάλλους ῥεῦμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἰόν, Pl. *Phdr* 255c5-7). Clinias echoes this reciprocal theory in his explanation of how the reception of beauty through the eyes effects a kind of unique sexual contact (καινὴ γάρ ἐστι σωμάτων συμπλοκή, 1.9.5, on which, Repath 2001: 204-7). With these parallels in mind, Thersander's request takes on an implicit sexual connotation, as we anticipate an erogenic reaction from the optic exchange of liquid beauty (cf. the continuation of this image, *infra* 6.7.5 with n.). Compare Anthia's experience of Habrocomes' beauty which shows a similar amalgam of the flow of beauty and optic theory

(ὅλοις μὲν καὶ ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχομένη, X. Eph. 1.3.2).

6.7.1 ἐπλήσθη δακρύων: The description transitions from figurative liquid beauty to the actual fluid of tears (cf. 6.7.5 with n., where these images are conflated). Cobet (in Vilborg's *app. crit.*) suggests "ἐνεπλήσθη", which could be supported by Reardon's (2004: 26) similar emendation of Charit. 2.2.6 (*contra* Zanetto 2007: 155; cf. also X. Eph. 2.3.8). **καὶ εἶχεν αὐτῆς ἴδιον κάλλος καὶ τὰ δάκρυα:** 'and even her tears had their own particular beauty'. Leucippe's tears are entirely disconnected from their host, a precursor of the disassociation of beauty and grief that is to come (6.7.3 with n.). Similarly, the eye is "detached from its corporeal context" (Morales 2004: 138), one of many ways in which a woman's body is dissected for viewing in the novel (cf. 6.21.1 with n., where Leucippe offers up various parts of her body for torture). **Δάκρυον γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀνίστησι καὶ ποιεῖ προπετέστερον:** 'For tears cause the eye to stand out and make it more prominent.' The singular (δάκρυ/δάκρυον) is often used in a generalising context, especially in Homer (Hutchinson 2018: 294; e.g. Hom. *Il*. 16.11, 19.323, 24.9). The comparative of προπετής (lit. 'falling/inclined forward') takes the meaning 'prominent' when used to describe the eye (LSJ s.v. A 5). Compare [Alex.] *Pr*. 2.22.2-4, where the eyes of the angry are said to be prominent, and those of the grieving sunken. **Κἂν μὲν ἄμορφος… ἐὰν δὲ ἡδύς…:** 'If the eye is ill-proportioned and unrefined, the tears contribute to its ugliness; but if it is a pleasing eye of dark hue lightly wreathed in white, then when it wells with tears, it seems like the bosoming swell of a spring'. The subj. ὀφθαλμός is understood from the previous sentence; the succession of pres. general conditionals allows Clitophon to slip into a sententious hypothetical tangent that obfuscates any genuine depiction of Leucippe's grief. A realistically humorous insertion for comparison's sake – on the whole crying disfigures the eye, making it blood-shot and harder to see. The description of Clitophon's first sight of Leucippe emphasises her dark eyes (ὀφρὺς μέλαινα, τὸ μέλαν ἄκρατον, 1.4.3); and there is a possible link here between her dark eyes and the dark-eyed 'virtuous' horse that draws the chariot of the soul in the Phaedran analogy (λευκὸς ἰδεῖν, μελανόμματος, Pl. *Phdr*. 253d5-6; so Repath 2001: 172), a connection which is strengthened by the possible allusion in Leucippe's name to this white horse (cf. Intro. 2.3.2; see also 6.18.3n. and 6.20.1n. on the chariot allegory). The wreathed concentricity of the dark pupil and the surrounding white sclera forms a culmination of the recurring *topos* of optical mimesis evident in descriptions such as the peacock's tail-feather (1.16.3), Calligone's unusual necklace (2.11.3), and the phoenix's corona (3.25.2). The dark βαφή ('dye/pigment') has erotic connotations, recalling the purple tinted cheeks of both

Leucippe (1.4.3) and Andromeda (3.7.3), as well as the Tyrian dye used for Calligone's wedding dress and Aphrodite's *peplos* (2.11.4; cf. *infra* 6.7.2n). **ὅταν τοῖς δάκρυσιν ὑγρανθῇ:** This form of δάκρυον is mainly poetic, the usual dat. Attic form is δακρύοις (Smyth §285.7; cf. Schmid 1894: 584; Moeris *Att*. δ.4); yet the phrase may contain a tragic echo (cf. κατεδάκρυσα καὶ βλέφαρον ὑγραίνω | δάκρυσιν, Eur. *Hel*. 673-4). **πηγῆς ἐγκύμονι μαζῷ:** lit. 'it is like a stream's pregnant breast'; ἔοικα + dat. = 'to be like', used in perf. with pres. sense (LSJ. s.v.). At first glance a rather peculiar image, AT conflates the eye with another erogenous zone, the breast (cf. 2.37.7), envisaged in a fountain, capitalising (no doubt) on the shared imagery of concentricity (in Greek erotic literature eyes were in fact more of a focus than the breasts, see Gerber 1978: 209). The phrase is clearly metrical; first identified as a paroemiac and conjectured as a tragic fragment, it has been added to the *Tragica Adespota* (Jaeger 1959: 337-40; *TrGF* 2 F12A). The paroemiac, which consists of anapaests and often marks the end of a period in a sequence of anapaestic dimeters, is also a metre used in comedy in moments of poetic showmanship or to parody tragic lamentation (cf. West 1982: 122; Arnott 2010: 310; Nesselrath 2016: 36). However, μαζός ('breast') is usual in epic poetry, and μαστός preferred in Attic (Jaeger 1959: 337). Perhaps taking this into account, Vilborg and O'Sullivan identified the phrase as the last half of a hexameter (without reference to Jaeger); Plepelits (1980: 249) and Yatromanolakis (1990: 682) are the only scholars to mention both possibilities, though neither single out a preference. The paroemiac and the last half of a hexameter (after a masculine caesura) are identical which may reflect their use in gnomic statements (Lardinois 2001: 103-4), an apt choice for Clitophon's sententious musing here. Coupled with the previous clause, AT is exploiting poetic language to suffuse Clitophon's already florid description with a heightened bravura, whether invoking an actual epic or tragic reference, or merely trying to sound like one. Given the somewhat laboured quality of the metaphor, as well as the tragic echoes in the previous clause, a paroemiac may be the more likely option. The eroticization of the stream of tears plays with the Phaedran image of liquid desire/beauty in the eyes (Pl. *Phdr*. 255c1-2; cf. also, Philostr. *Ep*. 26, 32, 33). There may be a pseudo-scientific pun here as πηγή is the technical term for a tear duct (e.g. Poll. *Onom*. 2.71.5, Hsch. π.2147), however this is usually in the plural. The adj. ἐγκύμων ('pregnant') can be translated neutrally as 'big with/replete', however the suggestion of Leucippe's 'fertility' heightens the erotic threat (and titillation). Hippoc. *Superf*. 19, for instance, makes the connection between a pregnant woman's eyes and breasts, arguing that the side of the larger breast/brighter eye indicates on which side the foetus lies. Melite uses a similar phrase to describe the pregnant sails of the ship that bore her and Clitophon to Ephesus (ὥσπερ ἐγκύμονα γαστέρα, 5.16.6), which she

interprets as a favourable omen that Clitophon will father a child with her soon (as they do indeed consummate their 'marriage', this prophecy may yet be true; on the anxiety of a bastard child produced from adultery, see Guettel Cole 1984: 106; Schwartz 2007: 298). The repetition of the pregnancy imagery heightens our awareness of the similarities between the two courtships (cf. *infra* 6.7.3n.), which intensifies our uncertainty of whether Leucippe will succeed in resisting where Clitophon has 'failed'.

6.7.2 Χεομένης… περὶ τὸν κύκλον: 'When the brine of the tears flows around the sphere'. The gen. absolute continues the image of the spring begun above, the encircling flow of tears enhancing the floral colours of the eye. This description alludes to the water source enclosing the plants and flowers in Europa's field (1.1.5); so too the stream in Clitophon's garden (1.15.6), which is also circumscribed, but into an artificial square, rather than the organic circle here. The site of this fountain is where it is explicitly indicated to the reader that we should be looking for the reduplication of the garden image, whether it be an actual, or metaphorical one (τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ τῶν ἀνθέων ἦν κάτοπτρον, ὡς δοκεῖν τὸ ἄλσος εἶναι διπλοῦν, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ δὲ τῆς σκιᾶς, 1.15.6). The circling movement of the tears may also contain an erotic undertone, as κύκλος ('circle') and ἔγκυκλον ('encircling') were puns or euphemisms for the female sexual organs in Attic drama (Henderson 1991: 139). The saltwater of the tears also recalls the erogenous depiction of the sea across which Zeus (as a bull) conveys Europa (1.1.8-9), and possibly even the ἅλμη from which Andromeda's monster emerges (3.7.6). Compare also the oceanic description of Theagenes' eyes at Heliod. 2.35.1. **τὸ μὲν πιαίνεται, τὸ δὲ μέλαν πορφύρεται:** '(the white of the eye) waxes, whereas the dark blushes burgundy'. πορφύρω contains a double meaning, 'to swell/heave', but also 'to redden, blush red', and there is an obvious connection with the adj. πορφύρεος, 'heaving/surging (of the sea)' or 'rosy/purple' (LSJ s.v.); cf. Homer's 'wine-dark/black/purple sea' (e.g. *Il*. 16.391, 24.79, *Od*. 5.132; cf. also, Aesch. *Ag*. 957-60; see Sassi 2015: 267 and Irwin 1974: 28, 208). The idea of the swell or surge of water naturally connects with the previous phrase. Although, as Vilborg suggests, it is possible to supply "<λευκὸν>" in the first clause to balance μέλαν, it is not essential to convey meaning. More troublesome is this phrase's connection with the comparison that follows of the narcissus and violet, for it is the narcissus that is white in colour, and the violet that is dark (usually purple, although it can be both white and purple). And so, Castiglioni's (1923) suggestion of reversing the adjectives (τὸ μὲν μέλαν…, τὸ δὲ <λευκὸν>…) is "worthy of consideration" (so Vilborg). This, however, would mean translating πορφύρεται as 'surges/swirls' without the additional meaning of 'dye purpley red', which overlooks the

sustained chromatic motif of the rosy/purple tint that is found swirling in places such as Leucippe's cheeks and Calligone's wedding dress (cf. *supra* 6.7.1n.). The ultimate 'hidden treasure' of purple pigment is found in the murex (2.11.6-8) which, when held horizontally looking into the interior of the shell, could be said to resemble an eye. **καὶ ἔστιν ὅμοιον τὸ μὲν ἴῳ, τὸ δὲ ναρκίσσῳ:** The description of the flowers in Clitophon's garden would seem to confirm that the violet is purple and the narcissus white (1.15.5), despite the text there being corrupt (see Jackson 1935: 101; O'Sullivan 1978: 326-7). The colour of the violet flower is also described as "like the effulgence of the calm sea" (transl. Whitmarsh; χροιὰ δὲ οἵαν οἵαν ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀστράπτει γαλήνη, 1.15.6), a colour that can only be conjectured. Floral imagery is a significant motif in the novel and although only the violet and narcissus are mentioned here, the rose, myrtle, and other plants also form part of the allusive intratextual web of erotic vegetation (see e.g. Hilton 2018: 17-8 on Leucippe and the rose). The narcissus is one of the flowers present in Europa's meadow (1.1.5), and in the offerings present at the sacrifice for Calligone's marriage (2.15.2), and both the narcissus and the violet grow in Clitophon's garden (1.15.5-6), reflected in its analogy with Leucippe's face (1.19.1). The violet is also found in Andromeda's eyes (3.7.3), her captivity foreshadowing Leucippe's own abduction (Bartsch 1989: 55; McHugh 2020: 3; on the proleptic functions of paintings in the novel, see Intro. 2.4.3). Littlewood (1979) and Bartsch (1989: 49-55) have both argued convincingly for linking the sexual subtext of the (enclosed) garden and its imagery with the burgeoning sexuality of the heroines in the novel (cf. more generally, Henderson 1991: 134-6; Calame 1999: 153-74); and while a number of scholars have analysed the links between Europa's meadow, Clitophon's garden, and Leucippe's floralized face (e.g. Mignogna 1995; Biraud 1995; Martin 2002: 150-4; Morales 2004: 138; Whitmarsh 2010: 339-42; De Temmerman 2009), few look forward to this instance. Mention of the narcissus flower in connection with viewing and the arrested eye would likely conjure the image of the visually obsessed Narcissus, which could be read as a potential cipher for Clitophon's narcissistic narration (see e.g. Dinkler 2017). **τὰ δὲ δάκρυα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἔνδον εἱλούμενα γελᾷ:** lit. 'as the tears collect in the eyes they laugh'. A paradoxical image: that her tears should be described as laughing shows how far removed from Leucippe's experience the description has taken us (cf. Santafé Soler 2010: 132; Hutchinson 2018: 292); however, as Frazier (2013: 286 n. 9) points out, the notion of 'brightness' or 'gleaming' is implicit in the etymology of γελάω (*DELG* s.v.; *BDAG* s.v. 1 B; *CGL* s.v. 4; see semantic discussion in Halliwell 2008: 520-9). Often cited in connection with this etymology is Hsch. γ.298 (γελεῖν· λάμπειν. ἀνθεῖν), linking γελάω with a light 'shining' and flowers 'blooming', images that are particularly apposite to

the current ekphrasis (cf. [Demetr.] *Eloc*. 188, who derides such usage as poetastical). The notion of 'brightness' when related to γελάω generally occurs when the subject is inanimate (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 19.362-3, *Hom*. *Hymn Dem*. 13-14, Hes. *Theog*. 40-2). Cf. τὸ πέταλον τῷ Ζεφύρῳ γελᾷ, 2.1.3, where it may be possible to see the same double sense, especially as just prior the rose is described as the eye of flowers (ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθέων, 2.1.2). εἰλέω can be either 'shut in/preserve/collect' or 'wind around/revolve'; while the latter is generally preferred by translators and is arguably closer to a continuation of the image begun in περὶ τὸν κύκλον, the former is also attested (e.g. Winkler's "tears held swimming in the eye"). Thus, an attempt at translating the phrase into prose as purple as AT's might read: 'the beaming tears are caught orbiting within the eyes'. Tears and laughter do occur together in other novels (e.g. Long. 1.31.1, Heliod. 10.38.4), however this is usually to describe conflicting emotions, or relief, and none seem to take the paradox quite as far.

6.7.3 Τοιαῦτα Λευκίππης… νενικηκότα: 'Such were Leucippe's tears, they vanquished her grief into beauty'. Clitophon rounds off his description by acknowledging Leucippe almost as an afterthought. The tears, rather than Leucippe, are the active agent, a fact enhanced by the staccato rhythm of the verb (see Hutchinson 2018: 293). Morales (2004: 162) argues that Leucippe's weeping "is interpreted as a provocation" and thus "Clitophon portrays Leucippe as complicit in her unhappy situation". Cf. Ov. *Am*. 1.7.12-18, on the attractiveness of a woman in distress. It is no surprise that her beauty prevails over her grief, the loveliness of the novelistic heroines is well-established, although in situations such as these it can be to their detriment (e.g. Charit. 6.6.4, X. Eph. 2.11.4, Heliod. 6.9.6). **εἰ δὲ ἠδύνατο… ἡ γῆ:** 'and if they could crystallize as they fell, the earth would possess a novel kind of amber'. The double augment in the aor. of δύναμαι is common "especially in later Attic" (Smyth §430; cf. Moeris *Att*. η.5), and is the usual form employed by AT (Whitmarsh 2020: 48-9 with refs.). πήγνυμι 'congeal/crystallize' (LSJ s.v. III; cf. 2.38.5). Leucippe's tears are depicted as a fresh take on the old myth of the Heliades, sisters to Phaethon, who was struck down by Zeus after his disastrous joyride in the chariot of the sun. The nymphs, in their unrelenting grief, were transformed into poplar trees and their tears into amber (see e.g. Ov. *Met*. 1.747-2.367, Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 4.595-611, Philostr. *Imag*. 1.11, Pliny *HN* 37.11.30-3). Cf. Lucian's account where he visits the Eridanus looking for amber, only to be ridiculed by the locals who have never heard the story (Lucian *Electr*. 1-5). The self-conscious καινόν is a metafictive narratorial (even authorial) acknowledgement of the inventive embellishment in the ekphrasis of Leucippe's tears (Intro. 2.4.3). **Ὁ δὲ Θέρσανδρος:** Garnaud omits ἰδών after Θέρσανδρος (α-

family) which may seem over rigorous given that the emphasis on the visual spectacle would invite the repetition of the act of seeing; nonetheless, its omission does not affect the meaning of the sentence. **πρὸς μέν… πρὸς δέ…:** The dichotomy of beauty and grief is expanded on, and the two almost equal clauses are united by their assonance. Although beauty is the vanquisher, as Hutchinson (2018: 293) notes, πρὸς δὲ τὴν λύπην "justifies its separate phrase, as it is particularly the distress of Leucippe that leads to Thersander's tears". Dionysius is also driven mad by the sight of Callirhoe's tears of grief (Charit. 2.4.4; cf. also, a possible echo of Anac. fr. 359 *PMG*). **καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς δακρύων ἐγκύους εἶχεν:** 'and his own eyes were gravid with tears'. Now it is Thersander who is 'pregnant' with tears (cf. 6.7.1n.) and it could be that the imagery here is intended to feminise him. Although heroes wept freely in archaic epic, in post-Homeric society weeping was considered the province of women and most heroes of tragedy would regard tears as a "loss of virility" (Segal 1992: 147-51; cf. Pl. *Resp*. x.605d-e, *Phaedo* 117c-e; see further, Baumgarten 2009: 87-95). Compare Hydaspes who controls himself despite being moved to compassion at his wife's tears (Heliod. 10.16.2; cf. also *infra* 6.7.6-7 with nn.).

6.7.4 Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ φύσει… τοσούτῳ καὶ γοητότερον: 'It is only natural that tears are most alluring to the pity of onlookers: those of a woman even more so, in that they are more abundant, and thus all the more bewitching'. Clitophon uses the same presumptuous phrase to introduce a narratorial *gnome* at 1.6.2 and his comments on the innate nature of things or people are common (e.g. 1.8.2, 2.17.3, 4.15.4, 6.19.4). The adj. ἐπαγωγός ('bringing on/eliciting') is used only once elsewhere (1.9.6) with its secondary, more sexual, meaning 'alluring/seductive' (LSJ s.v. II; cf. Heliod. 1.9.2, 3.4.1, 5.26.2, Lucian *Tox*. 13.10). It may be possible to construe a similarly magical meaning as implied by γοητότερον, since the subst. ἐπαγωγή also carries the meaning of an 'incantation/spell' (LSJ s.v. 4 b), and an ἀγωγή is used of a particularly intense love spell that induces the beloved from their home (Faraone 1999: 25-8; see also Winkler 1990: 85-91). While θαλερός ('stout/sturdy') is a standard Homeric descriptor of tears (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 2.266, 6.496, *Od*. 4.556, 10.201) and is common in subsequent authors (e.g. Eur. *IA* 39-40, Ar. *Eq*. 1271, Mosch. 4.56, Lucian *Nec*. 9.7, Ael. *NA* 14.10.7). Although technically redundant, μᾶλλον appears a deliberate addition, enhancing the homoioteleuton and heightening the already overwrought style (cf. Santafé Soler 2010: 134, who lists it as "careless"). **γοητότερον:** derived from γόης ('sorcerer/trickster') and appears to be a hapax (LSJ s.v. γόης); incidentally γόης (and its cognates) takes its etymology from γοάω ('to lament/weep') (cf. *DELG* s.v; Ogden 2002: 48-9; *Suda* γ.365). Hutchinson (2018: 294) deems

it “a doubtful form, certainly for this date”, supplying the possible analogy of “ἱερεὺς γόητος” (*P. Hib*. I 52 fr. A 2.18, ~3rd c. BCE), but this is an “obscure” example. Hercher provides the alternative “γοητικώτερον”, although no subsequent editor has adopted it and the translation (‘(more) skilled in magic/witchcraft’) seems less fitting to the context. Later, Thersander accuses Clitophon of being a wizard of persuasion with both words and tears (γόητος ἀκούοντες πιθανῶς μὲν ὑποκρινομένου, πιθανῶς δὲ δακρύοντος, 7.11.1; cf. 5.25.3). On the mystical/medical capacity of tears, cf. Heliod. 8.5.7, X. Eph. 1.9.3. That tears have some kind of power to ensorcell also conjures the magic of the ‘evil eye’ (βάσκανος ὀφθαλμός), testimony to “the eye’s imagined ability to do things to others” (quote from Squire 2016: 28); cf. the pseudo-scientific *discursus* on the topic in Heliod. 3.7.3-5. The evil eye is usually associated with envy (φθόνος) rather than desire (ἔρως), nonetheless, under the influence of either “the eye has the potential to send and/or receive emotions which have powerful physical effects on their target” (Cairns 2011: 142; cf. ἔρως βάσκανος, 2.34.1; see further on the evil-eye, Ogden 2002: 222-6; Lovatt 2013: 328-9; Squire 2016: 25-8). **Ἐὰν δὲ ἡ δακρύουσα… τὸ δάκρυον ἐμιμήσατο:** ‘And if the one who is weeping should be beautiful as well, and the onlooker her lover, his eye is not unmoved, but mimics her tears’. In yet another pres. general conditional, the sententious musing is delimited to a beautiful woman and her lover as viewer to make it more applicable to the situation at hand. **οὐδ᾽ ὀφθαλμὸς ἀτρεμεῖ:** The eye, rather than the man, as the subj., perhaps an acknowledgement that crying can be an ineluctable parasympathetic nervous response, thus setting up the conflict within the lover who would attempt to delay his natural reaction until a time he can profit from its occurrence (cf. 6.7.6n.). **τὸ δάκρυον:** Despite the current reading being that of the MSS, Vilborg prefers Jacobs’ emendation “τὸ δακρύον” (neut. part.); while either would be rhythmically suitable (Hutchinson 2018: 294), the noun in the singular is well attested (*supra* 6.7.1n.).

6.7.5 Ἐπειδὴ γάρ… τὴν πηγὴν συνεφέλκεται: ‘For since the beauty of attractive people lies in their eyes, flowing thence it ensconces itself in the eyes of onlookers, and there it draws upon the stream of their tears’. A reiteration of the sententious observation at 6.6.3, as well as a continuation of the Phaedran allegory (6.6.4 with n.). Beauty (τὸ κάλλος) is the active agent and once received in the eyes of the onlookers it activates the corresponding stream of tears from within. As Repath (2001: 213-6) shows, the source of the stream of tears is best explained by reference to other instances where Clitophon waxes sententiously on weeping: when kidnapped by the *Boukoloi*, Clitophon tells how great grief can obstruct the flow of tears to the eye, instead conducting the flow back to the soul (τὰ δὲ ἐκτρεπόμενα τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ, 3.11.2); and when in jail, he compares the postponement of the onset of tears to the delay of blood from a puncture wound (δάκρυον γὰρ αἷμα τραύματος ψυχῆς… τῶν δακρύων ἀπέφραξε τὴν πηγήν, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἔρρει, 7.4.5-6). The wellspring of tears, then, is located in the soul, whence it flows to the eyes, whereas beauty is received in the eyes and flows thence to the soul. The verb ἕλκω ('to draw/drag') "is suitable to liquids, cf. e.g. Theophr. *Hist. pl*. 3.18.10, 4.7.6, and the συν- shows the connection between the beauty and the abundant tears" (Hutchinson 2018: 295). **Ὁ δὲ ἐραστὴς δεξάμενος ἄμφω…:** The Phaedran allusion is made more explicit by a close verbal parallel (δεξάμενος γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους τὴν ἀπορροὴν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων, Pl. *Phdr*. 251b1-2). The lover 'receives' two streams (ἄμφω): the stream of beauty through the eyes to the soul, and the stream of tears from the soul to the eyes (Repath 2001: 215-6). The composition takes on a rhythmic parallelism in τὸ μὲν κάλλος… τὸ δὲ δάκρυον highlighting the contradistinction of the two flows. When describing the more esoteric aspects the verbs are in the gnomic aor., but this transitions to the pres. as the description reveals the lover's real intentions, while the verbs εὔχεται and φοβεῖται "contrast with each other, and both govern something unexpected" (Hutchinson 2018: 295). **μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ φύγῃ:** 'lest they (*sc*. his tears) fall before the opportune moment'. An amusing paradox emerges: on the one hand, the eye cannot help its mimetic weeping, but on the other hand, these seemingly spontaneous tears can be used as part of a contrived display of compassion. It may be possible to draw some analogy between the tears being held back for ὁ καιρός ('critical/advantageous moment'), which in oratory was considered vital to a rhetor's ability to adapt his discourse for the moment (see Kennedy 1963: 66-8; Isoc. *C. soph.* 13), and their intended use as ἐπίδειξις ('display/declamation') (cf. 6.6.2n.).

6.7.6 Ὁ δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὴν κίνησιν ἐπέχει… πεσεῖν: 'He even keeps from moving his eyes, lest the tear wishes to fall in haste before his beloved has seen it'. There is an irony to be found in the lover showing enough self-control to command his eyes, but not enough to refrain from crying entirely. The tear (sg.) as the subj. is given a curious agency that speaks almost of a battle between the lover's will and the tear's natural inclination to fall (Hutchinson 2018: 296). **μαρτυρίαν γὰρ ταύτην νενόμικεν ὅτι καὶ φιλεῖ:** 'for he considers this testimony that he is indeed in love'. The crux of this affected lachrymose display is that lover's tears are meant to signal to the crying woman that he is in love with her. Tears as an expression of love or desire are a common trope in Greco-Roman literature (e.g. X. Eph. 1.9.2, *Gr. Anth*. 5.212.1-2, Prop. 1.12.16; see Fögen 2009: 182).

6.7.7 Τοιοῦτό τι…: Following α-family, Garnaud omits "καί" after τι, possibly to highlight the alliteration. Clitophon connects the sententious portrayal to Thersander as he did earlier for Leucippe (6.7.3 with n.). **ἐδάκρυε γὰρ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν:** 'he wept for show'. There is a particular irony in "a spontaneous act being performed for viewing", especially as it is "an act that a man might wish to conceal" (Hutchinson 2018: 296; cf. Sen. *Ep*. 63.2; 6.7.3n.). In Latin poetry manipulating tears to impress or influence a lover is usually the province of women (Fögen 2009: 187; cf. Prop. 3.25.5-6, Tib. 2.6.41-3, Ov. *Am*. 1.8.83-4, Petron. *Sat*. 17.2-3); male lovers do weep, but usually from jealousy or rejection. However, Ovid instructs that a show of tears will sway a woman, which can be simulated if no actual tears are forthcoming (Ov. *Ars*. 1.659-62). **παθὼν μέν τι… ἀνθρώπινον:** 'likely he did feel some human inclination'. The phrase bears a close lexical resemblance to Clitophon's own justification of sleeping with Melite (ἔπαθόν τι ἀνθρώπινον, 5.27.2) and the insertion of κατὰ τὸ εἰκός is a noticeable reminder of his narratorial presence (cf. 6.2.3n., 6.7.9n.; see De Temmerman 2014: 168). A relatively common justification of 'natural' desire (e.g. Heliod. 7.21.1, Hdn. 5.6.2.8) the phrase is also used of sympathetic tears (e.g. Heliod. 10.16.5). **καλλωπιζόμενος:** 'peacocking', cf. 1.16.2. **ὡς διὰ τοῦτο δεδακρυμένος, ὅτι κἀκείνη δακρύει:** 'that he was weeping because she herself wept'. The repetition of the verb, as well as the general alliteration, adds the final emphasis to this lachrymose passage (cf. *Anth. Gr.* 12.72.5-6).

6.7.8 ὡς μὴ ὀχληρὸς εἴην: 'so as not to be troublesome/irksome'. With knowledge of Plato's *Phaedrus*, the educated reader would know to anticipate one of two reactions to the sight of beauty made manifest: either to give oneself up to erotic and animal instincts or to have a moment of philosophical transcendence (Pl. *Phdr*. 250e-251a). Considering Thersander's characterisation thus far, that his reaction would be the latter is humorously absurd, and we are led to anticipate his violent attempts on Leucippe (cf. 6.18.3n.). **διαλεχθήσομαι:** It may be possible to detect a sexual 'intercourse' pun here, διαλέγομαι + dat. = 'to converse with', but euphemistically 'to have sexual relations with' (LSJ s.v. B 5; *BDAG* s.v. 2; e.g. Ar. *Eccl*. 890, *Pl*.1082; cf. 1.6.5 for a similar possible inference).

6.7.9 θάρσει: More usual in AT is the Attic imper. "θάρρει" (e.g. 5.17.7, 6.15.3 with n., 7.14.6, 8.7.5; but cf. X. Eph. 2.10.2, 5.12.5, Heliod. 1.17.4, 2.4.4). **ταχὺ γάρ σου ταῦτα τὰ δάκρυα ἰάσομαι:** 'For I will quickly heal you of these tears'. Considering Clitophon's own recent 'healing' of Melite (6.1.1 with n.), there is almost certainly a sexual innuendo to be found here (cf. [Lucian] *Asin*. 6.27-30). The verbal echo undermines Clitophon's earlier attempts to

characterise his 'healing' as a chaste and compassionate act (De Temmerman 2014: 168). Furthermore, the allusion reminds us that Clitophon has just succumbed to his 'Ephesian suitor' and it might soon be Leucippe's turn. **Ὅπως εἴπῃς τὰ εἰκότα περὶ ἐμοῦ:** 'See that you say some reasonable sounding things about me'. Thersander's words echo Clitophon's own when he asks Satyrus to put in a good word for him with Leucippe (δέομαι τὰ εἰκότα εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτὴν περὶ ἐμοῦ, 5.21.1). Usually translated as 'fitting/suitable', here the phrase carries the same idea of possibility/plausibility that is implied in its singular "τὸ εἰκός" (cf. 6.2.3n., 6.7.7n.). This concept was considered an important factor in rhetoricians' attempts to give verisimilitude to their work; a verisimilitude, however, that was based on plausible conjecture (see Hoffman 2008). The implication, then, of Sosthenes saying something 'fitting' about Thersander, is that it is suitable to the situation based on what is *likely* to be true, not necessarily that it is *precisely* true. That Clitophon should make use of this phrase in both his own and Thersander's direct speech, especially in a section of the novel where his first-person narration is at its most tenuous, is a latent indication to the reader of the inherently fictive nature of his account (and indeed the entire novel). The dichotomy between that which is plausibly real-sounding and that which is actually true is addressed by Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, setting up the opposition between philosophers and sophists (cf. Pl. *Phdr*. 267a7, 272e, on which, Bryan 2014). Cf. also, Lucian who, playing on the Platonic conceit of the flow of beauty, tells us that once taken into the soul, it inspires eloquence in the viewer (*Dom*. 4); this is clearly not the case for Thersander who must rely on Sosthenes' smooth-talking on his behalf. **ἕωθεν:** Looking forward to 6.15.1 (with n.) when day finally breaks, and the parallel narratives set off once more (Intro. 2.1).

6.8-6.11.2: The Art of the *Apologia*

The narrative thread focuses once more upon Melite who has dispatched a youth to the estate to recover Leucippe; he arrives during a distressed and unsuccessful search-party and hastens back to his mistress with the ill tidings (6.8.1-2). Learning simultaneously of Clitophon's incarceration and Leucippe's disappearance, Melite momentarily succumbs to despair. Nonetheless, she immediately suspects Sosthenes, and constructs a cunning piece of sophistry to convert Thersander to her cause (6.8.3-4). Her husband returns vitriolic and vindictive, but she astutely transmutes the truth, concocting a tale in which Clitophon is but one of a string of shipwreck victims to whom she has given asylum (6.9.1-5). The true artifice of Melite's account is that she incorporates as much fact as fiction, and her tale stands up

remarkably well to scrutiny (6.9.6-7). She shrewdly chooses to conceal her knowledge of Leucippe's disappearance so that she can later produce the maids as witnesses and openly conduct a search party, compelling Thersander to join (6.10.1-2); and she is careful to point out that the tale of her and Clitophon is just a rumour, just as the false report of Thersander's demise (6.10.3). Ever mellifluous in moments of manipulation, Melite launches into a personification of Rumour and Slander as two wicked kinswomen: Slander shooting arrows that leave a wound from which Rumour is born in a deluge (6.10.4-6). These two malevolent forces conduct a war that holds Thersander's ears hostage from the truth (6.10.6). She then attempts to secure her argument with a kiss, but Thersander, although soothed, is not convinced and chooses to sleep alone (6.11.1-2).

6.8.1 Ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπράττετο…: Clitophon carefully realigns the parallel narratives, and it may be possible to detect a hint of historiographical influence in AT's transitional phrase (e.g. Xen. *Hell*. 4.8.1, 7.5.4, Dion. Hal. *Ant Rom* 3.56.3.1-2; cf. also 5.24.1). ὁμιλία ('company') puns on the two meanings of social/sexual intercourse (LSJ A 2; e.g. 2.37.8, Heliod. 1.25.4). **νεανίσκον τὴν Μελίτην:** Thus α-family (Garnaud; so too Jackson 1935: 101); whereas Vilborg takes the order (though not the -ττ- form of Melite's name) in β-family: "τὴν Μελίτ[τ]ην νεανίσκον". **μηδὲν ἔτι δεομένην φαρμάκων:** There is of course a deep irony in Melite's instruction as Clitophon has recently performed to satisfaction without recourse to potions.

6.8.2 ὡς δὲ ἦν οὐδαμοῦ, φθάσας ἀπήγγειλε τὸ συμβάν: 'as she was nowhere to be found, he was the first to report what had happened'. As in α-family, Garnaud omits "οὐκ" before ἦν and "δρόμῳ" before φθάσας which are both present in β-family (and Vilborg). AT does not use a double negative with οὐδαμοῦ (advb.) elsewhere in the text, however it is common enough in ancient Greek literature that the inclusion of "οὐκ" would be unremarkable. While φθάνω ('to anticipate in doing beforehand'), although in the part., contains the main idea of the clause (Smyth §2096), in which case the addition of "δρόμῳ" ('at a run') might add a sense of haste.

6.8.3 νέφος αὐτῇ κατεχύθη λύπης: 'a cloud of anguish enveloped her'. καταχέω 'pour down/over' + dat. Note the hyperbaton of νέφος… λύπης, which serves both to emphasise her emotion as the last word of the sentence, and to mimic the engulfing action of the cloud of grief. Notably, this is the only metaph. use of νέφος ('cloud') in *L&C* (cf. lit. 3.2.7, 5.6.3). The figurative image of grief descending like a cloud is best known from Achilles' reaction to Patroclus' death (τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα, Hom. *Il*. 18.22; cf. also Eur. *Med*.

107, *HF* 1140) which is alluded to in close verbal parallel in Chariton (Charit. 1.4.6, 3.9.11), and it is likely that AT is refracting that reference here. Cf. also the "λύπης ἀχλύς" ('mist of grief') that descends over Charicleia (Heliod. 6.9.1).

6.8.4 Καὶ τὸ μέν… Σωσθένην: 'And although she had no way of discovering the truth, she already suspected Sosthenes'. Melite's shrewd suspicion of Sosthenes is based on his previous conduct towards Leucippe (cf. 6.3.3n.); her ignorance of 'the truth' (ἀληθές) of the matter here is an ironic counterpoint to her own co-mingling of truth and fabrication that follows. **Βουλομένη δέ… τὴν ἀλήθειαν:** 'Wishing to conduct the search for Leucippe openly with Thersander, she came up with a cunning proof that combined the truth with sophistry'. This brief prefatory remark to Melite's lengthy appeal to Thersander shows the wry self-consciousness with which the more oratorical passages of the text are included and acknowledged by Clitophon (cf. 6.15.2n.). The phrase τέχνην λόγων, coming so close after the Phaedran description of beauty (6.6-7), means more than simply a "clever account" (Winkler) or "artful plan" (Gaselee), but better a "verbal artifice" (Whitmarsh), a translation that evokes the importance of this phrase in the *Phaedrus*, where it means the "art of discourse" (Yunis 2011: 180; Schiappa 1992: 4, 13 n. 8 with refs.). It may even be possible to draw an analogy between the personified Λογών Τέχνη ('Sophistic Discourse'), as she is depicted in the *Phaedrus* by Socrates (e.g. Pl. *Phdr*. 260d-e; see Yunis 2011: 180), and Melite, a character responsible for several stand-out sophistic displays in the novel (see Intro. 2.3.3, 2.4.3). **μεμιγμένην εἶχε σοφίσματι τὴν ἀλήθειαν:** A captiously antithetical euphemism to describe Melite's prevarication. σόφισμα means both 'clever/sly trick' (e.g. Long. 3.4.5, Heliod. 5.8.4) and 'specious argument/reasoning' (e.g. Charit. 3.3.16, 5.7.9) and an element of duplicity is inherent. It is also the technical designation for the "logical paradoxes and fallacies" discussed by the Stoics (Bobzien 2005: 239; see Ierodiakonou 2006: 525-7 with refs.). The play on truth and fiction here is palpable and, combined with the phrase above, suggests a metafictive wink in the abrupt segue from a markedly Phaedran *discursus* (6.6-7) to a sophistic display of deception (6.9-10), the former a florid consideration of eyes and vision and the latter an artful excursus on the spoken word and heard report.

6.9.1 Ἐπεὶ δέ: Vilborg has "Επεὶ γάρ…" (β-family); in this case, Garnaud's (α-family) editorial decision seems better, connecting to, rather than explaining, the previous sentence (6.8.4). **ἐβόα πάλιν:** Thersander enters bellowing 'once more', an allusion to his earlier shouted accusations against Clitophon (6.5.2-3), as well as his tumultuous initial entrance (5.23.3). **Τὸν**

μοιχὸν ἐξέκλεψας· σύ τῶν δεσμῶν ἐξέλυσας καὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἐξαπέστειλας· σὸν τὸ ἔργον: 'You got the adulterer out! It was you who removed his bonds and smuggled him from the house! This is your doing!' The parechesis in the tricolon of accusatory ἐκ-compound verbs draws attention to Melite's part in getting Clitophon 'out of' his predicament. Opinion differs over the punctuation of σύ: as Vilborg shows it "is taken with the preceding words by Hirschig and Gaselee, with the subsequent by Jacobs (but in that case it seems necessary to supply <σύ> in the first clause too)". In his own edition, Vilborg takes σύ with the first clause, whereas Garnaud has it (as Jacobs does) with the second (with no additional "<σύ>" in the first). Garnaud's choice of punctuation foregrounds the three verbs, situated at the end of each clause, and enhances the tricolic structure. Nevertheless, if a second "<σύ>" were to be supplied at the beginning of the first clause, the repetition of the 2nd person pronouns would connect with the possessive adj. in the final (emotionally) asyndetic clause and emphasise Melite's culpability. **Τί οὖν… Τί δέ… Ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ…:** 'Why not follow him? Why stay here? Why not go after your lover so that you may see him bound in sturdier fetters?' Thersander follows up his three accusations of Melite with three sarcastic (and tautologous) questions. The final question is given a hypothetical variation in the final clause, highlighting his incredulity that, having helped her lover to escape, she has remained behind. **στερροτέροις δεσμοῖς:** It is likely that Thersander means merely that Clitophon's current fetters and imprisonment (cf. 6.5.4) are more secure than his confinement in their house (from which he easily escaped), but there is also possibly some comparison between the literal chains that hold Clitophon and more figurative restraints. Vilborg suggests reading "viz. than those of love"; but the 'bonds' could also be those of marriage (cf. 5.16.4); or even, considering Melite's earlier attempt at employing a love philtre (5.25.3), of binding love magic (e.g. φιλτροκατάδεσμος; see Faraone 1999: 62; Baker 2016: 128; cf. δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις, *SuppMag* 45.44, *pedicis aeternis*, Apul. *Met*. 2.5.17, *Veneris… vincula necto*, Verg. *Ec*. 8.78). **Ποῖον μοιχόν; ἔφη, τί πάσχεις;:** 'What adulterer?', Melite asked, 'What is the matter with you?' Melite immediately picks up on Thersander's favourite charge, derisively dismissing it with the interrogative ποῖος, which expresses incredulity or sarcasm (or both) (LSJ s.v. A 2; cf. 2.6.3, 5.22.3). **Εἰ γὰρ θέλεις… τὴν ἀλήθειαν:** 'If you are willing to listen to the full story, having put this madness aside, you will easily learn the truth'. A simple pres. conditional, the aor. of both part. and inf. is due to aspect rather than time (Smyth §1872c, 1865b). Her derision is carried through in the insinuation that Thersander is somehow not in control of himself, an observation presciently proleptic of the Platonic battle for control that takes place in Thersander's soul at 6.19 (see Intro. 2.4.4).

6.9.2 Ἓν οὖν σου δέομαι… ἄκουσον: 'I only need one thing from you: be an impartial judge for me, cleansing your ears of slander and casting anger from your heart, with reason instituted as an incorruptible judge, listen!' It was a common tactic in the *exordium* of the defence to portray the prosecution's address as slanderous and to make a plea to the judge and jury for a fair trial (see Carey 1994: 28; de Brauw 2007: 192; cf. Arist. *Rh*. 1415a26-34, Cic. *Inv*. *rhet*. 1.20-1; e.g. Andoc. 1.6-9, Lys. 19.2-3, Aeschin. 2.1, Dem. 57.1, Pl. *Ap*. 23e3-4). Yet Melite's rhetoric shows even greater guile, aiming her *captatio benevolentiae* at Thersander not as the aggrieved prosecutor levelling accusations, but as an 'impartial judge' (cf. Schwartz 2016: 106). Melite's 'single' request (for Thersander to listen) is preceded by four separate prerequisites that must be fulfilled before he can do so. The aspect of the repeated aor. imper. highlights that one must be performed before the other, with emphasis on the final emotionally asyndetic ἄκουσον (cf. Rijksbaron §16.2 ii). The inner quartet forms a chiasmus (be an impartial judge – purge your ears – purge your heart – let reason be an impartial judge) with the effectively synonymous δικαστής/κριτής ('judge') and ἴσος/ἀκέραιος ('impartial') (LSJ s.v. ἀκέραιος II 3; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant*. *Rom*. 7.4.4). The chiasm subtly matches Thersander with Reason itself, ironic, considering Thersander's repeated failures to be guided by Reason (6.18.3, 6.20.1 with nn.). The request to purge his ears of slander is a deliberate addition, priming the figurative language for her peroration on Slander and Rumour (6.10.6 with n.). While the heart as home of ὀργή ('anger') is switched to the liver in the *discursus* on Anger and Desire (6.19.2 with n.). **καθάρας:** Applying καθαίρω ('purify') to one's ears may seem a mystic over-exaggeration (cf. Philo *De cherub*. 48.1, *De gig*. 54.6), but perhaps also looks forward to the personification of Slander and Rumour as maleficent feminine demiurges (6.10.4-6); compare similar religio-aural imagery at 6.12.3 with n. **ἐπιστήσας:** ἐφίστημι 'ordain/establish' (LSJ s.v. A III). **Ὁ νεανίσκος οὗτος οὔτε μοιχὸς ἦν ἐμὸς οὔτε ἀνήρ… Τυρίων οὐδενὸς δεύτερος:** 'This young man was neither my adulterous lover nor my husband. His family is of Phoenician descent, and he is second to none in Tyre'. By framing her statement in the past tense, it becomes technically (and paradoxically) true, since at the time of Thersander's absence Clitophon was neither her husband (the marriage was not consummated), nor her adulterous lover (as they were married) (Frazier 2013: xviii-xix; cf. 6.5.4n.) As part of her oratorial strategy Melite delivers a 'mini-encomium' on Clitophon, establishing the virtue of his provenance (cf. Sosthenes' panegyric of Thersander, 6.12.1-2 with nn.). There is perhaps some subtle irony in placing such emphasis on his Phoenician heritage, given their famed salaciousness (Intro. 2.3.1). **Ἔπλευσε δὲ καί…γέγονε τῆς θαλάσσης:** 'He also had an ill-fated voyage, and all his baggage now belongs to the sea'. Melite bases her argument on the factual

detail that Clitophon, like Thersander, was victim of a shipwreck. Clitophon and Leucippe lost all their baggage to the sea not because of the shipwreck itself, but rather the jettisoning of the cargo by the helmsman to prevent the ship from sinking (3.2.9). This common maritime practice (*iactus*) was set out in the *lex Rhodia de iactu* and mitigated the cost of goods ejected from the ship amongst the merchants and travellers (Rougé 1978: 279, see 277-80 for an analysis of the shipwreck in *L&C*).

6.9.3 Ἀκούσασα τὴν τύχην ἠλέησα καὶ ἀνεμνήσθην σου καὶ παρέσχον ἑστίαν: 'On hearing of his fate, I took pity on him and, reminded of you, I gave him sanctuary'. Melite gives a neat paratactic précis of her argument: it was the similarity of Clitophon's situation to Thersander's that led her to take pity on him and take him in (cf. *infra* 6.9.5n.). **'Τάχα', λέγουσα… 'τάχα', λέγουσα…:** 'Saying to myself, "Perhaps Thersander is similarly lost somewhere?", "Perhaps," I would say, "some woman has taken pity on him?"' By narrating her line of reasoning to Thersander in direct speech, Melite gives him access to her thoughts as if in real time, giving her speech a sense of *enargeia*, a tactic that was often used by declaimers to arouse sympathy (van Mal-Maeder 2007: 140). The repetition of the advb. τάχα ('perhaps') allows her to build her tale upon conjecture, and the anaphora gives her appeals an emotive urgency. In true rhetorical fashion she delays the third and final interjection to bracket her inventive tale (6.9.4 with n.). **Εἰ δὲ τῷ ὄντι… τὰ ναυάγια:** 'And if he has truly died at sea, as rumour has it, then let us honour all shipwrecks as if they were his'. The initial report given by slaves who survived the same wreck as Thersander was that he had perished at sea (5.23.4), while Sosthenes claims to have heard that Thersander still lived (6.3.5; cf. 6.10.3 with n.). Portraying herself as a guileless victim to plausible rumour is a sympathetic strategy to bolster her lengthy peroration that Thersander too should resist being duped by (the personified) Rumour and Slander (6.10.4-6). **Πόσους καὶ ἄλλους ἔθρεψα νεναυαγηκότας;:** 'Indeed how many other shipwreck victims did I take care of?' Something like 'indeed/if truth be told/to be sure' can be understood for advb. καί, although emphasis is on the anaphora of πόσους underscored by the alliteration of the verbs (ἔθρεψα… ἔθαψα) (6.9.4 with n.).

6.9.4 Πόσους ἔθαψα τῆς θαλάσσης νεκρούς… ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς νεὼς ἔπλει;: 'How many of the sea's corpses did I bury, if I picked up some shipwreck's timber flung upon the shore? Saying to myself, "Perhaps Thersander sailed on this very ship?"' Melite rather ingeniously avoids telling an outright lie as she frames her claims in rhetorical questions – the answer to πόσους would technically be 'none'. Shipwreck and loss at sea, a common theme in the

romance novels, was a daunting fact of life in the ancient Mediterranean (e.g. 1.1.2, 3.1-5, Charit. 3.3.8-11, X. Eph. 3.4.1, *Hist. Apoll.* 11-12, *Anth. Gr.* 7.264-79; see further Hilton 2012; cf. 6.13.2n.); and Melite plays on these anxieties with the emotive imagery of survivors, corpses, and shoreside debris. There is great irony in her claims here as she has only recently bemoaned the sea for ruining her plans by safely returning not only Leucippe, but also Thersander (5.26.5). **εἰ… ἐλάμβανον:** The protasis (πόσους ἔθαψα…), which denotes a repeated activity, is loosely connected with the previous question which then becomes an apodosis retrospectively, perhaps indicative of Melite's 'strong' emotion and extemporaneous oratory. Castiglioni (1923) suggests the addition of "<εἶδον>" after ξύλον, although this is not strictly necessary for meaning or syntax (O'Sullivan s.v. εἰ; Vilborg *app. crit.*). **ταύτης τῆς νεώς:** In this instance Garnaud prefers the Attic νεώς (α-family), whereas Vilborg has the Ionic νηός (β-family). The gen. varies throughout the text, while the acc. is always the Attic ναῦν (Whitmarsh 2020: 47; O'Sullivan s.v.). A survey of the instances of variance of νεώς/νηός across MSS (α-/β-family) and editorial choice shows a virtual fifty-fifty split. Variation of these forms does not appear to rely on proximity (see a good example of this at 3.4.1-3), indicative of AT's erratic application of Atticism (Intro. 1.3).

6.9.5 Εἷς δὴ καί… τῆς <σῆς> συμφορᾶς τὴν εἰκόνα: 'This man is only one of the latest of those that I saved from the sea: in honouring him I was paying homage to you. He travelled the seas, just like you! I was paying my respects, beloved, to the effigy of your own disaster'. Melite builds a syllogistic argument on the fact that both Thersander and Clitophon were shipwrecked, "to honour a shipwreck victim is to honour Thersander" (Schwartz 2016: 106). Clitophon is only one in a line of many such survivors who functioned as a substitute for Melite to pay homage to Thersander's disaster. This argument is "suspiciously similar" to Clitophon's own to Melite that he cannot sleep with her while at sea out of respect for Leucippe's ghost (τάχα που περὶ τὴν ναῦν αὐτῆς εἰλεῖται τὸ εἴδωλον, 5.16.1; so Anderson 1982: 30). Melite's response to Clitophon then was that he was 'playing the sophist' (5.16.3), which is precisely what she is doing here (cf. 6.8.4 with n.). **φίλτατε:** She repeatedly enhances her inveiglement of Thersander with the superlative address (cf. 6.10.2), a term which only recently she was applying to Clitophon (6.1.3 with n.). **Πῶς οὖν ἐνταῦθα συνεπηγόμην;:** 'Why else would I bring him along here?' συνεπάγομαι, 'to bring someone with' (LSJ s.v. 2; O'Sullivan s.v.). **Ὁ λόγος ἀληθής:** 'This is the true story'. She punctuates the end of her tale with this brazen lie that has an almost formulaic quality to it. If we allow some parallel to the *Apology* (cf. Intro.

2.3.3, 2.4.4), it may be possible to detect some correspondence with Socrates' similar insistence in the course of his defence that what he says is true (e.g. Pl. *Ap*. 17b7-8, 22a2, 24a4-6).

6.9.6 Ἔτυχε μὲν πενθῶν γυναῖκα… τὴν γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ἥκοντες εὕρομεν: 'He happened to be mourning his wife, who unbeknownst to him was not really dead. Someone revealed this to him and how she was here under one of our stewards, meaning Sosthenes. And so, it was! On arrival we discovered the woman'. With a vague approach to the timeline of events and a rather periphrastic turn of phrase, Melite's gives an essentially true narration.

6.9.7 Διὰ τοῦτο ἠκολούθησέ μοι: Only this final inference is an "outright falsehood" (Schwartz 2016: 107). **Ἔχεις τὸν Σωσθένην… τοὺς ἀγρούς:** It was a common rhetorical strategy to offer witnesses as proof (cf. *infra* 6.10.1n.), but since Sosthenes is a slave, this would likely mean torture (cf. 6.20.4n.). Melite already suspects Sosthenes of Leucippe's disappearance (6.8.4), and it is perhaps a gamble to cite him as a witness; however, he would have to agree with at least part of her story, as she has based most of it on fact. **Ἐξέτασον τῶν λεχθέντων ἕκαστον:** 'Scrutinize my every word'. ἐξετάζω ('examine/scrutinize/question closely') continues the forensic feeling of the vocabulary (e.g. Isoc. 5.29, 8.11, 11.34). This is a rather bold invitation to Thersander that he appears to accept (6.11.2). **Εἴ τι ἐψευσάμην, μεμοίχευμαι:** 'If I have lied about a single thing, then I am an adulteress!' Melite blurs the line between truth and fiction even in her sentence construction, as Schwartz (2016: 107) succinctly demonstrates: "The verb of the apodosis (μεμοίχευμαι) is in the perfect indicative without ἄν, suggesting a simple statement of fact; however, the aorist indicative of the verb in the protasis (εἴ τι ἐψευσάμην), suggests either a past unreal condition, i.e., 'if I had lied (but did not)' - as Melite means for Thersander to understand - or a simple past condition, i.e., 'if I lied', without any implication about whether it is true or not" (cf. Frazier 2013: xviii-xix). Melite's use of a hybrid conditional (Intro 1.3) is a deliberate and brilliant evasion that gives her argument the ring of absolute truth. μοιχεύω ('to commit adultery') is passive when applied to women, thus 'to be seduced/debauched' (LSJ s.v.; cf. 8.10.10 *bis*).

6.10.1 Ταῦτα δὲ ἔλεγε… οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεσθαι τὴν κόρην: 'She said this, pretending that she did not know of Leucippe's disappearance, keeping in reserve, if Thersander sought to discover the truth and if Leucippe did not materialize by dawn, the possibility of bringing in the maids, those with whom Leucippe had departed, who would say (as was true) that she was nowhere to be found'. A rather convoluted bit of reporting of both Melite's speech and internal

machinations by Clitophon-*auctor*. The circuitous syntax could be read as a means of portraying Melite's equally roundabout reasoning with Thersander, of whom she already appears suspicious. The use of witness testimony was considered an 'inartificial' proof (i.e. pre-existing evidence that is not reliant on the speaker's rhetorical composition), this stood in contrast to 'artificial' proofs (i.e. rhetorically constructed appeals to emotion or logical arguments) (cf. Arist. *Rh*. 1355b35-9, Quint. *Inst*. 5.1); however, the skilled rhetorician was able to manipulate the 'inartificial' proof quite artfully to their benefit (de Brauw 2007: 195-6), just as Melite does here. The maids' testimony is cited as corroborating evidence by both sides in the trial for Leucippe's murder (7.9.12, 7.11.5-7), and the judge agrees to a retrial for Melite based on the testimony to be gained from their torture (7.12.1). **ταμιευσαμένη αὖθις, εἰ ζητήσει ὁ Θέρσανδρος:** Two instances of hiatus following close on one another: the first is listed by Reeve (1971: 524-5) among the singular, "unexplained" instances, while the second is one of five instances of hiatus before the masc. nom. article. **ἂν <μὴ> παραγένηται…:** ἄν + subjv. in this case functions as a fut. temporal clause, "corresponding to a more vivid future conditional" (Smyth §2401). **ὅπερ ἦν:** The emphatic relative pronoun with εἰμί, 'as was [in fact] true/the case', cf. 2.20.1.

6.10.2 οὕτω γάρ… ἐπαναγκάσαι: 'Thus, she could commit herself to the search openly, and thereby compel Thersander to comply'. What exactly she will force Thersander to do is not entirely clear from the syntax, but it is best to assume, as most previous editors and translators, that it is to help in the search for Leucippe (cf. 6.8.4). **αὐτῇ ἦν:** Vilborg's emendation of "αὐτήν" in the MSS, as he points out a "verb for 'could' is missing"; however, Reeve (1971: 523) finds this emendation "questionable" for its introduction of hiatus (which Vilborg acknowledges with regret). Jacobs' "αὐτὴν ἦν", Vilborg finds "an unusual construction", suggesting also "αὐτῇ ἐνῆν" (which Yatromanolakis 1990: 683 prefers), although it still does not resolve the hiatus. Garnaud follows Vilborg's initial emendation, which, despite the hiatus, is the best thus far. **ἐπαναγκάσαι:** Cautadella (1960: 175-6), attempting to circumnavigate the missing verb, suggests the aor. part. "ἐπαναγκασάσῃ" (dat.) or "ἐπαναγκάσασαν" (acc.), if the "αὐτήν" of the MSS were retained. **Ταῦτα οὖν ὑποκριναμένη πιθανῶς κἀκεῖνα προσετίθει…:** 'After this plausible pretending, she added…'. ὑποκρίνομαι ('to play a part/deliver a speech/act on stage') coupled with the advb. πιθανῶς ('persuasively/plausibly') shows how Melite marries both dramatic and rhetorical skill to achieve her ends, and the credible quality of her words is underlined again below (6.11.1). The same combination is seen when Thersander decries Clinias' speech as false and affected in the courtroom (7.11.1); while

the alliteration recalls the description of Sosthenes' earlier prolixity (πάνυ πιθανῶς πλασάμενος, 6.3.4), indicating that we are about to be audience to a similar display of rhetorical grandiloquence. **Πίστευσον, ἄνερ… μηδὲ νῦν τοιοῦτον ὑπολάβοις:** 'Trust me, husband! You have never accused me of anything in all the time we have been together, my dearest, do not make such an assumption now'. ὑπολαμβάνω ('take up a notion/assume/suppose') is used "frequently of an ill-grounded opinion" (LSJ s.v. III); Vilborg suggests a cupitive opt. considering the "solemn context", although with her initial injunction (πίστευσον) in mind, an imper. opt. seems likelier (cf. Smyth §1820). Melite's choice of words is meticulous, stating merely that Thersander has never accused her before, not that he has never had cause. Indeed, Sopater, Thersander's lawyer, intimates that Melite has had a string of lovers that she was more successful in concealing from Thersander (8.10.8).

6.10.3 Ἡ δὲ φήμη… τῆς κοινωνίας: 'The rumour spread because of the honour I paid to the young man, since many people were unaware of the reason for our association'. διαφοιτάω, lit. 'to wander/roam', of a report 'to spread'. Melite segues back to the proliferation of false reports as a preface to her personification of Rumour and Slander. She is quick to point out that such gossip is due to the ignorance of the general public, a statement universal enough to be true for its own sake. There is (unintentional?) irony in κοινωνία ('association/connection') which has the secondary meaning of 'sexual intercourse' (LSJ s.v. II). **Καὶ γὰρ σὺ φήμῃ τέθνηκας:** 'For, according to rumour, even you are dead'. As with their shared experience of shipwreck (6.9.2), Melite continues to draw common ground between Thersander and Clitophon, comparing the undeniably false rumour of Thersander's demise to the report of her association with Clitophon (6.9.3), implicitly inviting Thersander to draw the same conclusion for both tales.

6.10.4 Φήμη δὲ καὶ Διαβολὴ δύο συγγενῆ κακά· θυγάτηρ ἡ Φήμη τῆς Διαβολῆς: 'Rumour and Slander are two kindred evils: Rumour is the daughter of Slander.' This opening statement sets the tone for her peroration: although they are essentially co-relative, Rumour is slightly subordinate to Slander in that she is her offspring. In the comparison of words to arrows (*infra* 6.10.5 with n.), their filial connection is clarified as Rumour is born from the wound that Slander's arrows leave. The image of a pair of vengeful kinswomen working together recalls the duo of Procne and Philomela (ὀργαὶ δὲ δύο, καὶ δύο γυναῖκες εἰς ἓν πνέουσαι, 5.5.6) (which does not bode well for Thersander who would stand in for Tereus presumably). Jolowicz (2021: 201) compares the genealogy here with that of Vergil's (*illam Terra parens… Coeo Enceladoque sororem | progenuit…*, *Aen*. 4.178-80); however, as Hardie (2012: 115) points

out, AT's genealogy is given "in terms of personification allegory rather than mythology". Comparable personified genealogies are given by both Aeschines (2.145), who rather dissociates Διαβολή and Φήμη, relating the latter instead to 'Malicious Prosecution' (Συκοφαντία) in his attempts to give credence to Φήμη as verifiable 'Common Report'; and Lucian who establishes a familial connection between Διαβολή and 'Flattery' (ἡ δὲ δὴ μεγίστη πασῶν ἡ κολακεία ἐστί, συγγενής, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀδελφή τις οὖσα τῆς διαβολῆς, *Cal*. 20.4-6). **Καὶ ἔστι μὲν ἡ Διαβολὴ μαχαίρας ὀξυτέρα… ἡ δὲ Φήμη ὕδατος ὑγροτέρα…:** 'Slander is sharper than a blade, more violent than fire, more persuasive than the Sirens; Rumour is more fluid than water, swifter than wind, quicker than wings'. In a catachrestic mixture of metaphors, Melite expands upon each in a pair of tricolons that leverage the rhythm in the homoioteleuton of the comparative adjs. (the iambic -έρα). Clitophon picks up on this description of Rumour later when describing how the news of the trial reached Leucippe before he could (οὐκ ἔστι δὲ οὕτως ἄνθρωπος δρομικώτατος, ὃν οὐ τῆς φήμης φθάνει τὸ πτερόν, 7.16.3). This is the only other mention of φήμη in *L&C* outside of Melite's *apologia* and it is indicative of the slippage inherent in Clitophon's homodiegetic narration. Scholars have noted the similarity to both Chariton and Vergil's description of Rumour as comparatively swift (Charit. 3.2.7, Verg. *Aen*. 4.174; Tilg 2010: 263, 270; Jolowicz 2021: 202). Chariton frequently attaches the epithet ταχεῖα ('swift') to rumour (Charit. 2.3.8, 3.3.2, 3.4.1; cf. Long. 4.25.3). Vergil's description also emphasises the correlation between her swiftness and flight, describing Rumour as a monstrous creature covered in feathers who travels through flight (*Aen*. 4.180-1, 9.473-5). Vergil's description is generally credited with popularising the image of the personified Rumour as winged (Guastella 2017: 172; cf. Quint. *Inst*. 9.2.36, Apul. *Met*. 11.18.1, Petron. *Sat*. 123.1.210-1, V. Fl. 2.124-5, Stat. *Theb*. 10.626-7). While AT, Chariton, and Longus all depict Rumour as swift, AT is the only one to draw on the imagery related to her as feathered or flying. **Σειρήνων πιθανωτέρα:** The Sirens were creatures of mythology who lured sailors to their death with their bewitching song. Odysseus famously bested them by blocking the ears of his crew with wax (Hom. *Od*. 12.39-54, 165-200). They were most often depicted as a combination of woman and bird form (cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 4.891-903; *LIMC* s.v. Seirenes), an image which also resonates with that of winged Rumour conjured below. The comparison of the Sirens' powers of persuasion echoes Clitophon's earlier lamentation that he would be unable to plead clemency from the Egyptians due to the language barrier (κἂν Σειρήνων τις γένηται πιθανώτερος, 3.10.3) and this reverberation of imagery is a reminder that Clitophon-*auctor* ultimately stands behind much of the verbal artifice in the novel. The Sirens also form part of the imagery that Clinias uses in his misogynistic tirade (1.8.2); and shortly after that, in

his catalogue of 'wicked' women, Clinias lists Stheneboea's crime as slander (1.8.4). The theme of persuasive feminine falsehoods, begun by Clinias, reaches its peak here in the female personifications conceived by Melite, herself deeply implicated in the manipulation of fact and fiction. **ἡ δὲ Φήμη ὕδατος ὑγροτέρα:** ὑγρός ('wet/moist/fluid') has previously been used to describe women's bodies (2.37.6, cf. 2.38.4), which could strengthen the feminine connection here. The image is of the effortless flow of water and its ability to seep through almost anything. Reeve (1971: 525) speculates a pause between Φήμη and ὕδατος to resolve the hiatus (cf. Intro. 1.3). **ταχυτέρα:** The more usual Attic comparative of ταχύς ('swift') is θάττων, which AT uses consistently in adv. form (e.g. 2.11.1, 3.5.5, 3.22.6; cf. LSJ s.v. C I). This variation from Attic here in order to parallel the other comparatives is an excellent example of AT's liberal approach to Atticism, and how he will sacrifice lexical 'purity' for verbal symmetry (Intro. 1.3).

6.10.5 Ὅταν οὖν ἡ Διαβολή… Τεχθεῖσα δὲ ἡ Φήμη…: 'Whenever Slander shoots a story from her bow, it flies forth like an arrow and wounds the person against whom it was sent, though he be absent; and the one who hears it is quickly persuaded, a fire of anger is kindled within him, and he rages against the targeted man. Rumour, spawned from the arrow shot, flows immediately in a great deluge upon the ears of whomever it chances upon, it blows through great distances rushing down like a storm with a gale of words and flies out, made light by the wings of the tongue'. ἐξίπταμαι is a later, non-Attic, form of ἐκπέτομαι ('fly out') and its repetition, enhanced by the alliteration with ἐξάπτεται, emphasises the airborne trajectory of Slander/Rumour. Compare the similar use of the verb in a quote regarding words that carelessly fly out: ἔνια ἐξίπτασθαι τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτόματα, Plut. *De cap*. 90c8. Here, Slander is depicted as an archer, her falsehoods as the arrows she sends forth, able to wound from a distance (an image also highlighted in Lucian, cf. *Cal*. 8.6-7, 9, 12.3-4, 15.4-5). Rumour flows rather amorphously from the wound Slander's shot leaves; quickly disseminated, it is compared to a tempestuous squall, given wing by the tongue (cf. Guastella 2017: 34-5). The image of words in flight reaches back to the ubiquitous Homeric formula "ἔπεα πτερόεντα" ('winged words') (a description that conjures both birds and arrows), an idea also evinced in the winged depiction of messenger deities such as Hermes and Iris (see Hardie 2012: 92-3; Guastella 2017: 22-32; on the phrase, Reece 2009). Plut. *De garr*. 507a connects the Homeric winged formula to the rapid spread of rumour (φήμη) as if releasing a bird from the hand (cf. also Lucian *Dom*. 20.14-6). The description of words that wound like an arrow shot bears a striking resemblance to Clitophon's earlier sententious description in Bk. 2 of Leucippe's embarrassment at her mother's accusations on discovering him in her room. Language,

Clitophon-*auctor* tells us, sends a variety of arrows to wound the soul from which corresponding emotions are produced, one of which is abuse and from its wound anger is born (τὸ μέν ἐστιν αὐτῷ λοιδορίας βέλος, καὶ γίνεται τὸ ἕλκος ὀργή, 2.29.3). The only remedy for these wounds is to respond in kind (λόγος γὰρ γλώσσης βέλος ἄλλης γλώσσης βέλει θεραπεύεται, 2.29.4). Also remarkable is the way in which the description of Slander shooting arrows that kindle a manic fire within bears much in common with the paradigmatic image of Eros in the novels as winged, torch-bearing/fire-kindling, and imposing his influence via bow and arrow (e.g. 1.1.13, 2.4.5, 2.5.2, Long. 4.34.1, *M&P* col. ii 42-60; cf. 6.18.2 with n.). The repeated parallels between Melite's words and Clitophon's narration show how even during episodes where his homodiegetic narration appears to have receded somewhat, Clitophon-*auctor* is, in fact, ever present (cf. Intro. 2.2). **ὁ μὲν δίκην βέλους:** The adverbial use of δίκην + gen. = 'in the manner of/like/as if' (LSJ s.v. A 2; cf. 1.12.4, 3.4.6, 5.9.2). **ὀργῆς αὐτῷ πῦρ ἐξάπτεται:** ἐξάπτομαι ('to be kindled/inflamed'). In his ekphrasis of Apelles painting of Slander, Lucian describes her as a beautiful and violently passionate woman, illumined by frenzy and rage, with a burning torch held in her hand (*Cal*. 5.6-10). **διαπνεῖ δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον καταιγίζουσα:** καταιγίζω 'rush down (like a storm') can be used metaphorically as here (LSJ s.v.; cf. e.g. Hipp. *Morb*. 3.7.19, *Anth*. *Gr*. 12.88.1). It may also be possible to link Rumour's spread as a gale with Vergil's *Fama* who is closely linked with storms, appearing directly after one (*Aen*. 4.160-72), and "like the storm affects both earth and sky" (Hardie 2012: 82-4, 100-1; cf. *Aen*. 4.180). Similar imagery appears in Ovid's description of *Fama*'s liminal abode which echoes with murmur of voices like far-off thunder (*Met*. 12.51-2) (see Hardie 2012: 160-2; Guastella 2017: 177-84). **κουφιζομένη τῷ τῆς γλώσσης πτερῷ:** The tongue as itself winged appears to be AT's own innovation, perhaps a creative evolution of the image of 'winged words' (or perhaps adapted from Pl. *Phdr*. 248c1-2, ἥ τε τοῦ πτεροῦ φύσις, ᾧ ψυχὴ κουφίζεται, τούτῳ τρέφεται). Further correspondences could be found with Vergil's *Fama* whose numerous feathers are matched by as many eyes, tongues, mouths, and ears (*tot uigiles oculi subter (mirabile dictu), tot linguae, totidem ora sonant, tot subrigit auris*, *Aen*. 4.182-3). Garnaud, as expected, prefers the γλώσσης of α-family, versus β-family's γλώττης (so Vilborg). This and 5.5.5 are the only instance of MSS variation, however in the latter case the MSS favour the -ττ- form and so too the editors. Overall γλώττης is by far the more prevalent form (e.g. 2.25.2, 3.10.2, 5.3.4, 6.18.3) and in this case may be preferred to enhance the alliteration (on -σσ-/-ττ- variation, see 6.4.4n.).

6.10.6 Ταῦτά με τὰ δύο πολεμεῖ: πολεμέω + acc. ('to make war upon') is a later construction (LSJ s.v. II; cf. Charit. 7.5.3). **ἀπέκλεισέ μου τοῖς λόγοις τῶν ὤτων σου τὰς θύρας:** 'They have shut the gates of your ears to my words'. Melite picks up on her earlier plea for a fair hearing (6.9.2 with n.); τοῖς λόγοις is the dat. of disadvantage. Blocking Slander's access to listeners ears is another common image. Lucian describes how Slander blocks the ears of listeners, preventing the defence from making its case (*Cal*. 8.9-12) and, in an analogy with the Sirens, he goes on to recommend blocking one's ears to Slander and setting Reason as doorkeeper (*Cal*. 30). Socrates, too, in his defence speech employs the image of 'filling up' one's ears with slander (Pl. *Ap*. 23e1-3). Vilborg suggests a parallel with the *Symposium* (πύλας πάνυ μεγάλας τοῖς ὠσὶν ἐπίθεσθε, Pl. *Symp*. 218b6-7); while the turn of phrase is similar, the context is not entirely analogous, as Alcibiades is speaking rather of philosophical passion than slander or its cognates. Compare also Ovid's echoing house of *Fama* (*Met*. 12.43-5) that has many apertures, but no doors to close them.

6.11.1 Ἅμα λέγουσα… ἤθελεν: 'As she spoke, she touched his hand and tried to kiss it'. The obj. of this clause is disputed amongst translators: Winkler has the supplicatory 'it' (i.e. his hand) (so too, Guez 2016: 526), whereas others have the more presumptuous 'him' (so Gaselee, Whitmarsh). Given the lengths she has gone to persuade him that she has been a faithful wife, as well as her own passionate impetuousness, it may be considered likelier that Melite attempts to kiss her husband directly, rather than on the hand; however, χειρός is the only subst. in the sentence and the corresponsive τε… καί would likely indicate that we are to assume the same obj. for both clauses. The most crucial aspect of the sentence is rather the impf. ἤθελεν, indicating she did not succeed in her kiss (wherever it was directed) (cf. Rijksbaron §6.1). **Ἐγεγόνει δέ… μετέφερεν:** 'He had become calmer, the plausibility of her words beguiled him, and the correspondence of the part concerning Leucippe with Sosthenes' account allayed some of his suspicion'. Although Thersander is placated by Melite's plea, the switch to the impf. thereafter (αὐτὸν ἔσαινε) indicates an ultimate lack of success (as above). There is potential irony in the application of the comparative adj. ἡμερώτερος to Thersander when he himself has just applied the comparative advb. to Leucippe (6.7.8). The adj. ἥμερος ('mild/calm') also means 'tame' (i.e. of animals; LSJ s.v. 1) which may be significant, considering Thersander is the 'beast-man' (Intro. 2.3.4). This play on animalistic instinct is augmented by σαίνω, here 'beguile/deceive' (LSJ s.v. III 4), which is properly used of a dog wagging its tail, and when used of deceit implies a misdirection based on fawning or flattery (see Harriott 1982: 11-14; Fries 2014: 139, on [Eur.] *Rh*. 55; cf. Hes. *Theog*. 769-74, Pind. *Pyth*. 2.82-3, Aesch. *Pers*.

111-4, Plut. *Rom*. 7.9.3, Lucian *Fug*. 16). Switching the subj. to τὸ πιθανόν functions as a kind of bookend to Melite's persuasive peroration (cf. 6.10.2n.), confirming the primacy of plausibility rather than factuality in rhetorical engagement (van Mal-Maeder 2007: 144). **τέλεον:** 'completely/absolutely', the neut. is used as the advb. (τελέως), which is common in later prose (LSJ s.v. VII 3; e.g. 3.2.2, 6.17.3, Lucian *Merc.Cond*. 5.30, App. *BC* 1.1.8.21). **ζηλοτυπία γάρ… ἐστιν:** 'for jealousy is hard to escape once it attacks the soul'. This *gnome* explains why, despite the rhetorical skill and plausibility of Melite's peroration, Thersander remains unconvinced (De Temmerman 2007a: 10). ζηλοτυπία ('jealousy'), as opposed to φθόνος ('envy') (which does not appear in *L&C*),[303] is most often applied to sexual/amorous rivalry, especially in the situation of a 'love triangle' and can often lead to violent conclusions, just as Thersander assaults Clitophon on two different occasions (5.23.5, 8.1.3) (see Fantham 1986: 45-53; Konstan 2006: 221-30; cf. Poll. *Onom*. 3.72.4-6, *Suda* ζ.58, Hsch. ζ.138). Usually, this type of sexual jealousy is seen as the province of women and "in men was regarded as a barbarian trait" (Konstan 2006: 230-1; e.g. Plut. *Them*. 26.4-5, Charit. 6.6.5, Heliod. 1.30.7, 7.29.1), particularly apposite to Thersander's 'barbaric' characterisation (Intro. 2.3.4). Every other instance of ζηλοτυπία in *L&C* is applied to women (Procne and Philomela: 5.5.6, 5.5.7, Melite: 5.24.3 *bis*, 7.3.7, 7.9.12), which makes its application here significant (on Clitophon's misogynistic take on female jealousy, De Temmerman 2007a: 13). Clitophon-*auctor* is not only (once again) presuming to know Thersander's emotional state, but he is also giving subtle commentary on Thersander's masculinity (developed further in Thersander's wish to be Clitophon, 6.17.1 with n.). There may be a further metaliterary implication in this *gnome*, as the jealous, cuckolded husband (*zelotypus*) was a trope of Latin mime, a genre in which fun could be had at his expense (Fantham 1986: 54-7). Characterising Thersander as the only male affected by ζηλοτυπία may lead us to anticipate Melite's ultimate evasion of the charge of adultery and Thersander's own ignominious disappearance from the novel. On the other hand, Billault (2009) shows how jealousy acts in the romance novels to set the general plot in motion (for the sake of his argument, he conflates ζηλοτυπία and φθόνος), in particular the case of Chariton, where Chaereas' innate jealousy plays a pivotal role in the action of the plot (cf. Charit. 1.2.5, 5.1.1, 8.1.15, 8.4.4). Interestingly, Billault does not cite this instance in *L&C*, which would have neatly supported his assertion, as it could be argued that Thersander's jealousy here prevents him from being convinced by Melite and therefore triggers much of the subsequent action that follows (his assault on Leucippe, his revenge on Clitophon, and the trials

[303] Cf. 1.13.6 ἡ φθονερὰ τύχη (β-family) : ἡ πονηρὰ τύχη (α-family).

that follow). Thersander's ζηλοτυπία is also another way in which he mirrors Dionysius (cf. Charit. 3.7.6, 3.9.4, 5.9.9). **δυσέκλειπτόν:** 'hard to escape' (α-family), apparently confirmed by the quotation of this *gnome* in Maxim. Conf. (91.961 *MPG*; cf. Intro. 1.5) and opted for by Vilborg, Garnaud, Plepelits, and Winkler; β-family gives "δυσέκνιπτόν" ('hard to wash out') which is followed by Gaselee, O'Sullivan, Yatromanolakis (1990: 684), and the LSJ (s.v. δυσέκνιπτόν). Despite using Garnaud's text, Whitmarsh also opts for "δυσέκνιπτόν" in his translation ("once the drops of jealousy have landed on the soul, they are hard to wash away"). It could be argued that δυσέκλειπτόν is the *lecto dificilior* considering the infrequency of this adj.'s occurrence; nonetheless, there is more evidence of δυσέκνιπτος being applied to emotions (and other abstract nouns; e.g. Pl. *Resp*. ii.378d8-e1, Them. *Or*. 21.249c1, *Const. Apost*. 8.32.37, Olymp. *Comm. Pl. Alc.* 50.26). Fortunately, in this case, whichever reading one prefers, the spirit of the *gnome* remains the same.

6.11.2 Ἐθορυβεῖτο οὖν ὅτε: Thus α-family (Garnaud) versus "ἐθορυβήθη οὖν ὅτι" (β-family, Vilborg). θορυβέω in the pass. means 'to be thrown into disorder, confused' (LSJ s.v. II). In this instance, α-family appears the sounder choice as the impf. implies a continued state and the correlatives ὅτε… τότε… link the sentences neatly. **ὥστε ἐμίσει με μᾶλλον:** 'and so hated me all the more'. Thersander has had no direct speech since his initial imprecations (6.9.1), and Clitophon, although perhaps justified in his conjecture here, nonetheless reveals his narration as rather self-involved. Compare Arsace's pang of jealousy on learning that Charicleia is Theagenes' wife rather than his sister (Heliod. 7.26.6). **῾Η δὲ Μελίτη κακῶς εἶχε τὴν ψυχήν:** 'And Melite was sick at heart, as she had not fulfilled her promise to me'. A phrase that Clitophon usually applies to himself (1.6.6, 6.5.5), revealing, perhaps, a propensity to project when he attempts to elucidate the emotional state of others.

6.11.3-6.14: Lovers Locked Up

Meanwhile, Sosthenes returns to Leucippe, attempting to rouse her enthusiasm with affected joviality (6.11.3-4). Leucippe responds with withering sarcasm, but he, unaware of her scorn, launches into an encomium of Thersander (6.12.1-2). She, in turn, rejects and deflates each of his praises (6.12.3-5). Sosthenes, nonplussed at Leucippe's rebuff, begins to rhapsodize his master yet again, recounting his miraculous survival of the shipwreck (6.13.1-2); however, when Leucippe remains unmoved his exhortations grow ominous (6.13.3-4). Focus then switches briefly back to the imprisoned Clitophon, whom Clinias and Satyrus have

rushed to visit (6.14.1). He tells them of Melite's promises, instructing them to return at dawn if Leucippe should materialise. The warder orders them out of the jail and Clitophon is left alone, suspended between feelings of hope and fear (6.14.2).

6.11.3 ὁ δὲ Σωσθένης…: When last in the narrative we saw Sosthenes Thersander had left him to promote his cause with Leucippe, bidding him to contact him at dawn (6.7.9). **μέχρι τινός:** Whitmarsh's "[he] had accompanied Thersander thus far" is awkward, for that would mean that Sosthenes has been silently present for Melite's entire oration. παραπέμπω ('to attend/escort') may suggest this, however, the indefinite pronoun after μέχρι indicates that it was only *some* of the distance (Vilborg; and thus, Winkler and Gaselee). **καθυποσχόμενος:** An intensified form of ὑπισχνέομαι ('to promise/undertake to do') (on κατά- as an intensifying prefix, Intro. 1.3), evidently a later compound, it does not appear to predate 1st c. CE (cf. Heliod. 2.30.5, 5.30.1). **σχηματίσας τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς ἡδονήν:** 'arranging his face in a cheerful demeanour'. There is some irony in Sosthenes' posturing when one considers Clitophon's earlier *gnome* on the ease of reading emotions from someone's face (6.6.2 with n.; cf. 5.25.2). σχηματίζω ('to assume a form/figure/position') is also used of Thersander's feigned compliance (6.18.1), and thus it is with great hypocrisy that he should accuse Leucippe of such dissimulation when it is only ever he and his steward who are described acting with such insincerity (6.20.2). That being said, it is Clitophon-*auctor* who describes them as such, and it is in his interest to rationalize any positive sentiments displayed by the two as false or feigned. **Κατωρθώσαμεν… γυναῖκα ποιήσεταί σε:** 'We have succeeded, Lacaena! Thersander loves you and is crazy enough about you to make you his wife soon'. An echo of Thersander's instruction to Sosthenes (6.7.9), however, the verb in the 1st person pl. rephrases it as a joint endeavour. Sosthenes invents an apparent marriage proposal from Thersander, who has given no such indication before. That Thersander would free his slave concubine and marry her is questionable, and could be read as an ironic echo of Dionysius, who frees Callirhoe to marry her. **εἶπε, Λάκαινα:** α-family (Garnaud); β-family (Vilborg) has "εἶπεν, ὦ Λάκαινα". **Τὸ δὲ κατόρθωμα τοῦτο ἐμόν:** A swift change of tack from 'our success' to 'my success'. Sosthenes seems particularly keen to take credit for Thersander's infatuation, however, his exultation is to be taken with a pinch of salt considering his dissemblance.

6.11.4 Ἐγὼ γάρ σου… φαντασίας ἐγέμισα: 'It was I that many a time mentioned the marvel of your beauty and filled his soul with fantasies'. τερατεύομαι ('to talk marvels') is used by both Sosthenes and Clitophon-*auctor* (6.13.2) to describe Sosthenes' exaggerated claims (cf.

on the contrast between truth and τερατεύομαι, Aeschin. 2.98). On the one hand, Sosthenes' use of the verb to describe his own words shows a remarkable self-awareness of his bombastic tendencies, yet on the other, it is indicative of Clitophon's narratorial presence. The verb also has the secondary connotation of 'to gesticulate wildly', used of Menelaus' sleight of hand at revealing Leucippe alive after her 'disembowelment' (3.18.3) and of Sostratus' courtroom antics (8.10.2; cf. Aeschin. 2.49, thus Whitmarsh 2001: 161). γεμίζω ('to fill *x* (acc.) with *y* (gen.)') is used in the beginning of the novel by Clitophon as a play on satiation of the belly versus that of the eyes (1.6.1; cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 145). The analogue of surfeit and sight is continued in the description of the storm at sea (3.4.5), as well as Clitophon's first pleasure-filled glimpse of Alexandria (5.1.1; cf. Whitmarsh 2011a: 83-4). Indeed, the verb is used for the most part in figurative contexts, often in moments of psychological commentary (e.g. 1.6.3, 2.29.1, 2.29.5, 6.19.5); so too, γέμω ('to be full of *x* (gen.)') (e.g. 2.4.5, 2.7.6, 5.23.5, 5.27.1, 6.17.1). That Sosthenes employs it here highlights the play between emotional amplitude, sight, and *phantasia* (see Intro. 2.4.4; 6.4.4n.). Plut. *Amat*. 759C makes the connection between poetic *phantasiai* and the ephemeral fantasies of lovers, however these *phantasiai* are based on the recollection of sight, whereas Thersander's (at least initially) stem from Sosthenes' report. **κλαίεις:** AT varies between κλαίω ('to weep/wail') and the Attic κλάω in a virtually even split (e.g. 2.21.2, 3.20.1, 4.1.4, 4.10.5, 5.21.5, 5.25.8), in the impf. he employs the Attic form exclusively. **Ἀνάστηθι… Ἀφροδίτῃ:** 'Get up and sacrifice to Aphrodite for your good fortunes!'. Sosthenes' exclamation here echoes Satyrus' own inducement that Clitophon should marry Melite (ἡ Ἀφροδίτη μέγα τούτῳ παρέσχεν ἀγαθόν, 5.11.5), highlighting the parallels between Clitophon and his trusted servant, and Thersander and his 'tricky' slave (cf. Intro. 2.3.5). The 'rites' of Aphrodite is a common euphemism for sex (e.g. 2.19.1, 2.37-8, 4.1.2, 5.15.6, 5.16.3) and most recently, Clitophon and Melite's tryst is characterised as taking place under the auspices of Aphrodite (5.25.7, 5.27.4). That Sosthenes should invoke the goddess here increases the anxiety that Thersander will succeed in his assault upon Leucippe – it also finds its counterpart in Leucippe's invocation of Artemis in defence of her virginity (6.21.2 with n.). Further parallels with Chariton are also evident: Plangon urges Callirhoe to pray at Aphrodite's shrine, where we learn that Aphrodite intends for her to marry again (Charit. 2.2.5-8); and Artaxates regards the King's interest in Callirhoe as 'good fortune' and urges her to make sacrifice to the gods in thanks (Charit. 6.5.7). **μνημόνευε δὲ κἀμοῦ:** 'And remember me too!' Another echo of Artaxates' words to Callirhoe (καὶ σὺ δὲ μνημόνευέ μου τῆς εὐεργεσίας, Charit. 6.5.1; De Temmerman 2014: 192; cf. 6.4.2n.). Chariton's narrator

explains in a *gnome* the selfish habit of slaves to insert themselves where they can in the hope of reaping some benefit (Charit. 6.5.5).

6.12.1 Καὶ ἡ Λευκίππη… πάρει: 'And Leucippe replied, 'May you have the same sort of good fortune as you come bearing to me'. Leucippe displays a sardonic spunk, echoing Sosthenes' words (6.11.4) and balancing her retort with the demonstrative and relative pronouns (τοιαῦτά σοι… οἷά μοι…), "the stress lies on the demonstrative pronouns" (Vilborg; cf. Smyth §1251). The sarcasm is reinforced by the almost tragic register she adopts and indeed the initial clause of her direct speech with the opt. (τοιαῦτά σοι…γένοιτο εὐτυχήματα) could be scanned as an iambic trimeter. Her 'good wishes' echo Callirhoe's own seeming felicitations to the Great King and his servant (Charit. 6.5.6). **Ὁ δὲ Σωσθένης… προσετίθει:** 'Sosthenes, however, failed to spot her irony and, thinking that she spoke sincerely, continued in a benevolent fashion'. Both Leucippe and Callirhoe resort to irony as a means of deflecting unwelcome solicitations (κατειρωνεύσατο λοιπὸν τοῦ βαρβάρου, Charit. 6.5.8) and both Sosthenes and Artaxates (Charit. 6.5.10), as slaves, fail to grasp the "rhetorical subtlety" of the heroines (De Temmerman 2014: 192). **φιλοφρονούμενος:** φιλοφρονέομαι ('to treat kindly') is elsewhere used of sympathetic characters: Clitophon's father (2.3.1), Menelaus (2.33.1), and the Priest of Artemis (8.4.1, thus β : φιλοφρόνως α). Sosthenes is both clueless and kindly here, which may seem odd given his selfish and conniving oratorical efforts thus far. The distinction, perhaps, is one of characterisation: Thersander is shown as manipulable by his slave's rhetoric, whereas Leucippe easily navigates Sosthenes' dissemblance, countering his rhetorical efforts with her own far more astute observations. **Μελίτης μὲν ἀνήρ:** This is surely news to Leucippe who met Melite on the estate with Clitophon in tow (5.17.3), and who was informed by women of the household that they were married (5.22.3).

6.12.2 γένει δὲ πρῶτος… νέος καὶ καλός: 'He is first among all Ionians by birth – his wealth is greater even than his birth, and his good character greater still than his wealth! As for his age, you have well seen, he is young and handsome'. Sosthenes delivers an elliptical, 'by the book' encomium of Thersander, beginning with his provenance, reputation, and wealth, followed by virtues of character and body (see e.g. Ael. Theon *Prog*. 109.20-112.18, Hermog. *Prog*. 7, Aphth. *Prog*. 10.21.5-22.11, Nic. Rhet. *Prog*. 50-53; cf. Arist. *Rh*. 1367b28-32, [*Rh. Al*.] 1425b36-1426b22). He escalates each quality as superior to the previous through rhythmic anadiplosis (γένει… πλοῦτος… γένους… πλοῦτον), reaching its crescendo with Thersander's χρηστότης ('good character') (cf. *infra* 6.12.4 with n.); note also the *variatio* of μείζων… ὑπέρ.

The final point of Thersander's good looks is given its own explanation as Sosthenes appeals to Leucippe's eyewitness (οἷός ἐστιν εἶδες), ironic considering Thersander's own scopophiliac reaction. The steward's description of his master is "hardly reliable" considering his ulterior motives (De Temmerman 2014: 155), and indeed, it is the encomiast's prerogative to 'rework' his subject's traits in the best possible light (e.g. Nic. Rhet. *Prog*. 52.20-53.6). His glorifying of Thersander echoes the descriptions of Dionysius as preeminent in lineage and wealth amongst the Ionians (e.g. Charit. 1.12.6, 2.1.5, 2.4.4, 2.5.4, 3.6.5, 4.4.3, 8.7.9; cf. De Temmerman 2014: 155), so too of his 'good character' (Charit. 2.2.1, 2.11.6; De Temmerman 2014: 191 n. 133), and good looks (Charit. 2.5.2). **ὃ μάλιστα τέρπει γυναῖκα:** 'which is particularly pleasing to women'. A generalisation bordering on the sententious, he repeats the same sentiment later to Thersander when assuring him of Leucippe's interest (6.17.3).

6.12.3 Πρὸς τοῦτο… Σωσθένην: 'At this Leucippe could no longer endure Sosthenes' prattling'. In her angry response here, Leucippe breaks with the ongoing allusion to Callirhoe, who was able to control her fury at Artaxates' proposition and maintain a position of flattered ignorance (Charit. 6.5.8-9; see Jones 2012: 35-7 on Callirhoe's response). On the one hand, Callirhoe is obliged to show more diplomacy than Leucippe in rebuffing the Great King, on the other, it could be read as suiting Clitophon's fictionalised conception of his heroine that she should violently reject any possible suitor or attempts at wooing her. **Ὦ κακὸν σὺ θηρίον:** A term of reproach used in both Attic comedy and oratory (e.g. Ar. *Plut*. 439, *Av*. 87, *Vesp*. 448, Din. 1.50, Dem. 58.49). Elsewhere in the novels this term appears only in its literal meaning of '(wild) animal' (apart from in the names of Thersander and Chariton's pirate Theron, see Intro. 2.3.4). Compare Plato who applies θηρίον to flatterers (κόλακες) (Pl. *Phdr*. 240b1). Although Sosthenes has had some persuasive success with Thersander, his attempts at encomium now fall flat, and as sycophantic slave he is more an overblown flatterer than an orator (cf. [Long.] 44.3-4, Arist. *Nic*. *Eth*. 1125a1-2). **μέχρι τίνος μιαίνεις τὰ ὦτα;:** 'How long will you sully my ears?' μέχρι (of time) + gen. = 'how long?' (LSJ s.v. II 2). Garnaud omits Jacob's addition of "<μοι>" after τίνος (dat. of possession, i.e. 'my ears') without comment, which is retained by Vilborg as "an error due to haplography" (cf. the μοι in the following sentence). The notion that Leucippe's ears are sacred objects to be defiled is a humorous over-exaggeration that echoes Melite's earlier comments on Thersander's ears (6.9.2 with n.), she may be aiming to ironize the language of tragedy (e.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 636-7), or it may well be that this phrase is an established idiom in Imperial Greek (cf. Joseph. *AJ* 16.94.1, *BJ* 2.132.3-133.1). **Τί μοι καὶ Θερσάνδρῳ κοινόν;:** 'What do Thersander and I have in

common?' Surprisingly, Vilborg prefers "Τί ἐμοὶ", which is supported only by M and introduces an unnecessary hiatus; furthermore, the enclitic here resonates with Leucippe's follow up question (6.12.5).

6.12.4 Καλὸς ἔστω… δεομένοις: 'Let his handsomeness be for Melite, his wealth for the city, and his good character and generosity for the needy!' Leucippe delivers a sarcastic counter-encomium, rejecting each of Sosthenes' points in turn; the 3rd person imper. gives her tone an imperious quality (cf. 6.21.1 with n.). Her enumeration is equally elliptical, beginning with Sosthenes' last point, Thersander's handsomeness, perhaps most offended by his pronouncement on female preferences. She varies her final point with the addition of μεγαλόψυχος ('magnanimous'), the only instance of this adj. in the romance writers; more usual are μεγαλόφρων ('generous') (e.g. Charit. 1.1.8, 2.8.1, Long. 4.17.1, Heliod. 10.7.4; cf. also, Callisthenes' extravagance transformed, 8.17.5) or φιλάνθρωπος ('benevolent/humane') (e.g. Charit. 2.2.1, 2.5.11, 5.7.1, Heliod. 1.26.5, 8.16.7). The 'virtue' of wealth is often highlighted in combination with that of generosity (as seen with Dionysius; cf. Long. 4.13.2, Plut. *Publ*. 1.2). Plepelits (1980: 249) links this sentiment to the practice of wealthy private citizens donating funds toward public works or entertainment. Compare the Priest's innuendo-filled *psogos* of Thersander (8.9.1-5), which is only briefly countered by his lawyer Sopatrus (8.10.7). **ἐμοὶ δέ… πλουσιώτερος:** 'I care nothing for these things, whether he is nobler-born than Codrus or richer than Croesus!' Leucippe expands on his wealth and good character in two balanced comparisons that are emphasised by their rhythmic parechesis. Notably, she does not give any mythological comparison for Thersander's handsomeness, unlike Clitophon, who has just been compared in looks to one of the greatest heroes of all (6.1.3 with n.). Codrus was the semi-mythical last king of Athens, who allowed himself to be murdered while in disguise by the invading Dorians to negate a prophecy of their victory (cf. Lycurg. *Leoc*. 84-8, Val. Max. 5.6(ext).1, Vell. Pat. *Hist*. *Rom*. 1.2); although, as Gaselee points, out the allusion here is to Codrus' elite lineage rather than his noble sacrifice. While Croesus, last king of Lydia, whose legendary wealth is proverbial even today, is particularly relevant to Ephesus, having captured the city in 560 BCE he made a sizable donation to the construction of the Artemision, such that this iteration of the temple was known as the Temple of Croesus (Immendörfer 2017: 123-131; cf. Hdt. 1.92). Frazier (2013: 297 n. 14) suggests that Leucippe's references here prove her a cultivated young woman "qui connaît les premiers temps d'Athènes"; however, there is evidence that by the 2nd c. CE these phrases had passed into everyday parlance (on Codrus, e.g. Lucian *DMort*. 19.4, Diogenian. 4.84, Zen. 4.3, Lib. *Ep*. 298.3.2; and on Croesus, e.g. Lucian

Merc.Cond. 20.22, Philo. *de Prov*. 2.7.5-6). Indeed, Lucian lists them amongst the usual sort of hyperboles that flatterers might say (εὐγενέστερον δὲ τοῦ Κέκροπος ἢ Κόδρου… πλουσιώτερον δὲ συνάμα Κροίσων ἑκκαίδεκα, *Tim*. 23.9-11), and we could infer a knowing jibe at Sosthenes' attempts at encomium. The phrase Κόδρου εὐγενέστερος is also one of the few instances of unresolved hiatus in *L&C* (Reeve 1971: 525; cf. Intro. 1.3).

6.12.5 Τί μοι… ἐγκωμίων: 'Why recite this plethora of someone else's plaudits to me?' Her phrasing suggests a mocking alliterative echo of Sosthenes' earlier claim that he arrived "φέρων σωρὸν ἀγαθῶν" (6.4.2). Although ἐγκωμίων is in the pl. ('praises'), her use of it here conjures an implicit rhetorical appreciation of Sosthenes' attempts at ἐγκώμιον ('encomium') (cf. Leucippe's vision of her own encomium at 6.22.2 with n.). The adj. ἀλλότριος ('of/belonging to another') is slightly tricky to translate here, Whitmarsh has "praises that do not belong to him [*sc*. Thersander]" (cf. Winkler's "irrelevant virtues"), but better is Gaselee's "another's praises". The adj. is employed to emphasise the contrast with ἀλλοτρίας… γυναῖκας ('other men's wives'). **Τότε… γυναῖκας:** 'I will only start praising Thersander as a good man when he stops sexually assaulting other men's wives!' The force of the fut. more vivid gives her statement an emphatic intensity (Smyth §2322).

6.13.1 Καὶ ὁ Σωσθένης σπουδάσας εἶπε· Παίζεις; Ποῖ παίζω; ἔφη: 'And Sosthenes, taking it seriously, replied, 'Surely, you're joking?' 'What do you mean joking!?', she snapped'. The interrogative advb. ποῖ when used indignantly to repeat the words of the previous speaker has the sense 'why do you say/what do you mean by…?' (*CGL* s.v. 3; LSJ suppl. s.v. IV; cf. Ar. *Lys*. 193, 383, with Henderson 1987: 93; cf. also ποῖος, 6.9.1 with n.). It can also be interpreted as 'what for?/how come?' with implied disapproval (*BDAG* s.v.), and this is how most editors have taken it (e.g. Vilborg, Gaselee, O'Sullivan). The chiastic alliterative construction of their exchange adds a scornful staccato that highlights her mimicry of Sosthenes' question (highlighting the derisive ποῖ in the central position). This chiasmus, however, is another example of Clitophon-*auctor*'s rhetorical hand, as it bridges both narrative description ('he said'/'she said') and the characters' direct speech. The apparently contradictory pairing of the verbs (and their cognates) σπουδάζω ('to be eager/serious') and παίζω ('to play/joke') throughout Greek literature has the connotation of 'serious play', that is, the joke contains some serious intent (so Melite at 5.14.4; see Kidd 2019: 162-84). The pairing here is both a play on Sosthenes' comic lack of understanding (6.12.1) and a subtle comment on this antithetical dynamic (cf. Long. 1.11.1, Heliod. 2.30.4, 9.19.3). It is also possible, as Vilborg shows, to take

παίζω as a deliberative subjv., but this seems unlikely (cf. Rijksbaron §13.2). **ἔα με… δαίμονος:** 'Leave me alone, man, to waste away with my ill-fortune and the daemon that dominates me!' The voc. ἄνθρωπε is used "in a contemptuous sense, as when addressed to slaves" (LSJ s.v. A 6); it can be more neutral if used of a stranger or a hypothetical addressee (as in Classical Greek), however, when used of someone who is known to the speaker (as mostly in later authors) it is considered very impolite (Dickey 1996: 150-2; cf. 4.7.4, 5.23.7, 7.14.4). Of the novelists ἄνθρωπε is used only by AT and once in Chariton in the parallel situation with Callirhoe and Artaxates after he returns to press the King's suit (Charit. 6.7.10). The mid. of συντρίβω ('to rub/beat/crush') has been translated as pass. for the most part (e.g. Whitmarsh, Winkler; cf. Hercher who replaced μετά with "ὑπό"); however, the inf. is epexegetic (Vilborg), and with μετά + gen. expressing accompaniment (cf. §Smyth 1691; O'Sullivan s.v. II 2 a), Garnaud's French translation may be the closest: "Laisse-moi seule, l'homme, me consumer en compagnie de ma mauvaise fortune" (cf. Gaselee and Plepelits who omit the inf.). On the verb, cf. Diod. Sic. 16.81.3, Plat. *Resp*. x.611d3-4; also, the literal (act.) usage at 4.16.3. Some translators have taken the inf. to govern both τύχη and δαίμων but considering that it is contained by the gen. phrase, it is better to take it with τύχη alone. Winkler chooses to capitalize τύχη here, however the reflexive possessive pronoun (τῆς ἐμαυτῆς) emphasises the personal nature of Leucippe's fate, rather than the workings of Tyche the personified deity (cf. Intro. 2.4.2). A δαίμων ('daemon') is a personified genius that oversees both good (e.g. 3.5.1, 3.20.2, 5.2.1) and ill (e.g. 4.9.7, 7.2.4, 7.5.1) fortune, which need not be a personal attendant spirit (e.g. 2.25.1, 4.15.3); the term can also be used more neutrally of any god or deity (e.g. Charit. 2.8.3, Heliod. 3.14.2). As with T/tyche, the characters of the novels are well aware of the influence a daemon can exert (often for the worse) and regularly mention or apostrophise them directly (e.g. 3.10.1, 5.11.1, Charit. 3.2.17, 6.2.9, 6.2.11, X. Eph. 2.7.5, 3.2.4, 3.2.13, Heliod. 1.26.4, 6.12.1, 7.21.3).[304] The pairing of T/tyche and daemon is a natural one (e.g. 3.22.3, 4.9.7, Heliod. 5.6.2, 6.8.5; cf. also Ar. *Av*. 544, Dem. 14.36, 48.24, Lys. 13.63), and by the 2nd c. CE both were ubiquitous entities in everyday life (Dodds 1965: 37-8; Greenbaum 2016: 46-9). On one occasion Clitophon uses the neut. subst. τὸ δαιμόνιον (1.3.2), most familiar as Socrates' 'divine sign' (e.g. Pl. *Phdr*. 242b-c, [*Theag*.] 128d-e, Xen. *Mem*. 1.1.1-5), but in this instance it is "more grandiloquent bombast" (Whitmarsh 2020: 135). More

[304] The term δαίμων does not appear in Longus, where perhaps the Muses and Pan take the place of intercessory deities, although εὐδαίμων ('fortunate/blessed by a good daemon') does (Long. 1.1.2, 3.25.3, 4.24.4).

generally on daemons and their power, see e.g. Dodds 1965: 37-68 and 1973: 39-43. **οἶδα γὰρ οὖσα ἐν πειρατηρίῳ:** 'I am well aware that I am in a pirate den'. Leucippe shows the characteristic, almost metaliterary, self-awareness of the protagonists in the novels of their persistent ill-fortune (e.g. Heliod. 2.4.1, 5.6.2-4, 6.7.3; cf. Konstan 1994: 57). Particularly apposite here is the etymological link between πεῖρα ('attempt to seduce', LSJ s.v. II) and πειρατής ('pirate') (Whitmarsh 2020: 160, 224; cf. *DELG* s.v. πεῖρα), and Leucippe imagines herself in a πειρατήριον ('pirate den/lair') due to Thersander and Sosthenes' persistent efforts to 'plunder' her chastity. The metaphor of the 'piracy' of love/desire is exploited throughout Bk. 6 (cf. 6.16.5, 6.17.1, 6.20.3, 6.21.3, 6.22.2 with nn.). **μαίνεσθαι μανίαν ἀνήκεστον:** The internal cognate acc. is a common construction in Attic (*Suda* λ.467), usually accompanied by an attributive word to avoid tautology (Smyth §1570; cf. Ar. *Thesm*. 793, *Anth. Gr.* 9.406.6). It is perhaps ironic that Sosthenes should accuse Leucippe of an 'incurable' madness, when previously in the novel she suffered from a madness which they were able to cure (4.17). In Bk. 6 it is Thersander who is generally characterised as mad with either jealousy (6.9.1), love (6.11.3), or desire (6.22.2).

6.13.2 Πειρατήριον… τῆς Τύχης: 'All this seems like a pirate den to you!? Wealth and marriage and luxury and gaining a man such as this by Fortune's grace'. The aor. part. λαβούσῃ refers to Leucippe, agreeing with σοι; παρά + gen. = 'issuing/proceeding from *x*' (LSJ s.v. A II 2; Smyth §1692). **ὃν οὕτω… ἀγαγεῖν;:** 'a man whom the gods love so much that they snatch him back from between the gates of death?' Although Sosthenes may be hyperbolising, loss of life at sea was a perennial peril (cf. 3.23.3-4; 6.9.4 with n.) and "recovery stories" were rare and often explained in terms of divine, supernatural, or some other extraordinary circumstance (Lindenlauf 2003: 423). While the metaphor of the passage to death through 'gates/doors' is ubiquitous, the usual phrase in classical Greek authors is 'the gates of Hades' (πύλας Ἀΐδαο) (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 5.646, 23.71, Aesch. *Ag*. 1291, Eur. *Hipp*. 56-7, *Alc*. 125-6, Theoc. *Id*. 2.160, Lucian *Nec*. 6.9-10; cf. also, the oft quoted "σκότου πύλας" of Eur. *Hec*. 1). The phrase "πύλαι θανάτου" ('the gates of death'), however, is first attested in the Septuagint (cf. LXX Job 38:17, Ps. 9:14, 106:18) and is associated with a "close brush with death" (Lewis 1995: 350). Subsequently, the expression proliferates amongst Christian writers of the 2nd-3rd c. CE (e.g. Clem. Al. *Strom*. 4.7.44.1.3, Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 1.3.11.6, *Dem. evang*. 4.10.14.15) but also appears in several secular authors of the era (e.g. [Gal.] *Puls. Ant*. 19.641.9, Lib. *Or*. 5.1.4, Eunap. *VS* 21.2.4.1). Clinias uses the same phrase when describing his own miraculous rescue (οἱ δὲ ἐφείλκυσάν με ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ θανάτου πυλῶν, 5.9.3) and its repetition here in the

same context emphasises the incredible contingency of surviving a shipwreck. **Εἶτα κατέλεγε… τὸν δελφῖνα τὸν Ἀρίονος:** 'Then he recounted the shipwreck aggrandizing to god-like proportions how Thersander was saved, making it a marvel surpassing even that of Arion's dolphin'. ἐκθειάζω (lit. 'make a god of/deify', but also 'make out as if divine/supernatural') is a later compound, used more neutrally at 2.14.6; coupled with τερατευόμενος (see 6.11.4 with n.), it emphasizes Sosthenes' 'miraculizing' of Thersander's escape (cf. Heliod. 8.2.1, 10.29.1). Arion, the famously innovative musician, faced with the choice of suicide or drowning at the hands of rapacious sailors, chose to sing one final song and then fling himself overboard where he was saved by a dolphin and borne safely back to land (Hdt. 1.23-4, on which, Asheri *et al*. 2011: 91-2; more generally, Bowra 1963).

6.13.3 Ὡς δ' οὐδὲν ἡ Λευκίππη οὐκέτι μυθολογοῦντα πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπε: μυθολογέω ('to mythologize') here meant in the "derogatory sense" of overimaginative prevarication (O'Sullivan s.v.; cf. 7.11.1). Used more neutrally of recounting a myth at 2.11.4 (cf. Long. 1.27.1, 3.23.5), or simply recounting stories, 8.15.3 (Long. 3.9.4; cf. 8.18.5). There is hiatus after Λευκίππη which Reeve (1971: 525) postulates could be solved by either reordering the sentence to "πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐκέτι μυθολογοῦντα", or by deleting οὐκέτι. The former is possible because AT admits hiatus before εἶπε (Reeve 1971: 522), however the latter is equally plausible. **Σκέψαι… ἀφόρητός ἐστι:** 'You need to think carefully about what is best for you and see that you say nothing of this sort to Thersander, lest you provoke that decent man. For he is unbearable when angered!' On the adj. ἀφόρητός ('unendurable/unbearable) coupled with anger, cf. Lib. *Prog*. 9.7.8.1-2. This warning foreshadows the rumination on Thersander's wrath at 6.19.

6.13.4. Χρηστότης γάρ… ἐρεθίζεται: 'For when decency is met with good grace it is increased yet further, but if met with disdain it is roused to anger'. προπηλακίζω (lit. 'to spatter with mud') is Attic and in the pass. means 'to be offended/affronted/outraged' (LSJ s.v.; *BDAG* s.v. 2; cf. Dem. 9.60, Lys. 15.6, Plut. *Them*. 24.2); it appears in the novelists only here and Charit. 4.2.2. This *gnome* serves to clarify the seeming oxymoron of how Thersander can be both a 'decent man' and 'unbearable when angered'. A similar sentiment is voiced by Plangon to Callirhoe of Dionysius in her attempts to bring the two together (φύσει δέ ἐστι βαρύθυμος, ὥσπερ καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, Charit. 2.7.2). **Τὸ γάρ… τιμωρίαν:** 'In fact, a man who shows an exceptionally philanthropic inclination can have an equal spirit for vengeance'. This is the *aitia* that elucidates the *gnome* (cf. Intro. 2.4.3); it is given an almost idiomatic sing-song quality in

the rhythmic cretics of the phrase εἰς φιλανθρωπίαν… εἰς τιμωρίαν (note also the parechesis). The Attic περιττός ('excessive/superfluous') is the usual form in AT and the other novelists, but cf. περισσός at 5.22.2 and Charit. 1.5.7, 3.10.5. **Τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ Λευκίππην εἶχεν οὕτως:** As the narrative simultaneity picks up pace and AT switches focus more frequently, these brief situational summary sentences become increasingly important in maintaining a coherent grasp on the thread of events (cf. Intro. 2.1). This particular phrase also recalls the title of the novel (see Intro. 1.1; cf. 3.23.2, 8.5.9).

6.14.1 Κλεινίας δέ… παρῆσαν: 'Clinias and Satyrus, on learning that I was locked in prison (Melite had sent a messenger to inform them), hastened straight for my cell though it was still night-time'. The pass. of καθείργνυμι = κατείργω 'to shut in/confine', used similarly in the pass. at 6.16.1 (cf. Charit. 4.2.5, Heliod. 8.7.4, 8.9.21). The small narrative detail of Melite's messenger enhances both the realism and the plausibility of the parallel action; correspondingly, the presence of such details also calls attention to the moments when Clitophon fails to fill in the narrative gaps. **τὴν ταχίστην:** advb. 'immediately/post-haste (LSJ s.v. ταχύς C II 3; cf. 5.17.6, 7.10.3).

6.14.2 Ὁ μὲν δή… ἐγὼ δέ…: This marks the end of Clitophon's 'direct' participation in Bk. 6 and although the handling is perfunctory, it is nonetheless an important pit-stop in the whirlwind of simultaneous narrative. It is also a neat reminder that both lovers are held captive at Thersander's command at this point in the novel. **περὶ τὴν ἕω:** Π^3 gives "[πρ]ὸς τὴν ἕω", while the MSS universally give "περὶ τὴν ἕω"; however, the former phrase is not attested elsewhere in the text of AT (Vogliano 1938: 129; cf. 1.6.4, 2.19.5, 2.27.3). As Vilborg notes, the papyrus reading may well be an error of dittography caused by πρός με which follows. **τὴν ψυχὴν εἶχον ἐπὶ τρυτάνης ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου, καὶ ἐφοβεῖτό μου τὸ ἐλπίζον καὶ ἤλπιζε τὸ φοβούμενον:** 'My soul was in the balance between hope and fear: the hopeful part feared for me, and the fearing part hoped'. Clitophon's psychological musings form a double chiasmus that inverts its pattern as it interlinks: first the hoping words contain the fear, then the fearing words contain the hope. This binary play subtly highlights the image of a scale in the balance, captured deftly in Winkler's rather free translation: "each new bit of hope found a new gram of fear to balance it; each particle of fear was counterpoised by hope". The alliterative polyptoton of the two emotions highlights the urgency of Clitophon's feelings, while the inherent contradiction of the final clauses emphasizes the instability of the balancing act. Compare the similarly chiastic interplay of hope and fear that Clitophon has as he enters

Leucippe's bedchamber (2.23.4). Hope and fear both involve anticipation of the future, and their emblematic pairing was popular (e.g. 3.8.7, Charit. 1.4.4, Philo *Abr*. 14, Lucian *Cont*. 15.17-22, *Alex*. 8; cf. 6.17.5n.). Later, Thersander's soul finds itself similarly poised, but in his case, it is desire and anger that battle for the balance (6.19.3 with n.; cf. also, 5.1.6). The division of the soul into parts is clearly Platonic but assigning the opposite emotion to the opposite part takes this to a paradoxical place (Repath 2007: 72; see Intro. 2.4.4).

6.15-17: The Eavesdroppers' Lament

Long-awaited day finally breaks and Sosthenes and Thersander resume their scheming for Leucippe's affections. Sosthenes, always economical with the truth, paints a picture of a Leucippe reluctant only because she is unsure of Thersander's intent (6.15.1-2). Thersander is adamant that his feelings are lasting and honourable, however he is concerned that she is truly married to Clitophon as Melite told him (6.9.6). As he and Sosthenes make their way to the hut where Leucippe is held captive, they overhear her lamenting her situation and settle down to eavesdrop (6.15.4). Afforded a rare moment alone, Leucippe laments her and Clitophon's predicament aloud. Displaying both selfless loyalty and remarkable perspicacity, she recounts how she withheld the truth of their relationship and her identity (6.16.1-5), resolving to continue her charade as the slave-girl, Lacaena, for now (6.16.6). With the eavesdroppers at the door, however, her canniness is ironically undercut. On hearing her speech, Thersander is both overcome by Leucippe's rhetoric and unnerved by her revelations (6.17.1-2). Sosthenes, taking his master to task for his weak-kneed response, delivers a platitudinous pep-talk that inspires renewed confidence (6.17.2-5).

6.15.1 Ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης: A phrase used by later historians and common in the novelists (e.g. Long. 4.9.3, on which Bowie 2019: 271 with refs.). The usual phrase AT employs to herald a new day of action is "τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ" or some variation thereof (e.g. 3.15.1, 4.11.2, 5.6.1), however, after "a night of action", he tends to vary his phraseology (as is the case here) unlike Xenophon and Chariton who remain consistent in terminology (Hägg 1971: 81). Note the narrative simultaneity (ὁ μέν… οἱ δέ…). Although his friends join him here, Clitophon is presumably alone once more when Thersander plants the phoney prisoner in his cell (7.1). **οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Σάτυρον:** Can mean 'Satyrus and those with him' (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 3.146, Xen. *Cyr*. 7.1.31) or can be understood as a paraphrase for a single person, as it is used in later prose (LSJ s.v. ἀμφί C I 3; *BDAG* s.v. ἀμφί II C; e.g. Lucian *Tox*. 21.9). Whether it is that Satyrus is

visiting alone, or that Clinias (and perhaps his own attendants) are in his company (as at 6.14.1), the focus is on the parallel between the two slaves, both now acting as *servus callidus* (see Intro. 2.3.5-6), hurrying to their respective masters. **τὸν Σωσθένην:** Π^3 gives the third declension acc. "Σωσθένη" (cf. Vogliano 1938: 128). Proper names ending -ης are hybrid and can take the first declension in the acc. (Smyth §264b), which AT appears to prefer almost exclusively (e.g. 2.13.2, 5.17.7, 6.7.8, 6.7.9, 6.8.4, 8.17.2). **ἐπυνθάνετο… εἰς πειθὼ πρὸς αὐτόν:** 'he asked him how the matter of influencing the girl in his favour was going'. lit. 'with regards to winning her over for him (*sc*. Thersander)', acc. of relation (O'Sullivan s.v. εἰς D I; Smyth §1686d; cf. 1.9.5, 6.17.5, Heliod. 8.5.7).

6.15.2 Ὁ δέ… πιθανῶς: 'Sosthenes, unable to bring himself to tell the truth, instead came up with a rather plausible sounding ploy'. σοφίζομαι + acc. = 'to devise skilfully' (LSJ s.v. σοφίζω A II 2; cf. 5.16.3 without acc.; Heliod. 5.14.4 of artisanal skill). This is the second time Sosthenes has had to embellish πιθανῶς ('believably/plausibly') (cf. 6.3.4 with n.). A similar word choice is evident in Melite's deception of Thersander which is described as a σόφισμα (6.8.4 with n.) that is delivered πιθανῶς (6.10.2 with n.). This moment of scheming between Thersander and Sosthenes is analogous to Charit. 6.6.6-8 where Artaxates misleads the King on his success with Callirhoe (so Owens 2020: 169). **Ἀρνεῖται μέν… ὀκνεῖ τὴν ὕβριν:** 'She continues to decline… but I do not think her refusal is a straightforward matter, rather it seems to me she suspects that, having enjoyed her once, you will get rid of her, and she demurs from such brutish treatment'. οκνέω 'to shrink/demur from'; on the multiple meanings of ὕβρις, see 6.19.6n. Sosthenes assumes Thersander will agree to a relationship, doubling down on his earlier claim to Leucippe that Thersander wished to make her his wife (6.11.3).

6.15.3 Ἀλλά… θαρρείτω: 'Well, let her not fear on that account!' Instead of the (Ionic) poetic form εἵνεκεν, AT uses ἕνεκεν elsewhere (e.g. 5.17.10, 5.26.12; but cf. 2.36.3, a quote from Hom. *Il*. 20.234-5); note also the Attic form θαρρέω (cf. 6.7.9 with n.). **εἰ τῷ ὄντι γυνὴ τυγχάνει τοῦ νεανίσκου γενομένη:** Thersander's acts on his suspicions, hoping to verify if Leucippe is Clitophon's wife, something she addresses in her monologue (6.16.3 with n.).

6.15.4 ἀκούουσιν αὐτῆς ποτνιωμένης: ποτνιάομαι ('cry/wail') is "found only in later prose" (LSJ s.v.; e.g. Plut. *Caes*. 63.10, Lucian *VH* 2.27), and this is the only instance in the novelists. It is a common feature for laments to be introduced with reference to crying or wailing (Alexiou 2002: 135-6). **Ἔστησαν οὖν ἀψοφητὶ κατόπιν αὐτῶν τῶν θυρῶν:** 'And so took up position

soundlessly behind the door'. Garnaud retains αὐτῶν (α-family), which is omitted by Vilborg (β-family), an addition that is not entirely necessary, but serves to emphasise their position outside the door. In keeping with the theatrical nature of the narrative, Leucippe's monologue is introduced by the common dramatic staging device of eavesdropping. Sosthenes and Thersander's silent presence during Leucippe's lament is initially similar to the tragic take on eavesdropping in which "the eavesdroppers are out of sight" (e.g. Aesch. *Cho*. 20-1, Eur. *El*. 109-220), whereas in comedy "attention is divided between the eavesdropper and his victim" (Bain 1977: 91; cf. Sommerstein 2019: 298-9 for an enumeration of eavesdropping scenes in Greek comedy). Listening at the door in tragedy, however, is generally restricted to the actors on-stage hearing some disturbance off-stage from behind the *skene* (e.g. Eur. *Hipp*. 575). The device of eavesdropping is also revealing of Clitophon's narrative strategy in general: Leucippe's moment of apparent truth is marred by the insidious masculine intrusion of Sosthenes and Thersander, a position implicitly shared by the reader as we listen in on her private words (Morales 2004: 201-2; cf. Morgan 2007: 106; see Intro. 2.2, 2.4.3).

6.16.1 Οἴμοι, Κλειτοφῶν: Leucippe opens with the standard lamentatious exclamation (e.g. 1.14.2, 4.10.5, Charit. 2.2.6, 3.3.15, X. Eph. 4.6.6, 5.8.7); cf. the similar, though less frequently employed, "φεῦ" (e.g. Long. 4.8.3, X. Eph. 1.4.1, 2.1.5, Heliod. 2.24.1). Clitophon calls out to Leucippe in the same way in his final lament for her (οἴμοι, Λευκίππη, 7.5.2), a speech which contains several verbal parallels to Leucippe's lament here. Clitophon's name in the voc. forms a natural cretic which, coupled with the long flat plaint of οἴμοι, gives a rhythmic repetitiousness. **τοῦτο γὰρ ἔλεγε πολλάκις:** Repetition of emotive words and phrases is a common feature of lament, and this explanatory narrative aside reminds us that it is Clitophon-*auctor*'s rhetorically practiced description that is reaching us and not Leucippe's unabridged words (see discussion Intro. 2.4.3). **οὐκ οἶδας ποῦ… οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγώ…:** Key to the lament's "balance of opposites" is also the contrast of 'I', the lamenter, and 'you', the person for whom they are lamenting (Alexiou 2002: 171-5). Leucippe highlights this by reflecting on their mutual ignorance of the other's whereabouts, her repetitious statements underscored by the assonance. Compare Charicleia similarly lamenting her ignorance at Theagenes' whereabouts (Heliod. 5.2.10). AT switches between 2nd person pres. of the Attic οἶσθα/ἴσασι and Ionic οἶδας/οἴδασιν (with a slight preference for the latter) (e.g. 1.9.4, 5.18.3, 5.21.7, 5.26.3, 7.6.3; cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 49). **τίς σὲ κατέχει τύχη:** Although tyche here is likely the abstracted entity, Leucippe's brooding anticipates Clitophon's bemoaning of the personified Tyche in his lament (7.5.2). **ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἄγνοιαν δυστυχοῦμεν:** 'We have the misfortune of the same

ignorance!' Switching to the 1st person plural, she underscores the mutuality of their shared ill-providence, which is itself accentuated in the repetitive play of τύχη/δυστυχοῦμεν, positioned at the end of their respective clauses for emphasis.

6.16.2 Ἆρα μή σε… Ἆρα μὴ καὶ σύ…: 'Surely Thersander did not come across you in his house? Surely you too have not suffered some act of brutality?' Rhetorical questions were a standard way of opening a lament, especially with the 2nd person address, and were used by the lamenter to express any apprehension that her words would not suffice and/or concern for her own plight (Alexiou 2002: 161-2). Here, however, it is revealing of Clitophon's narrative hand that all Leucippe's questions revolve around him, even more so since her questions reflect exactly what has already transpired between him and Thersander (5.23.4-7, 6.5.1-3). The cretic anaphora of ἆρα μή underscores the rhetorical questions which, as Ps.-Longinus (18.2) explains, "mimic mental agitation" (Birchall 1996: 13-4; cf. the asyndeton below, 6.16.5-6). **τι… ὑβριστικόν:** i.e 'some act (*vel sim*.) of violence/outrage'. Some irony can be detected: Melite previously described Clitophon's apparent ability to kiss her, yet not have sex with her, as the 'most insolent/outrageous' of all his misdeeds (τὸ πάντων ὑβριστικώτατον, 5.25.7). Of the novelists, only AT and Heliod. (5.31.1) employ the adj. forms of ὕβρις (cf. ὑβριστής, 6.22.1 with n.; see also on ὕβρις, 6.19.6n.). **Πολλάκις… ὅπως πύθωμαι:** 'Often I have wished to enquire from Sosthenes but had no idea how to ask'. She echoes the narratorial πολλάκις above (6.16.1) which is picked up on below with the variation ποσάκις (6.16.3). That the parechesis of her speech is augmented by a narratorial aside is indicative of Clitophon's rhetorical hand at work. This is borne out by similar vocabulary in Clitophon's own lament for Leucippe (οἴμοι, Λευκίππη, ποσάκις μοι τέθνηκας, 7.5.2; ἐγὼ τὴν ἀνδροφόνον σου κατεφίλησα πολλάκις, 7.5.4). **Εἰ μὲν ὡς περὶ ἀνδρὸς ἐμαυτῆς… Εἰ δὲ ὡς περὶ ξένου τινός…:** 'If I were to ask after my husband, I was afraid of inflicting some harm upon you, provoking Thersander against you. And if I asked after some stranger, that would also be suspicious'. The verb "ἐπυθόμην" is to be understood from above. Leucippe has weighed her options of enquiry, laying them out in a careful balance of opposites. The contrast between ἀνδρὸς ἐμαυτῆς and ξένου τινός, although hypothetical, hints at the larger contradistinction in her lament of Clitophon versus Thersander.

6.16.3 τί γὰρ μέλει γυναικὶ περὶ τῶν οὐχ ἑαυτῆς;: 'For why should/would a woman care about people that are not her own?' Leucippe (or Clitophon's version of her) shows a keen feminine sense of σωφροσύνη ('prudence/self-control'), sensitive to the expected conduct between a woman and an unfamiliar man. Indeed, earlier in the same section where Clitophon

admits to embellishing Leucippe's experiences (8.5.5), he similarly admits to doctoring the account of his and Melite's tryst to highlight his own 'self-control' (ἐξῆρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν, 8.5.2). It may be possible to infer a similar 'sanitization' of events, or even conduct, when it comes to Leucippe's ordeals. **Ποσάκις… ἔλεγον:** 'So many times I tried to force myself but could not persuade my tongue to speak; this alone I would have said…'. This statement is gravid with metaliterary irony: Leucippe's speech is repeatedly curtailed by, and rendered through, Clitophon's narratorial lens, and the image of her silenced voice is a leitmotif throughout the narrative (e.g. 2.25.2, 3.11.2, 3.17.6, 6.4.2; see esp. Morales 2004: 200-1; Repath 2013: 246 nn. 31, 32). This is also one of the few instances of γλῶσσα as opposed to the Attic γλῶττα (cf. 6.10.5 with n.). **Ἄνερ Κλειτοφῶν, Λευκίππης μόνης ἄνερ… πεπίστευκα:** 'Clitophon, my husband, husband to Leucippe alone, faithful, and steadfast, whom that other woman could not persuade even when sleeping beside him, though heartless am I who believed you had succumbed!' Leucippe begins her imagined address to Clitophon with a chiastic apostrophe that unites the lovers' names neatly at its heart. The repetition of the voc. ἄνερ in the first and last place emphasises Clitophon's status as her 'husband' or 'man' (most translators agree on the former, but cf. on the latter, O'Sullivan s.v. ἀνήρ III). The couple, however, are not yet married, having vowed only to a pact of fidelity (2.19.1, 3.10.4; cf. Long. 2.39, X. Eph. 1.11.5). Clitophon is referred to as Leucippe's ἀνήρ only once outside of this lament, by Menelaus in their attempt to hoodwink the General Charmides (4.7.5) and indeed, she is elsewhere referred to as Clitophon's 'lover/girlfriend' (ἐρωμένην, 7.9.3). Perhaps her exclamation here is meant to address the conundrum presented in Bk. 5 of Clitophon as both 'husband' and 'master' to both Melite and Leucippe (cf. 5.11.6, 5.14.2, 5.18.2-3, 5.22.3). The sharpest irony, of course, is that in the intervening time Clitophon's fidelity has proved not quite as impeccable as first thought and, if we read this statement through the lens of Clitophon-*auctor*, her praise becomes awkward overkill. It is also notable that the 'other woman' (ἄλλη γυνή, i.e. Melite) is made the active agent. The repetitive perf. reduplication of the verbs – enhanced by the alliterative (semi-)polyptoton of πιστέ/πέπεικεν/πεπίστευκα – draws attention to the meanings at play: that of 'persuading' (πείθω) versus 'being persuaded of' (πιστεύω, i.e. 'believing'). There is great irony that Leucippe finds herself ἄστοργος ('heartless/without affection', cf. 1.14.3) for not having trusted Clitophon's fidelity, while he reproaches himself in his lament to Leucippe as "ἀνόσιος καὶ ἀσεβής" (7.5.4) for his relationship with Melite. Self-chastisement is common to the lament, compare Anthia who reprimands herself as "πάντα ἄδικος… καὶ πονηρά" in a lament for not suffering as Habrocomes does (X. Eph. 3.5.2).

6.16.4 σε… οὐ κατεφίλησα: The irony is continued in Leucippe's regret at not kissing Clitophon when she had the chance, while in his own lament he repents for having spent so many of his kisses (and more) on her murderess (ἐγὼ τὴν ἀνδροφόνον σου κατεφίλησα πολλάκις καὶ συνεπλάκην μεμιασμένας συμπλοκάς, 7.5.4). Both Callirhoe (Charit. 5.9.5) and Chaereas (Charit. 6.2.11) lament parting from each other without a kiss. **Νῦν οὖν… εἴπω;:** 'Now if Thersander comes asking, what shall I say to him?' In laments νῦν acts as a transitional marker from consideration of the past to that of the present or future (Alexiou 2002: 165-9); although here the verb is the deliberative subj. Leucippe bridges the transition by resuming her rhetorical questioning, deliberating over what she would say to Thersander with a fut. more vivid conditional. **Ἆρα ἀποκαλύψασα… τὴν ἀλήθειαν;:** 'Do I disclose my role in this drama and tell him the truth?' The interrogative particle echoes her earlier questions to Clitophon (6.16.2). The introduction of the dramatic metaphor posits a distinct contrast between performativity (τὴν ὑπόκρισιν) and truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν), a knowing metafictive comment on the theatrical (and deceptive) nature of Clitophon's narration (Morgan 2007: 105; see Intro. 2.2, 2.4.2; *infra* 6.16.6n.). **Μή με νομίσῃς ἀνδράποδον εἶναι, Θέρσανδρε:** 'Do not consider me your chattel, Thersander!' She turns from contemplating Thersander to apostrophizing him directly with a bold assertion of her autonomy. The epithet ἀνδράποδον (lit. 'captive slave/slave taken in war') was in the 1st-2nd c. CE a lowbrow term and "very strong insult", usually avoided by classicizing purists (Dickey 1996: 174, 287 with refs.). That Leucippe should employ such a strong term is indicative not only of her extreme emotions at this point, but also of her general assertiveness, especially when it comes to defending herself with her own words (e.g. 2.25.1-2, 5.18.2-6, 6.12.1-13.1, 6.20.3-22.4). Thersander picks up on just this term later when he abuses her as his slave (ὦ κακόδαιμον ἀνδράποδον, 6.20.1 with n.), the only other time it is used in *L&C* (cf. the more general use of the term, X. Eph. 1.13.1, Heliod. 7.19.6).

6.16.5 Στρατηγοῦ θυγάτηρ εἰμί… οὐ καλοῦμαι Λάκαινα: 'I am the daughter of a general of Byzantium, wife of a distinguished Tyrian; I am not Thessalian, nor am I called Lacaena'. Her reveal is delivered in asyndetic short periods, a common construction in the lament and one that expresses heightened emotionality (cf. Birchall 1996: 9-12; Webb 2007: 531; e.g. Nic. Rh. *Prog*. 66.9-15). Leucippe's first wish is to assert her status as a free woman (6.16.4) and her εὐγένεια ('noble birth/pedigree') through her male relations as general's daughter, and 'wife' to a distinguished Tyrian citizen (not "the pre-eminent woman in Tyre", as Whitmarsh has it, cf. Trzaskoma 2002). That Clitophon is pre-eminent among the Tyrians echoes Melite's

‘encomium’ (6.9.2), yet in his own autobiography he mentions nothing of the sort (1.3.1), perhaps Clitophon-*auctor* is ‘modestly’ leaving the aggrandizement to other characters. The heroines of the novels spend much time conceptualizing the reversal of their status from elite and free to enslaved (cf. Callirhoe, who similarly reiterates her εὐγένεια in her own lament, Charit. 1.11.3), which itself carries tragic echoes of Euripides’ captive Trojan heroines (see De Temmerman 2019 with refs.). Her declaration is drawn out for dramatic effect as she defines herself in negatives (οὔκ εἰμι… οὐ καλοῦμαι…). Further on the Leucippe/Lacaena dichotomy, see Intro. 2.3.2. **Ὕβρις αὕτη ἐστὶ πειρατική· λελῄστευμαι καὶ τοὔνομα:** ‘This outrage is an act of piracy: even my name has been plundered!’ Here the striking metaphor of her name that has been ‘pillaged’ can be read as a kind of metalepsis for her status as an elite free woman that has been stripped from her (cf. 6.21.3, 6.22.2 with nn.). Compare the anxiety expressed by Charicleia in her lament that she has had to assume Thisbe’s name as part of their ploy (Heliod. 5.2.10, 5.8.3-4).

6.16.6 Ἀνήρ μοι Κλειτοφῶν, πατρὶς Βυζάντιον, Σώστρατος πατήρ, μήτηρ Πάνθεια: ‘My husband is Clitophon, Byzantium my fatherland, Sostratus my father, and my mother Pantheia’. Leucippe continues in her asyndetic litany of personal associations. Once again, Clitophon as her ‘man/husband’ is given primacy of place; however, her filial connections are highlighted by switching the expected order of words in the third colon, which creates a sort of double chiasmus: the first unites fatherland and father (πατρίς… πατήρ), emphasising Sostratus’ status as General of Byzantium; and the second unites her parents’ names in a chiastic pattern opposite to that of her and Clitophon’s (6.16.3). Compare Callirhoe’s reiteration of her status through her male relations (Charit. 1.14.10, 5.1.5, 5.5.4) **Ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ πιστεύσειας… ἀπολέσῃ:** ‘But you would not believe if I told you. Yet, I am afraid that if you believe the part about Clitophon, my ill-timed candour would spell doom for my dearest love’. Returning to a more conversational tone, she addresses Thersander directly, speculating on his reaction with the potential opt. (which in Attic usually takes ἄν, cf. Smyth §1821). Her fear for the possible outcome is expressed by a general conditional (φοβοῦμαι + ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς) that introduces an obj. clause of fear (μή… ἀπολέσῃ). Note again the repetition of πιστεύω and the import of having one’s words believed (cf. 6.16.3n.). Callirhoe also chooses to leave Chaereas out of her account of events to Dionysius (Charit. 2.5.11). **τὸ ἄκαιρόν μου τῆς ἐλευθερίας:** ‘my ill-timed frankness (*vel sim.*)’ (LSJ s.v. ἐλευθερία 2), as most translators have it; not “my untimely release [*sc*. from the hut]” (Whitmarsh). **τὸν φίλτατον:** This is the only time Leucippe refers to Clitophon with the superlative endearment, whereas Melite uses it regularly of him (cf.

6.1.3n.). Clitophon frequently employs φιλτάτη of Leucippe throughout the novel (e.g. 2.7.4, 3.11.2, 4.10.5, 5.7.2, 8.13.2), but also at times of Melite, particularly (and ironically) when he is trying to avoid sex with her (e.g. 5.16.8, 5.21.6). **Φέρε πάλιν… φέρε πάλιν…:** 'Come then, let me don my dramatic role once more. Come, let me assume the guise of Lacaena once again'. With the adhortative particle φέρε + hortatory subjv. (cf. LSJ s.v. φέρω A IX 2; Rijksbaron §15), Leucippe induces herself to resume the role of Lacaena that she briefly considered renouncing. On περιτίθημι ('place/put on') being used to don a theatrical mask, see Syn. Phil. *De prov*. 1.13.58-64 (cf. also Charit. 4.4.2). The theatrical metaphors are particularly apt considering the ubiquity of the lament in tragedy; yet, as discussed, the metaphor also speaks to Clitophon's "awareness of identity as an object of performance" (Morgan 2007: 108; cf. Whitmarsh 2011a: 256; Intro. 2.4.2). Compare Charicleia's equally metaliterary and dramatic self-awareness during her own lament (Heliod. 6.8.5, 7.14.7). Garnaud retains the second πάλιν of the MSS that is omitted in Π^3, which generates both a neat isocolon and a repetitive rhythmic alliteration that gives Leucippe's final words an almost mantra like quality. Vilborg, on the other hand, follows Π^3, noting that a second πάλιν is both unnecessary and that there is no space for it in the papyrus (see Vogliano 1938: 128-9); however, he does admit that its inclusion would be apposite "in this chapter abounding in repetitions" (similarly, Vogliano 1938: 130), and the anaphora does indeed have something to recommend it. Cf. 6.17.1n., where the two editors reverse their preference of papyrus and MSS reading.

6.17.1 Ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ Θέρσανδρος…: A stock transitional phrase for AT (e.g. 4.13.6, 5.12.3, 6.19.1, 7.1.1) also used by Chariton (e.g. Charit. 4.2.13, 7.1.4, 7.2.5, 7.6.7), particularly favoured by historians (e.g. Hdt. 1.206.12, 3.27.13, Plut. *Ages*. 12.5.6, *Artax*. 14.9.1, Hdn. 3.11.8.1, 3.14.2.1). Clitophon's knowledge of this private conversation is later explained when Sosthenes confesses everything before the magistrates (8.15.1), a "belated and rather half-hearted explanation" that emphasises rather than obscures Clitophon's narratorial hand (Morgan 2007: 106; see Intro. 2.2). **Ἤκουσας ἀπίστων ῥημάτων, γεμόντων ἔρωτος;:** 'Did you hear her unbelievable words, so filled with fervour?' On the figurative use of γέμω, cf. 6.11.4n. The homoioteleuton of the first couplet is disrupted in the next by the final and most important word ἔρωτος, which continues some of the assonance, though not as precisely. Both Thersander and Chariton's Dionysius have emotive responses to the revelation of the heroine's 'true' story, however, unlike Dionysius (Charit. 2.5.12), Thersander completely ignores the revelation that Leucippe is not a slave. The eavesdropping, then, does not necessarily forward the plot, since Thersander already knew she was Clitophon's 'wife' (6.9.6-7) (*contra* Morales

2004: 201; cf. Birchall 1996: 14-16, who finds that only Heliod. uses laments to further the plot). Nonetheless, as Duckworth (1952: 111) shows with regards to Roman Comedy, the reactions of eavesdroppers "provide valuable incidental effects", and there is certainly something comic to be found in Thersander's over-emotional reaction. **Ὅσα εἶπεν· οἷα ὠδύρατο· ὅτι ἑαυτὴν κατεμέμψατο:** 'What a long speech! What lamentation she made! Such censure of herself!' The *variatio* of the alliterative exclamatory relative pronouns heightens the rhetoricity of Thersander's crescendoing tricolon of rapture for Leucippe's soliloquy and emphasizes both his amazement and admiration. οἷα is given by Π^3, versus ὅσα in the MSS. Oddly Vilborg chooses to retain the reduplication of ὅσα despite admitting that "it is not improbable that AT aimed at pronomial variation in [these] three clauses". ὅτι ἑαυτὴν is Gaeselee's emendation (τοιαύτην α : τί ἑαυτὴν β : οἷα αὐτὴν Jacobs). **Ὁ μοιχός μου κρατεῖ πανταχοῦ:** 'The adulterer trounces me at every turn'. κρατέω + gen. = 'triumph over/get the better of' (LSJ s.v. II 3); πανταχοῦ advb. 'everywhere'. A rival in love twice over, Thersander's jealousy reaches fever pitch (cf. 6.11.1n.). **δοκῶ, ὁ λῃστὴς καὶ φαρμακεύς ἐστι:** 'he is both marauder and magician, I believe!' The verb is used absolutely, 'I think/in my opinion/to my mind' (cf. O'Sullivan s.v. I 3; LSJ s.v. I 2; e.g. 5.26.6). Clitophon was earlier accused of robbery (6.5.3 with n.), so the first charge may be no surprise; nonetheless a λῃστής ('robber/pirate') was considered a similar erotic threat (and metaphor) as a πειρατής (e.g. 8.17.3, Long. 1.32.4, *Anth. Gr.* 5.161.5-6, 309; see 6.13.1, 6.21.3, 6.22.2 with nn). While φαρμακεύς ('sorcerer/poisoner') was used of Gorgias, the Egyptian soldier, who cooked up the love philtre that drove Leucippe temporarily insane (ὢν δὲ φύσει φαρμακεὺς σκευάζει τι φάρμακον ἔρωτος, 4.15.4; cf. the fem. φαρμακίς 'female poisoner/sorceress', Heliod. 8.9.17). There is much irony considering it was Melite who thought to resort to a magical φάρμακον to seduce Clitophon (5.22.2-6). We have just witnessed Clitophon's 'healing' powers (6.1.1 with n.), but there is also an element of magic beyond the medical in his seductive abilities (e.g. 2.19.2, 5.25.3, 5.25.8). Translating φαρμακεύς can be tricky, derived from φάρμακον a notoriously nebulous word meaning variously 'drug/potion/poison/medicine/tincture' (see Faraone 1999: 110-9; Collins 2008: 133-6; e.g. 2.11.7, 4.10.4, 4.15.4, 5.26.2, 7.1.2), it combines the idea of both 'apothecary' and 'wizard', thus Whitmarsh's choice of "alchemist" is a happy one (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 1140, Pl. *Leg.* xi.933a-e, Lucian *DDeor.* 15.1.4, *Cal.* 13.7, *Merc.Cond.* 40.5). Hilton (*forthcoming*), commenting on 4.15.4, makes the excellent analogy of the South African traditional herbalist, or *inyanga*, who ministers in matters both medicinal and mystical (and so we might translate φάρμακον as 'muti'). The natural analogy is that of Plato's famous description of Eros as a "δεινὸς γόης καὶ φαρμακεὺς καὶ σοφιστής" (Pl. *Symp.*

203d8; cf. also X. Eph. 1.2.1), and the implication is that Thersander finds Clitophon's 'mojo' supernatural, even godlike. **Ὄφελον, ὦ Ζεῦ, γενέσθαι Κλειτοφῶν:** 'O Zeus, would that I were Clitophon!' The usual construction for an unattainable wish that AT uses is ὄφελον + indic. (e.g. 2.24.3, 5.15.5; cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 47; Smyth §1781), the use of the inf. gives Thersander's wish an almost Homeric note (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 11.380-1, *Od*. 1.217-8, 4.97-9). Putting these words in Thersander's mouth is a "characteristic effort at self-aggrandizement" by Clitophon-*auctor* (Jones 2012: 253). Compare Leucippe's similar taunt at 6.18.6 with n.

6.17.2 Ἀλλ' οὐ μαλακιστέον… ἰτέον αὐτήν: 'Now, master… do not be unmanned by the work at hand but meet the girl head on!' The verbs are the impersonal act. neut. construction of the gerundive with copula εἰμί understood (Smyth §§2149, 2152; cf. 2.25.3, 5.10.7, 5.11.3); μαλακιστέον itself is an uncommon form (cf. e.g. Pl. *Alc*. i.124d7, Men. *Dys*. 391). This admonishment implies the corollary that to 'become' Clitophon is to 'go soft' (i.e. become unmanly/effeminate), ironically highlighting Clitophon's own effeminacy in a moment when his apparent virility is being featured (Morgan 2007: 109; Jones 2012: 254). Sosthenes' role as *praeceptor amoris* to Thersander echoes that of Satyrus to Clitophon, and Satyrus exhorts his master in a similar vein (νῦν μὲν ἀνδρίζεσθαι καιρός, 2.10.1; see Intro. 2.3.5). Satyrus warns Clitophon that Eros does not take lightly to cowardice (2.4.5), while Clitophon berates himself as "ἄνανδρε" (lit. 'wanting in manhood', LSJ s.v. ἄνανδρος II) for his failure to make a move on Leucippe (2.5.1). **πρὸς τὸ ἔργον:** ἔργον is the usual (not-so-subtle) euphemism for sex in the novel (e.g. 1.9.5, 1.10.2, 1.10.4 *bis*, 1.10.6; Whitmarsh 2020: 157), which makes Sosthenes' reproof of Thersander's manliness here all the more acerbic. Satyrus uses the same phrase when he explains to Clitophon that he has recruited Clio's help in the 'job' of wooing Leucippe (ὡς καὶ συναίρεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἔργον, 2.4.2; cf. also 2.4.4).

6.17.3 Καὶ γὰρ ἄν… ἂν δ' ἅπαξ…: Sosthenes resorts to a pair of conditionals (pres. general and fut. more vivid, respectively) to formulate the rather tortuous rationale that Leucippe will somehow forget Clitophon once she 'experiences' how much more handsome Thersander is. **τοῦ καταράτου τούτου μοιχοῦ:** κατάρατος ('accursed/abominable') is a vituperative epithet common earlier in Attic orators and later in Lucian (e.g. Dem. 18.209, 244, 290, Lucian *JTr*. 17.2, 36.2, 46.1; cf. Charit. 4.2.9, the only other instance in the novels). The general alliteration and repetitive homoioteleuton of the gen. give his invective a ridiculous rehearsed quality. **μέχρι μέν… ἑτέρῳ:** 'as long as she has known only him and not been intimate with another'. μέχρι used as a conjunction means 'as long as' (LSJ s.v. III 2); κοινωνέω + dat. = 'have

dealings/be united with' (LSJ s.v. A 3), a sexual euphemism (e.g. 2.4.2, 2.36.4, 8.11.2). **ἔχει τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ' αὐτόν:** 'her soul is oriented toward him'. ἔχω in this sense means something like 'held in direction toward/be aimed at' (LSJ s.v. A II 8; cf. 6.18.3). The MSS have "πάσχει", which both O'Sullivan (s.v. πάσχω 1) and Plepelits (1980: 69) prefer; Gaselee offers "βόσκει" (translating: "she feeds her heart with love of him"), which Vilborg retains despite Π^3 reading "…]χει" (see Vogliano 1938: 130). Garnaud's emendation of ἔχει, although questionable, does give better sense while conforming to the reading of the papyrus. The hiatus it creates is "tolerable" (Consonni 2006: 119; cf. Reeve 1971: 522). Most recently, Kanavou (2022: 7) makes a compelling argument for the addition of the advb. "<κακῶς>" before ἔχει (i.e. 'she is distressed about him'), a reading which is supported by parallels at 1.6.6, 6.5.5, and 6.11.2. Whitmarsh leaves the clause out of his translation, and indeed not much is lost by its exclusion. **ἂν δ' ἅπαξ ἐς ταὐτὸν ἔλθῃς:** 'But once you 'get to know' her'. An idiomatic phrase meaning lit. 'to meet up with' (Vilborg; cf. Poll. *Onom*. 9.145.3). Some translate 'take his place/the same place as him' (Whitmarsh, Garnaud, Gaselee), others 'once you come together with her' (Winkler, Plepelits, Guez), grammatically the former is preferable. Cf. 2.16.1, where it suggests "a sexual undertone" (Whitmarsh 2020: 223; Poll. *Onom*. 5.92.6; but cf. more neutral synonyms at Poll. *Onom*. 1.154.6-7, 8.145.2). **πολλῷ <γὰρ> διαφέρεις ἐκείνου εἰς εὐμορφίαν:** 'for you are far more handsome than he'. One of a few isolated instances of hiatus that do not conform to a pattern (Reeve 1971: 525). διαφέρω + gen. = 'be superior to' (LSJ s.v. III 4; cf. Charit. 7.3.10, Long. 1.16.2). Sosthenes specifies 'with regards to handsomeness', echoing his earlier comment to Leucippe (6.12.1-2). A particle appears essential in this parenthetic remark but is not provided by the MSS (Yatromanolakis 1990: 688; γάρ add. Cobet; cf. Johnson's δέ in Vilborg's *app*. *crit*.). Vilborg speculates that the "isolated ὅσο[ν of Π^3 belongs here" (i.e. 'how much more handsome you are than him'). **ἐπιλήσεται τέλεον αὐτοῦ:** 'she will forget him entirely'. ἐπιλανθάνομαι + gen. = 'forget/lose thought of *x*' (LSJ s.v. ἐπιλήθω II); on the advb. use of τέλεον, see 6.11.1n.

6.17.4 Παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔρωτα μαραίνει νέος ἔρως: 'For a new love extinguishes the old'. μαραίνω ('quench/wither') in its figurative sense is used frequently in sententious statements (e.g. 2.29.4, 2.36.1, 5.8.2, 5.24.3), but also metaphorically in connection with beauty and flowers (e.g. 1.8.9 *bis*, 3.7.3, X. Eph. 1.5.6, 2.6.3, Long. 1.18.2; cf. lit. meaning, Heliod. 2.3.2). On the sentiments, cf. Heliod. 3.4.8. **γυνὴ δὲ μάλιστα… ἀπήλειψε:** 'A woman loves especially what is at hand, remembering the absent only so long as she has not found something new. When she takes up with another man, she erases the former from her soul'. Sosthenes presents

two *gnomai* in conjunction with each other to justify his logic: the first on the power of a new love to erase the former; and the second on the capricious nature of a woman's affection when she finds a replacement for the object of her affections. The latter is reworded in a chiastic *paraphrasis* (προσλαβοῦσα δέ…) that underscores the almost methodical nature of feminine fickleness. These are two of the four *gnomai* that apply to Leucippe (the other two are spoken by Clinias at 1.9.6, 1.10.3), which are never spoken to Leucippe, rather characters "display their 'wisdom' *about* Leucippe in her absence" (De Temmerman 2007a: 6-7). It is possible to see a parallel with Clitophon's narration in general: his entire account, although 'about' Leucippe, is spoken in her absence (Leucippe is not present in the initial frame narration between Clitophon and the anonymous narrator, cf. Intro. 2.2, 2.4.1). The fickleness of women is a long-established trope (e.g. Hom. *Od*. 15.20-4, Verg. *Aen*. 4. 569-70, Diogenian. 4.4, Petron. *Sat*. 110.6-7, *Anth*. *Gr*. 5.186, Charit. 4.7.6); cf. also the faithless *puellae* of Latin love elegy (e.g. Tib. 1.6, Prop. 2.5, 2.8, Ov. *Am*. 2.5, 3.3, 3.12). There is irony, of course, in the application of this *gnome* in a romance novel where the heroine's fidelity is paramount. **ἕως καινὸν οὐχ εὗρε:** ἕως + ind. 'while/so long as' (LSJ s.v. A III); cf. Vilborg on the verb: "The aor. is not necessarily gnomic ('as long as she did not find')". Possibly a subtle comment on the novelists' 'fetishization' of 'τὸ καινόν' (cf. Intro. 1.4).

6.17.5 Λόγος γὰρ ἐλπίδος… ἐγείρει τὴν ἐλπίδα: 'A hopeful speech on romantic success is easy to believe; for appetite, taking whom it wishes as ally, rouses hope'. Thersander's hopes are buoyed by Sosthenes' sententious declaration, inspiring a further gnomic pronouncement from Clitophon-*auctor* explaining this phenomenon. It seems there is no end to the sententiousness, and one cannot help but feel that it is being applied here with ironic liberality. The *gnome* itself is given an almost sing-song quality by the staccato homoioteleuton of the key words (λόγος… ἐλπίδος… ἔρωτος… ῥᾴδιος). Note the subtle polyptoton of ἐγείρω ('awaken/rouse') and ἐλπίς ('hope') that culminates in the final phrase (ἐγείρει τὴν ἐλπίδα). The martialization of emotions foreshadows the exposition on Thersander's Anger and Desire (6.19), where 'Appetite' (ἐπιθυμία) is the one taken under command (6.19.4-5). Hope for romantic or erotic success is a leitmotif throughout the novels, compare Melite's frisson in anticipation of the love-philtre (5.22.8), or Dionysius' optimistic expectation for winning Callirhoe over (Charit. 2.6.4; see further Fulkerson 2016; cf. 6.20.1 with n., where Thersander renounces his hopes). On Desire and Hope as allies, cf. Thuc. 3.45.5; for erotic hope inspired by words, cf. *Anth. Gr.* 5.241.6-8; and cf. *Anth. Gr.* 9.620.3-4, on hope as preferable to reality for lovers.

6.18-19: In Libidinous Battle

Allowing for a plausible pause, Thersander re-enters the hut and is inflamed with desire once more at the sight of Leucippe (6.18.1). Only just managing to check his lust, he sits beside her; but unable to rein in his tongue, he chatters away like a love-struck fool (6.18.2-3). He begins an almost comical attempt at physical seduction and Leucippe is forced to take evasive action to avoid his kisses (6.18.4-5); however, his attempts grow increasingly aggressive and Leucippe castigates him for his uncivil and dishonourable behaviour (6.18.6). Denied and insulted, Thersander finds himself in a quandary: whether to give into his lust or his wrath. Anger and Desire are conceptualized as two visceral fires that maintain an uneasy equilibrium within the individual (6.19.1-3). Generally, Desire achieves its aim, however, should it be spurned, it turns to Anger for assistance. Anger proves a treacherous ally, seizing power as soon as it can, forcing Desire to revile its beloved (6.19.4-5). Nonetheless, once Anger climaxes, it diminishes once more, and Desire seizes the opportunity to reclaim its position of authority. Thus reinstated, Desire attempts to appease the estranged beloved, but should these overtures be denied, Anger is roused once more, and the cycle begins anew (6.19.6-7).

6.18.1 Διαλιπὼν οὖν… ὡς ᾤετο: 'Then, allowing a moment to pass once Leucippe was done soliloquizing so that it did not seem he had overheard anything she had said, Thersander entered, contriving a countenance of amenability – or so he thought'. κατακούω + gen. = 'overhear' (cf. LSJ s.v. A 2; cf. 6.20.1, Strab. 14.1.32.12, Plut. *Alex*. 49.12). For the moment, Thersander is still anxious to make a favourable impression on Leucippe, yet his attempts are revealed as embarrassingly disingenuous by the caustic narratorial aside (ὡς ᾤετο). **σχηματίσας… πρὸς θέαν:** lit. 'arranging himself as more tractable in his appearance'. On the verb, cf. 6.11.3 with n. The adj. εὐάγωγος ('easily led/ductile') was previously used of seducing a woman as if she were an animal to be tamed (1.10.5, 1.16.1; cf. Whitmarsh 2020: 161). Yatromanolakis (1990: 688) prefers Jacobs' emendation of "ἐπαγωγότερον" (see Vilborg's *app*. *crit*.) meaning 'more seductive/bewitching' (cf. 6.7.4 with n.), but this does not seem particularly necessary (cf. e.g. καὶ φύσει πως εὐάγωγόν ἐστι πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἐρῶν, Men. fr. 250 *PCG*). The phrase πρὸς θέαν ('with respect to his facial expression') also conjures the secondary meaning of 'sight/spectacle', emphasising the performative nature of Thersander's posturing (perhaps a bit of projection on Clitophon's part considering the narratorial aside). **Ἐπεί… γεγονέναι:** 'When he saw Leucippe, his soul was ignited, and it seemed to him at that moment that she had become even more beautiful'. ἀναφλέγω ('light up/rekindle) in the pass.

has the metaph. meaning ‘to be inflamed (emotionally)’ (O’Sullivan s.v.; e.g. 5.19.1, Lucian *Tox*. 13.9, *DMeretr*. 8.3.7, Plut. *Alc*. 17.2.1, *Anth. Gr.* 12.80.2, Heliod. 4.4.4, 4.18.5); on the connection of fire and desire, see *infra* 6.18.2n.

6.18.2 Θρέψας γὰρ ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ πῦρ: ‘For he had tended the fire all night’. The poetic use of τρέφω (‘rear/cultivate’) has the metaph. sense ‘to have/harbour within oneself’ (LSJ s.v. II 6; O’Sullivan s.v. 4), a particularly Sophoclean extension of meaning (Barrett 1964: 226; e.g. Soph. *OC* 186, *Tr*. 28, Eur. *Hipp*. 367). The image of a fire of sexual desire being lit or nurtured is a common one, and a burning brand was a usual accoutrement for Eros (cf. 1.1.13, with Whitmarsh 2020: 130; e.g. Charit. 1.1.8, 4.7.6, *Anth. Gr.* 12.79-83). The metaphor of fire for the real physiological heat of arousal recurs throughout the novel, but this instance stands in apposition to Melite’s self-confessed blazing desire for Clitophon (5.15.5-6; cf. Long. 3.10.4, [Lucian] *Asin*. 6.6-15, 22-7, Plut. *Amat*. 762f-763a). **ὅλης τῆς νυκτός:** The gen. of time ‘within which’ (Smyth §1444). Clitophon too spent an overwrought night after his first sight of Leucippe (1.6.2-4), “a well-established symptom of love” (Whitmarsh 2020: 145 with refs; e.g. Charit. 2.4.3-4, Long. 1.13.6, 2.7.4-5, *Hist*. *Apoll*. 18); on the image of stoking the flames of love overnight, cf. *Anth. Gr.* 12.125, 12.127.5-8. **ἀνεζωπύρησεν… εἰς τὴν φλόγα τὴν θέαν:** ‘he rekindled it (*sc*. the fire) instantly using the sight of her as fuel for the flame’. ἀναζωπυρέω (‘rekindle’) is used elsewhere by AT to mean ‘revive’ (e.g. 1.17.5, 3.18.1), but cf. Joseph. *BJ* 1.444 on its use for rekindling erotic passion. Dionysius suffers a similar desirous blaze when attempting to handle the situation reasonably (Charit. 2.3.8, 2.4.5; cf. Heliod. 8.2.1, Plut. *De virt.* 448b5-9, with Repath 2007: 67). Considering the explicitly Phaedran metaphor below (6.18.3 with n.), it may be possible to connect Thersander’s conflagration with the warmth felt by the soul at the charioteer’s sight of the beloved (Pl. *Phdr*. 253e5-6). On the sight of the beloved as combustible matter for passion, cf. Heliod. 1.24.2, 4.4.4. **μικροῦ:** advb. ‘almost’, short for μικροῦ δεῖν (LSJ s.v. III 2; e.g. 7.14.3). **περιεχύθη τῇ κόρῃ:** On the construction, cf. 6.1.3 with n. **Καρτερήσας… ἄλλοτε ἄλλα ῥήματα συνάπτων οὐκ ἔχοντα νοῦν:** ‘Nonetheless, he managed to restrain himself and, sitting beside her, struck up a conversation, jumping from one topic to the next with little sense’. Dionysius also barely manages to restrain himself from falling at Callirhoe’s knees (Charit. 3.2.1), and the word choice here is a possible parallel of his pretexts for staying on the estate with Callirhoe (προφάσει μὲν ἄλλοτε ἄλλῃ, Charit. 2.7.1).

6.18.3 Τοιοῦτοι γάρ… χωρὶς ἡνιόχου τοῦ λογισμοῦ λαλοῦσιν: 'For such are lovers whenever they seek to speak with their beloveds: they fail to put Reason in command of their words, but rather, fixing their soul upon their sweetheart, they chatter with their tongue alone, unrestrained by that rational charioteer'. ἐφίστημι + acc. + dat. = 'to set *x* over *y*' (LSJ s.v. A II), i.e. 'to place *x* in control of *y*'; χωρίς + gen. = 'without/without the help of' (LSJ s.v. II). The parechesis of the final phrase gives an onomatopoeic imitation of the lovers' chit-chat. Whereas Thersander chatters aimlessly (6.18.2), Clitophon, when he eventually does gather the courage to speak with Leucippe, depicts himself as rather skilled (περιέπλεκον λόγους ἐκ λόγων, 2.6.3); compare also his erotic 'storytelling' (μυθολογία) delivered for Leucippe's benefit (1.16-19). The rambling talk of lovers is likened to a run-away chariot, the driver no longer at the reins, a recognizably Phaedran allusion. The Platonic tripartite division of the soul is envisaged as the charioteer who commands two horses: one representing baser instincts, and the other higher virtue (e.g. Plato *Phdr*. 246a-b, 253d-254e, 255e-256d). Repath (2001: 175-6 and 2007: 54-60) demonstrates how although not explicit from the *Phaedrus* it is clear in Platonic psychology that we are meant to equate the charioteer with the reasoning side of the soul (cf. Pl. *Resp*. iv.439d4-6, 441e4-6, Plut. *Quaest*. *Plat*. 1008c). He makes the case that this *gnome* is not meant to demonstrate that the 'bad horse' takes over, but rather the laxness of the charioteer (i.e. Thersander's faculty of reason), highlighting Thersander's ultimate baseness in comparison with Leucippe's virtue (Repath 2007: 73). This allusion is picked up again when Thersander's desires are frustrated, and he hands over the reins to Anger (6.20.1 with n.). On love-struck chatterers, cf. Plut. *Quaest*. *conv*. 622e7, [Lucian] *Am*. 15.24-5, Chor. *Decl*. 20.2.46.

6.18.4 Ἅμα οὖν… ὡς μέλλων φιλήσειν (*sc*. τὴν κόρην)**:** 'As he was chatting, he placed his hand upon her neck, encircling it as if about to kiss her'. Thersander's groping begins rather ineptly, attempting to snake his hand around Leucippe's neck as he goes in for a kiss. This picture of the awkward lover puts one in mind of the comic television trope, the so-called "yawn and reach". Comparing Thersander's (initially) awkward approach to kissing Leucippe with Clitophon's sly 'bee-sting' strategy (2.7), as with their attempts at conversing with Leucippe, it is clear that Clitophon is the more competent lover (or so he would have us believe); this is compounded when Thersander turns to violence when his efforts are frustrated. Cf. 2.4.4, where Satyrus, in his role as *praeceptor amoris*, recommends kissing on the neck. **Ἡ δὲ προϊδοῦσα… κατεδύετο:** 'And she, spotting the path his hand sought, ducked her head forward, dipping it to her breast'. κόλπος can mean both 'bosom' and 'lap'; however, Thersander is encircling the back of Leucippe's neck to bring her face into position for a kiss,

and she reacts by bending her head away towards her chest (so Gaselee, Whitmarsh, Garnaud), not (as Winkler has it) by folding herself in half to meet her lap. Leucippe's evasive manoeuvre is the beginning of a skirmish between the two of them that is marked by the parity of actions. She shows presence of mind in her evasion of Thersander's groping hands and refuses to meet him face on, rejecting both his kiss and his gaze (cf. 6.6.3n.), "microphysical resistances… [that transform] the scene from one of seduction to one of rape" (Shaw 1996: 270). **τῆς χειρὸς τὴν ὁδόν:** 'the path/course/direction of his hand', cf. 1.4.4, 2.21.4, 5.19.4.

6.18.5 Ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἧττον… τὰ φιλήματα: 'He continued encircling her, nonetheless, forcing her face upward, but she plunged down in return and continued to withhold her kisses'. advb. neut. ἧττον + neg. = 'no less/just as much as', i.e. he was not hampered by her evasion. Although the narratee is well aware that Leucippe has no interest in Thersander, he may well be forgiven for his initial persistence considering the lesson from Clinias that young women often conceal their consent under the guise of sexual coercion (θέλουσι βιάζεσθαι δοκεῖν, 1.10.6; see discussion, Whitmarsh 2020: 65-6; e.g. Ov. *Ars*. 1.669-78). Indeed, Thersander's tactics here bear much in common with Clitophon's first kiss with Leucippe (ἅμα λέγων τὴν χεῖρα βιαιότερον περιέβαλλον καὶ ἐφίλουν ἐλευθερώτερον, 2.7.7), in which she was not precisely a willing participant (ἡ δὲ ἠνείχετο, κωλύουσα δῆθεν, 2.7.7). In a continuation of the Phaedran imagery, Repath (2001: 175-6) reads this tug of war between Leucippe and Thersander as a humorous inversion of the tussle between the charioteer and the 'bad' horse (Pl. *Phdr*. 254b7-c3). **ἀντικατεδύετο:** A hapax formed in counterpart to κατεδύετο above (so Vilborg); the idea is that Leucippe renews her efforts to dip her head away once more from Thersander's advances. This compounding of prepositions highlights the brisk back-and-forth of their interaction. Compare Clitophon 'returning' Clinias' embrace (ἀντιπεριβάλλω, 5.8.3), which although not strictly a hapax, is given extended meaning by AT from the usual 'bind (a bandage) around the other way' (cf. Hippoc. *Frac*. 11.38-9; LSJ s.v.); cf. also, "ἀντεβόμβει" (3.2.2, 'thunder in return'), "ἀντῃσχύνετό" (8.4.1, 'be ashamed in return') (O'Sullivan 1978: 324 n. 53). **ἔκρυπτε τὰ φιλήματα:** The sensual pleasure of kissing and its role in seduction is explored on numerous occasions in *L&C* (e.g. 1.10.5, 2.8, 2.37.6-10; see Zeitlin 2018; with Fountoulakis 2001). On the one hand, Clitophon considers kissing the pinnacle of erotic pleasure (2.8.3, 4.8.1-3), but on the other, he is well aware that it is but the prelude to the main act (2.19.1; cf. X. Eph. 3.2.4, [Lucian] *Am*. 53.20-6). He jealously guards access to Leucippe's kisses (οὐ μοιχεύσεταί μου τὰ φιλήματα, 4.8.4), but receives Melite's far more freely (προσιέμενον οὐκ ἀηδῶς τὰ φιλήματα, 5.13.5). **Ὡς δὲ χρόνος ἐγένετο τῇ τῆς χειρὸς πάλῃ:**

‘After spending some time on this hand-wrestling’. γίγνομαι (of time) ‘pass/elapse’ (LSJ s.v. I 2; cf. 5.8.2, 5.10.2). The phrase in the dat. is puzzling: not really a dat. of accompanying circumstance (Smyth §1527); it reads more like a periphrasis for a verb meaning “hand-wrestling” (transl. Whitmarsh); yet it appears to approach how the dat. is deployed in the part. expressing time (Smyth §1498a) but lacking a part.; it may merely be a loose dat. of reference. Clitophon’s narration of the back-and-forth conveys much “slapstick” (Morales 2004: 117), putting one in mind of the physical comedy of the stage (where, it must be noted, the act of rape was not shown, Sommerstein 1998: 100). The correlation of sexual exertion and wrestling is long-established (e.g. Ar. *Pax* 894-905, Aesch. *Ag*. 1206, [Lucian] *Asin*. 8-10, Long. 3.19.2; cf. Henderson 1991: 169-170). AT employs the metaphor of wrestling several times, some neutral (2.22.5, 3.1.5, 8.14.4), others sexual (2.38.4, 5.3.5); and its inclusion here may be read as an analeptic reference to the depiction of the rape of Philomela by Tereus as “παλαίων πάλην Ἀφροδίσιον” (5.3.5). That painting, as Bartsch (1989: 69-71) shows, foreshadows both the love-triangles of Clitophon/Thersander/Leucippe and that of Clitophon/Leucippe/Melite. **φιλονεικία λαμβάνει τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐρωτική:** ‘a fit of erotic rivalry seized Thersander’. That is to say, “a determination to win” the sexual struggle (O’Sullivan s.v. φιλονεικία). The metaphor of sex and wrestling is part of a larger wheelhouse of imagery that depicts erotic engagement as competitive or combative (e.g. X. Eph. 1.9.9, Heliod. 4.1.1; see Jones 2012: 159-172), and Eros himself is characterised as a highly competitive god (Charit. 1.1.4). Compare Dionysius, whose attempts at self-restraint cause Eros to inflame his passions further (Charit. 2.4.6), whereas Thersander’s contentious approach to seduction is depicted as his own inclination. This is borne out in their different approaches to kissing the heroine: Dionysius’ gentlemanly circumvention (Charit. 2.7.7), versus Thersander’s rough coercion. Although, as observed above, some struggle was expected from the beloved, outright force was not advised (ἐπίσχες τὴν βίαν, 1.10.7). **τὴν μὲν λαιάν… τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ… τῇ μέν… τῇ δέ…:** ‘He put his left hand under her face, and with the right he grabbed her by the hair; he dragged her head backwards with the right hand, and, with the left braced under her chin, he thrust her face upwards’. The to-and-fro interaction heats up in the contrapositive cola that form a chiasm of parallel action: the longer ‘left hand’ clauses encompassing the shorter ‘right hand’ clauses. Coupled with the repetitive anaphora of pronoun plus particle as well as the general assonance, the sentence structure is itself mimetic of Thersander’s grappling with Leucippe; which, in effect, could be read as Clitophon-*auctor*’s rhetorical groping of his own girlfriend. It must also be remembered that Leucippe’s hair was shorn as part of her physical transformation into

the slave-girl Lacaena (Intro. 2.3.2), and so Thersander must be clutching painfully close to her scalp.

6.18.6 ἢ τυχών, ἢ μὴ τυχών, ἢ καμών: 'whether due to a favourable result, failure, or fatigue'. The bathos of this narratorial insertion, framed as an amusing rhyming and rhythmic microtricolon, highlights Clitophon's bias in his depiction of Thersander as a 'substandard' lover (Morales 2004: 118; cf. Hägg 1971: 132), but also, his apparent callousness as he indulges in frivolous rhetorical figures in the very moment of narrating Leucippe's fraught struggle. It also leaves unclear whether Thersander succeeded in kissing Leucippe, perhaps an inadvertent admission by the narrating Clitophon that he does not know everything that took place. **Οὔτε ὡς ἐλεύθερος ποιεῖς οὔτε ὡς εὐγενής:** 'You are behaving like neither a freedman nor a nobleman'. Leucippe undermines not only Thersander's social position – a topic first exalted by Sosthenes in his encomium (6.12.2 with n.) – but also his civic status – a topic that Leucippe will return to in her fierce rebuttal of his accusations (cf. 6.22.2-3 with nn.). The cola are balanced in both rhythm and sound and are partitioned by the verb, which is likewise emphasised by its central position. **Καὶ σὺ μιμῇ Σωσθένην:** 'Rather, you imitate Sosthenes'. Vilborg argues for the aor. ἐμιμήσω (β : μιμῇ α), however this form is likely due to the dittography of σω with Sosthenes name and introduces an unnecessary hiatus (O'Sullivan s.v. μιμέομαι). Sosthenes also resorted to physical violence when Leucippe refused to comply with his sexual coercion (5.17.4-6). **ἄξιος ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ δεσπότου:** 'the slave is worthy of the master!' This resounding rebuke, highlighted by the assonantal rhythm, has a gnomic quality about it, demonstrating "the view that slaves… reflect the moral qualities of their masters" (Owens 2020: 182 n. 61). In portraying Thersander as a slave to his lust, Leucippe turns a moment of seemingly masculine aggression on its head, showing instead how his dissolute behaviour undermines his status (Jones 2012: 254). The comparison with his slave Sosthenes is what triggers Thersander to lose control entirely: once Leucippe's 'slave' in love, he is transfigured into the vengeful master (cf. 6.20.1, 6.20.3 with nn.). **Ἀλλὰ ἀπέχου τοῦ λοιποῦ:** 'Henceforth leave me be!' (LSJ s.v. λοιπός 3). **μηδὲ ἐλπίσῃς τυχεῖν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ γένῃ Κλειτοφῶν:** 'Do not entertain any hope of success, unless you turn into Clitophon'. Her qualifying statement echoes Thersander's own words (6.17.1 with n.), a reiteration that not only highlights Clitophon's narratorial narcissism that he is somehow a paragon of manhood, but also implicitly invites the reader to compare the two men and their attempts at *moicheia* (Jones 2012: 254-5).

6.19.1 οὐκ εἶχεν ὅστις γένηται: lit. ‘Thersander did not know (grasp?) who he was’; the indirect interrogative pronoun + γίγνομαι in the deliberative subjv. denoting “baffled will” (Smyth §2546). In the clash of these two powerful emotions Thersander experiences a moment of disorientation, not an uncommon reaction when overcome by a medley of feelings (e.g. 2.29.1, 7.1.1). This split second of bewilderment is dilated to contain the lengthy narratorial exegesis on emotions that spans all of 6.19 and ‘real time’ is resumed in the instant of Thersander’s capitulation to anger at 6.20.1 with n. **καὶ γὰρ ἅρα καὶ ὠργίζετο:** Thersander is bisected by anger and desire, much like Melite in her struggle for Clitophon’s affections (κἂν ὀργίζωμαι, καίομαι· κἂν ὑβρίζωμαι, φιλῶ, 5.26.1; cf. 5.24.3). Compare Oroondates who is caught in the ‘net’ of both anger (against Theagenes) and appetite/desire for Charicleia (θυμοῦ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας ἅμα ὥσπερ εἰς ἄρκυς ἐμβεβλημένος, Heliod. 8.2.3; cf. also Heliod. 1.15.2, 1.30.7, 2.12.5, 7.29.1). **Θυμὸς δὲ καὶ ἔρως δύο λαμπάδες:** ‘Anger and Desire are two torches’. This statement is taken technically as the *gnome*, while the explanation that follows is the *paraphrasis* (6.19.2-7; De Temmerman 2007a: 10, 19; see Intro. 2.4.3; cf. *infra* 6.19.7n.). The play between the physiological and metaphorical burning heat of anger is a common trope (e.g. Pl. *Tim*. 70c1-d5, Plut. *De cohib. ir*. 454e7-f2, 455c5, Sen. *Ir*. 2.19-20, 3.1.1, Heliod. 8.2.3); one need think only of the modern expressions: ‘hot-blooded/tempered/headed’. On the association of *eros* and lamps, see 6.6.3n. (cf. also Charit. 1.1.15, X. Eph. 1.8.3); on *eros* and fire, see 6.18.2n. **ἔστι δὲ καί… καὶ ἔχει…:** ‘Anger, however, is a distinct type of fire, with a diametrically opposite nature, but an equal force’. The “abrupt transition” from past to pres. tense signals the change of focus from character specific narrative to generalized exposition (Morales 2004: 121). β-family reads “ἔχει γάρ… ἔστι…”, which Vilborg prefers, finding ἄλλο “disturbing” in the text of α-family. It could suggest that that notion of ἔρως as a kind of fire is well established, but that the fiery status of θυμός requires some explanation. Throughout this excursus AT plays with rhetorical strategies and figures that highlight the tension between Anger and Desire’s natural antithesis and yet their repeated correspondences and equivalencies – in this instance the oxymoronic contrast of ἐναντιωτάτην and ὁμοίαν. On Anger’s *physis*, cf. 6.19.4 with n.

6.19.2 Ὁ μέν (*sc*. θυμός)**… ὁ δέ** (*sc*. ἔρως)**…:** A punctilious antithesis of Anger and Desire that leverages the homoioteleuton of the verb endings through the almost even cola (parisosis). Nonetheless, bracketed by the two observations of their differences is a statement that approximates them. **καὶ ἀλλήλων πάροικος ἡ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι πηγή:** lit. ‘the source of (the) fire is near to each other’. πάροικος + gen. = ‘near/neighbouring’; this sentence, as Vilborg

shows, is most likely brachylogy for: "the sources of *both* fires are near to *each other*" (so too, Gaselee, Winkler, Garnaud); whereas Whitmarsh has the more literal rendition: "the spring of fire lies in the vicinity of each". While the former provides clarity, the latter shows the subtle rhetorical play that suggests a single source (πηγή) for the fire that ignites both Anger and Desire: depicted as individual lamps burning with discrete fires (ἄλλο πῦρ), they might well have been 'lit from the same taper' (τὴν δὲ βίαν ὁμοίαν). While the following statement clarifies that the source of each fire is discrete – that of Anger resides in the liver, Desire in the heart – the matter is muddled once more in the choice of internal organs. **Ὁ μὲν γὰρ** (*sc*. θυμός) **εἰς τὸ ἧπαρ κάθηται, ὁ δὲ** (*sc*. ἔρως) **τῇ καρδίᾳ περιβέβληται:** 'Anger located at the liver, and Desire encompassed in the heart'. More often the heart is depicted as the abode of Anger (LSJ s.v. καρδία; e.g. 2.29.2, 2.29.4, 6.9.2, Pl.*Tim*. 70a2-d6, Plut. *Quaest*. *conv*. 647e11, Sen. *Ir*. 2.19.3, Gal. *PHP* 5.1.2; but cf. Juv. 1.45); while, the liver, an organ that is home to a number of passionate emotions (LSJ s.v. ἧπαρ), is also associated with Desire (e.g. Theoc. *Id*. 11.16, 13.71, Hor. *Carm*. 1.25.13-15, 4.1.12, Anacreont. fr. 33.28), especially the more specific Platonic Desire/Appetite (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) (e.g. Pl. *Tim*. 70d7-71b1).[305] AT is the only novelist to mention the liver and does so only here and in the story of Prometheus (3.8.2-3) – reflected in the apparent evisceration of Leucippe's liver (3.19.3) – a myth which Galen (*PHP* 6.8.78-82) tells us is meant to demonstrate the fact that the desirous part of our nature resides in the liver. Morales (2004: 119) argues that the inversion of heart and liver is yet another way in which AT "comically subverts the erotic tradition", which should perhaps be phrased as the 'Platonic tradition', for love/desire is also very much felt in the heart (e.g. Sapph. 31.5-6, Eur. *Hipp*. 27-8, Plut. *Amat*. 762f5, Ath. 13.75.8, *Anth*. *Gr*. 5.1.1, 5.214.2, 9.16.4, 16.199.5; cf. also *Anth*. *Gr*. 5.224). Throughout *L&C* the heart is the location of various emotions, such as fear (1.4.5), grief/worry (7.4.1, 7.4.5; cf. Charit. 6.5.6, Heliod. 10.17.1), shock/recognition (5.24.2; cf. Charit. 3.9.2), even anger (as above), but most of all it is associated with desire (1.17.5, 2.5.2, 2.7.6, 2.37.10, 5.13.4, 5.27.1, 8.12.6; so too, Long. 1.14.2, 1.17.2, 1.18.1, 1.25.2, 1.32.4, 2.7.5, 3.10.4, Heliod. 1.14.6, 3.5.6, 4.4.3). While Anger's residence in the liver is an inversion of the normal trope, that Desire be found in the heart is clearly not without precedent, indicative of the rhetorical play between antithesis and equivalence deployed here. This is borne out by

[305] On the heart as the seat of anger, Vilborg cites Hom. *Il*. 9.642 and Aesch. *Chor*.181, which should surely read Hom. *Il*. 9.646 and Aesch. *Chor*.183-4 (cf. also Hom. *Il*. 10.107, Soph. *Ant*. 1254, Diog. Laert. 8.30); as for the liver as the seat of love, he cites Aristaen. 2.5.25-6, a reference which although useful (cf. Intro. 1.5), does not establish tradition prior to AT.

the deliberate suppression of the subst. words θυμός and ἔρως as the subj., a sly way of contributing to the confusion.

6.19.3 Ὅταν οὖν ἄμφω… ταλαντεύεται: 'Whenever both take hold of a person, the soul becomes their scale, weighing up the fire of each'. As usual, the conditional force is employed to expand on the sententious musings (Intro. 1.3). There is something notably extraordinary in the notion of 'weighing' disembodied fire, and perhaps we are to imagine their respective organs on the scale too. Although doing battle against each other, Anger and Desire are repeatedly treated together (ἄμφω… αὐτοῖς… ἄμφω). The imagery echoes Clitophon's earlier emotional counterpoise between fear and hope (6.14.2 with n.). A pair of scales is usually a symbol of divine/legal justice or weighing one's fate (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 22.209-12, *Hom*. *Hymn Herm*. 324, Aesch. *Pers*. 345-6, Dio Chrys. *Or*. 22.5.9-11, Max. Soph. *Or*. 4.8.a.3-4, Ph. *Mos*. 2.228.4-6, Heliod. 8.17.5, 10.9.3); cf. also Ps.-Lucian's depiction of being caught in the balance of bisexuality (*Am*. 4.10-13). **Μάχονται δέ… εὐτυχῇ:** 'They both quarrel over the turn of the balance; mostly Desire is accustomed to winning, whenever it manages to succeed in its appetite'. μάχομαι + περί = 'fight over' (cf. Plut. *Marc*. 7.7.3, *Pomp*. 19.3.6), usually of place around which the fight is taking place. The balance of the scale is an image also used to depict the shifting tides of war (e.g. Hom. *Il*. 12.433-5, Polyaen. *Strat*. 3.9.27, Lucian *Hist*. *Conscr*. 49.14-6, Heliod. 4.20.1) an association that allows for a natural transition to more martial imagery. **Ἢν δέ… καλεῖ:** 'But if slighted by the beloved, Desire itself summons Anger to an alliance'. Desire and Anger are aligned once more, this time as confederates (cf. Charit. 1.2.5). Eros as a fighting force was first introduced by Satyrus in his role as *praeceptor amoris* (2.4.5, 2.5.1; see further Christenson 2000). Compare Callisthenes (2.13.2-3) and Melite (5.26.8-9), who both portray the rejection of romantic overtures as a slight on one's honour.

6.19.4 Κἀκεῖνος ὡς γείτων πείθεται… τὸ πῦρ: 'Neighbourly Anger is persuaded, and they ignite their fire in concert'. It may seem incongruous that Anger is depicted as an avuncular neighbour amenable to persuasion, but Eros and Aphrodite are closely linked with the art of persuasion personified in Peitho (see North 1993: 408-11 with refs.); and their close proximity and the mutuality of their fire are emphasised again. On the connection between the fires of *eros* and war, cf. 1.8.6, 4.7.4. **Ἂν δὲ ἅπαξ…:** Once the alliance is formed, however, Anger's ulterior motives are revealed, and the internal landscape becomes a *theatrum belli*. The vocabulary of warfare and armistice to depict the struggle for emotional supremacy (ἐκπεσόντα κατάσχῃ… ἄσπονδος… συμμαχεῖ… κρατεῖ… σπείσασθαι) shows a strong Platonic influence

(e.g. Pl. *Resp*. iv.440a5-b5, 440e5-6, 441e6, 442b, *Phdr*. 237e). The control of Anger is also often depicted in militaristic terms (e.g. Cic. *QFr*. 1.1.38.13-15, Plut. *De cohib. ira* 454a3-7, 454c, 457d, Sen. *Ir*. 1.17, 3.1.1). **τῆς οἰκείας ἕδρας:** i.e. 'its usual position as victor' (cf. ὁ ἔρως εἴωθε νικᾶν, 6.19.3), this phrase is reminiscent of high dramatic diction (e.g. Eur. *IT* 136, *Tro*. 800, *Cyc*. 353). **φύσει γε ὢν ἄσπονδος:** Despite Anger's initial agreement, its true nature is implacable, and no trustworthy alliance can be reached (cf. Plat. *Leg*. ix.863b2-4, but also, *Resp*. iv.441a1-3), underscored by the intensifying particle γε. **ὡς δοῦλον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας πεδήσας κρατεῖ:** Anger takes Appetite as its slave an image that prefigures the change in Thersander from Leucippe's 'slave' in love, to treating her like a common servant (Owens 2020: 171; cf. 6.20.1 with n.). **κἂν θέλῃ:** 'even though it should wish (*sc*. to call a truce)'.

6.19.5 Ὁ δὲ τῷ θυμῷ… τὸ φιλούμενον: 'Plunging down, Desire is drenched by Anger; no longer autonomous, it wishes to reinstate its original position of power, but is instead compelled to despise its sweetheart'. The imagery now turns diluvial most likely a reference to Dionysius' similar torrent of feelings for Callirhoe (Charit. 2.4.4, 2.8.1, 3.2.6). Owens (2020: 171) points out the anxiety to know "if Thersander, an anti-Dionysius, was going to rape Leucippe, in contrast to Dionysius, who had not raped Callirhoe"; but this tension is undercut by the irony that Dionysius does in fact sleep with Callirhoe (albeit with her consent). The vocabulary emphasises the medical aspects of psychiatric disturbance echoing the descriptions of both Leucippe's anger (2.29.2) and her madness (4.10.1; on the latter, see McLeod 1969). Anger is often described by philosophers and physicians alike as a seething or simmering sensation (highlighted here by the sibilant alliteration), especially around the heart (e.g. Pl. *Crat*. 419e1-2, *Tim*. 70b, *Resp*. iv.440c7-8, Arist. *De an*. 403a31, Sen. *Ir*. 1.1.4-5, 2.19.3, Gal. *PHP* 3.1.30-3, 7.3.2.8-15). Compare also, the image of being 'swamped' (βαπτίζω) by one's troubles (e.g. 3.10.1, 7.2.1; cf. Heliod. 2.3.4, 5.16.2). The inversion of Desire's usual compulsion (ὁ δὲ ἀναγκάζει φιλεῖν, 6.19.2) plays on the '*odi et amo*' *topos* begun by Melite (μισουμένη τὸν μισοῦντα φιλῶ, 5.25.5). The *variatio* of τὸ φιλούμενον over the usual (Platonic) τὸ ἐρώμενον (6.19.3, 6.19.4, 6.19.6) both highlights the inversion and prefigures Clinias' own deployment of these terms in his courtroom oration (7.9.6, 7.9.8). **Ὅταν δέ… παρίεται:** 'But whenever simmering Anger is inundated and filled full of its own power, it gushes forth; it then grows tired from its satiation, and in tiring relaxes'. ἐμφορέω in the pass. + gen. = 'to pour in/fill full of' (LSJ s.v. II) and can be used metaph. of power/hybris (e.g. Plut. *Cic*. 19.6.3, *Sert*. 5.6.3); ἐξουσία ('power/authority') is used similarly of Dionysius' position over Callirhoe (Charit. 2.4.10, 2.6.2, 3.2.6), and again foreshadows Thersander's switch from 'slave' to master

(6.20.1). The figurative language of surfeit is commonly employed for desire (e.g. 1.6.1, 6.17.1; cf. 6.11.4 with n.) but also of anger (e.g. X. Eph. 2.4.3, 3.2.10, Heliod. 1.11.2, 1.16.3, 7.27.4, 8.2.1, Sen. *Ir*. 2.5.3, Plut. *De cohib*. *ir*. 460c2-3). There is certainly a sly hint of humour that the titanic force of Anger should find itself sluggish after a big meal, highlighted by the staccato alliteration. **ὁ ἔρως ἀμύνεται… νικᾷ:** 'Desire then retaliates, arms Appetite, and vanquishes the sleeping Anger'. The martial imagery is resumed in a paratactic *tricolon crescens* that emphasises Desire's victorious retaliation, bathetically undercut by the fact that it defeats Anger while it is sleeping. It is perhaps a witty play on the viewpoint that one should not go to sleep angry (cf. e.g. Pl. *Resp*. ix.572a4-5, *Ep.Eph*. 4:26). Compare the emotions (and circumstances) that 'armed' Clitophon with the courage to visit Leucippe's bedchamber (2.10.3).

6.19.6 Ὁρῶν δὲ τὰς ὕβρεις…: 'On witnessing the injuries committed in drunken violence against its sweetheart, Desire is pained and makes its defence plea to the lover, appealing for a settlement, and testifying that Anger is placated by pleasure'. παροινέω lit. 'drunkenly abuse'; κατά + gen. = 'against', "in a hostile sense" (LSJ s.v. A II 5); a summative neut. pl. ('what [i.e. the things which] it most adores'), the superlative highlights Desire's attempts to re-ingratiate itself with the beloved. This scene acts out (metonymically) the trope of the lover who abuses (and even assaults) his beloved in drunken anger (e.g. Pl. *Phdr*. 240e4-7). The image of Desire as drunk on anger plays on the trope of being 'drunk on love' (μεθύων ἔρωτι, 1.6.1; cf. Anac. fr. 31.2 *PMG*, *Anth*. *Gr*. 5.305, 12.115). This theme is taken to the usual rhetorical heights in the comparison of the effects of Eros and Dionysus on a person (2.3.3), a description which foreshadows the association of Desire and Anger here. Compare also Heliod. 5.32.1, where drunkenness and anger are an irrational emotional sea-storm. The metaphorical waters are muddied yet further as the register turns juridical, describing Desire's *apologia* for the crimes it has committed. Clitophon's very first spoken words in the novel (addressed to the initial narrator) are to bemoan just such 'outrages' he has suffered at the hands of E/eros (ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἂν εἰδείην, ἔφη, τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών, 1.2.1). The sheer polysemy of ὕβρις means that these 'outrages' cover anything from verbal abuse (8.9.2, 8.10.4), physical battery (7.14.3, 8.1.4, 8.3.2), or general insult (2.13.3, 6.5.4, 6.16.5), to rape (2.24.3, 5.5.2). Later, Clitophon reports that Leucippe has suffered every one of these, except the last (8.5.5). The use of the plural (ὕβρεις) here suggests that there need not only be one type of injury implied, however the threat of rape naturally looms large (cf. Pl. *Phdr*. 238a1-2). Vilborg suggests that θυμός here "is probably the anger of the beloved (the anger of the lover is sleeping…)" (so too

Garnaud, “sa colère”), while Gaselee, Winkler, and Whitmarsh take it as a continuation of the personified forces, and the difference is whether to read ἐπαγγέλλω as ‘promise’ or ‘proclaim’. The latter translation appears sounder for several reasons: 1) there is no real logical fallacy in Desire reporting the satiated and sleeping Anger appeased; 2) considering the legal flavour of the vocabulary, translating ἐπαγγέλλω as ‘promise’ shows the least nuance; 3) until now ‘the beloved’ has been nothing more than a figurehead around which the passionate forces move, the sudden speculation of their feelings seems entirely out of place; 4) the fact that Anger has been appeased by pleasure contains the subtle suggestion that the ‘outrages’ committed might well have included rape. **καταμαλάττειν ἡδονῇ:** κατά + μαλάσσω (‘to soften/appease’), this compound is a later formation and may well appear in *L&C* for the first time, cf. Lucian *JTr*. 24.4-5 (metaph.), *Anach*. 24.7-8, 24.41, Gal. *Ant*. 14.173.13 (lit.); note the Attic form here. The verb is found echoed in Charicleia’s instruction to Theagenes that he pacify Arsace with promises (ἐφηδύνων ἐλπίδι καὶ καταμαλάττων ὑποσχέσει τοῦ θυμοῦ τὸ φλεγμαῖνον, Heliod. 7.21.4), very likely a reference to Thersander’s anger here.

6.19.7 Τυχὼν μὲν οὖν… καταδύεται: ‘Once it has achieved its wish, Desire becomes gracious, but if disdained yet again, it plunges back into Anger’. The final observation on the repetitive nature of Desire and Anger’s inflammatory cycle (πάλιν… τὰ ἀρχαῖα ποιεῖ) resumes the diluvial and martial imagery in miniature (a *gnome* en abyme?). **ἀτιμίᾳ γὰρ ἔρωτος σύμμαχός ἐστι θυμός:** The excursus began with one *gnome* (θυμὸς δὲ καὶ ἔρως…, 6.19.1) and ends with another (notable for its sibilant homoioteleuton); the description in between serving as *paraphrasis* to both. The imagery of diluvial battle between two titanic forces that then become strange allies recalls the “θέαμα καινόν” (‘novel spectacle’) of the Nile wetlands that are the result of a truce in the rivalrous relationship between land and water (4.12.1-3).

6.20-21: The Passion of Leucippe

Thersander becomes apoplectic with rage, revealing that he has heard her soliloquy, and resorting to the paradoxical argument of disappointed misogynists everywhere: she must be a whore if she refuses me (6.20.1-2). Conveniently overlooking Leucippe’s revelation of her distinguished heritage, he now seeks to impose his authority as master. Once more, Leucippe displays remarkable forbearance in the face of such abuse, pointing out that she has already withstood such advances from Sosthenes. Shamefaced at being so exposed, Sosthenes attempts to shift the focus by calling for Leucippe’s torture (6.20.3-4). Leucippe takes

Sosthenes' call for torture and makes it her rallying cry, offering herself up piecemeal for a variety of torments; she then turns on Thersander, shaming him before Artemis, patron goddess of Ephesus and venerated virgin herself (6.21.1-2). Thersander, however, finds her claim to virginity laughable (6.21.3). In the face of his incredulity, Leucippe launches into an impassioned defence of her virginity (6.22.1). She lists all those who have abducted or assaulted her, characterising Thersander as the very worst in this catalogue of abusers (6.22.2-3). Her final words, and the final words of Bk. 6, are an impassioned avowal of the inviolable nature of her liberty (6.22.4).

6.20.1 Καὶ ὁ Θέρσανδρος οὖν… ἀφῆκε τῷ θυμῷ τὰς ἡνίας: 'And while Thersander's initial hopes were of amatory advancement, he was Leucippe's slave entire; but when his hopes were dashed, he gave free rein to anger'. Moving from exegesis to diegesis once more, Clitophon applies the generalities on the psychosomatics of love and anger (6.19), specifically to Thersander's personal psychology. καί… οὖν is an uncommon combination (Denniston, 445), and καί is omitted in β-family (so Vilborg); however, its inclusion heightens the conjunction between the generality of the excursus and Thersander's specific reaction. His response is framed around his hopes which, when dashed, provide the impetus for his angry retribution (cf. Heliod. 1.26.3, 8.6.1; see also 6.17.5n.). The contrast between the literary trope of *servitium amoris* and Leucippe's literal enslavement ties together AT's continued deployment of slavery "as an organizing idea for the episode and digression" (Owens 2020: 171; cf. 6.6.3n., 6.18.6n., 6.19.4n.). The allegory of the Phaedran charioteer is employed once more (cf. 6.18.3 with n.), but where previously the driver was envisioned in charge of the tongue alone, here Anger gives rein to both verbal and physical insult. Exercising control over anger was a key aspect in moral thinking concerning the vice, and succumbing to it was considered a barbarian trait (e.g. Plut. *De cohib. ir.* 458d10-e1, Gal. *PHP*. 3.3.6, Heliod. 2.12.5; cf. Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.38), which reflects the continued inversion of Thersander as 'barbarian' (Intro. 2.3.4). **Ῥαπίζει δὴ κατὰ κόρρης αὐτήν:** As Whitmarsh (2020: 236), commenting on 2.24.1, shows, "[t]he original, Attic idiom is ἐπὶ κόρρης ῥαπίζειν ('beat around the head')". From Thersander's first entrance into the drama he has shown a propensity for violence committed in anger (ῥαπίζει με κατὰ κόρρης πληγὴν θυμοῦ γέμουσαν, 5.23.5; cf. παίει με κατὰ τῶν προσώπων μάλα βιαίως, 8.1.3). While the physical punishment of a slave is not remarkable, Plutarch makes the point that such punishment should not be meted out in anger and doing so reflects poorly on the master (Plut. *De cohib. ir.* 459c-d, 460c, 463b). **Ὦ κακόδαιμον ἀνδράποδον:** Thersander uses Leucippe's own words against her (6.16.4), choosing to ignore the revelation that she is freeborn (6.16.5).

His addition of the adj. κακοδαίμων (lit. 'possessed by an evil daemon') reflects Leucippe's description of her fate (cf. 6.13.1 with n.); however, these words were spoken to Sosthenes alone, and perhaps Clitophon-*auctor* is losing track of what Thersander has overheard. The epithet is used several times of 'wanton' women: Leucippe's mother uses the term of her when reprimanding her for her laissez-faire attitude towards her chastity (2.24.3), and Leucippe herself uses the epithet of the prostitute that was beheaded in her place (8.16.1). While κακοδαίμων on its own is not offensive (see Dickey 1996: 168-7, 289 with refs.), its inclusion acts as an intensifier for the more pejorative ἀνδράποδον (6.16.4n.). **ἀληθῶς ἐρωτιῶν:** It is as if Clitophon-*auctor* would offer us irrefutable proof of Leucippe's feelings, with his greatest nemesis providing testimony (cf. on the somewhat lopsided nature of Leucippe and Clitophon's romance, Intro. 2.4.1). ἐρωτιάω is given in contrast to its counterpart δυσερωτιάω (5.1.5), and thus is perhaps better translated 'love-struck' than 'love-sick' (which would be better suited to the latter; cf. Poll. *Onom*. 6.189.1, Plut. fr. 150.5; also, the more frequently used adj. δύσερως 'madly or disastrously in love'). Both verbs are rare and do not appear earlier than 1st-2nd c CE (ἐρωτιάω may well appear in AT for the first time).[306] That both appear in *L&C* is remarkable and their distinction is revealing: on the one hand is Clitophon's self-confessed infatuation with viewing the city of Alexandria, a love that can never be returned; and on the other, Leucippe's (alleged) ardour for him, confirmed by Thersander, his rival in love. **πάντων γάρ σου κατήκουσα:** On the verb, cf. 6.18.1 with n.

6.20.2 Οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ὅτι…: Thersander's indignant questions here echo those of Artaxates to Callirhoe (σὺ δέ, ἡ δούλη, τὴν εὐτυχίαν οὐ φέρεις, οὐδὲ ἀγαπᾷς ὅτι σε παρακαλεῖ κελεῦσαι δυνάμενος, Charit. 6.7.7); that his words should now reflect those of the eunuch (previously this was Sosthenes' department, see Intro. 2.4.1) alludes to Leucippe's accusation that his bad behaviour emulates that of his slave (6.18.6 with n.). **τὸν σὸν καταφιλῆσαι δεσπότην:** The aor. is "timeless" (Smyth §1998). There is some disagreement amongst translators as to the orientation of the kiss: Vilborg suggests "to be allowed to kiss (*sc*. your master)" (similarly, Gaselee); while Whitmarsh has the pass. "to be kissed by your master" (similarly, Garnaud); only Winkler has the straight-forward act. "to kiss your master". While the former two hold

[306] The LSJ (s.v. ἐρωτιάω) also cites Hippoc. [*Ep*.] 19 as an example (cf. *BDAG* s.v.), however this was due to Diels' supposition that Urb. Gr. 68 was a lengthier, modified version of the letter (cf. κῆν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κοῖλοι ἔωσιν ὡς ἐρωτιώντων, §62 Diels 1918), which has since been disproven (see discussion in Smith 1990: 30-1, although not of ἐρωτιάω specifically).

merit, the latter is perhaps more in keeping with Thersander's narcissistic characterisation. **ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκκίζῃ καὶ σχηματίζῃ πρὸς ἀπόνοιαν:** 'you would rather feign frigidity and affect anguish?' ἀκκίζομαι ('to pretend indifference') when used of a woman means 'to affect prudishness' (LSJ s.v. 3; e.g. Philippid. 5.2, Alciphr. 3.5.2.4, 4.14.5.3); σχηματίζω, cf. 6.11.3 with n. Vilborg (β-family) omits the first καί, but its inclusion here adds to the equal rhythm of the verbs' homoioteleuton. Thersander's accusation that Leucippe is feigning her emotions is a twisted echo of her own self-conscious performativity (6.16.6n.). **Ἐγὼ μέν σε καὶ πεπορνεῦσθαι δοκῶ:** 'It seems to me you are indeed a whore'. πορνεύω in the pass. 'to prostitute oneself/be a prostitute' (LSJ s.v.). The charge that Leucippe is a prostitute is one that Thersander will maintain for the rest of the novel (e.g. 8.3.3, 8.8.3, 8.11.2). This is not her first brush with prostitution though: she was almost prostituted out to Charmides (4.6.2), and as she later explains, it was a prostitute that acted as her body double in her beheading (8.16.1). These slanders and associations play into the depiction of Leucippe as the 'Virgin–Whore' (Morales 2004: 215-20; cf. Intro. 2.3.2). It is not uncommon for the novelistic heroines to be sold into prostitution, yet maintain their chastity through some lucky intervention (e.g. X. Eph. 5.5-7, *Hist*. *Apoll*. 33-4). **καὶ γὰρ μοιχὸν φιλεῖς:** 'and in love with an adulterer, no less!' Characterising the couple as a pair of sexual deviants is a tactic that Thersander and his lawyer will exploit in the second trial (8.8.11, 8.10.5). The irony here, of course, is that while he is slandering Leucippe, he is quite correct about Clitophon. Leucippe picks up on this attack at 6.21.2 (with n.).

6.20.3 Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μὴ θέλεις ἐραστοῦ μου πεῖραν λαβεῖν, πειράσῃ δεσπότου: 'Well, since you do not wish to sample me as your lover, you will suffer me as your master!' The chiastic and alliterative structure of Thersander's ultimatum lends a tone of finality to the threat. The polyptotonic play at the heart of the chiasmus with the subst. πεῖρα ('trial/attempt on') and the verb πειράω + gen. ('make trial of/make an attempt on') highlights the leitmotif of Thersander's 'piratical' attempts at seduction (see 6.13.1n., 6.21.3n.). While ἐραστοῦ and δεσπότου form the outer rim of the chiasmus, highlighting both their contrast and his transition from lover to master. Thersander's threat is the reversal of Sosthenes' earlier promise to Leucippe (6.4.3 with n.); but also reminds us of Melite's declaration that Clitophon is *her* master (*sc*. 'in love') (5.26.7). From this point, Thersander continues to assert Leucippe's status as his slave as well as his 'rights' as slave-owner, holding the threat of torture over her head (e.g. 7.11.4, 8.1.2, 8.8.10, 8.8.14, 8.11.1-2; cf. *infra* 6.20.4n.). **Κἂν τυραννεῖν ἐθέλῃς, κἀγὼ τυραννεῖσθαι, πλὴν οὐ βιάσῃ:** 'Even if you wish to act the tyrant over me, and I am indeed to be tyrannized, even

so you will not violate me!' Leucippe's phrasing here is "short to obscurity" (Vilborg; cf. O'Sullivan s.v. πλήν II 3 b), but I suspect this is deliberate. As with her repartee with Sosthenes (Intro. 2.4.2), Leucippe frames her comeback around Thersander's own words: in a rather procrustean concessive construction, she picks up specifically on ἐθέλω (θέλεις/ἐθέλῃς) ('Even if *you* wish…') and gives her own tautologous polyptoton in the act. and pass. inf. of τυραννεύω ('to tyrannize'). While the repetition of καί is "annoying" (Vilborg), it could be read as an imitation of Thersander's "ἀλλὰ καί… καί…" (6.20.2). πλήν 'except/only (do) not' (Smyth §2966a); βιάζομαι ('to overpower by force/act with violent force') is intended here in the sense of sexual coercion (*sc*. 'to rape') (e.g. 1.10.6, 4.1.8, 6.21.2, Charit. 3.2.2; cf. *infra* 6.22.2 with n.). Considering the Platonic overtones of 6.19 (Intro. 2.4.4; also, 6.20.1 with n.), it is possible that we are meant to associate Thersander with the 'tyrannical man' (ὁ τυραννικὸς ἀνήρ) of *Resp.* ix.571a-80a, who is ruled by his appetites (and is himself tyrannised over by Eros, Pl. *Resp* ix.573d; cf. also Epict. 1.9.13-15). The verb reflects the Rape of Ganymede (ὁ δὲ ἀνάρπαστος γενόμενος ὑβρίζεται καὶ ἔοικεν τυραννουμένῳ, 2.37.3), which now appears a cautionary homoerotic precursor to Leucippe's own abduction (cf. 6.4.3n.). Clitophon later accuses Thersander of tyrannizing over him under the eyes of the gods when he punches him in the temple precinct (8.2.1); yet, despite the seeming severity of these charges, Clitophon and the Priest characterise the charge of 'tyrannizing' as rather melodramatic (8.1.5, 8.9.7). In her emphatic repetition of the verb Leucippe casts Thersander in the role of 'Tyrant', a stock character of oppression and violence in both Roman declamation (e.g. Sen. *Contr*. 1.7.8-9, 2.5.6; see Intro. 2.4.3), and martyrological texts, such as Antiochus IV in 4 Macc. (compare the mother who defeated 'the tyrant' in words alone, 4 Macc. 16:14), or the tyrannical Commodus faced by Appian on behalf of the Alexandrians (*AA* XI *P*. *Oxy*. 33 col. ii 3-14; cf. Musurillo 1954: 238-9; see Intro. 1.4). **Μαρτύρησον… ἠδίκησας:** 'Testify to how I acquit myself in the face of assaults – indeed it was you who committed just such injustices against me!' Leucippe's command that Sosthenes testify to her fortitude is delivered with all the vigour of a legal orator. She employs the juridical term αἰκία ('assault') to refer to Sosthenes' abuse (LSJ s.v. 3; e.g. Dem. 37.33, 47.8, 47.40; cf. 6.5.4, 8.5.5), as well as ἀδικέω ('to commit an injustice/do wrong'). The asseverative force of γάρ and the intensifying advb. μᾶλλον ('very/exceedingly') emphasise Sosthenes' active role in committing these injuries against her. Calling for witness testimony for her chastity is a "ringing reminder" of Pantheia's concern that anyone should have witnessed her attempted premarital liaison with Clitophon (καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων δυστυχῶμεν, 2.28.3; Morales 2004: 214); similarly, Leucippe tries to forestall relations with Charmides by claiming that there are too many witnesses in town (καὶ ἐν ὄψει

τὰ γινόμενα, καὶ πολλοὶ μάρτυρες, 4.7.2). μαρτυρέω ('to bear witness/give evidence/testify') extends in Christian usage over the 2nd c. CE to mean 'to give testimony of the faith', hence 'to suffer martyrdom' (cf. *BDAG* s.v.; e.g. Clem. Al. *Strom*. 4.4.13.2-15.4; see Bowersock 1995: 5-6; Kitts 2018: 268-77); the term αἰκία also came to be used of the tortures suffered by martyrs (e.g. Euseb. *Hist. eccl*. 8.3.1.2, 8.12.1.3). It is not likely that AT means any deliberate Christian reference with this choice of words in this instance, but rather speaks of a naturally shared vocabulary of legal proceedings and public punishment (Intro. 1.4).

6.20.4 Καὶ ὁ Σωσθένης αἰσχυνθεὶς ὡς ἐληλεγμένος: 'And Sosthenes, ashamed as if he had been exposed under cross-examination'. ἐλέγχω ('to cross-examine/bring to proof/expose') continues the forensic vocabulary (LSJ s.v. II). Sosthenes' mortification and his corresponding suggestion to torture Leucippe is ironically proleptic of his own fear of being tortured, which is so great that he flees without locking Leucippe's hut, allowing her to escape (7.10.3-5). It is notable that Sosthenes is depicted with a flicker of embarrassment (something Thersander never experiences), however even this seems a result of being exposed in front of his master. **ξανθῆναι μάστιξι δεῖ:** The verb ξαίνω originally means 'to comb/card (wool)', and hence 'to rake/lacerate (the skin)' (*CGL* s.v.). This is not the first time Sosthenes has thought to flog Leucippe, and she offers her wounds as evidence of the abuse to Clitophon and Melite on the estate (5.17.6). **μυρίαις βασάνοις περιπεσεῖν:** The hyperbole of his proposal suggests that Sosthenes is merely embellishing with his usual excess (compare the similar phrasing in Clitophon's cellmate's made-up story: ὥσπερ βασάνους παθὼν μυρίας, 7.3.5); however, this does not undercut the very serious anxiety around slave-torture, as Clio shows in her haste to flee (θάνατός μοι πρόκειται, τῶν βασάνων γλυκύτερος, 2.26.3). The pairing of μυρίαι and βάσανοι ('countless tortures') is found mainly in later authors (e.g. Lib. *Or*. 1.26.10, 56.6.10) and is especially popular amongst Christian writers (e.g. Euseb. *Hist. eccl*. 8.6.10.3-4, Jo. Chrys. 50.640.20, 60.491.45 *MPG*).

6.21.1 Πείσθητι… συμβουλεύει γὰρ καλῶς: συμβουλεύω ('to advise/counsel') is used elsewhere of plotting murder (7.7.4, 8.16.4; cf. σύμβουλος 6.22.4 with n.). **Φερέτω… Φερέτω… Κομιζέτω…:** 'Bring the wheel: here are my arms – stretch them! Bring the lashes: here is my back – flog it! Fetch the fire: here is my body – burn it!' In her imperious demands for torture (continued below, 6.21.2 with n.), Leucippe utilises the 3rd person (pres.) imper., as if granting permission. *She* is the one in control of the implements and what is to be done with them (Haynes 2003: 60). Each of the four commands has the same tricolic construction: 1)

bring the torture device; 2) behold the corresponding body part to which it applies; 3) apply it! The repetitive anaphora, alliteration, and homoioteleuton of her injunctions capitalise on the rhythmic cretic ending of the final verbs …τεινέτω …τυπτέτω …καιέτω …σφαζέτω (similarly 6.22.2, 6.22.4 with nn.). Leucippe's commands for torture bear much in common with Sen. *Contr*. 1.7.9 (see discussion Intro. 2.4.3) but compare also calls for martyrdom in Ignat. *Ep*. *ad Rom*. IV.5.3 and Orig. *Dial*. *Heracl*. 24.9-10, or Andrew's readiness to be tortured to preserve Maximilla's chastity (*Acta Andreae* 39(7)). The deictic injunction advb. ἰδού ('lo/behold!') also carries a tragic quality (e.g. Eur. *Hec*. 563-5, *HF* 319-20; cf. Soph. *Trach*. 1076-80, with 1088-90). The array of instruments follows a fairly standard litany (e.g. 7.12.2, X. Eph. 2.6.2-4, Charit. 3.4.7, 3.9.7, 4.2.10, Lucian *Nec*. 14.4-7, Apul. *Met*. 10.10.16-9). **Φερέτω τροχόν:** The wheel (τροχός) was used as a rack upon which the person would have their body stretched and their limbs twisted (Vergote 1972: 113-5; e.g. Ar. *Lys*. 845-6, *Pax* 452, Plut. *Phoc*. 35.1, *De garr*. 509b7-c3, Lucian *Tox*. 28.10). Later Clitophon is suspended from ropes in anticipation of being stretched on the wheel (7.12.2). **Κομιζέτω πῦρ:** With classic *variatio*, Leucippe supplants the third expected φέρω ('bring/fetch') with the essentially synonymous κομίζω ('provide/carry'). Fire, too, is a less specific tool than the other three: Winkler, for instance, chooses to translate it as "hot irons", perhaps to assimilate it into the list of instruments.

6.21.2 Φερέτω καὶ σίδηρον· ἰδοὺ δέρη, σφαζέτω: 'Bring the blade: here is my throat – slash it!' AT is the only novelist to use δειρή (usually in the Attic form, but cf. 4.19.4) interchangeably with τράχηλος for 'neck/throat' (e.g. 2.4.4, 4.19.4, 6.18.4, 8.12.9), the rest use the latter term exclusively (e.g. Charit. 3.5.4, 4.2.7, Heliod. 4.7.11, 8.9.19). In addition, δειρή is by far the more 'tragic' of the two terms and, coupled with σφάζω (lit. 'to slaughter/sacrifice by slitting the throat') imbues her vocabulary with further dramatic overtones (cf. Eur. *Andr*. 411-2, *Or*. 1199). **Ἀγῶνα θεάσασθε καινόν… νικᾷ:** 'Spectate at a novel contest: one woman will contend with all these torments and defeat them all!' The return to 2nd sg. (aor.) imper. gives her command a vivid directness; θεάομαι ('gaze/behold') positions Thersander and Sosthenes as spectators to something marvellous (LSJ s.v.; e.g. 1.7.1, 2.14.7, 3.18.1, 5.2.1), the sight of the lone Leucippe enduring their tortures is an image she reiterates later (6.22.4 with n.). The use of the polysemous word ἀγών ('contest/battle/trial') to describe her endurance under torture plays on a variety of intertexts: the imagery of martial/athletic endeavour and spectatorship has a long tradition amongst both Stoic and Cynic philosophers as a metaphor for moral struggle (e.g. Dio. Chrys. *Or*. 8.11, Epict. 4.4.30-2), and Christian and Jewish authors avail themselves of the same imagery to depict the suffering and spectacle of martyrs (e.g. 4

Macc. 17:11-17, Euseb. *Hist. eccl*. 5.1.38, 7.11.20; see esp. King 2012: 155-6; with Shaw 1996: 275-80; and, more generally, Pfitzner 1967: 16-37). The only other instances of this word in *L&C* are in reference to courtroom procedure (7.9.1, 8.8.12), and echoes can also be found in the self-conscious spectacle of the Alexandrian martyrs' trials (e.g. *AA* XI *P. Oxy*. 33 col. iii 8-11; see Intro. 1.4). The description of her ἀγών as καινός ('novel') has a number of further possible implications: it may be read as a comment on AT's innovation on previous novelists' depiction of torture as spectacle (e.g. X. Eph. 2.5-6, Charit. 3.4.7); it could be interpreted as a comment on the reorienting of spectacular scenes from paradoxographical to juridical that takes place over the course of the novel; it may also have significance as tortures were often combined, or new ones innovated, to heighten the novelty of the gruesome exhibition (Coleman 1990: 56; cf. Sen. *Contr*. 2.5.5, Euseb. *Hist. eccl*. 8.10.5, 8.16.2). Compare the phrasing of her spectated torture with the 'most deplorable sight' of Prometheus in the painting (τὸ θέαμά ἐστιν αἴσχιστον, 2.37.3), whose situation appears even more analogous now (cf. fn. 65; 6.19.2n.). It also recalls the sight of Habrocomes torture as a 'piteous spectacle' (ἦν δὲ τὸ θέαμα ἐλεεινόν, X. Eph. 2.6.3); and, in Christian narratives, the crowd who decry Thecla's martyrdom as a 'bitter spectacle' (πικρὸν θέαμα, *APTh* 32.4-5), or Agnes' torments described as 'a new kind of martyrdom' (*Novum martyria genus*, *De Virg*. 1.2.8 = 16.190.35-6 *MPL*). **Εἶτα Κλειτοφῶντα μοιχὸν καλεῖς, αὐτὸς μοιχὸς ὤν;:** 'And you call Clitophon the adulterer, when you yourself are one!?' advb. εἶτα ('and so?) used "esp. in questions or exclamations to express surprise, indignation, contempt, sarcasm, and the like" (LSJ s.v. II). Leucippe displays a deft forensic flair as she turns Thersander's charge that Clitophon is a μοιχός against him (*anticategoria*) (6.20.2); however, there is tremendous dramatic irony in the narratee's knowledge that the opposite is in fact the case. The exchange of insulting jibes is also a feature in the Alexandrian martyrs (e.g. *AA* IV *Rec*. *A* col. iii 7-12). **Οὐδὲ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν… παρθένον ἐν πόλει παρθένου;:** 'Tell me, do you not fear your goddess Artemis? Would you violate a virgin in the Virgin's city?' Leucippe calls upon Artemis in both her civic and literary/mythic capacity. She emphasises to Thersander that, as an Ephesian, Artemis is ostensibly *his* patron deity (τὴν σήν) (particularly as there is currently a festival to her underway, 6.3.2 with n.). Thus violence upon her virginity is akin to violating the city and cult of the virgin Artemis, underscored by the repetitive polyptoton of παρθένος and its rhythmic alliteration with the central word πόλις. The triangulation of the heroine, her virginity, and the virgin goddess Artemis is a natural, and often quite literal, *topos* in the novels; for example, Anthia first appears dressed as Artemis at a festival to the Ephesian goddess (X. Eph. 1.2.6-8, cf. X. Eph. 1.11.5, 5.15.2), and Charicleia, also outfitted as Artemis, rains arrows down upon her and

Theagenes' attackers (Heliod. 1.2, cf. Heliod. 5.31-32, 2.33.4-5), even Callirhoe, who is largely associated with Aphrodite, is fantasised as Artemis by King Artaxerxes (Charit. 6.4.6, cf. Charit. 1.1.16). Leucippe's connection begins rather opaquely with her Iphigenia-esque sacrifice at 3.15-17 (cf. 6.2.3n.), but confirmation soon comes in Artemis' dream visitation (4.1). However, it is not until Bks. 7 and 8 that Artemis' presence is really felt: it is an epiphany of Artemis that brings victory to the Byzantines and alerts Sostratus that Clitophon and Leucippe are in Ephesus, which triggers a religious embassy that delays Clitophon's torture (7.12.2-4); Leucippe takes refuge in the temple of Artemis after her escape from Thersander and Sosthenes (7.13.2-3); they are offered hospitality by the Priest of Artemis (8.4.1), who also advocates on their behalf in court (8.9); and, of course, Leucippe's supernatural virginity test is presided over by Artemis (8.12). As Dowden's (2010: 366-7) survey of gods in the novels shows, Artemis and Aphrodite are the two principal deities in *L&C*, a dyad that reflects not only the broader contrast between the sexually available Melite and the chaste Leucippe, but also the same schism within Leucippe herself (Intro. 2.3.2). On the Artemis/Aphrodite pairing in *L&C*, see further Segal 1984; Bouffartigue 2001; Guez 2012: 38-50; Papadimitropolous 2015. **Δέσποινα, ποῦ σου τὰ τόξα;:** 'Lady goddess, where are your arrows?' She breaks from addressing Thersander to apostrophizing Artemis directly in supplication, calling for her (bow and) arrows (cf. LSJ s.v. τόξον II), Artemis' iconic weapons as virginal huntress (*LIMC* s.v. Artemis; cf. *Hom*. *Hymn Artem*. 1-6). The open-ended nature of her question means that the direction of the arrows is ambiguous: like the women of tragedy, she may be hoping for Artemis' protection (e.g. Eur. *Phoen*. 151-3, *Hipp*. 166-9, 228-31, Soph. *El*. 626-7); or, like Homer's Penelope, she may be wishing for her own death at Artemis' hand to avoid being matched with a dishonourable man (Hom. *Od*. 18.201-5, 20.60-82).

6.21.3 Παρθένος… ὢ τόλμης καὶ γέλωτος: 'A virgin? What impudence and folly!' ὤ + gen. (of cause) for exclamations is common in prose (e.g. 1.13.2, 2.22.7, 3.10.3, Charit. 5.10.5, Lucian *Tim*. 48.1). Just as Leucippe picked up on Thersander's charge of μοιχός, Thersander cynically picks up on *her* operative word παρθένος ('virgin') (a term that she will shortly reclaim with mantra-like devotion, see 6.22.1 with n.). Incredulity at Leucippe's claims to virginity is something of a running theme: her own mother refused to believe her (2.28); Thersander now finds it risible; and later even the Priest of Artemis is hesitant to assume she has remained chaste (8.6.15). Thersander's "trenchant sarcasms against Leucippe" echo the established declamatory *topos* of impugning virginity (Anderson 1982: 26; e.g. Sen. *Contr*. 1.2.9-10; see Intro. 2.4.3). Morales (2004: 83-4) reads Thersander's "bathetic scepticism" of

Leucippe's "piety" as a realistic reaction that undermines the usual novelistic idealism, spoken, however, by the novel's villain, this opinion is discredited. **παρθένος τοσούτοις συννυκτερεύσασα πειραταῖς;:** 'A virgin after having spent the night with all those pirates?' συννυκτερεύω + dat. = 'to spend the night with', this compound (σύν + νυκτερεύω) occurs elsewhere only at Plut. *Dio*. 55.3.3 and may be a relatively late formation. Thersander highlights the sheer preposterousness of the idea with three follow-up rhetorical questions, each building on the absurdity of the one before. **Εὐνοῦχοί σοι γεγόνασιν οἱ λῃσταί;:** That a man would have to be a eunuch to pass up sex with a beautiful woman has already been established with regards to Clitophon and Melite (5.22.5, 5.25.8; Robiano 2017: 53 n. 24; on eunuch characters in the novels, see further Robiano 2017; and in the Second Sophistic, Richlin 2017: 417-23). AT uses the Attic term λῃστής and the later term πειρατής (and their cognates) synonymously as both 'brigand' and 'pirate' (cf. 2.17.3, 5.7.6, 6.16.5, 7.5.3, 8.16.1; see Ormerod 1924: 59-60; de Souza 1999: 3-12; Boulic and Létoublon 2014: 129-30). Nonetheless, the former is by far the more frequent, leading Mcleod (1961: 43) to suggest that the instances of πειρατής are a "slip" on our author's part; this, however, overlooks the sexual word play of the πειρα– root (6.13.1n.), which is deliberately employed throughout Bk. 6 to leverage the theme of metaphorical piracy (see also 6.22.2 with n.). In the novels, brigands and pirates represent the rough outer margins of society where important social identity markers such as status and chastity are either ignored or 'plundered' (on the topic, see esp. Hopwood 1998 and Dowden 2013; cf. 6.16.5 with n.). **Φιλοσόφων ἦν τὸ πειρατήριον;:** Previously Leucippe used πειρατήριον in the context of place, hence a 'pirate den' (6.13.1 with n.), but since Thersander is speaking of people here, it is possible to translate 'pirate gang' (LSJ s.v. II 2) coupled with the adnominal gen. (Smyth §1290, 1295), thus: 'Was it a pirate gang/horde of philosophers?'. But Leucippe picks up on the word πειρατήριον in her response (6.22.2), which is universally translated as 'pirate den', and so it is also possible to translate: 'Was it a pirate den of philosophers/den of philosopher pirates?'. Thersander is playing on the reputed sexual continence of philosophers (Morales 2004: 60), a notion that developed from "Plato's depiction of the philosopher as shibboleth for sexual abstinence" (Bartsch 2005: 67; e.g. Pl. *Symp*. 217a-219e; cf. Petron. *Sat*. 128.7, Quint. *Inst*. 8.4.23). AT (ab)uses this *topos* chiefly in his deployment of φιλοσοφέω (lit. 'to philosophise'), which is used on occasion of sexual temperance (5.16.7, 8.5.7) or self-restraint (5.23.7) (see Perkins 1995: 90-1), but at other times also of discussing sexual desire (1.12.1, 5.27.1) (on the slippage, see Goldhill 1995: 94-100). Compare also, the pirate who finds the virtuous suggestion of returning Callirhoe safely alive from her tomb as the absurd piety of philosophers (Charit. 1.10.4); while Dionysius, the 'anti-

Thersander', wrestles with his desire for Callirhoe, attempting to maintain philosophical temperance (Charit. 2.4.6). **Οὐδεὶς ἐν αὐτοῖς εἶχεν ὀφθαλμούς;:** Thersander's last question is the most scathing and evinces a rather satirically metafictive appreciation of his own sensual response to the sight of Leucippe (6.6-7). Compare Heliod. 1.4.3, where a beautiful appearance can cause even brigands to submit; or Long. p.1.4.1, where the narrator notes that none can escape *eros* as long as beauty exists and eyes can see.

6.22.1 Ἦ παρθένος, καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην· ἐπεὶ πυθοῦ Σωσθένους: 'A virgin indeed! Even after Sosthenes – go on and ask him!' The MSS give "εἰ παρθένος…", which could be retained if a comma is placed after Σωσθένην, and ἐπεί deleted, rendering her response: 'Ask Sosthenes if I am a virgin even after him (*sc*. his treatment)'. Fortunately, consensus is that this is a rather bland reaction, thus Gaselee opts for Jacob's "εἰμὶ παρθένος" ('I am a virgin!'), while both Garnaud and Vilborg adopt Lumb's (1920: 93) asseverative particle "ἦ παρθένος" ('A virgin indeed!'), that he suggests "would suit her passionate claim to purity" (cf. Wakefield's similar, but less compelling, "ναὶ παρθένος" in Vilborg's *app*. *crit*.). Although the verb εἰμί is perfectly acceptable, the particle is particularly apt: a strong affirmative, ἦ expresses the "subjective certainty" of speech, and in prose is almost always confined to dialogue (except in some combinations, cf. 2.7.6; Denniston, 279-80; cf. also 4.7.7, but the text there is equally problematic); it is also common in tragic avowals (e.g. Soph. *Ant*. 484, Eur. *Tro*. 424, 446), very much in keeping with Leucippe's pious theatricality here. παρθένος is notorious for its ambiguity of meaning, encompassing both 'maiden' (i.e. a young, unmarried woman) and a 'virgin' (i.e. one who remains sexually inexperienced), a deceptively fine distinction between social and sexual mores that nonetheless reveals the gulf between modern and ancient conceptions of the female body. This distinction, explored at length by Sissa (1990a and 1990b), pivots on the anatomic inscrutability of virginity in the ancient world, where the hymen was not the warrant of sexual authentication it is now considered. Therefore, loss of virginity could only be confirmed if caught *in flagrante* by a watchful parent (as Leucippe almost is, 2.23-28) or by the physical signs of pregnancy (Dowden 1989: 2; cf. 6.7.1n.). Thus, as Leucippe herself points out, there is no procedural examination for determining her virginity (εἰ παρθενίας ἔστι τις δοκιμασία, δοκίμασον, 2.28.2); and Thersander can taunt her as a 'false virgin' (ψευδοπάρθενος, 8.3.3) until the supernatural confirmation of Leucippe's virginity by the sound of pipes belonging to Pan 'the virgin lover' (φιλοπάρθενος, 8.13.3) issuing from the cave in which she is entombed (8.13.1-14.2) (see esp. Sissa 1990a: 83-6). This relentless engagement with the *topos* of virginity and its examination becomes almost an end in itself as

we are constantly invited to consider Leucippe's (im)penetrability (see esp. Goldhill 1995: 121-2; Ormand 2010: 164-8; Morales 2004: 212-4). **καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην:** advb. καί ('*even* after Sosthenes'). This reference to Sosthenes' attempts at sexual coercion (5.17.4) becomes the basis for the recitation of abusers (6.22.2), that culminates with Thersander himself (6.22.3). **ἐπεὶ πυθοῦ Σωσθένους:** Although an unusual construction, ἐπεί + imper. is by no means unheard of (e.g. Soph. *OT* 390, *OC* 969, *El*. 352, Ar. *Vesp*. 73, Lys. 12.39, Pl. *Gorg*. 473e5; cf. LSJ s.v. B 1; *BDAG* s.v. D B); this semi-elliptical use of ἐπεί is like that of γάρ and is considered a colloquial solecism that reflects the realities of direct speech (in which way it suits the particle ᾗ) (see Collard 2018: 144-5; Tzamali 2001: 388-9). In the Sophoclean examples ἐπεί "introduces a fact which proves the correctness of what has been said (and which was not previously known to, or adequately recognized by, the person addressed)" (Moorhouse 1982: 304), which suits Leucippe's tone here as she emphatically avers her virginity to the doubting Thersander. πυνθάνομαι + gen. = ask a person; cf. πολλάκις ἠθέλησα πυθέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Σωσθένους (6.16.2), on which basis O'Sullivan (s.v.) suggests reading "πυθοῦ <παρὰ τοῦ> Σωσθένους" here – though considering the idiomatic exuberance of Leucippe's response this addition is not strictly necessary. **οὗτος γὰρ ὄντως γέγονέ μου λῃστής:** Garnaud retains the μου of the MSS, thus 'he was my true bandit', whereas Vilborg opts for Hase's emendation of the dat. μοι, 'he was the real bandit to me' (so too Gaselee and O'Sullivan); considering that her remark here is a variation on Thersander's sarcastic question (εὐνοῦχοί σοι γεγόνασιν οἱ λῃσταί;, 6.21.3), the dat. seems the likelier choice. **Ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ… οὕτως ὑβριστής:** The demonstrative advb. brings the accusation home: 'not one of them was *this* wanton'. The adj. ὑβριστής ('violent/wanton/insolent) is not used frequently by the novelists, only here by AT and Heliod. 1.12.1, 2.16.3, 7.20.4 (cf. the equally infrequent adj. ὑβριστικός, 6.16.2 with n.). Leucippe's key defensive tactic thus far has been to undermine Thersander's masculinity and status as a noble, comparing him to his slave Sosthenes (6.18.6 with n.). Building on his sarcastic postulations, she takes it one step further, pointing out that both he and Sosthenes, in their attempts at rape, show less self-restraint than pirates, the stereotypical villains of the novels (see discussion Intro. 2.3.4).

6.22.2 ἀληθινὸν τοῦτο πειρατήριον: Leucippe now explicitly aligns the metaphorical piracy of love and seduction with her real experience of pirates with "the qualification of ἀληθινόν… a paradoxical way of underlining the fantasy of the metaphor" (Boulic and Létoublon 2014: 131-2). The image of the πειρατήριον ('pirate den/gang') and the threat (both real and metaphorical) that it poses to Leucippe is concentrated almost entirely in Bk. 6 (cf. 6.13.1,

6.16.5, 6.21.3 with nn.); however, shortly after, Clitophon employs the same expression to describe Melite's apparent murder of Leucippe (δύο ἐξέφυγες λῃστήρια, τὸ δὲ τῆς Μελίτης πεφόνευκέ σε πειρατήριον, 7.5.3), revealing his rhetorical hand. **Εἶτα οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε ποιοῦντες ἃ μὴ τετολμήκασιν οἱ λῃσταί;:** 'Are you not ashamed to do that which even the bandits did not dare!?' *sc*. 'to rape and/or murder her' (cf. 6.22.3 with n.); on the indignation expressed by εἶτα, cf. 6.21.2n. Parallels with Sen. *Contr*. 1.7.9 are evident (*Si parum est, fac quod ais ne piratas quidem fecisse*…; see Intro. 2.4.3), a distinct demonstration of how the threat of pirates/brigands and their savage behaviour found its way into the novels through declamation (which itself took inspiration from New Comedy; see Ormerod 1924: 260-6). Compare Dionysius' self-censure that he should attempt to do what even the bandit Theron refrained from (Διονύσιος ὁ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ περιβόητος ἄκουσαν ὑβριῶ, ἣν οὐκ ἂν ὕβρισεν οὐδὲ Θήρων ὁ λῃστής;, Charit. 2.6.3); or the bandits of Apul. *Met*. 4.23, who assure the virgin Charite that it is not rape for which they have kidnapped her, but ransom. That Leucippe places Thersander, not only on a level with his slave Sosthenes (6.18.6), but beneath even these dissolute outlaws, is meant to emphasise the depths of his delinquency. **Λανθάνεις δὲ ἐγκώμιόν… τῆς ἀναισχυντίας:** 'What you fail to realise is that your shameless conduct adds all the more to my acclaim'. ἀναισχυντία ('shamelessness/impudence') is generally used in the sense of transgressing social boundaries (e.g. Arist. [*Mag*. *Mor*.] 1193a3-9 = 1.29, Thphr. *Char*. 9), but in the novels this transgressiveness is "located [almost] exclusively on an erotic level" (De Temmerman 2007b: 102-3; e.g. 5.4.2, 8.10.8, Charit. 5.6.10, 6.2.8). Thus, Leucippe's reference to Thersander's 'shamelessness' here is not merely boorish behaviour, but (attempted) rape. Leucippe acerbically points out how Thersander, in his violent simple-mindedness, fails to realise that his shameless actions only enhance (πλεῖον) her acclaim in resisting him. On an extratextual level, it is possible to draw comparisons with the eulogizing of defiant Christians (e.g. Euseb. *Hist*. *Eccl*. 8.6.1), while on the intratextual level, scholars have read this comment by Leucippe as a metafictive cue to consider the entire novel as 'encomium' to Leucippe, a prompt to the *lector scrupulosus* to be alert for narrative aggrandizement (see both Morales 2004: 205 and King 2012: 156-7). In particular apposition is Clitophon's recapitulation of this incident to Sostratus, worth quoting in full: καὶ <u>οὐκ ἐμὸν τοῦτο ἐγκώμιον</u>, ὅτι φυγὴν ἑλόμενος οὐδὲν ἔδρασα ὑπὲρ ὧν ἔφυγον, <u>ἀλλ' αὐτῆς</u>, ὅτι καὶ <u>ἐν μέσοις λῃσταῖς ἔμεινε παρθένος</u> καὶ <u>τὸν μέγαν ἐνίκησε λῃστήν</u>, Θέρσανδρον <u>λέγω</u>, <u>τὸν ἀναίσχυντον, τὸν βίαιον</u>, 8.5.6. Clitophon's précis echoes Leucippe's words here uncannily, and while he emphasises that it is *her* encomium (ἀλλ' αὐτῆς), we are also reminded that it is Clitophon who is speaking (λέγω) (cf. Boulic and Létoublon 2014: 132, who identify this aside

as a "metalinguistic remark" on the piracy of love metaphor). **καί τις ἐρεῖ, κἂν νῦν μαινόμενος φονεύσῃς:** 'And even if you murder (*sc*. me) in your current mad rage, someone will say…'. μαίνομαι ('to rage with anger') shows an implicit understanding on Leucippe's part of the outcome of Thersander's psychological battle (6.20.1). The fut. more vivid gives a sense of certainty to the fulfilment of her pronouncement, the aor. of the subjv. indicating only that the action in the protasis precedes that of the apodosis (Rijskbaron §24.3.1). She imagines a 'someone' who will give her eulogy, which reads almost like an epitaph (cf. *Anth*. *Gr*. 7.351, 352). The possibility of Leucippe's post-mortem encomium also inspires a flicker of foreboding at her unexplained absence at the beginning of the novel. **Λευκίππη παρθένος μετὰ βουκόλους… καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην:** 'Leucippe was a virgin after the Herdsmen, a virgin even after Chaereas, a virgin even after Sosthenes'. Leucippe launches into her own imagined funeral oration, revelling in the repetitious paromoiosis. The anaphora of παρθένος is enhanced by its cretic rhythm which is supplemented at the end of each colon by the cretic endings in her list of assailants (…βουκόλους … Χαιρέαν … Σωσθένην); cf. the reversal in the climax, 6.22.3 with n. Omission of the copula ἐστί also adds to the urgency of the staccato paratactic accumulation. She recalls first the *Boukoloi* (βουκόλοι), those 'terrifying savages' (3.9.2) of the Nile Delta who enacted her ritual slaughter and anthropophagy. Next Chaereas, who, after exposing Gorgias and furnishing the antidote for Leucippe's madness (4.15; cf. 6.17.1n.), double-crosses them, employing pirates to abduct Leucippe from his native island of Pharos and (apparently) behead her (5.3.1-2, 5.7); later she explains (with some relish) that he was himself decapitated by a pirate whom he had offended (8.16.6). Penultimate is Sosthenes, whose physical torments she has already visibly withstood (6.20.4n.). Each example in her recitation – savage insurgents, duplicitous Egyptian, verbose slave – delivers a further blow in her degradation of Thersander. The list also acts as a brief synopsis of their adventures thus far, a common contrivance in the novels (e.g. 4.1.3, Charit. 6.2.10, 6.7.8-9, Heliod. 1.8.2, 2.4.1).

6.22.3 Ἀλλὰ μέτρια ταῦτα· τὸ δὲ μεῖζον ἐγκώμιον…: 'That is but the modest account, the greatest accolade will be…'. Her willingness to accept death instead of rape at Thersander's hands plays into the *topos* of the 'noble death' (i.e. dying for one's principles) and thus her murder would amplify her claim to honour, shaming Thersander in the process (Harland 2017: 137; e.g. X. Eph. 2.1.4, Charit. 7.6.8, Heliod. 1.8.3; cf. 6.22.4 with n.); further on the topic (though not including the novels), see Droge and Tabor 1992. **Καὶ μετὰ Θέρσανδρον παρθένος, τὸν καὶ λῃστῶν ἀσελγέστερον:** 'And virgin still after Thersander, a man more

beastly than any brigand!' Leucippe switches from anaphora to epistrophe with the crucial word παρθένος (still cretic in its rhythm), bringing Thersander's name to the fore as the target of her contempt, and placing the avowal of her virginity after to emphasise its continued preservation. The adj. ἀσελγής ('licentious/wanton/brutal') is essentially synonymous with ὑβριστής (6.22.1n.; cf. 8.10.2), also uncommon in the novelists, it appears elsewhere only in Dionysius' courtroom attack on Mithridates' allegedly adulterous designs on Callirhoe (ἀσελγής… καὶ τυραννικός, Charit. 5.6.7, 5.7.2). In the Attic legal orators, the term was used to describe particularly transgressive/violent behaviour (e.g. Dem. 2.19, 21.128, Lys. 24.15), the sense of 'insolent/impudent' was attached later (*DELG* s.v.; cf. also Lib. *Or*. 40.10, Plut. *Tim*. 13.5, Philostr. *VA* 4.42.18-19, 5.29.33). There is trenchant irony here in the verbal echoes with Melite's earlier charge against Clitophon as 'more savage than the brigands' (ὦ καὶ λῃστῶν ἀγριώτερε, 5.25.7) for *not* consenting to have sex with her. The implicit correspondence between Clitophon and Thersander as more dissolute than bandits is yet another way in which Clitophon (inadvertently?) discredits himself in his own narration (Jones 2012: 255-6); but it may equally discredit Melite's assertion as absurd. Leucippe's rebuke shows a warped echo of Callirhoe's pleas that Dionysius, a cultivated Greek citizen, not treat her as the tomb robbers did (Charit. 2.5.11). Compare, also, Callisthenes who takes great pains to assure Calligone he is not really a λῃστής, but rather of noble birth (8.17.3). Leucippe's impugning of Thersander's honour also finds parallel in the *Acta Alexandrinorum*, when plucky Alexandrian envoy, Appian, derides the tyrannical Commodus as a λῄσταρχος ('brigand chief') (a term Clitophon uses elsewhere of the leader of the *Boukoloi*, e.g. 3.22.2-5) and continues to undermine the emperor's εὐγένεια in comparison to his own (*AA* XI *P. Oxy*. 33 col. iv-v). **ἂν ὑβρίσαι μὴ δυνηθῇ, καὶ φονεύει:** 'if he cannot commit rape, he commits murder'. The pres. general conditional indicates a habitual situation (the iterative subjv.) with the sense of 'if ever/whenever' (Smyth §2335; Rijksbaron §24.3.2), characterizing Thersander as accustomed to this kind of violent escalation. φονεύω, repeated now in the pres. indic. in the apodosis, conjures the possibility of her murder that much more vividly.

6.22.4 Ὅπλίζου τοίνυν… ὁ σύμβουλος Σωσθένης: 'Well then, arm yourself! Without delay, lay into me with the lashes, the wheel, the fire, the blade – let even your confidant Sosthenes fight along with you'. With the resumptive τοίνυν ('well then'), Leucippe impatiently (ἤδη) returns to issuing instructions for her own torture, reiterating the list of instruments with slight *variatio* (τροχόν… μάστιγας… πῦρ… σίδηρον, 6.21.1-2). Sosthenes' role as *praeceptor amoris* (6.17.2n.; Intro. 2.3.5) is now confirmed. Considering the juridical and martial

overtones here, and the fact that σύμβουλος is used elsewhere in *L&C* only of the 'royal' president's councillors at the trial (7.12.1, 8.8.5, 8.9.10), it also reflects the language of legal procedure. Compare the political vocabulary of council deliberations found in the *Acta Alexandrinorum* (e.g. *AA* IV *Rec*. *A* col. i 15; with Tcherikover and Fuks 1960: 86 n. 42; cf. συμβουλεύω, 6.21.1 with n.). **Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γυμνὴ καὶ μόνη καὶ γυνή:** This is Leucippe's first definitive 'I' statement in her speech (her imagined encomium having been delivered in the 3rd person) and she continues in emotive polysyndeton, relishing the obvious homoioteleuton. The omission of copula εἰμί heightens the rhythm of this microtricolon of epithets; note also the *variatio* of adj. – adj. – subst. In this martial context the first descriptor, γυμνή, is primarily translated as 'unarmed/defenceless' (LSJ s.v. 2; cf. 3.13.6, Heliod. 9.12.2); however, the continued subtle eroticization of Leucippe's self-defence naturally conjures the primary meaning of 'naked' (see Intro. 2.3.2; cf. also, the description of Eros at Long. 2.4.1). **καὶ ἓν ὅπλον ἔχω τὴν ἐλευθερίαν:** Leucippe reaches new metaphorical heights in the weaponization of her own defencelessness. It is notable that she begins her avowal with firm emphasis on her continued status as a virgin (παρθένος) (6.22.1n.), yet it is not her παρθενία ('virginity') or σωφροσύνη ('modesty' *vel sim*.) that she declares inviolable, but her ἐλευθερία ('freedom'). Despite her admission that she is powerless in a way to resist Thersander's 'tyrannical' advances (6.20.3), "it is her will or consent that is to be the final arbiter of the self" (Shaw 1996: 271). In the 'martyrdom of Leucippe' the higher power she calls on in her darkest hour is her own intrinsic belief in her personal liberty and it is clear that the change in her status from free woman to slave is considered just as much a threat to her identity as the constant attacks on her παρθενία (e.g. 5.17.3, 6.16.4 with n., 8.1.2; cf. Charit. 2.3.6, 2.5.12; see Konstan 1994: 53 n. 53). In this sense she bears much in common with the ill-fated heroines of tragedy (e.g. Eur. *Hec*. 550-3, *IA* 1374-1401), the high-mindedness of the philosophers (e.g. Epict. 4.1.172-3), or the Christian sentiment that suffering and death for Christ will grant one liberty (e.g. Ignat. *Ep*. *ad Rom*. IV.4.3). **ἢ μήτε πληγαῖς κατακόπτεται μήτε σιδήρῳ κατατέμνεται μήτε πυρὶ κατακαίεται:** The trochaic anaphora of the negative particle complements the anaphora of the κατά- compound verbs with their natural cretic endings (cf. 6.21.1n.), heightening the already repetitive paromoiosis. Her words here echo Habrocomes' proclamation of his inalienable liberty when defying Manto to torture him (X. Eph. 2.4.4), reflecting the Latin literary *topos* of the "distinction between the violated body and unviolated mind, will or spirit" (Morales 2004: 203 with refs.; cf. also Heliod. 8.6.4). Leucippe's tricolic vision of violence – battery, laceration, burning – echoes her earlier avowal to triumph over the same tortures (6.21.1-2), and the implication is that Leucippe and her 'freedom' (the subj.

of the pass. verbs here) are indivisible, which she affirms in the following sentence. **Οὐκ ἀφήσω ποτὲ ταύτην** (*sc*. τὴν ἐλευθερίαν) **ἐγώ:** 'Never shall I relinquish it (*sc*. my freedom)!' Leucippe closes her 'I' statements by positioning the first-person pronoun at the end of her declaration, part of a rhythmic cretic that foregrounds her personal autonomy in the matter. **Κἂν καταφλέγῃς, οὐχ οὕτως θερμὸν εὑρήσεις τὸ πῦρ:** 'Even if you set it ablaze, you will not find the fire hot enough!' lit. 'you will not find the fire so hot'. Still exploiting the anaphora of the κατά- verb compounds (and the latent cretic rhythm in the final clause), Leucippe once more turns to the fut. more vivid to envisage the uncanny failure to burn up her freedom (we are meant to understand "τὴν ἐλευθερίαν" again). The supernatural escape from immolation is part and parcel of the torture/sacrifice/martyrdom narrative wheelhouse (e.g. X. Eph. 4.2.8-10, Heliod. 8.9.13-14, 10.9.1-3, *APTh* §22, *passio Polycarpi* §15); however, the imagery of 'burning up', particularly with words of the φλεγ– root, is largely associated with the heat of arousal in *L&C* (e.g. 2.5.2, 5.11.4, 5.22.3, 6.18.1 with n.; cf. Whitmarsh 2011: 246), and so perhaps it is possible to detect a further narratorial eroticization of Leucippe's seemingly pious declaration. The MS W appends "Ἀχιλλέως λόγος ἕκτος" after τὸ πῦρ (see Garnaud *app*. *crit*.) indicating the end of the Book. It appears fitting to end Bk. 6 here given the rhetorical impact of Leucippe's perfervid pronouncement, as well as the change of narrative focus at the beginning of Bk. 7, where the thread follows Thersander as he flees the hut, dumbfounded by her performance, and his subsequent plotting against the imprisoned Clitophon (7.1; see Intro. 2.1).

Works Cited

1. Editions, Translations, and Commentaries of *L&C*

Brioso Sánchez, M. transl. (1982) 'Leucipa y Clitofonte', in M. Brioso Sánchez and E. Crespo Güemes eds. (1982) *Dafnis y Cloe; Leucipa y Clitofonte; Babiloníacas (Resumen de Focio y Fragmentos)*, Madrid, pp. 145-381.

Carney, T. F. ed. and comm. (1960) *Leucippe and Clitophon - Book III*, Salisbury.

Ciccolella, F. ed. and transl. (1999) *Leucippe e Clitofonte*, Alessandria.

Garnaud, J.-Ph. ed. and transl. (1991) *Achille Tatius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris.

Garnaud, J.-Ph. ed. and transl. (2013) *Achille Tatius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, rev. et avec introduction, notes et annexes par F. Frazier, Paris.

Gaselee, S. ed. and transl. (1917) *Achilles Tatius*, revised edn. by E. H. Warmington (1969), Loeb Classical Library 45, Cambridge MA.

Grimal, P. transl. (1958) *Romans grecs et latins*, Paris.

Guez, J.-Ph. transl. (2016) 'Achille Tatius, *Leucippé et Clitophon*', in R. Brethes and J.-Ph. Guez eds. (2016) *Romans grecs et latins*, Paris, pp. 403-564.

Hercher, R. ed. (1858) *Erotici Scriptores Graeci*, I, Leipzig.

Hilton, J. comm. (*forthcoming*) *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon, Books 3 and 4*.

Hirschig, W. A. ed. (1885) *Erotici Scriptores*, Paris.

Jacobs, F. ed. (1821) *Achillis Tatii Alexandrini de Leucippes et Clitophontis Amoribus Libri VIII*, Leipzig.

McLeod, A. M. G. ed. and comm. (1961) *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon - Book IV*, MA Diss. University of Natal.

Plepelits, K. transl. (1980) *Achilleus Tatios*. *Leukippe und Kleitophon*, Stuttgart.

Rojas Álvarez, L. ed. and transl. (1991) *Las aventuras de Leucipa y Clitofonte*, Mexico City.

Vilborg, E. ed. (1955) *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*, Stockholm.

Vilborg, E. comm. (1962) *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Goteborg.

Whitmarsh, T. transl. (2001) *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, with introduction by H. Morales, Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. ed. and comm. (2020) *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon, Books 1 and 2*, Cambridge.

Winkler, J. J. transl. (1989) ‘Achilles Tatius *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, in B. P. Reardon ed. (1989) *The Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley CA, pp. 170-284.

Yatromanolakis, Y. ed., transl., and comm. (1990) *Ἀχιλλέως Ἀλεξανδρέως Τατίου Λευκίππη καὶ Κλειτοφῶν: Εἰσαγωγή, Μετάφραση, Σχόλια*, Athens.

2. Secondary Scholarship

Alexiou, M. (2002) *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, 2nd ed., rev. D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos, Lanham MD.

Allan, R. J. (2017) ‘The Imperfect Unbound. A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Greek Aspect’, in K. Bentein, M. Janse, and J. Soltic eds. (2017) *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 100-130.

Anderson, G. A. (1976) *Studies in Lucian’s Comic Fiction*, Leiden.

Anderson, G. A. (1979) ‘The Mystic Pomegranate and the Vine of Sodom: Achilles Tatius 3.6’, *AJPh* 100 (4): 516-518.

Anderson, G. A. (1982) *Eros Sophistes – Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico CA.

Anderson, G. A. (1984) *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*, London and Sydney.

Anderson, G. A. (1992) ‘Review: *Achille Tatius d’Alexandrie, Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon* by Jean-Philippe Garnaud’, *CR* 42 (2): 439.

Anderson, G. A. (1993) *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London and New York NY.

Anderson, G. A. (1997) ‘Perspectives on Achilles Tatius’, *ANRW* II 34.3, Berlin and New York NY, pp. 2278-2299.

Armstrong, D. and McOsker, M. (2020) *Philodemus, On Anger: Introduction, Greek Text and Translation*, Atlanta GA.

Arnold, I. R. (1972) ‘Festivals of Ephesus’, *AJA* 76 (1): 17-22.

Arnott, W.G. (1973) ‘Imitation, Variation, Exploitation: a Study in Aristaenetus’, *GRBS* 14 (2): 197-211.

Arnott, W. G. (2010) ‘Middle Comedy’, in G. W. Dobrov ed. (2010) *Brill’s Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 279-332.

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A., and Corcella, A. eds. (2011) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford.

Bain, D. (1977) *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*, Oxford.

Baker, A. J. E. (2016) 'The Spell of Achilles Tatius: Magic and Metafiction in *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *AncNarr* 13: 103-137.

Baker, A. J. E. (2018) '*Theama Kainon*: Reading Natural History in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in Futre Pinheiro, Konstan, and MacQueen eds. (2018): 51-64.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, transl. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Austin TX and London.

Ballengee, J. R. (2009) *The Wound and the Witness: The Rhetoric of Torture*, Albany NY.

Barrett, W. S. (1964) *Euripides Hippolytos*, Oxford.

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

Bartsch, S. (2005) 'Eros and the Roman Philosopher', in S. Bartsch and T. Bartscherer eds. (2005) *Erotikon: Essays on Eros, Ancient and Modern*, Chicago IL and London.

Bartsch, S. (2006) *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*, Chicago IL and London.

Baumgarten, R. (2009) 'Dangerous Tears? Platonic Provocations and Aristotelian Answers', in Fögen ed. (2009): 85-104.

Beard, M. and Henderson, J. (2001) *Classical Art from Greece to Rome*, Oxford.

Beare, J. I. (1906) *Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition from Alcmaeon to Aristotle*, Oxford.

Billault, A. (2006) 'Rhétorique et récit dans le roman d'Achille Tatius', in B. Pouderon, J. Peigney, and C. Bost-Pouderon eds. (2006) *Discours et débats dans l'ancien roman. Actes du colloque de Tours, 21-23 octobre 2004*, Lyon, pp. 77-86.

Billault, A. (2009) 'Remarques sur la jalousie dans les romans grecs antiques', in C. Bost-Pouderon and B. Pouderon eds. (2009) *Passions, vertus et vices dans l'ancien roman. Actes du colloque de Tours, 19-21 octobre 2006*, Lyon, pp. 171-184.

Billault, A. (2019) 'Achilles Tatius, Slaves, and Masters', in Panayotakis and Paschalis eds. (2019): 95-105.

Biraud, M. (1995) 'La répétition dans trois descriptions de Leucippé et Clitophon d'Achille Tatius', *L'Information Grammaticale* 64: 32-35.

Birchall, J. (1996) 'The Lament as Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel', *GCN* 7: 1-17.

Bird, R. (2019) 'Achilles Tatius and Chariton: Reflections and Refractions', *Mnemosyne* 72: 471-487.

Bird, R. (2020) *Sophrosune in the Greek Novel: Reading Reactions to Desire*, London and New York NY.

Blouin, K. (2014) *Triangular Landscapes: Environment, Society, and the State in the Nile Delta under Roman Rule*, Oxford.

Bobzien, S. (2005) 'The Stoics on Fallacies of Equivocation', in D. Frede and B. Inwood eds. (2005) *Language and Learning: Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age, Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum*, Cambridge, pp. 239-273.

Borg, B. E. ed. (2004) *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin and New York NY.

Bossu, A. (2015) 'Steadfast and Shrewd Heroines: The Defence of Chastity in the Latin post-Nicene Passions and the Greek Novels', *AncNarr* 12: 91-128.

Bouffartigue, J. (2001) 'Un triangle symbolique. Eros, Aphrodite et Artémis dans le roman de *Leucippé et Clitophon*', in A. Billault ed. (2001) *Ὄπωρα: la belle saison de l'hellénisme. Études de littérature antique offertes au Recteur Jacques Bompaire*, Paris, pp. 125-138.

Boulic, N. and Létoublon, L. (2014) 'Pirates in the Library', in Futre Pinheiro, Schmeling, and Cueva eds. (2014): 125-141.

Bowersock, G. W. ed. (1974) *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: Papers Presented to the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association*, University Park PA.

Bowersock, G. W. (1994) *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley CA.

Bowersock, G. W. (1995) *Martyrdom and Rome*, Cambridge.

Bowie, E. L. (1987) 'The Greek Novel', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox eds. (1987) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. 1: Greek Literature*, Cambridge, pp. 683-699.

Bowie, E. L. (1994) 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in Tatum ed. (1994): 435-459.

Bowie, E. L. (2019) *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge.

Bowra, C. M. (1963) 'Arion and the Dolphin', *MH* 20 (3): 121-134.

Bremmer, J. N. (1998) 'The Novel and the Apocryphal Acts: Place, Time and Readership', *GCN* 9: 157-180.

Bremmer, J. N. (1999) 'Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus in Christian East Syria', in H. L. J. Vanstiphout ed. (1999) *All Those Nations…: Cultural Encounters within and with the Near East. Studies presented to Han Drijvers at the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday by colleagues and students*, Groningen, pp. 21-29.

Brethes, R. (2001) 'Clitophon ou une anthologie de l'anti-héros', in Pouderon ed. (2001): 181-191.

Brethes, R. (2007) *De l'idéalisme au réalisme: une étude du comique dans le roman grec*, Salerno.

Brethes, R. (2012) 'How to Be a Man: Towards a Sexual Definition of the Self in Achilles Tatius' Novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in Futre Pinheiro, Skinner, and Zeitlin eds. (2012): 127-146.

Brethes, R. (2017) 'Clitophon lecteur d'Ovide', in M. Biraud and M. Briand eds. (2017) *Roman grec et poésie. Dialogue des genres et nouveaux enjeux du poétique*. *Actes du colloque international, Nice, 21-22 mars 2013*, Lyon and Paris, pp. 133-148.

Briand, M. (2018) 'Achilles Tatius' *Ecphraseis* of Abused Female Bodies: Interplays of Gendered Metafiction and Intensity', in Cueva, Harrison, Mason, *et al.* eds. (2018): 127-150.

Bryan, J. (2014) '*Eikos* in Plato's *Phaedrus*', in V. Wohl ed. (2014) *Probabilities, Hypotheticals, and Counterfactuals in Ancient Greek Thought*, Cambridge, pp. 30-46.

Burkert, W. (1977) 'Air-Imprints or Eidola: Democritus' Aetiology of Vision', *ICS* 2: 97-109.

Burrus, V. (2005) 'Mimicking Virgins: Colonial Ambivalence and the Ancient Romance', *Arethusa* 38 (1): 49-88.

Buttrey, T. V. (1961) 'Dio, Zonaras and the Value of the Roman Aureus', *JRS* 51 (1/2): 40-45.

Bychkov, O. (1999) 'ἡ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροηή: A Note on Achilles Tatius 1.9.4-5, 5.13.4', *CQ* 49 (1): 339-341.

Byrne, S. N., Cueva, E. P., and Alvares, J. eds. (2006) *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel. Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling*, *ANS* 5, Groningen.

Cairns, D. (1993) *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford.

Cairns, D. (2005) 'Bullish Looks and Sidelong Glances: Social Interaction and the Eyes in Ancient Greek Culture', in D. Cairns ed. (2005): 123-156.

Cairns, D. ed. (2005) *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Swansea.

Cairns, D. (2011) 'Looks of Love and Loathing: Cultural Models of Vision and Emotion in Ancient Greek Culture', *Metis* 9: 37-50.

Cairns, F. (2005) 'Lavinia's Blush (Virgil *Aeneid* 12.64-70)', in D. Cairns ed. (2005): 195-214.

Calame, C. (1999) *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece*, Princeton NJ.

Calame, C. (2016) 'The Amorous Gaze: A Poetic and Pragmatic *Koinê* for Erotic *Melos*?', in V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois eds. (2016) *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual*. *Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song*, Vol. 1, pp. 288-306, Accessed on: 17 March 2020, stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1163/j.ctt1w8h2ct.17

Cameron, A. (2009) 'Young Achilles in the Roman World', *JRS* 99: 1-22.

Carey, C. (1993) 'Return of the Radish, or Just When You Thought It Safe to Go Back into the Kitchen', *LCM* 18 (4): 53-55.

Carey, C. (1995) 'Rape and Adultery in Athenian Law', *CQ* 45 (2): 407-417.

Carey, C. (2004) 'The Rhetoric of *Diabole'*, in C. Balla ed. (2004) *The Interface between Philosophy and Rhetoric in Classical Athens*, Rethymno, pp. 137-158.

Castiglioni, L. (1923) 'Studi intorno ai romanzieri greci: Il Achille Tazio', *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* (4): 18-50.

Cautadella, Q. (1960) 'Note critiche al testo di Achille Tazio', in G. C. Sansonsi ed. (1960) *Studi in onore di L. Castiglioni*, Florence, pp. 171-177.

Cavallo, G. (1996) 'Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo. Maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere', in O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia eds. (1996) *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Cassino, pp. 11-46.

Chalk, H. H. O. (1960) 'Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus', *JHS* 80: 32-51.

Chew, K. (2000) 'Achilles Tatius and Parody', *CJ* 96 (1): 57-70.

Chew, K. (2003a) 'The Chaste and the Chased: ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ, Female Martyrs and Novelistic Heroines', *SyllClass* 14: 205-222.

Chew, K. (2003b) 'The Representation of Violence in the Greek Novels and Martyr Accounts', in Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen eds. (2003): 129-141.

Chew, K. (2012) 'A Novelistic Convention Reversed: Tyche vs. Eros in Achilles Tatius', *CPh* 107 (1): 75-80.

Chew, K. (2014) 'Achilles Tatius, Sophistic Master of Novelistic Convention', in Cueva and Byrne eds. (2014): 62-75.

Christenson, D. (2000) 'Callinus and *Militia Amoris* in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *CQ* 50 (2): 631-632.

Cioffi, R. L. (2014) 'Seeing Gods: Epiphany and Narrative in the Greek Novels', *AncNarr* 11: 1-42.

Cline, R. H. (1972) 'Heart and Eyes', *Romance Philology* 25 (3): 263-297.

Coleman, K. (1990) 'Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments', *JRS* 80: 44-73.

Collard, C. (2018) *Colloquial Expressions in Greek Tragedy*, Stuttgart.

Collins, D. (2008) *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*, Malden MA.

Colonna, A. (1994) ‘Nota su un codice antico di Achille Tazio (Marciano Gr. 409)’, in C. Curti and C. Crimi eds. (1994) *Scritti classici e cristiani offerti a F. Corsaro*, Catania, pp. 179-181.

Conca, F. (1969) ‘I papiri di Achille Tazio’, *RIL* 103: 649-677.

Connors, C. (2008) ‘Politics and Spectacles’, in Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 162-181.

Consonni, C. (2006) ‘On the Text of Achilles Tatius’, in Byrne, Cueva, and Alvares eds. (2006): 112-130.

Conte, G. B. (1994) *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius’ Satyricon*, Berkeley CA.

Cooper, K. (1996) *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge MA and London.

Corbeill, A. (2020) ‘Physical Excess as a Marker of Genre in the Elder Seneca’, in M. T. Dinter, C. Guérin, and M. Martinho eds. (2020) *Reading Roman Declamation: Seneca the Elder*, Oxford, pp. 115-133.

Cresci, L. R. (1978) ‘La figura di Melite in Achille Tazio’, *Atene e Roma* 23: 74-82.

Cueva, E. P. and Byrne, S. N. eds. (2014) *A Companion to the Ancient Novel. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, Hoboken NJ.

Cueva, E. P., Harrison, S. J., Mason, H., Owens, W., and Schwartz, S. eds. (2018) *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel, Volume 1: Greek Novels*, *ANS* 24 (1), Groningen.

Cunningham, I. C. (1971) *Herodas Mimiambi: Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Appendixes*, Oxford.

Darrigol, O. (2012) *A History of Optics: From Greek Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford.

de Brauw, M. (2007) ‘The Parts of Speech’, in Worthington ed. (2007): 187-202.

de Jong, I. (2004) ‘Introduction. Narratological Theory on Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives’, in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie eds. (2004): 1-12.

de Jong, I., Nünlist, R., and Bowie, A. eds. (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden and Boston MA.

de Souza, P. (1999) *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge.

De Temmerman, K. (2007a) ‘A Narrator of Wisdom. Characterization through *Gnomai* in Achilles Tatius’, *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics* (2007): 1-21.

De Temmerman, K. (2007b) ‘Where Philosophy and Rhetoric Meet: Character Typification in the Greek Novel’ in Morgan and Jones eds. (2007): 85-110.

De Temmerman, K. (2009) ‘A Flowery Meadow and a Hidden Metalepsis in Achilles Tatius’, *CQ* 59 (2): 667-670.

De Temmerman, K. (2014) *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Oxford.

De Temmerman, K. (2019) ‘Noble Slaves: The Rhetoric of Social Status Reversal in the Ancient Greek Novel’, in Panayotakis and Paschalis eds. (2019): 19-34.

Dickey, E. (1996) *Greek Forms of Address: from Herodotus to Lucian*, Oxford.

Diels, H. (1918) ‘Hippokratische Forschungen V. v. Eine neue Fassung des XIX Hippokratesbriefes’, *Hermes* 53 (1): 57-87.

Dinkler, M. B. (2017) ‘Narcissus Has Been with us All Along: Ancient Stories as Narcissistic Narratives’, *Frontiers of Narrative Studies* 3 (1): 33-49.

Dodds, E. R. (1965) *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantinus*, Cambridge.

Dodds, E. R. (1973) *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley CA.

Dollins, E. (2015) ‘Women’s Voices in the Lucianic *Onos*: The Tale of the ‘Edible Man’’, *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 61: 15-28.

Donnet, D. (1993) ‘Review: *Achille Tatius. Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. (Collection des Universités de France) by Jean-Philippe Garnaud’, *AC* (62): 295-296

Dörrie, H. (1935) *De Longi Achillis Tatii Heliodori memoria*, PhD Diss. University of Göttingen.

Dover, K. J. (1989) *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge MA.

Dowden, K. (1989) *Death and the Maiden: Girls’ Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*, London and New York NY.

Dowden, K. (2010) ‘The Gods in the Greek Novel’, in J. N. Bremmer and A. Erskine eds. (2010) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh, pp. 362-374.

Dowden, K. (2013) ‘“But there is a difference in the ends…”: Brigands and Teleology in the Ancient Novel’, in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013) *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 17, Groningen, pp. 41-60.

Droge, A. J. and Tabor, J. D. (1992) *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*, San Francisco CA.

du Bois, P. (1985) ‘Phallocentrism and its Subversion in Plato’s *Phaedrus*’, *Arethusa* 18 (1): 91-103.

Duckworth, G. E. (1952) *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*, Norman, OK.

Dunlop, J. C. (1888) *History of Prose Fiction*, Vol. 1, London.

Durham, D. B. (1938) 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CPh* 33 (1): 1-19.

Dyck, A. R. (1987) 'On *Digenes Akrites*, Grottaferrata Version, Book 6', *GRBS* 28 (3): 349-369.

Egger, B. (1990) *Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine*, PhD Diss. University of California, Irvine.

Egger, B. (1999) 'The Role of Women in the Greek Novel: Woman as Heroine and Reader', in Swain ed. (1999): 108-136.

Evans-Grubbs, J. (1989) 'Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (CTh IX. 24. I) and Its Social Context', *JRS* 79: 59-83.

Fantham, E. (1986) 'ZHΛOTYΠΙΑ: A Brief Excursion into Sex, Violence, and Literary History', *Phoenix* 40 (1): 45-57.

Faraone, C. A. (1999) *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, Cambridge MA.

Fisher, N. (2001) *Aeschines, Against Timarchos. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.

Fögen, T. (2009) 'Tears and Crying in Graeco-Roman Antiquity: An Introduction', in Fögen ed. (2009): 1-16.

Fögen, T. ed. (2009) *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, Berlin and New York NY.

Foucault, M. (1986) *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality*, Vol. 3., transl. R. Hurley, London.

Fountoulakis, A. (2001) 'A Theocritean Echo in Achilles Tatius', *C&M* 52: 79-92.

Fowler, R. C. (2017) 'Variations of Receptions of Plato during the Second Sophistic', in H. Tarrant, D. A. Layne, D. Baltzly, and F. Renaud eds. (2017) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 223-249.

Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. (1998) *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London and New York NY.

Frazier, F. (2013) 'Introduction, notes et annexes', in J.-P. Garnaud (2013) *Achille Tatius Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, rev. F. Frazier, Paris.

Fredericksen, E. (2018) 'In the Mouth of the Crocodile: Interiors, Exteriors, and Problems of Penetrability in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in Cueva, Harrison, Mason, *et al.* eds. (2018): 77-94.

Fries, A. (2014) *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus: Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Berlin.

Friesen, C. J. P. (2014) 'Dionysus as Jesus: The Incongruity of a Love Feast in Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe and Clitophon* 2.2', *HThR* 107 (2): 222-240.

Frilingos, C. (2009) '"It Moves Me to Wonder": Narrating Violence and Religion under the Roman Empire', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 77 (4): 825-852.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1996) 'Eros, Desire, the Gaze', in N. B. Kampen ed. (1996) *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, Cambridge, pp. 81-100.

Fulkerson, L. (2016) '"Torn Between Hope and Despair": Narrative Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Greek Novel', in R. R. Caston and R. A. Kaster eds. (2016) *Hope, Joy, and Affection in the Classical World*, Oxford, pp. 75-91.

Fusillo, M. (1991) *Naissance du roman*, transl. M. Abrioux, Paris.

Fusillo, M. (1997) 'How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler eds. (1997) *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton NJ, pp. 209-227.

Fusillo, M. (1999) 'The Conflict of Emotions: A *Topos* in the Greek Erotic Novel', in Swain ed. (1999): 60-82.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P. (2014) 'Heliodorus, the *Ethiopian Story*', in Cueva and Byrne eds. (2014): 76-94.

Futre Pinheiro, M.P., Konstan, D., and MacQueen, B. D. eds. (2018) *Cultural Crossroads in the Ancient Novel*, Berlin and Boston MA.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P., Schmeling, G., Cueva, E. P. eds. (2014) *The Ancient Novel and the Frontiers of Genre*, *ANS* 18, Groningen.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P., Skinner, M. B., and Zeitlin, F. I. eds. (2012) *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*, Berlin and Boston MA.

Gammage, S. M. (2018) *Atticism in Achilles Tatius: An Examination of Linguistic Purism in Achilles Tatius' 'Leucippe and Clitophon'*, PhD Diss. University of KwaZulu Natal.

Gammage, S. M. (2019) 'Atticism in Second Declension Nominal Categories in the Language of Achilles Tatius', *AClass* 62: 40-61.

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

Gerber, D. E. (1978) 'The Female Breast in Greek Erotic Literature', *Arethusa* 11 (1/2): 203-212.

Gleason, M. W. (1995) *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton NJ.

Goldhill, S. (1995) *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (1997) 'The Language of Tragedy: Rhetoric and Communication', in P. Easterling ed. (1997) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge, pp. 127-150.

Goldhill, S. (2001) 'The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict', in Goldhill ed. (2001): 154-194.

Goldhill, S. ed. (2001) *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (2007) 'What is Ekphrasis For?', *CPh* 102 (1): 1-19.

Gomme, A. W. and Sandbach, F. H. (1973) *Menander: A Commentary*, Oxford.

Gotteland, S. (1997) 'La rumeur chez les orateurs attiques: vérité ou vraisemblance?', *AC* 66: 89-119.

Graverini, L. (2009) 'Apuleio e Achille Tazio. Una scena di caccia e una "regola aurea"', in F. Gasti ed. (2009) *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria*, Pavia, pp. 61-96.

Greenbaum, D. G. (2016) *The Daimon in Hellenistic Astrology: Origins and Influence,* Leiden.

Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S. (1914) 'P. Oxy 1250' in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, X, pp. 135-142.

Gronewald, M. (1976) 'Ein verkannter Papyrus des Achilleus Tatios (P. Oxy. 1014 = Achilleus Tatios IV 14, 2-5)', *ZPE* 22: 14-17.

Guastella, G. (2017) *Word of Mouth: Fama and its Personifications in Art and Literature from Ancient Rome to the Middle Ages*, Oxford.

Guettel Cole, S. (1984) 'Greek Sanctions against Sexual Assault', *CPh* 79 (2): 97-113.

Guez, J.-Ph. (2008) 'Happy Ending, Happy Beginning: la circularité romanesque et sa contestation par Achille Tatius', in B. Bureau and C. Nicolas eds. (2008) *Commencer et finir. Débuts et fins dans les littératures grecque, latine et néolatine*, Paris, pp. 335-346.

Guez, J.-Ph. (2012) 'Le royaume d'Aphrodite et la grotte d'Artémis: amour et chasteté chez Achille Tatius', in C. Bost-Pouderon and B. Pouderon eds. (2012) *Les hommes et les dieux dans l'ancien roman*, Lyon, pp. 33-54.

Hagedorn, D. and Koenen, L. (1970) 'Eine Handschrift des Achilles Tatios', *MH* 27: 49-57.

Hägg, T. (1971) *Narrative Techniques in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm.

Hägg, T. (1983) *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford.

Hägg, T. (1994) 'Orality, Literacy, and the "Readership" of the early Greek Novel', in R. Eriksen ed. (1994) *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, Berlin and New York NY, pp. 47-81.

Hall, E. and Wyles, R. eds. (2008) *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, Oxford.

Halliwell, S. (2008) *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity*, Cambridge.

Hancock, J. L. (1917) *Studies in Stichomythia*, Chicago IL.

Hardie, P. (2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*, Cambridge.

Harker, H. (2008) *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt: The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*, Cambridge.

Harlan, E. C. (1965) *The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and Its Application in Achilles Tatius*, PhD Diss. University of Columbia.

Harland, P. A. (2017) '"Do not deny me this noble death": Depictions of Violence in the Greek Novels and Apocryphal Acts', *AncNarr* 14: 129-147.

Harriott, R. M. (1982) 'The Argive Elders, the Discerning Shepherd and the Fawning Dog: Misleading Communication in the *Agamemnon'*, *CQ* 32 (1): 9-17.

Harris, E. M. (1994) '"In the Act" or "Red Handed"? *Apagoge* to the Eleven and the *Furtum Manifestum*', in G. Thür ed. (1994) *Symposion 1993: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Köln, pp. 169-184.

Harris, W. V. (2001) *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge MA and London.

Hartsock, C. (2008) *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts: The Use of Physical Features in Characterization*, Leiden and Boston MA.

Haynes, K. (2003) *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London and New York NY.

Heiserman, A. (1977) *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*, Chicago IL and London.

Henderson, J. (1987) *Aristophanes Lysistrata*, Oxford.

Henderson, J. (1991) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, 2nd ed., Oxford.

Henrichs, A. (1968) 'Achilleus Tatios, Aus Buch III (P. Colon. inv. 901)', *ZPE* 2: 211-226.

Henrichs, A. (1972) *Die "Phoinikika" des Lollianos*, Bonn.

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

Heseltine, M. (1918) ‘Review: Achilles Tatius by S. Gaselee’, *CR* 32 (5/6): 132.

Heslin, P. J. (2005) *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius’ Achilleid*, Cambridge.

Hilton, J. (2009) ‘Contemporary Elements in Achilles Tatius’s *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, *AClass* 52: 101-112.

Hilton, J. (2012) ‘The Theme of Shipwreck on (In)hospitable Shores in Ancient Prose Narratives’, *Trends in Classics* 4 (2): 274-295.

Hilton, J. (2018) ‘The Analgesic Elephant and the Black Rose of India (Achilles Tatius 4.2-5)’, *Mnemosyne* 72 (4): 1-24.

Hilton, J. (2020) ‘The Revolt of the *Boukoloi*, Class and Contemporary Fiction in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, in R. Evans and M. De Marre eds. (2020) *Piracy, Pillage and Plunder in Antiquity: Appropriation and the Ancient World*, London and New York NY, pp. 129-144.

Hock, R. F. (1997) ‘The Rhetoric of Romance’, in S. E. Porter ed. (1997) *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Leiden and New York NY, pp. 445-466.

Hoffman, D. (2008) ‘Concerning *Eikos*: Social Expectation and Verisimilitude in Attic Rhetoric’, *Rhetorica* 26 (1): 1-29.

Holzberg, N. (1995) *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, transl. C. Jackson-Holzberg., London and New York NY.

Holzberg, N. (1996) ‘The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe’, in Schmeling ed. (1996): 11-28.

Hopwood, K. (1998) ‘“All that may become a man”: the Bandit in the Ancient Novel’, in Foxhall and Salmon eds. (1998): 195-204.

Hunt, Y. (2008) ‘Roman Pantomime Libretti and their Greek Themes: The Role of Augustus in the Romanization of the Greek Classics’, in Hall and Wyles eds. (2008): 169-184.

Hunter, R. L. (1983) *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge.

Hunter, R. L. (2012) *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature: The Silent Stream*, Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G. O. (2018) *Plutarch’s Rhythmic Prose*, Oxford.

Ierodiakonou, K. (2006) ‘Stoic Logic’, in M. L. Gill and P. Pellegrin eds. (2006) *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, Oxford, pp. 505-529.

Imbert, C. (1980) ‘Stoic Logic and Alexandrian Poetics’, in M. Schofield, M. Burnyeat, and J. Barnes eds. (1980) *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology*, Oxford, pp. 182-216.

Immendörfer, M. (2017) *Ephesians and Artemis: The Cult of the Great Goddess of Ephesus as the Epistle’s Context*, Tübingen.

Irwin, E. (1974) *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*, Toronto.

Jackson, J. (1935) ‘The Greek Novelists: Miscellanea-II’, *CQ* 29 (2): 96-112.

Jaeger, W. (1959) ‘Echo eines unerkannten Tragikerfragments in Clemens’ Brief an die Korinther’, *RhM* 102 (4): 330-340.

Jebb, R. C. (1885) *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose. Vol. 2: The Oedipus Coloneus*, Cambridge.

Jebb, R. C. (1921) *The Trachinae of Sophocles. A Commentary*, abridged edn., Cambridge.

Jeffreys, E. (2010) *Four Byzantine Novels: Translated with Introductions and Notes*, Liverpool.

Jolowicz, D. (2021) *Latin Poetry in the Ancient Greek Novels*, Oxford.

Jones, M. (2012) *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Oxford.

Jones, M. (*forthcoming*) ‘The Lover in the Painting: (Meta)Fiction from Art in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, in J. R. Morgan and I. D. Repath eds. (*forthcoming*) *Where the Truth Lies: Fiction and Metafiction in Ancient Narrative*, *ANS*, Accessed On: 12 February 2020, URL: http://lamp.academia.edu.MerielJones

Kanavou, N. (2022) ‘Textual Notes on Achilles Tatius’, *CQ* (*FirstView*): 1-8.

Kanellou, M. (2013) ‘Lamp and Erotic Epigram: How an Object Sheds Light on the Lover’s Emotions’, in E. Sanders, C. Thumiger, C. Carey, and N. Lowe eds. (2013) *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, pp. 277-292.

Karakasis, E. (2016) ‘Petronian Spectacles: The Widow of Ephesus Generically Revisited’, in S. Frangoulidis, S. J. Harrison, and G. Manuwald eds. (2016) *Roman Drama and its Contexts*, Berlin and Boston MA, pp. 505-531.

Kauffman, N. (2015) ‘Beauty as Fiction in *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, *AncNarr* 12: 43-69.

Kehoe, P.H. (1984) ‘The Adultery Mime Reconsidered’, in D. F. Bright and E. S. Ramage eds. (1984) *Classical Texts and their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C. R. Trahman*, Chico CA, pp. 89-106.

Kennedy, G. A. (1963) *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton NJ.

Kidd, S. E. (2019) *Play and Aesthetics in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Kim, L. (2010) 'The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic', in E. J. Bakker (2010) *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Chichester, pp. 468-482.

Kim. L. (2017) 'Atticism and Asianism', in Richter and Johnson eds. (2017): 41-66.

King, D. (2012) 'Taking it like a Man: Gender, Body and Identity in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in Futre Pinheiro, Skinner, and Zeitlin eds. (2012): 147-157.

King, D. (2018) *Experiencing Pain in Imperial Greek Culture*, Oxford.

Kitts, M. (2018) 'The *Martys* and Spectacular Death', *Journal of Religion and Violence* 6 (2): 267-294.

Konstan, D. (1994) *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton NJ.

Konstan, D. (1995) *Greek Comedy and Ideology*, New York NY and Oxford.

Konstan, D. (2006) *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, Toronto.

Konstan, D. and Ramelli, I. (2014) 'The Novel and Christian Narrative', in Cueva and Byrne eds. (2014): 180-197.

Kussl, R. (1991) *Papyrusfragmente griechischer Romane*, Tübingen.

Kytzler, B. (2003) 'Der Regenbogen der Gefühle: zum Kontrast der Empfindungen im Antiken Roman', *Scholia* 12 (1): 69-81.

Laird, A. (2008) 'Approaching Style and Rhetoric', in Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 201-217.

Lalanne, S. (2006) *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*, Paris.

Langlands, R. (2006) *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.

Laplace, M. (1983) 'Achilleus Tatios, *Leucippe et Clitophon*: *P. Oxyrhynchos* 1250', *ZPE* 53: 53-59.

Laplace, M. (1991) 'Achille Tatius, *Leucippé et Clitophon*: des Fables au Roman de Formation', *GCN* 4: 35-56.

Laplace, M. (1993) 'A propos du P. Robinson-Coloniensis d'Achille Tatius, *Leucippé et Clitophon*', *ZPE* 98: 43-56.

Laplace, M. (2007) *Le roman d'Achille Tatios. «Discours panégyrique» et imaginaire romanesque*, Berne.

Lardinois, A. (2001) 'The Wisdom and Wit of Many: The Orality of Greek Proverbial Expressions', in J. Watson ed. (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek World*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 93-107.

Lebeck, A. (1972) 'The Central Myth of Plato's *Phaedrus*', *GRBS* 13 (3): 267-290.

Lefteratou, A. (2018) *Mythological Narrative: The Bold and Faithful Heroines of the Greek Novel*, Berlin and Boston MA.

Lehmann, W. (1910) *De Achillis Tatii aetate. Accedit corollarium De Achillis Tatii studiis Lucianeis*, PhD Diss. University of Wrocław.

Lehoux, D. (2007) 'Observers, Objects, and the Embedded Eye; or, Seeing and Knowing in Ptolemy and Galen', *Isis* 98 (3): 447-467.

Létoublon, F. (1993) *Les lieux communs du roman: stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour*, Leiden.

Létoublon, F. (2003) 'La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses', in Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen eds. (2003): 271-288.

Létoublon, F. and Genre, M. (2014) 'Respect these Breasts and Pity Me: Greek Novel and Theater', in Cueva and Byrne eds. (2014): 352-370.

LeVen, P. A. (2018) 'Doing Philosophy in the Elephant's Mouth: Three Readings of Two Ekphrases in Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, IV, 2-5', in Cueva, Harrison, Mason, *et al.* eds. (2018): 109-126.

Lewis, J. P. (1995) '"The Gates of Hell Shall Not Prevail Against It" (Matt 16:18): A Study of the History of Interpretation', *The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 38 (3): 349-367.

Liapis, V. J. (2006) 'Achilles Tatius as Reader of Sophocles', *CQ* 56 (1): 220-238.

Lindberg, D. C. (1976) *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler*, Chicago IL and London.

Lindenlauf, A. (2003) 'The Sea as a Place of No Return in Ancient Greece', *World Archaeology 3*5: 416-433.

Ling, R. (1991) *Roman Painting*, Cambridge.

Littlewood, A. R. (1979) 'Romantic Paradises: The Role of the Garden in the Byzantine Romances', *BMGS* 5: 95-114.

Liviabella-Furiani, P. (2002) 'Il corpo nel romanzo di Achille Tazio', *AncNarr* 1: 134-151.

Lovatt, H. (2013) *The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*, Cambridge.

Lowe, N. J. (2000) *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*, Cambridge.

Lumb, C. W. (1920) 'Some Readings in Achilles Tatius', *CR* 34 (5/6): 93-94.

Luz, M. (2014) 'The Erlangen Papyrus 4 and Its Socratic Origins', *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 8: 161-191.

MacAlister, S. (1991) 'Byzantine Twelfth-Century Romances: A Relative Chronology', *BMGS* 15: 175-210.

MacAlister, S. (1996) *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*, London and New York NY.

MacFarlane, J. (2000) 'Aristotle's Definition of "Anagnorisis"', *AJPh* 121 (3): 367-383.

Marinčič, M. (2007) 'Advertising One's Own Story: Text and Speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in V. Rimell ed. (2007) *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 7, Groningen, pp. 168-200.

Marini, N. (1991) 'Δρᾶμα: Possibile denominazione per il romanzo greco d'amore', *SIFC* 84: 232-243.

Martin, R. (2002) 'A Good Place to Talk: Discourse and Topos in Achilles Tatius and Philostratus', in M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis eds. (2002) *Space in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 1, Groningen, pp. 143-160.

Mason, H. J. (1990) 'Review: Collected Ancient Greek Novels by B. P. Reardon', *Phoenix* 44 (4): 383-385.

Mastronarde, D. J. (2002) *Euripides: Medea*, Cambridge.

May, R. (2006) *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage*, Oxford.

McDermott, H. (1989) *Novel and Romance: The 'Odyssey' to 'Tom Jones'*, Basingstoke.

McHugh, K. (2020) 'Euanthes and the World of Rhetoric in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *AncNarr* 16: 1-14.

Mcleod, A. M. G. (1969) 'Physiology and Medicine in a Greek Novel: Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *JHS* 89: 97-105.

Merkelbach, R. (1962) *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*, Munich.

Messeri, G. (2010) 'I papiri di narrativa dal 1893 ad oggi', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova eds. (2010) *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Firenze, 11-12 giugno 2009*, Florence, pp. 3-22.

Mignogna, E. (1995) 'Roman und "Paradoxen": Die Metamorphosen der Metapher in Achilleus Tatios' *Leukippe und Kleitophon*', *GCN* 6: 21-37.

Mignogna, E. (1996a) 'Il Mimo "Leucippe". Un ipotesi su PBerol inv. 13927 [Pack2 2437]', *RCCM* 38: 161-166.

Mignogna, E. (1996b) 'Narrativa greca e mimo: il romanzo de Achille Tazio', *SIFC* 14: 232-242.

Mignogna, E. (1997) 'Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3, 15-22): mimo e "pantomimo" tra tragedia e romanzo', *MD* 38: 225-236.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2009) 'The Readership of *Leucippe and Clitophon*: The Test-Case of the Anonymous Narrator', *Aevum(ant)* 9: 189-206.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2010) 'Rhetorical Displays of Knowledge in *Leucippe and Clitophon*: Animal Talk', *Prometheus* 36 (3): 263-283.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2016) 'Nonnus and the Novel', in D. Accorinti ed. (2016) *Brill's Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 549-573.

Mittelstadt, M. C. (1967) 'Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and Roman Narrative Painting', *Latomus* 26: 752-761.

Montiglio, S. (2013) *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*, Oxford.

Montiglio, S. (2020) *Musaeus' Hero and Leander: Introduction, Greek Text, Translation and Commentary*, London and New York NY.

Moorhouse, A. C. (1982) *The Syntax of Sophocles*, Leiden.

Morales, H. L. (2000) 'Sense and Sententiousness in the Greek Novels', in A. Sharrock and H. L. Morales (2000) *Intertextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford, pp. 67-88.

Morales, H. L. (2001) 'Introduction', in T. Whitmarsh transl. (2001) *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, Oxford, pp. vii-xxxv.

Morales, H. L. (2004) *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' 'Leucippe and Clitophon'*, Cambridge.

Morales, H. L. (2009) 'Challenging Some Orthodoxies: The Politics of Genre and the Ancient Greek Novel', in G. A. Karla ed. (2009) *Fiction on the Fringe: Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 1-12.

Morel, W. (1963) 'Zurn Text der griechischen Romanschriftsteller', *Gymnasium* 70: 545-548.

Morgan, J. R. (1993) 'Make-believe and Make Believe: the Fictionality of the Greek Novels', in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman eds. (1993) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Exeter, pp. 175-229.

Morgan, J. R. (1995) 'The Greek Novel: Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception', in A. Powell ed. (1995) *The Greek World*, London and New York NY, pp. 130-152.

Morgan, J. R. (1998) 'On the Fringes of the Canon: Work on the Fragments of Ancient Greek Fiction 1936-1994', *ANRW* II 34.4, Berlin and New York NY, pp. 3293-3390.

Morgan, J. R. (2004) 'Achilles Tatius', in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie eds. (2004): 493-506.

Morgan, J. R (2007) 'Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilles Tatius as Hidden Author', in Paschalis, Frangoulidis, Harrison, *et al*. eds. (2007): 105-120.

Morgan, J. R. and Jones, M. eds. (2007) *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 10, Groningen.

Morgan, J. R. and Stoneman, R. eds. (1994) *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London and New York NY.

Most, G. W. (1989) ‘The Stranger’s Stratagem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture’, *JHS* 109: 114-133.

Mouritsen, H. (2011) *The Freedman in the Roman World*, Cambridge.

Musurillo, H. (1954) *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*, Oxford.

Nails, D. (2002) *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and other Socratics*, Indianapolis IN and Cambridge.

Nakatani, S. (2003) ‘A Re-examination of Some Structural Problems in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, *AncNarr* 3: 63-81.

Nakatani, S. (2004) ‘Review: *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon* by Tim Whitmarsh and Helen Morales’, *Hermathena* 176: 83-88.

Nakatani, S. (2005) *Achilles Tatius and Beyond: Studies in the Reception of Leucippe and Clitophon in Modern Europe*, PhD Diss. University of Swansea.

Nesselrath, H.-G. (2016) ‘Sopater of Paphus and the *Phylax* Plays’, in G. Colesanti, L. Lulli, and R. Nicolai (2016), *Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture. Volume 2 Case Studies*, Berlin and Boston MA, pp. 25-40.

Nilsson, I. (2001) *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure: Narrative Techniques and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites’ Hysmine & Hysminias*, Uppsala.

Nilsson, I. and Zagklas, N. (2017) ‘“Hurry up, reap every flower of the *logoi*!” The Use of Greek Novels in Byzantium’, *GRBS* 57 (4): 1120-1148.

Ní Mheallaigh, K. (2007) ‘Philosophical Framing: The Phaedran Setting of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*’, in Morgan and Jones eds. (2007): 231-244.

Nimis, S. (1998) ‘Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel’, *Arethusa* 31 (1): 99-122.

Nimis, S. (1999) ‘The Sense of Open-Endedness in the Ancient Novel’, *Arethusa* 32 (2): 115-238.

North, H. F. (1993) ‘Emblems of Eloquence’, *PAPhS* 137 (3): 406-430.

Novikov, K. (2014) *Leucippe and Clitophon by Achilles Tatius: Rhetorical Figures, Narrative Tempo and Genres in the Greek Novel*, Tartu.

Núñez, L. (2019) ‘“Hidden Authors” and Framing Narrators: Intertextual Dialogue on Narrative Embeddedness between Achilles Tatius and Núñez de Reinoso’, in I. Repath and F.-G. Herrmann eds. (2019) *Some Organic Readings in Narrative, Ancient and Modern*, *ANS* 27, Groningen, pp. 299-320.

Nutton, V. (1973) ‘The Chronology of Galen’s Early Career’, *CQ* 23 (1): 158-171.

Obbink, D. and Trnka-Amrhein, Y. (2009) ‘P. Oxy. 4948’, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LXXII, pp. 119-122.

Ogden, D. (2002) *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: a Sourcebook*, Oxford.

Ogle, M. (1924) 'Dame Gossip's Rôle in Epic and Drama', *TAPhA* 55: 90-119.

Olson, K. (2017) *Masculinity and Dress in Roman Antiquity*, London and New York NY.

Ormand, K. (2010) 'Testing Virginity in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus', *Ramus* 39 (2): 160-97.

Ormerod, H. A. (1924) *Piracy in the Ancient World: An Essay in Mediterranean History*, Baltimore MD.

Oster, R. (1987) 'Holy Days in Honour of Artemis', in G. Horsley ed. (1987) *New Documents Illustrating Christianity*, Vol. 4, Sydney, pp. 79-80.

Oster, R. (1990) 'Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I. Paganism before Constantine', *ANRW* II 18.3, Berlin and New York, pp. 1661-1726.

O'Sullivan, J. N. (1977) 'On Achilles Tatius 6.6.3', *CQ* 27 (1): 238-239.

O'Sullivan, J. N. (1978) 'Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Achilles Tatius I', *CQ* 28 (2): 312-329.

O'Sullivan, J. N. (1980) *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*, Berlin and New York NY.

Owens, W. M. (2020) *The Representation of Slavery in the Greek Novel: Resistance and Appropriation*, London and New York NY.

Panayotakis, C. (2006) 'Women in the Greco-Roman Mime of the Roman Republic and the Early Empire', *Ordia prima* 5: 121-138.

Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., and Keulen, W. eds. (2003) *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden.

Panayotakis, S. and Paschalis, M. eds. (2019) *Slaves and Masters in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 23, Groningen.

Papadimitropolous, L. (2015) 'Erotic Transgression and Knowledge in Achilles Tatius' "Leucippe and Clitophon"', *QUCC* 110 (2): 153-173.

Parsons, P. J. (1989a) 'P. Oxy. 3836', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LVI, pp. 63-66.

Parsons, P. J. (1989b) 'P. Oxy. 3837', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, LVI, pp. 66-69.

Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S., Harrison, S., and Zimmerman, M. eds. (2007) *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings*, *ANS* 8, Groningen.

Paulsen, T. (1992) *Inszenierung des Schicksals: Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor*, Trier.

Perkins, J. (1995) *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London and New York NY.

Perry, B. E. (1967) *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley and Los Angeles CA.

Pfitzner, V. C. (1967) *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature*, Leiden.

Pierce, K. (1997) 'The Portrayal of Rape in New Comedy', in S. Deacy and K. Pierce eds. (1997) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, London, pp. 163-184.

Pizzone, A. M. V. (2013) 'The Tale of a Dream: *Oneiros* and *Mythos* in the Greek Novel', in M. P. Futre Pinheiro, A. Bierl, and R. Beck eds. (2013) *Intende Lector – Echoes of Myth, Religion, and Ritual in the Ancient Novel*, Berlin and Boston MA, pp. 67-76.

Plepelits, K. (1996) 'Achilles Tatius', in Schmeling ed. (1996): 387-416.

Poethke, G. (2002) 'Der Achilleus-Tatios-Papyrus P. Schubart 30 identifiziert', *APF* 48: 1-5.

Pouderon, B. ed. (2001) *Les personnages du roman grec: actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999*, Lyon.

Price, A. W. (1989) *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.

Puccini-Delbey, G. (2001) 'Figures du narrateur et du narrataire dans les œuvres romanesques de Chariton d'Aphrodisias, Achille Tatius et Apulée', in Pouderon ed. (2001): 87-100.

Rabau, S. (1997) 'Le roman d'Achille Tatius a-t-il une fin? ou Comment refermer une œuvre ouverte?', *Lalies* 17: 139-149.

Ramelli, I. (2001) *I romanzi antichi e il Cristianesimo: contesto e contatti*, Madrid.

Ramelli, I. (2009) 'Origen, BardaiṢan, and the Origin of Universal Salvation', *HThR* 102 (2): 135-168.

Rathbone, D. (2009) 'Earnings and Costs: Living Standards and the Roman Economy', in A. Bowman and A. Wilson (2009) *Quantifying the Roman Economy: Methods and Problems*, Oxford, pp. 299-326.

Rattenbury, R. M. (1933) 'Romance: the Greek Novel', in J. U. Powell ed. (1933) *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, 3rd series, Oxford, pp. 211-257.

Rattenbury, R. M. (1937) 'Review: *De Longi, Achillis Tatii, Heliodori Memoria* by Heinrich Dörrie', *Gnomon* 13 (7): 358-365.

Rattenbury, R. M. (1956) 'Review: A New Edition of Achilles Tatius', *CR* 6 (3/4): 229-233.

Reardon, B. P. (1971) *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècle après J.-C.*, Paris.

Reardon, B. P. (1974) 'The Second Sophistic and the Novel', in Bowersock ed. (1974): 23-34.

Reardon, B. P. ed. (1989) *The Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley CA.

Reardon, B. P. (1991) *The Form of Greek Romance*, Princeton NJ.

Reardon, B. P. (1994) ‘Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative’, in Morgan and Stoneman eds. (1994): 80-96.

Reardon, B. P. ed. (2004) *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: de Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*, Munich and Leipzig.

Reece, S. (2009) ‘Homer’s Winged and Wingless Words: ΠΤΕΡΟΕΙΣ / ΑΠΤΕΡΟΣ’, *CPh* 104 (3): 261-278.

Reeve, M. D. (1971) ‘Hiatus in the Greek Novelists’, *CQ* 21 (2): 514-539.

Reeve, M. D. (1981) ‘Five Dispensable Manuscripts of Achilles Tatius’, *JHS* 101: 144-145.

Reeves, B. T. (2007) ‘The Role of the Ekphrasis in Plot Development: The Painting of Europa and the Bull in Achilles Tatius’ “*Leucippe and Clitophon*”’, *Mnemosyne* 60 (1): 87-101.

Repath, I. D. (2001) *Some Uses of Plato in Achilles Tatius’ Leucippe and Cleitophon*, PhD Diss. University of Warwick.

Repath, I. D. (2005) ‘Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: What Happened Next?’, *CQ* 55 (1): 250-265.

Repath, I. D. (2007) ‘Emotional Conflict and Platonic Psychology in the Greek Novel’, in Morgan and Jones eds. (2007): 53-84.

Repath, I. D. (2013) ‘Yours Truly? Letters in Achilles Tatius’, in O. Hodkinson, P. A. Rosenmeyer, and E. Bracke eds. (2013) *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden and Boston MA, pp. 237-262.

Repath, I. D. (2015) ‘Cleitophon the Charlatan’, in S. Panayotakis, G. Schmeling, and M. Paschalis eds. (2015) *Holy Men and Charlatans in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 19, Groningen, pp. 47-68.

Reynolds, R.W. (1946) ‘The Adultery Mime’, *CQ* 40: 77-84.

Richlin, A. (2017) ‘Retrosexuality: Sex in the Second Sophistic’, in Richter and Johnson eds. (2017): 379-448.

Richter, D. S. and Johnson, W. A. eds. (2017) *The Oxford Handbook of Second Sophistic*, Oxford.

Robiano, P. (2002) ‘Lycénion, Mélité, ou la satisfaction du désir’, *Pallas* 60: 363-373.

Robiano, P. (2009) ‘Pour en finir avec le christianisme d’Achille Tatius et d’Héliodore d’Émèse: La lecture des *Passions de Galaction et d’Épistèmè*’, *Ant. Class*. 78: 145-160.

Robiano, P. (2017) ‘L’eunuque, un personage négligé du roman grec’, *AncNarr* 14: 47-68.

Roby, C. (2016) *Technical Ekphrasis in Greek and Roman Science and Literature: The Written Machine between Alexandria and Rome*, Cambridge.

Rogers, G. M. (1991) *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London and New York NY.

Rogers, G. M. (2012) *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos: Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World*, New Haven CT and London.

Rohde, E. (1914) *Der Griechischen Roman und seine Vorläufer*, 3rd edn., Berlin.

Rojas Álvarez, L. (1989) 'Realismo erótico en Aquiles Tacio', *Nova Tellus* 7: 81-90.

Rommel, H. (1923) *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios*, Stuttgart.

Rosenmeyer, P. A. (2001) *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*, Cambridge.

Rougé, J. (1978) 'Romans grecs et navigation: le voyage de Leucippé et Clitophon de Beyrouth en Egypte', *Archaeonautica* 2: 265-280.

Rudolph, K. (2016) 'Sight and the Presocratics: Approaches to Visual Perception in Early Greek Philosophy', in Squire ed. (2016): 36-53.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1996) 'The Rise of the Greek Novel', in Schmeling ed. (1996): 29-86.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (2007) 'Magic in the Ancient Novel', in Paschalis, Frangoulidis, Harrison, *et al*. eds. (2007): 38-56.

Russell, D. A. (1964) *Longinus' 'On the Sublime'. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.

Russell, D. A. (1983) *Greek Declamation*, Cambridge.

Russo, C.F. (1955) 'Pap.Ox.1250 e il romanzo di Achille Tazio', *RAL* 8 (10): 379-403.

Russo, C. F. (1958) 'Review: *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon* by Ebbe Vilborg', *Gnomon* 30 (8): 585-590.

Rutherford, I. (2000) 'The Genealogy of the Boukoloi: How Greek Literature Appropriated an Egyptian Narrative-Motif', *JHS* 120: 106-121.

Rutherford, R. (2005) 'Notes', in J. Davie transl. (2005) *Euripides: The Bacchae and Other Plays*, London, pp. 263-335.

Saïd, S. (1994) 'The City in the Greek Novel', in Tatum ed. (1994): 216-235

Sandy, G. N. (1979) 'Notes on Lollianus' *Phoenicica*', *AJPh* 100 (3): 367-376.

Sandy, G. N. (1989) 'A Phoenician Story', in Reardon ed. (1989): 809-812.

Sandy, G. N. (1994) 'New Pages of Greek Fiction', in Morgan and Stoneman eds. (1994): 130-145.

Santafé Soler, S. (2005) *Aproximación lingüística a la obra de Aquiles Tacio*, PhD Diss. University of Valencia.

Santafé Soler, S. (2010) 'Retórica en Aquiles Tacio', *SPhV* 12: 119-138.

Sanz Morales, M. (2006) 'The Copyist as Novelist: Multiple Versions in the Ancient Greek Novel', *Variants* 5: 129-146.

Sanz Morales, M. (2018) 'Copyists' Versions and the Readership of the Greek Novel', in Futre Pinheiro, Konstan, and MacQueen eds. (2018): 183-194.

Sapsed-Foster, I. (2021) *Anatomy and Spectacle in Imperial Greek Medicine and Fiction*, MA Diss. Kings College London.

Sassi, M. M. (2015) 'Perceiving Colours', in P. Destrée and P. Murray eds. (2015) *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics*, Hoboken NJ, pp. 262-273.

Scarcella, A. M. (1987) 'Carrateri e funzione delle gnomai in Achille Tazio', *Euphrosyne* 15: 269-280.

Schiappa, E. (1992) '*Rhêtorikê*: What's in a Name? Toward a Revised History of Early Greek Rhetorical Theory', *QJS* 78 (1): 1-15.

Schmeling, G. ed. (1996) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden, New York NY, and Köln.

Schmeling, G. (2011) *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*, Oxford.

Schmeling, G. (2019) 'Narrative and the Ancient Novel: The Human Imagination is Always a Form of Lying', in K. Chew, J. R. Morgan, and S. M. Trzaskoma eds. (2019) *Literary Currents and Romantic Forms: Essays in Memory of Bryan Reardon*, *ANS* 29, Groningen, pp. 3-18.

Schmid, W. (1894) 'Achilleus Tatios', *RE* 1: 245-248.

Schwartz, J. (1967) 'Quelques observations sur des romans grecs', *AC* 36 (2): 536-552.

Schwartz, S. (2002) 'Clitophon the *Moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel', *AncNarr* 1: 93-113.

Schwartz, S. (2007) 'From Bedroom to Courtroom: The Adultery Type-Scene and the Acts of Andrew', in T. Penner and C. Vander Stichele eds. (2007) *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourse*, Leiden, pp. 267-375.

Schwartz, S. (2012) 'Dressing Up, Dressing Down: False Enslavement in the Greek Novels', in S. Dubel, S. Gotteland, and E. Oudot (2012) *Éclats de littérature grecque d'Homère à Pascal Quignard: Mélanges offerts à Suzanne Saïd*, Paris, pp. 175-189.

Schwartz, S. (2016) *From Bedroom to Courtroom: Law and Justice in the Greek Novel*, *ANS* 21, Groningen.

Seaford, R. (2006) *Dionysos*, London and New York NY.

Sedelmeier, D. (1959) 'Studien zu Achilleus Tatios', *WS* 72: 113-143.

Sedley, D. (2002) ‘Zeno’s Definition of *Phantasia Kataleptike*’, in T. Scaltsas and A. S. Mason eds. (2002) *The Philosophy of Zeno: Zeno of Citium and his Legacy*, Larnaca, pp. 135-154.

Segal, C. (1984) ‘The Trials at the End of Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*: Doublets and Complementaries’, *SIFC* 77: 83-91.

Segal, C. (1992) ‘Euripides’ “Alcestis”: Female Death and Male Tears’, *CA* 11 (1): 142-158.

Selden, D. (1994) ‘Genre of Genre’, in Tatum ed. (1994): 39-64.

Sexauer, H. (1899) ‘Der Sprachgebrauch des Romanschriftstellers Achilles Tatius’, PhD Diss. University of Heidelberg.

Shaw, B. D. (1996) ‘Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs’, *JECS* 4 (3): 269-312.

Sheppard, A. (2014) *The Poetics of Phantasia: Imagination in Ancient Aesthetics*, New York NY.

Shorrock, R. (2001) *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Leiden and Boston MA.

Silverman, A. (1991) ‘Plato on “*Phantasia*”’, *ClAnt* 10 (1): 123-147.

Sissa, G. (1990a) *Greek Virginity*, transl. A. Goldhammer, Cambridge MA and London.

Sissa, G. (1990b) ‘Maidenhood without Maidenhead: The Female Body in Ancient Greece’, in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin eds. (1990) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton NJ, pp. 339-364.

Skinner, M. B. (2014) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*, 2nd edn., Chichester.

Slater, W. J. and Cropp, M. (2009) ‘Leukippe as Tragedy’, *Philol*. 153: 63-85.

Smith, A. M. (1996) ‘Ptolemy’s Theory of Visual Perception: An English Translation of the Optics with Introduction and Commentary’, *TAPhS* 86 (2): iii-300.

Smith, A. M. (1999) ‘Ptolemy and the Foundations of Ancient Mathematical Optics: A Source Based Guided Study’, *TAPhS*, New Series, 89 (3): 1-172.

Smith, A. M. (2015) *From Sight to Light: The Passage from Ancient to Modern Optics*, Chicago IL and London.

Smith, S. D. (2014) ‘From Drama to Narrative: The Reception of Comedy in the Ancient Novel’, in S. D. Olson ed. (2014) *Ancient Comedy and Reception*, Berlin and Boston MA, pp. 309-321.

Smith, W. D. (1990) *Hippocrates’ Pseudepigraphic Writings: Letters–Embassy–Speech from the Altar–Decree*, Leiden.

Sommerstein, A. H. (1998) ‘Rape and Young Manhood in Athenian Comedy’, in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon eds. (1998) *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*, London and New York NY, pp. 100-114.

Sommerstein, A. H. (2019) ‘Eavesdropping’, in A. H. Sommerstein ed. (2019) *The Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy*, vol. 1, Hoboken NJ.

Squire, M. (2016) ‘Introductory Reflections: Making Sense of Ancient Sight’, in Squire ed. (2016): 1-35.

Squire, M. ed. (2016) *Sight and the Ancient Senses*, London and New York NY.

Stephens, S. A. (1994) ‘Who Read Ancient Novels?’, in Tatum ed. (1994): 405-417.

Stephens, S. A. and Winkler, J. J. (1995) *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Princeton NJ.

Strelan, R. (1996) *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*, Berlin and New York NY.

Swain, S. (1999) ‘A Century and More of the Greek Novel’, in Swain ed. (1999): 3-35.

Swain, S. ed. (1999) *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford.

Swain, S. (2007) ‘Polemon’s *Physiognomy*’, in Swain ed. (2007) *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon’s ‘Physiognomy’ from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*, Oxford, pp. 125-202.

Tatum, J. ed. (1994) *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore MD and London.

Tcherikover, V. A. and Fuks, A. eds. (1960) *Corpus papyrorum Judaicarum*, Vol. 2, Cambridge MA.

Tilg, S. (2010) *Chariton of Aphrodisius and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford.

Todd, S. C. (2007) *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1-11*, Oxford.

Toohey, P. (1992) ‘Love, Lovesickness, and Melancholy’, *ICS* 17(2): 265-286.

Toohey, P. (2004) *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*, Ann Arbor MI.

Traill, A. (2008) *Women and the Comic Plot in Menander*, Cambridge.

Trapp, M. B. (1990) ‘Plato’s *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature’, in D. A. Russell ed. (1990) *Antonine Literature*, Oxford, pp. 41-175.

Trzaskoma, S. (2002) ‘Review: Achilles Tatius, Tim Whitmarsh, *Leucippe and Clitophon*’, *BMCR* 2002.09.31.

Tsouna, V. (2011) ‘Philodemus, Seneca and Plutarch On Anger’, in J. Fish and K. Sanders eds. (2011) *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition*, Cambridge, pp. 183-210.

Turner, P. (1960) ‘Daphnis and Chloe: An Interpretation’, *G&R* 7 (2): 117-123.

Tyrrell, W. B. (2005) ‘Sophocles Wins Again’, *CW* 99 (1): 21-24.

Tzamali, E. (2001) ‘Zur Verselbständigung von Nebensätzen im Altgriechischen’, *Mnemosyne* 54 (4): 385-392.

van Mal-Maeder, D. (2007) *La fiction des declamations*, Leiden and Boston MA.

Vergote, J. (1972) ‘Folterwerkzeuge’, in T. Klauser ed. (1972) *Das Reallexikon fur Antike und Christentum*, Bnd. 8, pp. 112-141.

Vessey, D. W. T. (1991-3) ‘Thoughts on the “Ancient Novel” or What Ancients? What Novel?’, *BICS* 38: 144-161.

Vogliano, A. (1938) ‘Un Papiro di Achille Tazio’, *SIFC* 15: 121-130.

Vogt-Spira, G. (1992) *Dramaturgie des Zufalls: Tyche und Handeln in der Komodie Menanders*, *Zetemata* 88, Munich.

Walden, J. W. H. (1894) ‘Stage-Terms in Heliodorus’ Aethiopica’, *HSPh* 5: 1-43.

Walker, A. (1993) ‘*Erōs* and the Eye in the Love-letters of Philostratus’, *PCPhS* 38: 132-148.

Watson, G. (1988) *Phantasia in Classical Thought*, Galway.

Webb, R. (1997) ‘Imagination and the Arousal of Emotions in Greco-Roman Rhetoric’, in S. M. Braund and C. Gill eds. (1997) *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, Cambridge, pp. 112-127.

Webb, R. (2006) ‘Fiction, *Mimesis* and the Performance of the Greek Past in the Second Sophistic’, in D. Konstan and S. Saïd eds. (2006) *Greeks on Greekness: Viewing the Greek Past under the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, pp. 27-46.

Webb, R. (2007) ‘Rhetoric and the Novel: Sex, Lies and Sophistic’, in Worthington ed. (2007): 526-541.

Webb, R. (2008) *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge MA and London.

Webb, R. (2009) *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, London and New York NY.

Webb, R. (2013) ‘Mime and the Romance’, in Whitmarsh and Thomson eds. (2013): 285-299.

West, M. (1973) *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique. Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*, Stuttgart.

West, M. (1982) *Greek Metre*, Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (1999) ‘The Writes of Passage: Cultural Initiation in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*’ in R. Miles (1999) *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, London and New York NY, pp. 16-40.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001) *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (2003) ‘Reading for Pleasure: Narrative Irony and Erotics in Achilles Tatius’, in Panayotakis, Zimmerman, and Keulen eds. (2003): 191-205.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005a) ‘The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre’, *AJPh* 126 (4): 587-611.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005b) *The Second Sophistic*, *G&R* New Surveys in the Classics 35, Oxford.

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

Whitmarsh, T. (2009a) 'Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works', in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis, and G. Schmeling eds. (2009) *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 12, Groningen, pp. 36-50.

Whitmarsh, T. (2009b) 'Performing Heroics: Language, Landscape and Identity in Philostratus' *Heroicus*', in E. Bowie and J. Elsner eds. (2009) *Philostratus*, Cambridge, pp. 205-229.

Whitmarsh, T. (2009c) 'An I for an I: Reading Fictional Autobiography', *CentoPagine III*: 56-66.

Whitmarsh, T. (2010) 'Domestic Poetics: Hippias' House in Achilles Tatius', *CA* 29 (2): 327-348.

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

Whitmarsh, T. (2011b) 'Hellenism, Nationalism, Hybridity: The Invention of the Novel', in D. Orrels, G. K. Bhambra, and T. Roynon eds. (2011) *African Athena*, Oxford, pp. 210-224.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013a) *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, Berkeley CA.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013b) 'Resistance is Futile? Greek Literary tactics in the Face of Rome', in L. Van der Stockt, P. Schubert, P. Ducrey, and P. Derron eds. (2013) *Les Grecs héritiers des Romains: huit exposés suivis de discussions: Vandoeuvres - Geneve, 27-31 août 2012*, Geneva, pp. 57-85.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013c) 'The Erotics of *mimēsis*: Gendered Aesthetics in Greek Theory and Fiction', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013) *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel*, *ANS* 17, Groningen, pp. 275-291.

Whitmarsh, T. (2018) 'The Flowers of the Meadow: Intrageneric Intertextuality in Achilles Tatius 1-2', in S. J. Harrison and T. Selliaas Thorsen eds. (2018) *The Dynamics of Ancient Prose*, Berlin and New York NY, pp. 115-130.

Whitmarsh, T. and Thomson, S. eds. (2013) *The Romance between Greece and the East*, Cambridge.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1907) 'Die griechische Literatur des Altertums', in K. Krumbacher, U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, F. Leo, *et al*. eds. (1907) *Die griechische und lateinsiche Literatur und Sprache*, Berlin and Leipzig, pp. 3-238.

Willis, W. H. (1990) ‘The Robinson-Cologne Papyrus of Achilles Tatius’, *GRBS* 31 (1): 73-102.

Winkler, J. J. (1980) ‘Lollianos and the Desperadoes’, *JHS* 100: 155-181.

Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Desire in Ancient Greece*, New York NY and London.

Winkler, J. J. (1994) ‘The Invention of Romance’, in Tatum ed. (1994): 23-38.

Wiseman, T. P. (2008) ‘“Mime” and “Pantomime”: Some Problematic Texts’, in Hall and Wyles eds. (2008): 146-156.

Wohl, V. (2012) ‘The Eye of the Beloved: *Opsis* and *Eros* in Socratic Pedagogy’, in M. Johnson and H. Tarrant eds. (2012) *Alcibiades and the Socratic Love-Educator*, London, pp. 45-60.

Worman, N (2008) *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.

Worthington, I. ed. (2007) *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Malden MA.

Wright, M. R. (1981) *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments*, New Haven NJ and London.

Yunis, H. (2011) *Plato Phaedrus*, Cambridge.

Zanetto, G. (2007), ‘Review: B.P. REARDON (ed.): *Chariton. De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*’, *AncNarr* 6: 150-157.

Zeitlin, F. I. (2012) ‘Gendered Ambiguities, Hybrid Formations, and the Imaginary of the Body in Achilles Tatius’, in Futre Pinheiro, Skinner, and Zeitlin eds. (2012): 105-126.

Zeitlin, F. (2017) ‘Longus and Achilles Tatius’, in Richter and Johnson eds. (2017): 405-419.

Zeitlin, F. (2018) ‘From the Neck Up: Kissing and Other Oral Obsessions in Achilles Tatius’, in Cueva, Harrison, Mason, *et al*. eds. (2018): 95-108.

Zimmerman, B. (1999) ‘Poetische Bilder: Zur Funktion der Bildbeschreibungen im griechischen Roman’, *Poetica* 31: 61-79.