



Swansea University  
Prifysgol Abertawe



## Swansea University E-Theses

---

# Playing the man: Performing masculinities in the Greek novel.

Jones, Meriel

### How to cite:

---

Jones, Meriel (2007) *Playing the man: Performing masculinities in the Greek novel..* thesis, Swansea University.  
<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa42521>

### Use policy:

---

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence: copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder. Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

Please link to the metadata record in the Swansea University repository, Cronfa (link given in the citation reference above.)

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

**Playing the Man:  
Performing Masculinities in the  
Greek Novel**

**Meriel Jones**

*Submitted to the University of Wales in fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.*

Swansea University

2007

ProQuest Number: 10805270

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10805270

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346



## Abstract

This study offers a literary analysis of the discourses of masculinity represented in the five extant complete ancient Greek novels, Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Its methodology draws on the work of sociological theorists such as Erving Goffman and Judith Butler. Goffman argued that identity is constituted by the performance of roles, through which we project idealised versions of ourselves. Butler applied the theory of performance to gender, arguing that gender is constituted by repeated performance, but that a full and wholly successful performance can never quite be achieved, resulting in a disparity between cultural ideals and lived realities. The study begins from the premise that such modern theories are appropriate for use in the analysis of imperial texts because those texts themselves demonstrate a contemporary fascination with notions of performance, and especially the performance of masculinity.

Chapter 1 examines the concept of *paideia*, intellectual and behavioural 'culture', which was probably the most important signifier of Greek masculinity in the intensely competitive world of the elite in the Second Sophistic. Here, the disparity between the ideals and the realities of masculinity is particularly striking. Chapter 2 explores *andreia*, a complex notion often inadequately translated as 'courage' or 'manliness'. We see that *andreia* operates symbiotically with *paideia*, and that although it is an attribute that may be evident in a man's appearance, it must nonetheless be displayed in action. Chapter 3 investigates how masculinity may be constituted or threatened by a man's sexual behaviour. It questions whether sexual identity in the novels is fixed or fluid, and explores the texts' negotiation of the Graeco-Roman notion of effeminacy. The thesis argues that despite their exclusion from their texts of large-scale contemporary issues such as Roman domination and the rise of Christianity, and although they are influenced by classical gender ideals, the authors of the Greek novels in fact engage in dynamic and sometimes surprising ways with markedly contemporary notions of performative masculinity.

## Declarations and Statements

### DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed ..... (Meriel Jones)

Date ..... 14/12/07 .....

### STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed ..... (Meriel Jones)

Date ..... 14/12/07 .....

### STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed ..... (Meriel Jones)

Date ..... 14/12/07 .....

## Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Declarations and Statements</i>	iii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
Introduction	1
<i>Why masculinity?</i>	1
<i>Defining masculinity</i>	4
<i>Discourse, identity, and performance</i>	6
<i>Nature and culture</i>	13
<i>Public and private</i>	14
<i>Masculinity in the Greek novels: some problems</i>	15
<i>i. Date of composition versus dramatic date</i>	15
<i>ii. Culture and the passage of time</i>	18
<i>iii. The influence of Christianity</i>	20
<i>iv. The effect of 'genre' and what remains of it</i>	23
<i>The structure and content of the study</i>	24
<i>A note on the term 'Second Sophistic'</i>	26
<i>A note on translations</i>	26
Chapter 1: <i>Paideia</i>	27
<i>Introduction</i>	27
<i>History and social context</i>	28
<i>i. Classical paideia</i>	29
<i>ii. Hellenistic paideia</i>	31
<i>iii. Second Sophistic paideia</i>	33
<i>The gendering of paideia</i>	38
<i>Female paideia in the novels</i>	40
<i>The age and aspect of the pepaideuменos</i>	45
<i>The pepaideuменos and kingship</i>	50
<i>The public display of paideia: the symposium</i>	53
<i>The self as audience</i>	57

<i>The display of paideia before family and superiors</i>	61
<i>The display of words</i>	68
<i>Paideia as erotic education</i>	72
<i>Paideia and anger</i>	75
<i>Chapter summary</i>	84
<b>Chapter 2: <i>Andreia</i></b>	<b>87</b>
<i>Introduction</i>	87
<i>Defining and contextualising andreia</i>	89
<i>i. Andreia and warfare</i>	90
<i>ii. Andreia and athletics</i>	92
<i>iii. Andreia and other virtues</i>	95
<i>iv. Andreia as metaphor</i>	98
<i>The gendering of andreia</i>	99
<i>Female andreia</i>	100
<i>Andreia by allusion and appearance</i>	110
<i>Andreia and deilia</i>	115
<i>Suicidal andreia</i>	122
<i>Andreia and autonomy</i>	126
<i>Wise andreia</i>	131
<i>Erotic andreia</i>	140
<i>The lover as soldier and athlete</i>	146
<i>Chapter summary</i>	157
<b>Chapter 3: Sexual Identity</b>	<b>159</b>
<i>Introduction</i>	159
<i>i. Homosexuality problematised</i>	160
<i>ii. The paederastic ideal</i>	164
<i>iii. Effeminacy</i>	168
<i>Resisting the paederastic ideal?</i>	170
<i>Performing sexual identities</i>	185
<i>Masculinity in peril</i>	197
<i>The faces of effeminacy: the moichos and the kinaidos</i>	213



<i>Becoming the woman</i>	221
<i>Chapter summary</i>	229
Conclusion	233
Bibliography	241

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost I want to thank my thesis supervisor, Professor John Morgan, for unfailing support and expert advice even through difficult times: ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἀνέθορε κάμπτατο χαίρων. My gratitude also goes to my second supervisor, Professor Ceri Davies, and to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, without whose funding this thesis would not exist.

My colleagues in the Department of Classics at the University of Wales Lampeter have been good enough to understand the pressures of finishing a thesis in the first year of an academic job; they were especially understanding during the summer months of 2007.

The following people have been kind enough to let me have sight of as yet unpublished work, or simply to say encouraging things: Ken Dowden and Alan Lloyd have been ever-supportive and kept the booze flowing at conferences or on nights out with the Swansea cygnets, and Daniel Ogden has continued to offer support from Exeter; David Konstan has sent me two unpublished articles, and although we have not yet met in person, he has been generous with his encouragement by e-mail; Costas Panayotakis has been similarly supportive; and Ian Repath has kindly lent me a copy of the manuscript of his forthcoming book.

The members of the KYKNOS *kyklos* have made the last few years a lot of fun: Gill Bazovsky (for ‘fig’ hysteria), Koen De Temmerman (for the neologisms ‘dillfish’ and ‘buggstress’), Phil Etherington (for the ‘Regina’ line, which still makes me laugh), Fritz-Gregor Herrmann (for having a surprising tolerance for poor-quality ‘German’ jokes), Sarah Maguire (*sui generis*), Saiichiro Nakatani (for not being afraid to enjoy the British way of life, even at the expense of his liver), Maria Loreto Nuñez (for being annoyingly unteachable in the matter of obscene English slang), and Maria-Elpiniki Oikonomou (for being ‘busy with her vegetables’).

These people have de-stressed me: Lisa Germano, Aimee Mann, Willy Porter, Bettie Serveert, Joseph Arthur, Fiona Apple, Iron & Wine, PJ Harvey, Icehouse, Cat Power, Regina Spektor, Elvis, Mew, Heather Nova, A-ha, Kristin Hersh, Ernest & Julio Gallo, Tori Amos, Elton John (pre-1984), Alanis Morissette, and Lamb.

And finally, thanks to my family, and especially to Chris Anderton, who deserves a medal for his organisational skills, patience, and forgiveness.

## Introduction

### *Why masculinity?*

The study of men and masculinities has been gaining headway over the last quarter of a century, but remains inchoate when measured against the study of women, which continues to attract vigorous scholarship.<sup>1</sup> Feminism has been viewed as the most influential political discourse of the twentieth century, and has led to the term ‘gender’ often being interpreted as referring to women alone (Whitehead & Barrett 2001: 3). As the study of gender is interdisciplinary, the corollary of a one-sided definition of the term is that the detailed study of men has been neglected across the board, including the field of classical scholarship. The feminist movement has had a somewhat paradoxical role in the study of masculinities, both contributing to and detracting from its centrality. It is frequently noted that although we have a vast corpus of evidence on which to build a reconstruction of the ancient woman, we have nothing that we might consider her authentic voice, since the material we possess is almost entirely male-authored (Just 1994: 1). The portrayal by men of the lives of women is therefore indirectly concerned with masculinity, for it is refracted through the male lens; consequently, the work of feminist scholars has explored to some extent the ‘non-neutral, politically loaded construct’ (Ormond 1999) of manhood in antiquity, attempting to bring ancient masculinity into sharper focus.<sup>2</sup> But while feminists have argued that masculinity is a construct in need of analysis, their prioritisation of the search for the ancient female voice – however admirable – has somewhat obscured the masculine: the often politically-driven feminist approach has attempted to see *through* the social and literary dominance of men in antiquity in order to see the women behind them,<sup>3</sup> with the result that men have rarely been the primary focus of scholarship, but rather the offshoot; the upshot of this is the relative invisibility of the masculine, despite its ubiquity.<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, it is only since the

---

<sup>1</sup> The still embryonic nature of masculinities research within Gender Studies is evidenced by a glance along the shelves of a library: in my institution’s library at the time of writing I found 3 shelves on gender in general, 3 on men and masculinities, and over 60 on women and feminism.

<sup>2</sup> Feminist studies devoted to masculinity, or edited volumes containing dedicated chapters on the subject, include Richlin (1992; see also 1993 and 1997), Hallett & Skinner (1997), and Wyke (1998).

<sup>3</sup> Feminist studies of women in the ancient world are too numerous to mention individually here; for an overview of the history of scholarship on ancient women, see Blok (1987).

<sup>4</sup> See Tosh (1994: 180): ‘In the historical record it is as though masculinity is everywhere but nowhere’.

growth of feminism that masculinity has migrated into the conscious realm, and been recognised as a research topic in its own right, worthy of problematisation (Horrocks 1994: 6, 12).<sup>5</sup> Feminism has thus played both a positive and a negative role in the development of masculinity as an area of research in Gender Studies in general and in Classics in particular.

In modern western society it may no longer be said that the literary voices we hear are predominantly male, yet men continue to wield most of the power in political and economic spheres, and may therefore still be viewed as the dominant sex. Such dominance has ensured that masculinity has been taken for granted, and has remained, to all intents and purposes, an unconscious part of our social, political, and psychological worlds. In the field of Gender Studies, the work of Gilmore (1990), Morgan (1992), Horrocks (1994, 1995), Connell (1995), and many others has enabled masculinity finally to begin to take centre-stage.<sup>6</sup> In recent years, interest in classical masculinities has also begun to take shape: Dover (1978), Halperin (1990), and Williams (1999) have contributed greatly to our understanding of male homosexuality;<sup>7</sup> Gleason (1990, 1995) has explored the influence of physiognomy on the behaviour of the elite male in the Roman period; Bassi (1998) has examined the negotiation of masculinity in the Athenian tragic theatre; in a new study, Roisman (2005) demonstrates the importance of notions of manhood in fifth- and fourth-century Attic oratory; in edited volumes, Rosen & Sluiter (2003) and Borg (2004) consider the various incarnations of *andreia* and *paideia* respectively;<sup>8</sup> and Foxhall & Salmon (1998a, 1998b) offer wide-ranging studies of the representation of masculinity in art, architecture, and literature.<sup>9</sup> Yet despite these

---

<sup>5</sup> For men's relation to feminism see Heath (1987) and Whitehead & Barrett (2001: 14).

<sup>6</sup> In April 2005 I co-organised an international interdisciplinary research student conference entitled *Masculinity as Masquerade: Men and the Performance of Gender*. The success of the event demonstrated that masculinity as an area of research is indeed beginning to gain ground in all fields. A further illustration is the establishment in April 2007 of a new research centre, the Research Unit on Men and Masculinities, at Bradford University (see the article by Melanie Newman (surely a *nom de plume*) in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* No. 1,788, April 6 2007).

<sup>7</sup> Winkler (1990), Thorp (1992), and Davidson (2001) have also done important work in this field, which will be the subject Chapter 3 of this study.

<sup>8</sup> Borg's volume concentrates on the expression of *paideia* through the visual media of art and architecture, rather than literature.

<sup>9</sup> In addition, the study of Christian, and predominantly New Testament, masculinity is gaining ground: see, for example, Moore & Capel Anderson (2003). Smythe's edited collection on masculinities in the Byzantine era is also forthcoming.

recent and significant contributions, masculinity in Classics still has some way to go before it may be considered the equal of its feminine counterpart.

As is the case in Classics more generally, the bulk of gender work on the ancient novel has concentrated on the feminine: Wiersma (1990), Elsom (1992), Egger (1994a, 1994b, 1999),<sup>10</sup> Kaimio (1995), and Johnne (2003) offer short studies of women in the Greek novels, while Haynes (2003) adopts a range of methodologies in a book which offers a social constructionist reading of the novels' female character-types.<sup>11</sup> In the last ten years, however, novelistic masculinities have begun to come to the fore, with several studies addressing narrow topics of the genre that fall within the ambit of masculinity: Hock (1997) considers male friendship in Chariton, Hopwood (1998) explores banditry in the novels in general, and Watanabe (2003a, 2003b) discusses friendship, homosexuality, and banditry in Xenophon of Ephesus. While these studies have begun to redress the balance, they have also served to highlight the gap in the market. Egger notes that commentators have often remarked on the apparent dominance of women in the Greek novels; she nuances such remarks by observing that the heroines' dominance lies only in their erotic appeal and emotional fortitude:

The narratives concentrate constantly on the attractiveness and emotions of their women protagonists, and in this sense are gynocentric, *but the world of romance is dominated in every other aspect by its men*. The novels work with the principle of *emotional gynocentrism*, but *factual androcentrism* (Egger 1994b: 272; emphases mine).

There is a need, therefore, for a more systematic investigation of this 'factual androcentrism'. There is also a need for some qualification of the concept of 'emotional gynocentrism': while the novels' heroines may readily be considered the centre of the texts' emotional life, that should not be taken to indicate that the novels' male characters have no contribution to make here; this much has already been demonstrated by Balot (1998), who offers an incisive examination of the effect

---

<sup>10</sup> All derived from Egger (1990).

<sup>11</sup> In addition, Cooper (1996: 20-44) explores the novels' female sexuality as a backdrop to the Christian and later Roman idealisation of virginity, and Maguire (2005) locates Heliodorus' Charicleia in the wider contexts of generic heroines, virginity, and female education.

of love on masculinity and self-image in Chariton's novel, a discussion on which I shall build later. But while Balot and the other scholars mentioned above have begun the exploration of the masculine in the novels, there is as yet no comprehensive discussion of the subject. Rightly recognising that no analysis of one gender can be supported without consideration of its opposite, Haynes (2003) touches on aspects of masculinity as a complement to her primary focus on the feminine; yet this can be no more than a superficial treatment. Lalanne (2006) engages with some elements of masculinity in the novels, such as *andreia* and *paideia*, but only for their relationship to her unifying theme, a reading of the novels' plots as rites of passage undergone by the central characters.<sup>12</sup> Again, the need for a devoted study makes itself apparent. It must be made clear from the outset, however, that I make no claim to completeness here: this is not, and cannot be, an exhaustive study, and I shall explain at the end of the Introduction the structure of the discussion, and the discourses chosen for analysis. My aim is to open the way further for research on the multifarious masculinities of the imperial age, by means of an analysis of the discourses of masculinity that lie both in and between the lines of the Greek novels. Before this task can begin, the terms of reference must be defined.

#### *Defining 'masculinity'.*

'Masculinity', to the extent that the term can be briefly defined at all, is simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture (Connell 2001: 33).

Connell explains that 'masculinity' only exists by virtue of its contrast with 'femininity', and vice versa. It is the belief that men and women possess polarised character types that gives rise to the opposing concepts of 'masculinity' and 'femininity'. Masculine identities are thus constructed through the concept of alterity,<sup>13</sup> and masculinity is an expression of the current images men have of themselves in relation to women, images which may be contradictory and ambivalent (Brittan 2001: 52), exhibiting tensions and fractures. To this I would add

---

<sup>12</sup> The concepts of *paideia* and *andreia* will receive much fuller treatment in Chapters 1 and 2 of this study.

<sup>13</sup> See Phillips & Jørgensen (2002: 43) and Laclau & Mouffe (1985: 127ff.) on identity through alterity, the latter drawing on a Lacanian model.

that such images are produced not only in relation to women, but also in relation to other men, creating a division between the discourse of hegemonic masculinity and those of various subordinated masculinities. The term ‘hegemonic’ refers to the form of masculine expression that receives cultural sanction, and by which particular groups of men hold and legitimate positions of power and wealth in society (Carrigan *et al.* 2002: 112). Men who obviously deviate from this culturally sanctioned masculinity are expelled from the circle of legitimacy, and thus subordinated. So, for example, within the contemporary Anglo-American discourse of hegemonic masculinity, the heterosexual male is idealised and the homosexual male to some extent ostracised. As a subdivision within masculinity, hegemony refers to a historical situation, ‘a set of circumstances in which power is won and held’ (*ibid.* 114), and so it is subject to change over time. By assuming whatever are the current socially dominant forms of male behaviour, men achieve association with other men, and differentiation from the ‘Other’ (Whitehead & Barrett 2001: 20), whether that be women or subordinated men. As masculinity is understood in opposition to femininity and to subordinated versions of itself, any exploration of it must consider those alternatives to some degree. Consequently, this study will examine the extent to which the novels’ gender discourses are established through the construction of gendered opposites.

It will be understood from what has been written so far that masculinity reflects social and cultural expectations of male behaviour: it is socially and culturally constructed.<sup>14</sup> Hence it is not a fixed, immutable entity, but may change over time, space, and in the course of an individual’s life (Whitehead & Barrett 2001: 8). Such contingency ought to alert us to the problems of assuming transhistorical truths about masculinity. To illustrate the historically fluid nature of masculinity, Brittan (2001: 51) and others use the plural, ‘masculinities’, underscoring gender’s potential to alter in relatively short time spans. There is no one homogeneous ‘masculinity’ at any one time, but a multitude of ‘masculinities’, and a man may be a different person in different situations and with different people (Horrocks 1994: 5). In explaining the protean nature of gender, Connell (2002: 246) describes the way in which cultural changes may give rise to new understandings of sexuality and gender

---

<sup>14</sup> See Whitehead & Barrett (2001: 16) and Burr’s four premises of social constructionist approaches (1995: 2-5).

expression. He provides the example of the disruption of mediaeval Catholicism by the spread of Renaissance secular culture, which led to marital heterosexuality replacing monastic denial as a masculine ideal. As he makes clear, we should not hope to find linearity in the history of masculinity, but rather a complex network of gender relations, always subject to the forces of social, cultural, and historical specificity. To modern western sensibilities the term ‘masculinity’ has meaning, since we have identified certain social behaviours and categorised them as ‘masculine’. Yet, as Haywood & Mac an Ghail (2003: 90) stress, we should not extrapolate our understandings to other cultures, where analytical and conceptual categories are likely to differ from ours. The culture in any one place may change over time, while different geographical locations may propagate different cultures contemporaneously. This must bear on any study of ancient masculinities, which will require an appreciation of the cultural, as well as the historical, contingency of gender expression. But as Tosh (1994: 194) remarks, gender is not simply a social construction, but is also in part a subjective identity: cultural constraint and individual subjectivity both have roles to play in the creation of a gendered identity. These issues lead us now to a discussion of the study’s methodology and focus.

#### *Discourse, identity, and performance.*

Until now I have freely used the word ‘discourse’, and throughout the study I shall employ the methodology of discourse analysis; these terms require further explanation. Phillips & Jørgensen (2002: 1) state that: ‘[A discourse is] a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)’. They propound the social constructionist view that discourse is not a neutral reflection of the world, but actually impinges upon it and causes change, and that what we think we know about the world – what we might call ‘taken-for-granted knowledge’ – is a product of discourse. On the basis of the above discussion of masculinity, we might say that ‘masculinity’ is the ‘order of discourse’ within which many discourses, such as that of hegemonic masculinity, function in the production of truth.<sup>15</sup> The methodology of discourse analysis begins from the premise that access to that truth or reality is through language (*ibid.* 8). Language is explored as a system that constitutes social identities, and as instrumental in the formulation and

---

<sup>15</sup> See Phillips & Jørgensen (2002: 142) for other examples.



dissemination of discourses. Fairclough (1992: 73) recommends that text-based discourse analysis should focus on three elements: the linguistic features of the text, the processes relating to the production and consumption of the text, and the wider social practice to which the text belongs. He analyses discursive change and reproduction by investigating the combined articulation of different discourses in a single text, the repeated articulation of the same discourses across a series of texts, and the articulation of different discourses in new combinations. The discovery of patterns in a text's discursive make-up allows the social implications of discursive representations of reality to be examined. It is on the model of textual discourse analysis that this study is based. However, a particular discourse may be articulated not only explicitly, through the specific use of certain language, but also implicitly. For example, the articulation of the discourse of *andreia* is not evidenced solely by the use of the noun ἀνδρεία and its cognates; its presence may also be implied by the way in which a scene is constructed, and the way in which characters interact. Text-based discourse analysis should therefore examine both the occurrences of specific language and those scenes where a discourse is revealed by implication. Yet it is often difficult to delineate where one discourse ends and another begins. We may find that discourses cannot be separated into discrete, manageable blocks, but overlap and feed into one another (Phillips & Jørgensen 2002: 143). This condition must be accepted in any attempt at discourse analysis, for it is sometimes inherent to the way in which an individual is constituted, or constitutes himself. To offer a modern example, a man may speak or write of himself as a 'family man'. Within this discourse he might include feelings and displays of love for his wife and children, as well as a desire or perceived responsibility to provide for and protect his family, and a need to associate with other 'family men' who have similar experiences. Each of these elements must be understood as miniature discourses which do not exist in isolation, but overlap and collectively ascribe meaning to the term 'family man'. We should not prise apart these discourses, but should first identify them and then attempt to discover how they function together in constituting the subject and his relation to others.

Discourse plays a vital role in forming identity: ‘the subject acquires identity by being represented discursively’ (Phillips & Jørgensen 2002: 43),<sup>16</sup> and literature itself is a discursive practice (Culler 1997: 113). However, as Fox (1998: 16) observes, ‘there is always a significant gap between life itself and any attempt to capture it in language’. Fox also notes that such gaps are compounded by the passage of time, and this of course has important consequences for a discursive analysis of ancient texts, which will always confront us with a shortfall between discourse and reality. Ancient textual evidence can only be a partial representation of reality, and can never give us unambiguous statements of social norms and identities. We must therefore accept a somewhat fragmentary reconstruction of the ancient novels’ masculine identities.

We have observed that constructions of masculine identity may change historically and culturally. Laclau & Mouffe (1985: 127ff.) describe a further way in which identity is mutable: the subject may have different identities depending upon the discourses of which he forms a part. Nonetheless, some inflexibility is experienced in specific situations, restricting the identities an individual can assume, and the discourses that can be accepted as truth (Phillips & Jørgensen 2002: 6): identity is not boundless, but is constrained to some extent by the context in which it finds itself; and yet, simultaneously, it also influences and shapes that context. These observations reflect the notion of performance, a notion which underpins this study. In 1929, Riviere published her findings from a psychoanalytical case-study, arguing that a woman may assume a ‘mask’ of overt femininity in order to disguise what might be perceived as ‘masculine’ traits.<sup>17</sup> Although I shall not be employing psychoanalytical models here,<sup>18</sup> the concept of the assumption of ‘masks’ is a useful one, and one which was given a different and very productive articulation by Goffman. Goffman (1969) suggested that in everyday life we ‘perform’ roles which both constitute our identities and influence our audience’s interpretation of us and of the wider situation in which we perform. Such performances may not always be conscious, but are characterised by the performer’s projection of ‘an idealized

---

<sup>16</sup> See also Gutterman (2001: 57ff.) for the relationship between discourse and identity.

<sup>17</sup> Riviere (2000 (1929)).

<sup>18</sup> Skinner (1997: 132) demonstrates the potential pitfalls in the application of psychoanalytical theory to ancient texts; the problems she highlights are evident in Haynes’ (2003) study of women in the Greek novels. For a defence of the use of psychoanalytical theories in Classics, see Leonard (2003).

version of himself' (*ibid.* 42), requiring the concealment or downplay of any action which might detract from that version. The audience's detection of behaviour detrimental to the idealised version results in problems of 'impression management' (*ibid.* 121), whereby the performer must attempt to revert to his more usual performance in order to save face: as Goffman (*ibid.* 49) remarked, 'the impression of reality fostered by a performance is a delicate, fragile thing that can be shattered by very minor mishaps'. Such theories will be particularly useful for our purposes, as will Bauman's definition of performance as a communicative act that is displayed, marked out from its context, and exposed to evaluation; performance, he writes:

... calls forth special attention to and heightened awareness of the act of communication and gives license to the audience to regard it and the performer with special intensity. Performance makes one communicatively accountable; it assigns to an audience the responsibility of evaluating the relative skills and effectiveness of the performer's accomplishment (Bauman 1989: 263).

Like Phillips & Jørgensen above, Bauman (1989: 262) questions the extent to which the cultural 'script' determines a performance, and how much 'flexibility, interpretive choice, or creative opportunity rests with the performer'.

Goffman (1977) took his theory of identity-performance further by applying it to gender, arguing that gender is constituted by means of its 'display' (*ibid.* 324) in certain social situations.<sup>19</sup> However, Goffman was not primarily concerned with the display of gender, and in fact viewed it as less important than other forms of action.<sup>20</sup> Butler (1990), on the other hand, makes theories of gender-display her focus, developing Goffman's ideas to argue that behaviours which we classify as 'masculine' or 'feminine' are not the results of an innate gender, but themselves constitute gender identity by being repeatedly performed:

Gender is ... a construction that regularly conceals its genesis; the tacit collective agreement to perform, produce, and sustain discrete and polar genders as cultural fictions is obscured by the credibility of those

---

<sup>19</sup> On the influence of these ideas, see Branaman (2003).

<sup>20</sup> See West & Zimmerman (1987: 130).

productions ...; the construction “compels” our belief in its necessity and naturalness (Butler 1990: 140).

Central to Butler’s thesis is the argument that the full and successful performance of gender is never quite achieved: we never completely attain the ideals for which we are culturally-conditioned to strive. Whitehead & Barrett (2001: 20) observe that for the majority of men today, ‘masculine performance’ provides entry to and acceptance within particular ‘communities’ of men. Yet, if we follow Butler, there is a distance between the ideal masculinity and any man’s lived reality: the hegemonic model may only correspond to the actual characters of a small number of men, creating a tension between the collective ideal and real life (Carrigan *et al.* 2002: 112).<sup>21</sup> In the gap between the ideal and real life, Butler would argue, there lies the possibility for resistance.<sup>22</sup>

The present study seeks to examine the Greek novels’ discursive representations of masculinity in the light of theories of the performance of gender. The application of such apparently modern notions to ancient texts requires explanation. In 1985, Herzfeld published a sociological and ethnographical study of masculinity in a Cretan mountain village, finding an undeniable emphasis not on ‘being a good man’, but on ‘being good at being a man’ (Herzfeld 1985: 16 *et passim*) – in other words, giving a persuasive performance according to an accepted script of masculine behaviour. Wray (2000) has since shown that a similar ‘poetics of manhood’ can be observed in action in Catullus’ poems. Goldhill and Osborne’s (1999) edited volume has demonstrated the suitability of performance theory to the study of classical Athenian culture, which was itself dominated by ‘regimes of display and regulation’ (Goldhill 1999: 1). As Gleason (1995) has shown, imperial Rome was similarly concerned with performance – and specifically the performance of gender – in public contexts.<sup>23</sup> Also important is Kokolakis’ (1960) collection of references from classical philosophy to Christian and late antique writings, illustrating the widespread and long-lived conception of life as a series of dramatic performances,

---

<sup>21</sup> See also Rosen (1993: xiii) on ‘masculine role stress’, the result of conflict between ‘inherited masculine values and the patterns of actual behaviour’.

<sup>22</sup> See Culler (1997: 101ff.) for a summary of Butler’s arguments and their applicability to literary analysis.

<sup>23</sup> Gleason follows Goffman’s lead.

with human beings as actors.<sup>24</sup> The notion of life in general, and gender in particular, as something actively performed clearly had a persistent influence. This influence is evidenced also in studies by Stehle (1997),<sup>25</sup> Bassi (1998), Williams (1999), Gunderson (2000), and Duncan (2006),<sup>26</sup> who all employ modern performance theory in order to elucidate the elite Greek and Roman obsession with the construction and maintenance of gendered identities.<sup>27</sup>

Bauman (1989) and Carlson (2004) see performance in terms of a consciousness of doubleness, of some disparity between what one feels and what one presents to others; this sense of doubleness sits comfortably alongside Reardon's (1974: 23) identification of a 'double personality' in the literature and leading figures of the Second Sophistic. Writing on the place of athletics in the formation of identity in the Roman empire, König also observes a conflict between ideals and realities:

Identification – the making and experience of one's own identity – always involves tensions, whether consciously perceived or not, between ostensibly fixed standards and the various instabilities and contradictions and insufficiencies which lie behind them. Often individuals seek to reject or refashion the values which they encounter, or the social and cultural status and identity with which society presents them ... Often, too, individuals seek to conform to perceived social norms, but find themselves unable to do so fully (König 2005: 11).

We shall see that various male characters in the Greek novels exhibit consciousness of the importance of the performance of masculinity, sometimes projecting idealised versions of themselves, and tackling problems of impression management, in a manner that provides strong support for the theories of performance and identity outlined above. Perkins (1995: 77ff.) explores the novels' expression of Stoic

---

<sup>24</sup> Kokolakis (1960: 59-61) includes references found in the Greek novels.

<sup>25</sup> In the first instance Stehle draws on the work of the performance theorist Schechner (1988), but the theories used derive ultimately from Goffman.

<sup>26</sup> Duncan's important study explores the anxieties informing Greek and Roman responses to actors and the whole concept of theatre, and has much of interest to say about the performance of gender in such contexts. Special issues of *Helios* present collections of conference proceedings which explore literal performance on stage and its relation to the figurative performance of identity: see Gamel (2000, *Helios* 27.2) and Stehle (2001b, *Helios* 28.1).

<sup>27</sup> Frangoulidis (2001) uses performance theory in a study of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, although he bases his approach on Greimas' (1987) narrative theory, which is interested principally in linguistic structures rather than in meaning.

values, including Epictetus' favourite metaphor of man as an actor playing a role:<sup>28</sup> according to Epictetus' doctrine, each individual has a particular responsibility to give a good performance in any circumstance (*ibid.* 84), a notion revealed time and again in the novels.<sup>29</sup> We shall find an abundance of examples of the difficulty inherent in achieving a successful performance; of the delicacy and fragility of the impressions created by the performance of gender; and consequently of the tension between discourse and reality.

Stehle explains that certain types of performance may be deliberately revealing or transgressive:

Parody and irony give a performer a way of signaling to the audience that he or she sees the role as only a role, with a knowing person behind it. On the other hand, to expose the conventionality of an ideal to the audience, performers may transgress a shared (or at least recognized) ideal as a way of breaking through to the "real" (Stehle 2001a: 5).

This is especially applicable to the way in which I want to suggest that Achilles Tatius uses Cleitophon. Achilles seems to toy not only with the *topoi* of romantic fiction,<sup>30</sup> but also with contemporary notions of masculinity, so that his text emerges as the exception that proves the rule. Although, as we have noted, many male characters in the novels seem conscious of giving performances, only Cleitophon explicitly acknowledges that his performance is 'only a role', to borrow Stehle's words; he alone openly admits and acquiesces in the potential for duplicity inherent in that performance.<sup>31</sup> However, despite having ostensible control over the identity he shows to his narratee, Cleitophon nevertheless frequently presents himself failing to perform his gender convincingly, sometimes even riding roughshod over the codes of elite masculinity. Cleitophon is of course not the only 'knowing person' behind his role: his performance is controlled on two further levels, by the

---

<sup>28</sup> Found, *e.g.*, at Epict. *Ench.* 17.

<sup>29</sup> This does not mean, however, that Stoicism is the sole source of the notion of role-playing and performance in the novels; rather, the novels draw on and appeal to a pervasive cultural semiotics of performance.

<sup>30</sup> For which see Durham (1938) and Chew (2000).

<sup>31</sup> His acknowledgement that he has embellished his narrative for Leucippe's father (8.5.2) is one such admission; his feigning of a bee-sting (2.7) is another.

anonymous primary narrator, and ultimately by Achilles. The entire narrative is built around the concept of performance, as we learn of Cleitophon's failings not from Cleitophon himself, but from the narrator, who performs Cleitophon misperforming masculinity. The text's extra layers of performance inevitably complicate efforts to read it, but they also suggest an authorial fascination with the notions of performance and identity. Achilles seems to invite the ancient reader to notice Cleitophon's misperformances of gender, and to relate them to current ideologies of masculinity. In having Cleitophon display his failings, Achilles both emphasises his period's concerns for masculinity, and perhaps subversively questions the importance of those concerns: he reveals the 'conventionality' of masculine ideals, thus transgressing them and 'breaking through to the "real"'.<sup>32</sup> It may tickle the reader to observe Cleitophon's failures, but it also enables him to identify with Cleitophon to some extent: he is everyman, and more human than a Theagenes or a Chaereas;<sup>33</sup> it is in Cleitophon's failings as a man that we might see Achilles contesting the culturally-assigned performance of masculinity.

#### *Nature and culture.*

The idea of a gender constituted by performance raises the issue of the interaction of nature and culture in identity-formation. Butler (1990: 24ff. *et passim*) argues that there is no essential, 'natural', core of gender – that gender does not exist prior to its performance, and that we are acculturated to perform certain roles which, through their repeated performance, acquire a gendered meaning and ascribe that gender to their performer. The novels' engagement with the notion of performance reveals a contiguous struggle with the complex question of the degree to which gender is a product of nature or of culture. In discussing literary theory, Culler (1997: 110-111) observes that some narratives present an identity determined by birth: 'the son of a king raised by shepherds is still fundamentally a king and rightfully becomes king when his identity is discovered' (*ibid.* 110). Other narratives may present identity as the ultimate product of culture and changing circumstances. Culler articulates the

---

<sup>32</sup> *E.g.* through Cleitophon's cross-dressing (6.1ff.), which, Morales (2004: 61) observes, 'symbolises the marked theatricality' of this novel. We shall examine this episode in the final chapter.

<sup>33</sup> Though we shall see that both of these characters occasionally exhibit masculinity of a standard to which a reader might be able to relate.

interplay of nature and culture in identity-formation in a way which has particular relevance for the Greek novels:

Consider the question of whether the identity of the subject is something given or something constructed. Not only are both options amply represented in literature, but the complications or entanglements are frequently laid out for us, as in the common plot where characters, as we say, ‘discover’ who they are, not by learning something about their past (say, about their birth) but by acting in such a way that they *become* what then turns out, in some sense, to have been their ‘nature’ (Culler 1997: 110).

These remarks have obvious resonances when we think of *Daphnis and Chloe*, the text most explicitly concerned with the role of nature and culture in social and sexual maturation. But we shall also see that Heliodorus is concerned with the interaction of nature and culture in the expression of adult masculinity, and that he, like Longus, leaves the reader with a sense of *aporia* as to the precise role of each element. The novels seem to imply that the influence of culture can result in performances of gender which *appear* to be natural: perhaps the theories of Goffman and Butler were not as innovative as they seemed.

#### ***Public and private.***

The notion of performance raises not only the function of nature and culture in the emergence of a gendered identity, but also the apparent dichotomy of public and private. In terms of sexuality, Foucault (1987, 1990) has traced a development in the Greek concept of the self, whereby the ethical works of the classical period conceive of the individual’s responsibility for sexual self-restraint as a *public* responsibility to the wider *polis*, while imperial moralists, by contrast, stress self-restraint as a *private* concern, centred on the individual himself and on his role within marriage.<sup>34</sup> However, Goffman’s metaphor of the individual as an actor giving a performance before an audience presupposes a public context, and we have seen that similar metaphors were prolific throughout the literature of antiquity, suggesting an analogous concern with the individual’s appearance before others. How can the imperial shift of emphasis from ‘public’ to ‘private’ be reconciled with the evident

---

<sup>34</sup> See also Swain (1996: 128).



importance of performance? Although sexuality may have migrated from the public sphere to the private, we should be wary of assuming that sexual behaviour is always central to the moral identity and evaluation of an individual (Fox 1998: 7). Of course, we might expect it to play a large part in the masculinities presented in the ancient novels, since they take romantic love as their subject, but we shall see that gender in these texts is about much more than sex. Competition with others in public matters, and private deliberation with oneself in matters of erotic comportment, both emerge as defining elements in the performance of masculinity. Thus the performance of gender in the novels has both public and private aspects, with the self, as well as others, acting as audience. Indeed, Bauman (1989: 266) and Carlson (2004: 5) observe that performance sometimes has a reflexive mode, whereby the self plays the role of the audience expected to recognise and validate the performer. But private, reflexive performances may also interact with public concerns. For example, an individual's interiorisation of ethical dilemmas – such as Dionysius' struggle with his feelings for Callirhoe – may be driven by a concern for his public status, so the distinction between public and private is less of a dichotomy than it at first appears: like nature and culture, the two often function symbiotically. Just as Tosh (1994: 198) argues for masculinity in nineteenth-century Britain, novelistic masculinity is both a psychic and a social identity, the former because it is an integral part of the subjectivity of every male, and the latter because it is bound up with peer recognition, which depends upon social performance.

### *Masculinity in the Greek novels: some problems.*

We observed above that, in modern terms, masculinity is culturally constructed and historically contingent. We have also remarked that the Greek novels present gender as largely culturally dependent, notwithstanding the concomitant influence of nature. However, the status of the texts under analysis poses several problems that pertain to issues of culture and history. Let us look at those problems now.

#### *i. Date of composition versus dramatic date.*

The dates of composition of the novels have been the subject of much debate.<sup>35</sup> The time-span of the novels known to us could feasibly be as much as five hundred years

---

<sup>35</sup> See Bowie (1989: 124) for a helpful table of possible dates, and Bowie (2002) for an update on the chronology of the earlier novels.

(Bowie 1989: 123), if we believe *Ninus* to have been composed as early as 100 B.C., and the *Aethiopica* as late as the latter part of the fourth century.<sup>36</sup> Chariton is generally agreed to be the earliest of the five complete novels,<sup>37</sup> but his dating is far from certain.<sup>38</sup> It is often observed that we find a ‘bulge’ (Morgan 1995: 131) of novel-writing and consumption in the second century, the height of Philostratus’ ‘Second Sophistic’.<sup>39</sup> Xenophon, Achilles, and Longus all seem to belong here, though Xenophon earlier than the other two, and with more in common with Chariton and *Ninus*.<sup>40</sup> In her study of women and marriage in the Greek novels, Egger (1994b: 265) notes that the novelists make assumptions about marriage ‘as members of their own societies, with their specific cultural experiences’. Thus we might also reasonably expect to find contemporary masculine concerns reflected by the authors in their texts. However, Egger (*ibid.*) goes on to observe that the novelists are also ‘learned writers of antiquarian and rhetorical literary interests’; we must therefore remain open to the possibility that – as Egger finds in the case of marriage and the status of women in the novels – any representation of masculinity may be influenced by such interests. This is where the novels’ dramatic dates become important. It is widely recognised that the novels are not precisely contemporary in their settings, with Chariton explicitly evoking the fifth century B.C., and Heliodorus implicitly the classical period more generally. Hägg (2004 (1987): 92-93, 97) would exclude Xenophon, Achilles, and Longus from the category of ‘historical novel’, though all have a ‘feel’ that is certainly more remote

---

<sup>36</sup> Bowie (1989: 136) favours a date in the third century for Heliodorus, on the grounds that he exhibits style and content similar to that of Achilles Tatius and Philostratus; Bowie would therefore envisage Heliodorus breathing the same intellectual air as those flourishing at the height of the Second Sophistic. The argument is tempting, especially in view of Philostratus’ reference to one ‘Heliodorus the Arab’ (*VS* 626 Olearius), and Heliodorus’ Emesan origins, which invite a connection with Julia Domna’s intellectual circle. Morgan (1978: ii-xxxvii, 2003: 418-419, following van der Valk, Colonna, and Keydell), on the other hand, prefers a date in the fourth century, on the basis of strong similarities between Heliodorus’ description of the siege of Syene and Julian’s references to the historical siege of Nisibis in A.D. 350 (*Or.* 1 and 3). Reardon (1974: 24) too is convinced that Heliodorus ‘belongs incontrovertibly to the late fourth century’; he remarks that this was still a sophistic period, but sees Heliodorus as a ‘throwback’ to a more sophistic time.

<sup>37</sup> One dissenting voice is that of O’Sullivan (1995: 145-170, 2005: xiii), who sees Chariton as post-dating, and imitating, Xenophon of Ephesus.

<sup>38</sup> Reardon (2003: 312) sees him somewhere in the first century before or after Christ. I prefer a second century date, an issue to which I shall return in Chapter 1.

<sup>39</sup> Reardon (1974) assesses the novels’ place in the sophistic literary and declamatory movement referred to by Philostratus (*VS* 481); the use of the phrase ‘Second Sophistic’ in the present study will be discussed shortly.

<sup>40</sup> See Kytzler (2003), Plepelits (2003), and Hunter (2003).

than the present.<sup>41</sup> Given this not-precisely-contemporary setting, sometimes definitely classical, sometimes not, might the novels' construction of gender be less-than-contemporary too? Egger (1994b) finds many classical traits in the novels' treatment of women and marriage, and states that the texts display a femininity that is 'conventional and archaizing as compared to contemporary reality' (*ibid.* 271). It will be seen in the course of this study that many elements of what might be termed 'classical masculinity' are represented in the novels; however, it will also be observed, from comparison with extra-generic texts roughly contemporary with the novels, that 'classical' masculinities continued to be endorsed as valid forms of gender expression into much later periods. Hence, while such classical masculinities might be related to their classical dramatic setting, that does not preclude them from being considered 'contemporary'. Indeed, in arguing that the novels should be seen as valuable to the social and economic historian, Bowie (1976: 93-94) observes the care with which they 'present a convincing reflection of the contemporary world', and suggests that they may be taken as 'points of reference for significant aspects of the *Zeitgeist*' (*ibid.* 96).

---

<sup>41</sup> Xenophon's dramatic date has been much pondered. Hägg (2004 (1987): 92-93) lists the references in the text that place the action 'postclassical', 'post-Hellenistic' and 'probably even post-Trajan', and concludes that 'this is no historical novel ..., either in intent or in effect'. I am less certain: it is entirely possible that, as Hägg suggests, such references are anachronisms, but in any case, the impossibility of locating it in a specific time period lends it a vague historical air, while it may not be a 'historical novel' as such, its vagueness removes it from the present. Achilles' reference to the Byzantines' war with the Thracians certainly adds historical colour, even if it is a colour of only the relatively recent past. See Bowie (1989: 133-134) on Achilles' evocation of the 'contemporary world of the East Mediterranean reader'. Plepelits (2003: 411) wants to see as specific a dramatic date as A.D. 47; I am not convinced that such specificity is intended: see Swain (1996: 111). Longus' tale is clearly of past events, but he 'never makes any attempt to anchor his story in any particular period or puts on stage any historical figure' (Hägg 2004 (1987): 93). This again is perhaps precisely the point: the lack of historical exactitude creates an appealing general sense of 'the past', making the story more fluid and more fictional, and allowing the reader easier access to it and identification with it; even Chariton and Heliodorus, while choosing classical settings, do not specify exact dates, thus giving a historical atmosphere, but retaining the sense of fiction. My feeling is that the novels' dramatic dates work in a similar way to their physical descriptions of their heroes and heroines: I am inclined to think that in the latter case, sufficient description is given to enable the reader to form an impression, but the descriptions are vague enough that the reader can imagine the hero or heroine to match her or his subjective notion of what constitutes beauty (Achilles is, unsurprisingly, the notable exception, giving a Technicolor description of Leucippe's face); thus every reader is able to identify with the protagonists through the author's clever use of vagueness and specificity. Similarly, the dramatic settings are both specific and vague, creating a folk/fairytale atmosphere, with recognisable elements.

*ii. Culture and the passage of time.*

We have said that gender is culturally constructed, and that different cultures therefore give rise to different constructions of gender. We should consider, then, what effect the novelists' ethnic origins and their place within the cultural milieu of their times might have had on the genders they represent in their works. Asia Minor has been identified as 'the real home of sophistic and novel' (Reardon 1974: 25), and an especial link has been seen between the earliest novels and western Asia Minor (Bowie 2003: 90): Chariton states that he is from Aphrodisias,<sup>42</sup> and Bowie (*ibid.*) would also connect *Ninus* and *Metiochus and Parthenope* with Asia Minor, adding that earlier works may well have been produced in that region too. Xenophon's origin may or may not be Ephesus: the epithet 'of Ephesus' perhaps refers only to the fact that his story begins and ends in that place (Kytzler 2003: 345). In the case of Longus, the debate continues as to whether he may have been from, or may at least have known, Lesbos;<sup>43</sup> a connection with Lesbos puts him close enough to Asia Minor: Bowie (1994: 452) comments that although Lesbos was not a sophistic centre, its location suggests that it probably hosted some sophistic performances.<sup>44</sup> Achilles and Heliodorus come from further afield. Although Achilles remains something of a shadowy figure, the manuscripts seem to agree that he was from Alexandria,<sup>45</sup> while Heliodorus identifies himself unequivocally as 'a Phoenician from Emesa'.<sup>46</sup> If we might see the earlier novelists, and perhaps Longus, as having similar conceptions of gender by virtue of living in similar cultures, what of Achilles in Alexandria and Heliodorus in Emesa? And what also of the several hundred years that may separate Heliodorus from the earliest novels? If constructions of gender are historically as well as culturally fluid, are we justified in reading similar gender concerns in, for example, both Chariton and Heliodorus?

Both of these problems may be addressed by a consideration of the prevailing intellectual climate of the first few centuries after Christ. The highly literate and intellectually-demanding world of the elite in these centuries – and in particular the

---

<sup>42</sup> Chariton 1.1.1.

<sup>43</sup> Discussion and further references in Hunter (2003: 367-369) and Morgan (2004: 1).

<sup>44</sup> Indeed, Philostratus refers to the sophist Dionysius of Miletus as having taught in Lesbos during his early career (*VS* 526).

<sup>45</sup> See Plepelits (2003: 387).

<sup>46</sup> *Hid.* 10.41.4.

second century – is well-known and has been much discussed,<sup>47</sup> and the term ‘Second Sophistic’, which Philostratus applied to the archaising and Atticising tendencies of the late first to early third centuries, has come to be used frequently of that historical period, rather than of the style to which it originally referred.<sup>48</sup> While perhaps only two or three of the five complete novels sit squarely in the centre of this period, and while not all of them exhibit the movement’s linguistic trademarks, each author can be seen to have had pretensions which match well the academic interests and aspirations of the elite of the time:<sup>49</sup> all five are united by a sense of ‘sophistic’ culture. I do not mean to suggest that the *Ephesiaca* is knowingly sophistic in the same way as *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, or literarily sophisticated in the same way as the *Aethiopica*. I mean rather that even the apparently naïve Xenophon shows an awareness of elite cultural and literary concerns,<sup>50</sup> albeit that they are not expressed in a narrative of the same calibre as those of Achilles or Heliodorus.<sup>51</sup> The affluent cities of Asia Minor were centres of Hellenism and scholarship (Anderson 1993: 4). Although Philostratus does not mention Alexandria as a sophistic focal-point (*ibid.*), it was, nonetheless, traditionally a centre of intellectualism, and on the basis of the bookish learning of Achilles Tatius’ Cleitophon, and the slippery, self-aware nature of his narrative, we might well believe that Alexandria was indeed Achilles’ home. The literary credentials of Heliodorus’ city, Emesa, are in no doubt.<sup>52</sup> In an intellectual sense, then, the novels

<sup>47</sup> E.g. Bowersock (1969), Bowie (1974 (1970), 1982), Reardon (1971, 1974), and Anderson (1989, 1993).

<sup>48</sup> See Whitmarsh (2005: 4-5).

<sup>49</sup> See Reardon (1971: 339ff., 1974). On those to whom the novels may have appealed, and on the novels’ socio-cultural contexts, see Bowie (1994, 2003), Stephens (1994), Morgan (1995), and Hägg (2004 (1994)). Bowie (1989: 128) sees the texts as perhaps ‘lighter reading for the intelligentsia’, and as appealing to the same sort of reader who would have enjoyed Plutarch and Lucian (1994: 441). I am persuaded of this: Achilles Tatius, for example, has much in common with Lucian in his manipulation of the reader and of the concept of fiction; for a brief discussion of Achilles’ sophistic style, see Anderson (1993: 159ff.); Bartsch (1989) and Morales (2004) offer longer treatments. Reardon (1974: 28) points out that there were undoubtedly ‘various levels of novel’, written by variously-skilled authors, and appealing to different audiences; some novels, he argues, will have been enjoyed by those who also took pleasure and inspiration from listening to sophists declaim. In considering the relationship between sophistic declamation and the novel, Reardon (*ibid.*) suggests that the former addressed the community in a very public way, while the latter operated on a far more individual level, encouraging personal identification; the two forms, however, were not incompatible, and enjoyment of both could co-exist in a single listener/reader.

<sup>50</sup> See Ruiz Montero (2003, esp. 58-60) and Doulamis (Forthcoming, 2007).

<sup>51</sup> The question of whether Xenophon’s novel is an epitome, or at least not in its original form, remains unresolved (see Hägg 2004 (1969)). It will be seen in Chapter 3 just how difficult it is to make a consistent reading of this text; because of its apparent inconsistencies, I am inclined to think that it has undergone some degree of adulteration.

<sup>52</sup> See Bowersock (1969: 101-109).

form a unified whole, despite being written by men from sometimes geographically disparate areas: while, in the details of day-to-day life, one author will undoubtedly have had different cultural experiences from the next, the overarching elite cultures of all five are likely to have been similar in their attitude to intellectualism. Gleason (1995) has shown just how intricately and inextricably linked were the concepts of intellectualism and elite masculinity; it is reasonable to suppose that if our authors all shared the sophistic outlook, they may well also have experienced similar concerns with regard to gender.

Although, with the spread of the empire and the gradual rise of Christianity, this was a period of considerable social change, the novels seem deliberately to exclude these issues. As Scarcella observes:

... in none of these works any mention is made [*sic*] of the Roman empire, within whose political jurisdiction and cultural and ideological framework these authors and their works must presumably be located. On the other hand, the form of state, the civil institutions, the war conventions, the law implications, the social structure, the economic background (as well as the religious and ideological attitudes) of such novels are largely to be referred to Greek tradition ... (Scarcella 2003: 220).

Indeed, the encroachment of new or different moral values and understandings of gender may well have been responded to by a reassertion of classical ideals – we have already noted that certain classical ideals of masculinity retained currency well into imperial times. Along with their shared expression of intellectualism, then, the novels are united by their general exclusion of the contemporary world. But this is an exclusion only of large-scale political and religious matters. By contrast, we shall see that several of the texts do exhibit an interest in very contemporary issues pertaining to masculinity. Characteristics such as these, common to several, and in some cases all, of the novels, reduce the significance of the chronological gap between, for example, Chariton and Heliodorus.

### *iii. The influence of Christianity.*

The novels were developing at a time which was also witnessing the growth of Christianity and the beginnings of its expression through texts. The *Apocryphal*

*Acts*, for example, are probably roughly contemporary with some of the ideal Greek novels, and may well share provenance with them (Rhee 2005: 3, 31). We ought, therefore, to consider the possibility that the novels and early Christian literature experienced a certain amount of cross-fertilisation. Scholars have recently begun to explore potential connections between New Testament writings and ancient fiction.<sup>53</sup> Rhee observes that:

The narrative form and structure [of the *Apocryphal Acts*] betray their affinity with the ancient novel in general, including the Greek ideal romances, with a focus on historical figures, biographical character, the travel motif, adventures and trials, miracles and the marvelous, and the chastity theme (Rhee 2005: 4).

However, while Brown (1988: 155-156) views the novels as the model for the *Acts*, and Cooper (1996: 44) sees the *Acts* as ‘a penumbral manifestation of the romance phenomenon’, Rhee (2005: 37) argues that shared motifs do not constitute a model and that ‘the fundamentally biographical and missionary focus of the Acts delimits the ideal romances as the main literary model for the Acts’. I am inclined to agree, although it does seem reasonable to think that, in their shared generic *topoi*, the novels and early Christian literature may have been responding to similar external impetuses. Yet I remain unconvinced that comparisons between specific scenes in these texts can be made to stick in any more than a superficial way. Ramelli’s (2007) contention that the authors of the novels may have had knowledge of Christianity is a fair one, though her observations on Petronius’ possible Christian references are more persuasive than the parallels she draws between the Greek novels and Christian texts. To my mind it is possible for a genre of literature or a school of thought to flourish independently of Christian influence, regardless of how strong that influence may be in other areas of life. For example, Gill (1995: xxiii) observes of Epictetus that his philosophy was uninfluenced by Christianity, despite the fact that the religion was taking hold during his lifetime; on the contrary, Epictetus’ doctrines had a significant influence on the early Church Fathers (*ibid.*). In a rather similar manner, later Christians identified with certain of the novels’ motifs, and

---

<sup>53</sup> E.g. Hock, Chance, & Perkins (1998), Thomas (2003), Ramelli (2007), and, to some extent, Perkins (1995) and Rhee (2003).

claimed that Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus converted to Christianity.<sup>54</sup> While the novels and Christian texts may have motifs in common, and the novels may thus have appealed to Christians, it is possible to account for those motifs by reference to classical paradigms, or to contemporary Graeco-Roman pagan belief systems.

This holds true for gender and sexuality in the novels. Perhaps the most tempting possible connection between the novels and Christian texts in the area of gender is their shared emphasis on male chastity and virginity. Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius are particularly notable (though in very different ways) for their engagement with these themes. In the former, the virginity and chastity of the hero are elevated to a stature virtually comparable to that of the heroine's sexual purity;<sup>55</sup> in the latter, the hero ironises and manipulates the concepts of male virginity and chastity.<sup>56</sup> Achilles' play with such concepts may be better read as a parodic dig at the concerns of the romance genre than as a response to Christian ideology.<sup>57</sup> Given its later date, Heliodorus' novel seems the one most likely to be engaging with Christian concerns, but even here the evident interest in male chastity need not be accounted for by reference to Christianity;<sup>58</sup> it may be explained simply as a corollary of the period's increasing focus on the individual's relationship with himself, and on the importance of the conjugal bond. Rather than seeing the novels and early Christian literature as in some sort of dialogue with each other, I prefer to see them as developing generic similarities against shared geographical, cultural, and historical backdrops. While the issue of shared motifs and ideologies is an interesting one, it is beyond the scope of this study, which attempts first and foremost to locate the novels' masculinities in a classical and Graeco-Roman setting.

---

<sup>54</sup> See Plepelits (2003: 387) on Achilles and Morgan (2003: 419-421) on Heliodorus.

<sup>55</sup> We shall consider Theagenes' resistance to Arsace's advances in Chapter 2. Like Theagenes, Xenophon's Habrocomes is proud of his lack of erotic experience; unlike Theagenes, however, he comes close to sleeping with another woman.

<sup>56</sup> Cleitophon's attitude to sex will recur throughout the study, but will feature especially in Chapter 3. Interestingly, Lollianus' *Phoenicica* also seems to engage with the notion of male virginity, featuring the apparent 'deflowering' (A.2.10, Stephens & Winkler 1995) of a male narrator; we shall touch on this scene in Chapter 3.

<sup>57</sup> Chew (2000: 68) sees Achilles as questioning the 'ridiculously overblown moral scrupulosity in his predecessors' novels by inverting the moral impulses of his own characters'.

<sup>58</sup> Indeed, as Perkins (1995: 78-79) observes, the Stoics Seneca and Musonius Rufus both urged husbands as well as wives to preserve their chastity.



*iv. The effect of 'genre' and what remains of it.*

Chariton, Xenophon, Achilles, Longus, and Heliodorus were all writing a particular form of literature, and, regardless of individual differences between their works, they all follow the same broad narrative pattern. It is certainly a problem that we have only these five complete novels out of a collection which was evidently (to judge from the fragments) far larger and more complex in nature than the remaining examples would suggest.<sup>59</sup> What we know of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* and Antonius Diogenes' *Wonders beyond Thule* tells us that there existed extended works of prose fiction whose fantastical plotlines may have made what now remains seem tame by comparison. Morgan (1995: 131) argues that the emergence of works like the *Phoenicica* and the *Iolaus* forces us to rethink the boundaries of the form, but does not entail rejection of the concept of 'generic homogeneity'. If we think of the remaining novels as belonging to a 'genre', then we must appreciate that their authors were subject to literary constraints, even though the genre's boundaries may have been somewhat fluid. Such constraints might have a bearing not only on narrative content, but also on the manner in which gender is represented. Should we be concerned that 'generic homogeneity' might give rise to male characters whose depiction is constrained by the need for conformity to a literary stereotype, and who, as a result, do not reflect the realities of masculinity? To the extent that character functions as an element of plot, novelistic masculinity must also be generic, and it will be seen that certain coherent standards of masculinity are applied by authors across the genre as we know it: although the apparent fluidity of the genre undoubtedly allowed for some exploration of the meanings of gender, it is possible to identify a composite picture of masculinity in the five complete novels which seems to be broadly representative of the genre as a whole. But the fact that generic homogeneity applies also to gender should not necessarily be thought to equate to a lack of realism. Similarly, we should not be too concerned that the novels' status as fiction might present us with unreliable, unrealistic markers of gender. As Culler (1997: 113) observes, writing fiction does not give an author *carte blanche* to create just any kind of character: fictional literature strives to create identification with its reader, and so characters are likely to exhibit concerns that are recognisable in some way to their audience, both internal and external. The novels' status as fiction, then,

---

<sup>59</sup> Another frustration is the lack of ancient theory on the novel (see Morgan 1995: 132).

does not mean that its masculinities are wholly fictional. We have noted, however, and we shall see further later, that some of the novels' male characters and behaviours might be thought more 'real' and easier to identify with than others.

*The structure and content of the study.*

We have said that reconstructions of gender will necessarily be lacunose on account of the distance between gender's representation and its reality.<sup>60</sup> This is true regardless of the extent of the investigation conducted, but is still more applicable to the present study, whose size does not allow for an exhaustive examination of every aspect of masculinity in the Greek novels – even though only five texts are extant in anything like their entirety. Consequently, I have had to be selective in the discourses analysed. The study has been conducted and organised discourse-by-discourse, rather than novel-by-novel. It was felt that a thematic approach would produce a more in-depth analysis, and would minimise the risk of repetition from one chapter to another. Each chapter begins with an attempt to define and contextualise the central theme, and to explore its place in Greek thought from the classical to the imperial period. As we have noted, gender can exist only in relation to an 'other'.<sup>61</sup> In view of this, the introductory sections of Chapters 1 and 2 also give some consideration to the ways in which their discourses are 'gendered' – in other words, the extent to which they are interpreted in the sources as discourses of masculinity, and whether and to what degree it is possible for women to partake in them. In the case of Chapter 3, the issues of femininity and subordinated masculinities will recur throughout the discussion. In each chapter, the examination of the novels' masculinities is organised in subsections, each of which investigates a different aspect of the chapter's central discourse; an effort is made to relate these representations to literary and cultural history.

The discourse explored in Chapter 1 is *paideia*. As a defining feature of the Second Sophistic, this topic is a prerequisite in any study of imperial gender. It is a matter of significant interest and concern for Chariton in particular, whose male characters' behaviour often seems governed by this quality. It is of some importance to other novelists too, if not foregrounded to the same extent, and sometimes only an implicit

---

<sup>60</sup> See above, p.8.

<sup>61</sup> See above, p.4-5.

presence. Chapter 2 tackles *andreia*, a concept that might be thought *paideia*'s polar opposite, seemingly a very physical characteristic that is in some sense the quality of maleness itself. Focusing on the military and athletic feats of Chaereas and Theagenes, the chapter explores whether *andreia* really is such a physical quality, and what its relationship to *paideia* might be. Finally, in Chapter 3 we take a slightly different turn. The subject there is sexual identity as constituted by homosexual desire and effeminacy, which, as we shall see, are in some ways rather more complex notions than *paideia* and *andreia*. Male-male sexual behaviour features overtly in three of the five extant novels, where its relation to effeminacy (masculinity's 'other') is a key issue. But also associated with effeminacy are certain forms of heterosexual conduct, and we shall analyse the ways in which such behaviours are perceived to detract from a man's masculinity. While sexuality is not the *raison d'être* of the thesis, it is inevitably a central component, since '[c]onceptions of sexuality ... are inseparable from conceptions of gender' (Edwards 1993: 75).

The scope of the study does not allow for a full investigation of all of the papyrus fragments and summaries, although I shall make occasional references to the novels we no longer have complete. Comparative literature contemporary, or roughly so, with the novels will also be examined in order to support arguments and to contextualise the discourses discussed. Russell (1990: 1) identifies three types of reader from the age of Cicero onwards: one speaking and reading Greek, one Latin, and one both languages, the last of which he views as the most influential. This study will therefore address certain concepts of Roman masculinity, as well as of Greek, on the assumption that ancient readers of the novels may well have been conversant in Latin too. We shall see that many of the discourses of masculinity found in the hellenising Greek novels are remarkably akin to those of imperial Latin literature. This is, above all, a literary study. The primary aim is an analysis of the modes of masculine expression that emerge from close examination of the five complete texts, and an attempt to locate those modes within the wider elite culture of the five hundred years that may separate the first and last of them.

*A note on the term 'Second Sophistic'.*

I propose to use the term 'Second Sophistic' in a maximalist, 'non-Philostratus' way. Although the novels of Chariton and Heliodorus probably fall outside the boundaries of the historical period within which the Second Sophistic movement flourished, their evocation of the classical Hellenic past seems to warrant their inclusion.<sup>62</sup> Thus, where the term occurs in this study, it denotes the roughly half-millennium of the novels' *floruit*, rather than the intellectual movement itself.

*A note on translations.*

If not otherwise stated, translations are my own.

---

<sup>62</sup> See Goldhill (2001a: 14) on the somewhat amorphous boundaries of the period.

## Chapter 1: *Paideia*

### *Introduction.*

When Chariton's pirate, Theron, is trying to sell Callirhoe, he spots Dionysius and is informed that he 'exceeds the other Ionians in wealth, birth, and *paideia*, and is a friend of the Great King'.<sup>1</sup> This is Theron's and the reader's first encounter with Dionysius, and although it was customary to introduce a protagonist by reference to his noble birth and financial resources (Ruiz Montero 1989: 137),<sup>2</sup> Chariton significantly also includes a reference to Dionysius' *paideia*. Progressing through the text, one cannot help but be struck by the preponderance of direct references to, or implicit suggestions of, *paideia*. This is certainly the novel that engages most overtly with *paideia*, betraying an intense interest in a notion that became a dominant feature in the construction of – particularly – second-century masculinity, and one that was very much connected with public, oratorical performance. Bowie (1976: 94) observes that Chariton's emphasis on *paideia* 'fits the cultural boom of the second sophistic', and ought to be taken into account in any attempt at dating. If we assign an early date to this text, then a man's development and maintenance of *paideia* was clearly a matter of intense concern prior to the second century; my own inclination is to place Chariton in the second century, and to see the arch-*pepaideumenos* Dionysius as inspired to some extent by the sophists of that period.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, Hock (2005) argues plausibly that Chariton's characters can be seen as having a level of educational and behavioural *paideia* that would not have been out of place in the real world, and that elements of Chariton's style and structure show the author himself to have attained an advanced level of *paideia*. Imperial *paideia* was brought to bear in the public recreation of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.; it is notable, then, that Chariton's dramatic date is precisely that of the thought-world of second-century *pepaideumenoi*: in its historical setting and its prioritisation of *paideia*, we might well read this novel as a sophistic performance in itself.<sup>4</sup> Given that *paideia* seems to be such a preoccupation for Chariton, his text will be the

<sup>1</sup> Chariton 1.12.6: πλούτω καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων ὑπερέχοντα, φίλον τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως.

<sup>2</sup> See the introduction of Chaereas and Callirhoe (Chariton 1.1.1ff.), and Habrocomes and Anthia (X. Eph. 1.1.1ff.).

<sup>3</sup> See below, p.65, n.155, for further discussion.

<sup>4</sup> See also p.110-111.

primary focus of this chapter. Within his concern for *paideia*, he is also notable among novelists for the amount of attention he pays to jealousy and anger as aspects of masculine comportment. This attention is epitomised by Chaereas' violent physical attack on Callirhoe, which is significantly placed near the beginning of the narrative, and which we shall examine in detail at the end of the chapter. We begin, however, by considering the history and social context of *paideia*; we shall then relate that to the novels' uses of the concept.<sup>5</sup> The aim here is to ascertain how novelistic *paideia* is performed as an element of elite masculinity.

### *History and social context.*

The term παιδεία has been variously translated, the most common choices being 'education' and 'culture', although neither adequately conveys its semantic range; in fact, 'education' and 'culture' are themselves somewhat protean concepts, open to different interpretations. Most recently, the trend has been to interpret *paideia* in the sense of 'acculturation',<sup>6</sup> in order to stress its nature as a process. The compound of education and culture that *paideia* represented seems never to have possessed a concrete, singular, or finite structure, but rather to have undergone a series of metamorphoses throughout Greek history,<sup>7</sup> as well as to have been a constant evolutionary force in the public and private life of the elite Greek male. Yet despite its fluid nature, the application of the term *paideia* could be telling for an ancient Greek reader, connoting moral and ethical values, as well as extensive learning in a variety of fields:

... *paideia* ... implies both a body of privileged texts, artworks, values – a culture to be inherited and preserved as a sign of civilization – and also a process of acculturation – education – which 'makes men', which informs the structures and activities of the lives of the civic elite (Goldhill 2001a: 17).

---

<sup>5</sup> It is perhaps no surprise that Chariton of Aphrodisias is so concerned with *paideia*: see Yildirim (2004) on Aphrodisias' growing importance from the first century as a centre of *paideia* of all kinds; see also Bowie (2002: 62) on Aphrodisias as a focal point for *paideia* and the erotic novel.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., Gleason (1990: 412) for the 'acculturation' of men.

<sup>7</sup> See Jaeger (1945 *passim*). Marrou (1956: 95) qualifies this somewhat, stating that although it was only after Alexander that *paideia* (in the sense of 'education') found its definitive form, any changes thereafter were 'little more than the completion of a process that had been going on from the very beginning, the fulfilment of tendencies already present'.

*i. Classical paideia.*

Throughout the classical period, *paideia* encompassed everything learned formally at school and in the gymnasium,<sup>8</sup> and often also included the development of skills in music and hunting. As part of their *paideia*, Xenophon's Persian king Cyrus and his fellow elite youths learn both *dikaiosynē* and *sōphrosynē* at school,<sup>9</sup> and Xenophon shows himself a great adherent of the value of hunting in producing a man who is both *sōphrōn* and *dikaios*<sup>10</sup> – something we shall observe in Chariton too. Also extremely important for understanding Chariton's *paideia* is Isocrates, for whom, as for Xenophon, *paideia* subsumes certain moral virtues: the educational aspect of *paideia* is expected to develop ethical characteristics, enabling a man to control his pleasures and desires, and to be just in his relations with others.<sup>11</sup> For Isocrates' rival, Plato, the case was similar: *paideia* was not simply education in any technical sense, but education in *aretē* from a young age, and an understanding of how to rule and be ruled in the correct manner; a *paideia* devoid of νοῦς and δίκη would not deserve the name παιδεία.<sup>12</sup> A correlation between *paideia*, virtue, and wise thought is thus established at an early stage. But *paideia* was not perfect, and might allow a man to behave inappropriately:

... καὶ εἴ ποτε ἐξέρχεται, δυνατόν δ' ἐστὶν ἐπανορθοῦσθαι, τοῦτ' ἀεὶ δραστεῖον διὰ βίου παντὶ κατὰ δύναμιν.

... if ever [*paideia*] errs from the right path, but can be put straight again, to this task every man, so long as he lives, must address himself with all his might (Pl. *Lg.* 644b; Loeb trans.).

This image of *paideia* as fallible will be especially relevant when we turn to Dionysius and Chaereas.

<sup>8</sup> Athletic training was an important part of *paideia* in later eras too: see van Nijf (2004) and now König (2005) on the place of athletics in *paideia* in the Second Sophistic, and see Chapter 2, below, for the significance of athletics in the performance of *andreia*.

<sup>9</sup> X. *Cyr.* 1.2.6ff.

<sup>10</sup> X. *Cyn.* 12.7ff.; see also *Cyr.* 8.1.34ff.

<sup>11</sup> Isoc. *Panathenaicus* 30ff.

<sup>12</sup> Pl. *Lg.* 643e ff.

Isocrates identifies the *logos* as the symbol of *paideia* (Jaeger 1945: 79), arguing that it distinguishes man from other animals, and facilitates the formation of laws.<sup>13</sup> Since *logos* is not only reason, but also speech, Isocrates thereby makes a firm and enduring connection between *paideia* and speech, specifically oratory. In discussion of the role of *paideia* in the formation of the orator,<sup>14</sup> he states that the most important quality in such a man is natural ability (τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀνυπέρβλητον), which, with only a clear voice and courage (τὴν τόλμαν) to assist it,<sup>15</sup> can give rise to an impressive speaker; but, coupled with experience and plenty of practice (ταῖς δ' ἐμπειρίαις καὶ ταῖς ἐπιμελείαις), natural talent turns out the best orators. By contrast, if a man has *paideia* alone, he need lack only courage and he will be speechless before the crowd (οὐδ' ἂν φθέγγασθαι δυνηθείη). This seems to impose limits on *paideia*: while it is, as we shall see, an immensely powerful badge of honour, its power is circumscribed, and in order to be most effective it must be complemented by other positive qualities, including natural ability. Again, these observations will be useful when we examine Chariton.

Rhetorical ability in public is not all that Isocrates expects of a man. In addition, the Isocratean *logos* must be directed inward, so that the power of reason takes on a private aspect which is as, if not more, important than its public face:

μετὰ τούτου καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητησίμων ἀγωνιζόμεθα καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοουμένων σκοπούμεθα· ταῖς γὰρ πίστεσιν αἷς τοὺς ἄλλους λέγοντες πείθωμεν, ταῖς αὐταῖς ταύταις βουλευόμενοι χρώμεθα, καὶ ῥητορικοὺς μὲν καλοῦμεν τοὺς ἐν τῷ πλήθει δυναμένους λέγειν, εὐβούλους δὲ νομίζομεν οἵτινες ἂν αὐτοὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄριστα περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων διαλεχθῶσιν.

With this faculty [*logos*] we both contend against others on matters which are open to dispute and seek light for ourselves on things which are unknown; for the same arguments which we use when persuading others when we speak in public, we employ also when we deliberate in our own thoughts; and, while we call eloquent those who are able to speak before a crowd, we regard as sage those who most skilfully debate their problems in their own minds (Isoc. *Nicocles* 8; Loeb trans.).<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Isoc. *Nicocles* 5ff.

<sup>14</sup> Isoc. *Antidosis* 186ff.

<sup>15</sup> Τόλμα often carries negative connotations (see below, p.88, with n.8), but here suggests self-confidence without braggadocio or over-boldness, as Isocrates is keen to clarify (*ibid.* 190).

<sup>16</sup> This is clearly a vital concept for Isocrates: we find identical language at *Antidosis* 256.



Here the performative nature of *paideia* is very much in evidence, though the rhetorical skills learned from teachers are sometimes to be divorced from their public context, and applied before a more private audience – the audience of the self; we shall see this notion in operation later.

Yet philosophical and ethical texts do not have the monopoly on *paideia*. In his discussion of New Comic echoes in Chariton, Borgogno (1971: 260) views *paideia* as an ideal in Menander's work, terming it an 'elevazione morale' which, far from being the 'egoistico esercizio di un' astratta virtù', is rather 'comprensione dei bisogni di chi ci è accanto e rispetto per l'altrui sofferenza'. *Paideia* assumes yet another aspect here, becoming – in addition to a thoroughgoing elite education, the exercise of virtue in relation to others and to oneself, and the ability to reason both publicly and privately – a profound comprehension of, and respect for, the needs and sufferings of others: it is the ability to empathise, to relate to others by means of one's own experiences. *Paideia* thus emerges as a rather Russian doll-like construct, appearing simple at first glance, but in fact comprised of several interdependent parts. It has both educational and ethical aspects, and within each of these are public and private facets: educationally, one must be able to debate publicly with others and privately with oneself; ethically, one must demonstrate virtue in one's public dealings with others, which in turn entails the exercise of control over the self, and a highly-developed sense of empathy. If any one of these elements is missing, *paideia* is incomplete; indeed, an unstable or incomplete *paideia* may threaten one's very masculinity – a threat we shall observe in Chariton.

### ii. Hellenistic *paideia*.

The *Tabula* of Cebes is an important text for our understanding of the significance of Hellenistic and Roman imperial *paideia*. The authorship of this text, which purports to be an allegorical interpretation of a painted votive tablet,<sup>17</sup> is uncertain, although it appears to have been universally attributed by writers of the imperial period to Cebes of Thebes, a pupil of Socrates and fellow of Plato.<sup>18</sup> While there is

<sup>17</sup> Longus, of course, employs a similar pretext in the prologue of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

<sup>18</sup> See X. *Mem.* 1.2.48 for Cebes as a disciple of Socrates. Diogenes Laertius (2.125) and Lucian (*De Merc. Cond.* 42; *Rh. Pr.* 6) both unequivocally accept Cebes as the author of the *Tabula*. Opinion had not changed by the time the *Suda* was compiled (s.v. Κέβης).

now a general consensus that the work should be dated to the Hellenistic or early imperial period, the content may derive from the ideas of the classical Cebes, thus accounting for the ancient belief that he was its author (Fitzgerald & White 1983: 2ff.). The basic form of the *Tabula* recycles Prodicus' myth of Heracles' choice between Virtue and Vice,<sup>19</sup> and the text has been seen to reflect Platonic, Cynic, Stoic, and Neopythagorean doctrines.<sup>20</sup> Needless to say, philosophy through *ekphrasis* is commonplace almost to the point of cliché, particularly in Second Sophistic texts,<sup>21</sup> but important for our purposes here is the stout differentiation the *Tabula* makes between two forms of *paideia*, one genuine and the other fraudulent – a dichotomy very much evident in second-century literature, and one whose traces may be detected in the novels. In the *Tabula*, true *paideia* admits a man to many virtues, including *enkrateia*, *karteria*,<sup>22</sup> *andreia*, *dikaiosynē*, and *sōphrosynē*,<sup>23</sup> but such *paideia* cannot be claimed by someone who merely possesses academic knowledge:

οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει εἰδέναι μὲν γράμματα καὶ κατέχειν τὰ μαθήματα πάντα, ὁμοίως δὲ μέθυσον καὶ ἀκρατῆ εἶναι καὶ φιλάργυρον καὶ ἄδικον καὶ προδότην καὶ τὸ πέρασ ἀφρονα.

... nothing prevents one from knowing literature and mastering all the academic disciplines and yet at the same time being drunken, incontinent, avaricious, unjust, treacherous, and, in short, foolish (Ceb. 34; trans. Fitzgerald & White).

Those who know their letters but lead immoral lives possess a mere *pseudopaideia*, a form that attracts many poets and orators, according to the elderly exegete who interprets the painting for his younger audience.<sup>24</sup> Cebes' attack is founded on the presumed existence of people who believe *paideia* to be nothing more than literate education. He is clearly adopting a polemical stance against this bastardised *paideia*:

<sup>19</sup> For which see X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34; for an early appearance of the motif of choice between two ways of life, see Hes. *Op.* 287-292. This became a common theme in the imperial period, as we shall see from Lucian's *The Dream*.

<sup>20</sup> For discussion of doctrinal influences in the *Tabula*, see Fitzgerald & White (1983: 20ff.) and, more recently, Trapp (1997: 168ff.).

<sup>21</sup> See Bartsch (1989 *passim*) and Morales (2004 *passim*).

<sup>22</sup> Ceb. 16.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 20.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* 13.

his outspoken self-positioning suggests that he perceives *pseudopaideia* to be a prevalent and pernicious force amongst his contemporaries, and one which disguises itself as something it is not. *Paideia* had always been a hard-won badge of honour, but Cebes had evidently observed men attempting to claim it, while having no right to do so. Consequently, *paideia* was being cheapened, and one means of restoring its exclusivity was to flag up a distinction between what he saw as ‘real’ *paideia*, and the marker to which others were now laying claim.

### *iii. Second Sophistic paideia.*

Kleijwegt (1991: 84) observes that *paideia* was increasingly labelled as praiseworthy in inscriptions of the imperial period, and he cites one from Aphrodisias, Chariton’s hometown, honouring a man for his *paideia*, his gentleness, and his gentlemanly behaviour.<sup>25</sup> Anderson (1993: 8) remarks that Second Sophistic *paideia* is notoriously difficult to define; where a concept is flexible, I would suggest, it may be easier to claim it for oneself by imposing on it one’s own interpretation. The increased emphasis on *paideia* at this time, both in inscriptions and in literature, implies a renewed concern over the nature of *paideia* and those who claimed to possess it. The distinctions that Cebes makes between legitimate and counterfeit *paideia* resurface in the Second Sophistic: in order to establish their own authenticity, sophists and rhetoricians stressed the dichotomy between true and false *paideia*, implying, without ever having to state overtly, that they themselves possessed the former and others the latter. Once such a distinction is laid down, the race is on to prove oneself a true *pepaideumenos*; true *paideia* is a rare breed, and consequently competition for it becomes intense.<sup>26</sup> Dio Chrysostom makes what is effectively the same distinction, using the terms ‘human’ and ‘divine’: conversing with Alexander, Diogenes observes that human *paideia* involves deception, and that the majority believe that by reading the most books they will acquire the most *paideia*;<sup>27</sup> divine *paideia* is sometimes known as *andreia* and sometimes as *megalophrosynē*, and those who possess this variety are thought to have received

<sup>25</sup> Kleijwegt (1991: 85; *CIG* 2795: 84).

<sup>26</sup> On *paideia* as something to which sophists and rhetoricians laid especial claim, see Anderson (1989).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Lucian *Ind.*, the addressee of which expects a reputation for *paideia* to follow from the purchase of books.

‘good *paideia*’, and to be ‘manly with respect to their souls’.<sup>28</sup> Since the education of Xenophon’s Cyrus, *paideia* had been associated particularly with kings; in his kingship orations, Dio is keen to promote Hellenistic kingship discourse, a discourse which stresses that it is appropriate for no one more than for kings to develop *paideia* and the virtues to which it gives access.<sup>29</sup> All of these issues – competition, deception, and *paideia*’s relationship to kingship and to the virtues – will be important when we discuss the representation of *paideia* in the novels.

*Paideia*, then, was far from being a ‘single, doctrinally coherent system’ (Whitmarsh 2001a: 5), although its true form still comprised an ‘educational’ and a ‘cultural’, or ‘behavioural’, aspect. Emphasising these elements, Jones (1986: 149) notes the frequency of Lucian’s references to *paideia*, and reflects that ‘[t]o lack culture [*paideia*] [in this period] implies ignorance not only of classics such as Homer, but of the behaviour expected of civilized beings’. Lucian in fact appears to have been especially troubled by the prevalence of *pseudopaideia* amongst his contemporaries.<sup>30</sup> In his short piece, *The Dream*, he recounts his choice of the path of *paideia* as a youth. As he had shown some early promise in art, and as his family members were artisans, it was assumed that he too would enter the sculpture trade. But after a disastrous first day as an apprentice to his uncle, he dreams that two women, the personified *Paideia* and *Techne*, appear to him and fight over his future. *Paideia* is refined, attractive, and feminine in appearance, while *Techne* is burly, rough, and masculine. The obvious physical contrast between the two women enables Lucian to make his choice quickly, and he of course chooses *Paideia*, who takes him on a fantastic chariot-ride through the heavens and returns him to his father, regaled in splendid purple robes. Lucian’s piece is not simply a witty take on Prodicus’ well-known tale, which presented the path to virtue as more arduous than that to vice,<sup>31</sup> though preferable in the long term from a moral and ethical perspective. Gera (1995) shows that the work may actually be read as somewhat

<sup>28</sup> D. Chr. Or. 4.29ff.: ... τῆς ἀγαθῆς παιδείας ... καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνδρείους.

<sup>29</sup> This is evident in Isocrates too, where a king’s *paideia* is epitomised by the triumph of self-control (*To Nicocles* 29); see Jaeger (1945: 79ff.).

<sup>30</sup> Bompaire (1958) downplays contemporary references in Lucian, examining instead his use of literary models; Baldwin (1973) and Jones (1986), however, see in Lucian’s work the presence of contemporary social and political currents; my own feeling is that his preoccupation with *paideia* is a sign of very contemporary concerns.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. also Ceb. 15, in which the road to true *paideia* is difficult.

ambiguous. As she points out, it differs from other versions of the story in presenting both female figures as forceful and highly active, whereas the custom was to depict the negative woman as physically aggressive and quick in motion, while the positive woman remained sedate and composed.<sup>32</sup> A further point Gera highlights is that the negative one of the pair was often seductive in appearance, though overly reliant upon artificial aids to beauty,<sup>33</sup> while the virtuous woman may not be as obviously appealing. Moreover, manliness was sometimes a characteristic of the positive one in a Prodicus pair (*ibid.* 244), so by his attribution of this quality to Techne, Lucian plants some uncertainty in the mind of the reader familiar with standard versions of the myth. Techne's outward unattractiveness and evident masculinity imply that she may not in fact be a wholly negative choice; conversely, Paideia's glamour and femininity suggest that she may not be wholly positive. Is Lucian suggesting, Gera asks, that there is no real difference in value between the two ways of life (*ibid.* 241)?

I find Gera's reading intriguing, but would offer a slight alternative. Since sculpture involves the convincing reproduction of a subject through art, it is the perfect cipher for Second Sophistic *paideia*, which recreates the past by the art of oratorical performance. Perhaps, then, Techne represents a sort of *paideia*, while Paideia herself is little more than an artful deception, devoid of the rigorous training of her counterpart.<sup>34</sup> She presents her skills as easily acquired, offering Lucian 'many noble adornments – temperance [σωφροσύνη], justice [δικαιοσύνη], piety [εὐσεβεία], kindness [πρότης], reasonableness [ἐπιείκεια], understanding [σύνεσις] [and] steadfastness [καρτερία]' for his soul,<sup>35</sup> as though these attributes no longer had to be worked for. By contrast, Techne will involve the young Lucian in nothing but toil for very little return, according to Paideia.<sup>36</sup> As Gera notes (*ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> See X. *Mem.* 2.1.23; Ceb. 18.

<sup>33</sup> See X. *Mem.* 2.1.22.

<sup>34</sup> Techne's brief, solecistic, and decidedly clumsy speech (7-8) provides the necessary contrast with Paideia's loquaciousness (9-13), and perhaps symbolises the barbarisms that rhetorical training was designed to eradicate; I do not think it precludes her from being identified as the true form of what Paideia only purports to be. Indeed, τέχνη was a watchword of Alexandrian poetics; in this light it is hard not to see Techne as the route to true *paideia*. Whitmarsh (2001a: 122), on the other hand, sees Sculpture as 'the inflexible, 'monolithic' use of the Greek tradition'; I rather prefer Gera's observations of ambiguity in this piece.

<sup>35</sup> *Somn.* 10; Loeb trans.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* 13.

249), Paideia seems only to mention the virtues because they are the components one would expect to find in her; her true concerns are fame, popularity, and the outward trappings of wealth and attractiveness. I suggest that Lucian adopts the guise of autobiography to illustrate the trap into which young men are now falling, bewitched by the glamorous appeal of a *pseudopaideia* like that of the *Tabula*.<sup>37</sup>

In her discussion of this text, Gera rightly sees parallels with *A Professor of Public Speaking*, which draws a distinction between old-fashioned teachers of rhetoric and the new – and to Lucian’s mind inferior – teachers,<sup>38</sup> who are obsessed with appearance, exhibit effeminacy, and consider manliness to be uncouth.<sup>39</sup> A teacher of this type has ‘a mincing gait, a thin neck, a womanish glance, and a honeyed voice ... and carefully dresses his hair’.<sup>40</sup> The new *paideia* of such teachers is artificial and superficial; it is no longer an emblem of masculinity, but has been prettified into something attractive, yet false.<sup>41</sup> We shall meet such *pseudopaideia* in Cleitophon and Gnathon. So, for Lucian, there now existed a popular, or pseudo-, *paideia* whose form was effeminate, shallow, and often merely a label to be adopted and manipulated for personal gain. It did not require the intensive study of what was once considered ‘manly’ material, like the writings of Plato, Isocrates, and Demosthenes.<sup>42</sup> The *paideia* of many public speakers was no longer a lifelong process, dedicated to instilling and developing the manly qualities of self-control, justice, and steadfastness, and turning out a rounded man who knew how to relate to himself and to others, as well as possessing broad academic knowledge.<sup>43</sup> In some

<sup>37</sup> Bartsch (1989: 15, 25, 41) observes some similarities between Lucian and Cebes in their use of *ekphrasis*.

<sup>38</sup> Lucian explicitly tells us that there are now two paths to rhetoric, that vital element of *paideia*: a ‘short, easy road, direct to Rhetoric, has recently been opened’ (*Rh. Pr.* 10; Loeb trans.).

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 12: the new teacher of rhetoric does not wish to appear ‘masculine’ (ἀρρενωπός).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* 11; Loeb trans., modified. Gleason (1990: 400) notes that imperial moralists thought excessive grooming detrimental to a man’s masculinity, and indicative of effeminacy and a lack of self-restraint. Chariton betrays a similar belief, for the beauty regime of his supposed adulterer is deliberately excessive so as to render the character credible (1.4.9): the external appearance of this man is a clear index of character, identifying him before the reader (and before the watching Chaereas) as a licentious type; a man who looks this way *must* have duplicitous and immoral intentions, and lack true *paideia*. We shall return to these issues in Chapter 3.

<sup>41</sup> See also *Bis Acc.* 31, where the Syrian (Lucian himself) states that Rhetoric is no longer what she was when he met her: she has ‘made herself up, arranged her hair like a courtesan, put on rouge, and darkened her eyes underneath’ (Loeb trans.); this, he says, made him suspicious and caused him to leave her.

<sup>42</sup> Lucian *Rh. Pr.* 9, 17; *Bis Acc.* 31. Cf. Dio’s remarks on pseudophilosophers (*Or.* 72.15-16).

<sup>43</sup> According to Lucian, a man need only bandy about a handful of Atticisms for others to believe him far superior in *paideia* (*Rh. Pr.* 17). Lucian also offers advice on how one should behave if following

cases it was now little more than a cloak, hurriedly assumed and used to conceal a lack of actual knowledge and an absence of traditional masculine attributes.<sup>44</sup>

Whitmarsh (2001a: 123) has pointed to the inherent power of imperial *paideia* to act as a disguise, concealing or appearing to transform reality; indeed, a well-mastered *paideia* could even effect the transformation of one disadvantaged by birth, as Gleason (1995: 168) observes of Favorinus. Lucian's preoccupation with the nature of *paideia* and rhetoric underscores the long-standing and ingrained association between *paideia* and public-speaking. Moreover, his concern regarding the apparently superficial *paideia* of some teachers and public speakers emphasises *paideia*'s second-century connection with the specific field of epideictic oratory. Over and above its use as a tool for debate, Isocrates had privileged the power of the *logos* in moral and ethical contexts, but Lucian suggests that the moral and the ethical were now being neglected in favour of the spectacular, reducing *paideia* to nothing more than a glittering exterior with no substance. By placing this superficial *paideia* under the spotlight, Lucian implicitly leads the reader to surmise that, by contrast, Lucian himself possesses a traditional *paideia* that has regard for behaviour, and not merely for the show of learning. But both *pseudopaideia* and true *paideia* could be used for concealing purposes, and when we turn to the novels we shall observe in action both the substantial and the superficial forms of *paideia*, and their capacity for concealment.

Whitmarsh (2001a: 19) argues that *paideia*'s role in the literature of the Second Sophistic was as a vehicle for the exploration of right behaviour in everyday life, and as a site for debate on the best way to live life. This is very much the light in which Chariton seems to see it. Despite *paideia*'s ambiguity, the title of *pepaideumenos* could still serve as an index of one's social standing (Brown 1992: 39-41) and a powerful cultural descriptor, a form of 'symbolic capital' (Bourdieu 1977: 171-183; Gleason 1995: xxi): because *paideia* was an ongoing, lifelong process, to be a true *pepaideumenos* implied that a man possessed the time and

---

this new path to rhetoric: one should 'be resolved to do anything and everything – to dice, to drink deep, to live high and to keep mistresses' (*ibid.* 23; Loeb trans.).

<sup>44</sup> On philosophy as a cloak for sexual deviance, see Goldhill (1995: 46-111); we shall return to this notion in Chapter 3.

money to develop his education and culture on a continual, rolling basis. The acquisition and maintenance of *paideia* defined the self both personally, within one's own social context, and ethnically, in the wider world: it marked a man out from the crowd at home, and from non-Greeks abroad.<sup>45</sup> Focusing on the importance of rhetoric, Gleason (*ibid.* xxii *et passim*) has stressed the Second Sophistic as a very public, face-to-face society, in which the appearance and conduct – and thus the *paideia* – of elite males were constantly scrutinised and judged. A man might be described as *pepaideumenos*, but this cultural marker was a fragile one, open to attack from external forces, or from his own emotions and desires. The identity of the *pepaideumenos*, the hegemonic badge of the elite Greek male, was constructed and performed through a lifetime's effort. We should thus understand true *paideia* as an intellectual and moral *way of being*, which continued throughout a man's life and could never be taken for granted.<sup>46</sup>

#### ***The gendering of paideia.***

As *paideia* had always been grounded in academic study, and as literacy and scholarship were largely masculine realms, *paideia* had throughout Greek history been the preserve of men (Connolly 2003: 294). Women, however, were not entirely excluded, even at earlier points in history, although their inclusion was limited and of a variety wholly different from that of men. Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, for example, recommends a form of *paideia* for the wives of estate-owners, but the education they are to receive is geared towards making them best able to support their husbands in the day-to-day running of the estate (Jaeger 1945: 176).<sup>47</sup> For the classical wife, then, access to *paideia* was dictated by her role in the patriarchal household (Whitmarsh 2001a: 111). One might think that with women's increased access to education in the imperial period, and the concomitant rise in female literacy, female *paideia* would become more prevalent. It is certainly true that there were more educated women at this time (*ibid.* 109), particularly amongst the elite,

<sup>45</sup> The particular 'Greekness' of *paideia* had been evident also in Isocrates' work (e.g. *Panegyricus* 50ff., where Hellenism and *paideia* are synonymous). As we saw in the case of Cyrus, however, (and as we shall see in Chariton later), non-Greeks could sometimes attain *paideia*; indeed, it often appears that Greekness is more a matter of culture than of race (Goldhill 2001a: 13; Whitmarsh 2001b: 272-273).

<sup>46</sup> Cribiore (2001: 243-244) describes *paideia* as 'a slow vegetable growth that affected people through the course of their lives'.

<sup>47</sup> See X. *Oec.*, esp. 7.15ff.



but the *paideia* that women were able to develop again appears to have differed from that of men. Plutarch, whose views on women were relatively liberal, wrote a treatise entitled *A Woman, Too, Should Be Educated*, whose few remaining fragments unfortunately tell us little about his ideas on the subject. He does, however, state in *Advice to Bride and Groom* that a husband should educate his wife,<sup>48</sup> though it is notable that the husband is the purveyor of this education, and that she is dependent upon him for it. Although it is impossible to gain a full impression of Plutarch's conception of female *paideia*, for Whitmarsh (*ibid.* 109ff.) his extant recommendations reinforce a wife's submissive status within the marriage bond, whereas for a man *paideia* has the potential to empower. While Plutarch may have been an adherent of reciprocal love and mutual pleasure within marriage, his 'essential conservatism' (Stadter 1995: 222) seems to have supported the continuing focus of *paideia* in this period on the creation of a male subject. Plutarch's female *paideia* seems to have extended only to her role as a partner in marriage, and as such should not be seen as radically different from earlier forms of female *paideia*. In fact, Plutarch perpetuates a normative classical dictum, namely that without the guidance of men, women would revert to their natural low-minded condition:

τῇ δὲ γυναικὶ πανταχόθεν τὸ χρήσιμον συνάγων, ὥσπερ αἱ μέλιτται, καὶ φέρων αὐτὸς ἐν σεαυτῷ, μεταδίδου καὶ προσδιαλέγου, φίλους αὐτῇ ποιῶν καὶ συνήθεις τῶν λόγων τοὺς ἀρίστους. ... Ἄν γὰρ λόγων χρηστῶν σπέρματα μὴ δέχωνται μηδὲ κοινωνῶσι παιδείας τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰς ἄτοπα πολλὰ καὶ φαῦλα βουλευμάτων καὶ πάθη κύουσι.

And for your wife you must collect from every source what is useful, as do the bees, and carrying it within your own self impart it to her, and then discuss it with her, and make the best of these doctrines her favourite and familiar themes ... For if [wives] do not receive the seed of good doctrines and share with their husbands in intellectual advancement [*paideia*], they, left to themselves, conceive many untoward ideas and low designs and emotions (Plu. *Coniugalia Praecepta* 145b ff.; Loeb trans.).

However, these observations deserve some qualification in the light of the changing face of marriage in the imperial period. It appears that, with the growing emphasis on mutual love within marriage, it was not for the woman alone to direct her *paideia*

<sup>48</sup> Plu. *Coniugalia Praecepta* 146a.

into the *oikos*. Whilst male *paideia* may have been empowering, and may have provided opportunities outside the home, the emerging focus on reciprocal love ensured that some of that *paideia* was invested in a man's relationship with his wife:

The moralists and philosophers of [the imperial period] devote much space in their surviving writing to the art of successfully ruling oneself and one's body ... Above all, the desired poise and stability of the self was rooted in the home and the marriage relation. This was the centre of self-control in the crucial areas of sexual and emotional conduct (Swain 1996: 128).

Women may have been disadvantaged in terms of the extent of their access to *paideia*, and of its scope and potential, as Swain (*ibid.* 64, n.75) would argue, yet many must surely have benefited from marriage becoming a site for their husbands' practice of *paideia*. We shall see that Chariton presents *paideia* as performed to some extent within the marriage bond, and certainly as having a bearing on a man's response to his own feelings of erotic desire. First, though, how do the novels present female *paideia*?

#### *Female paideia in the novels.*

Of the seven instances of the term παιδεία in Chariton, none applies to women, while the feminine participle πεπαιδευμένη is used only twice, and in both cases in relation to Callirhoe. So, does the *pepaideumenē* differ from the *pepaideumenos*? Is the nature of female *paideia* dictated by the *pepaideumenē*'s marital status and conjugal responsibility, as we have observed it to be in Xenophon and Plutarch? Callirhoe is first described as *pepaideumenē* when the Persian king's eunuch, Artaxates, has propositioned her on behalf of his master. Her response to such an unwelcome suggestion is a desire 'to pluck out the eyes of this corrupter'.<sup>49</sup> This is clearly a situation that provokes Callirhoe to great anger: her emotion is described as ὀργή, and she is driven (ὄρμησεν) by her revulsion at the eunuch's proposition; and yet, because she is a γυνή πεπαιδευμένη καὶ φρενήρης, she is capable of controlling her anger (τὴν ὀργὴν μετέβαλε),<sup>50</sup> quickly calculating (ταχέως

<sup>49</sup> Chariton 6.5.8; trans. Goold.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. 3.2.1, where Dionysius too must control his first impulse on learning that Callirhoe has agreed to marry him; and see below, p.80, with n.220, on Chaereas' anger.

λογισαμένη) her position, and dissimulating before Artaxates from then on (κατειρωνεύσατο λοιπὸν τοῦ βαρβάρου). The *paideia* she has received, with its capacity for *logos*,<sup>51</sup> allows her to disguise her true emotions, and to produce an eloquent and convincing speech in response to a proposition that has disgusted her;<sup>52</sup> her speech in fact has such an effect as to leave Artaxates with ‘mouth wide open’.<sup>53</sup> Scourfield (2003: 180) notes that *LSJ* give the opposite of φρενήρης as ἐμμανής (‘frantic’, ‘raving’), which is how Callirhoe really feels; yet Scourfield misses the fact that this is an opposition Chariton plays on in Callirhoe’s first line of response: “‘May I never be so mad [μαίνομαι],” she said, “as to consider myself worthy of the Great King!””<sup>54</sup> In this short scene we see the potential of *paideia* to develop effective speech, and to disguise what truly underlies it. But this is no *pseudopaideia*, concealing an absence of true knowledge. Rather, it is the use of acculturation – of rhetorical finesse and artful deception – to positive effect, in order to deflect an assault on chastity; in this moral goal, Callirhoe thus shows herself to possess true *paideia*. Her adept performance might suggest that her *paideia* is little different from male *paideia* – that the term *pepaideumenē* has the same parameters as its masculine equivalent. But we should note that her *paideia* is directed toward the marriage bond, as we saw was the case with the female *paideia* of Xenophon and Plutarch: her performance of *paideia* is dictated to some extent by her marital status.

Although Heliodorus never uses the word *paideia* or its cognates, *paideia* is nonetheless an implicit concept in his text. At an early point we learn that Charicleia has undergone a quite considerable *askēsis*, and is in fact far more competent in argument than many of her male counterparts. Quickly mastering Greek, she employs rhetorical skill to argue against Charicles’ wish to marry her to Alcamenes: she uses her newfound feathers (πτερόις),<sup>55</sup> brandishing her great experience in argument (τὴν ἐκ λόγων πολυπειρίαν ... ἐπανατείνεται), the intricacies

<sup>51</sup> At 2.6.1 she is said by Dionysius to possess ἡ τῶν λόγων πειθώ.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. 1.11.2: Callirhoe pretends to believe Theron’s lies, as she realises that her life will be threatened if she vents anger (ὀργίζομαι) at her situation. Scourfield (2003: 179) is right to object to Goold’s rather patronising translation of the verb as ‘become petulant’: there is nothing derisory about Callirhoe’s emotions, as her urge to physical violence against Artaxates shows.

<sup>53</sup> 6.5.10.

<sup>54</sup> 6.5.9.

<sup>55</sup> The word carries the multiple connotations of ‘feathers’, ‘wings’, and ‘arrows’, suggesting that Charicleia’s education has enabled her to take metaphorical flight (one of Heliodorus’ many nods to

(ποικίλην) of which Charicles himself had taught her.<sup>56</sup> The education Charicles gave her was designed to prepare her to choose the best path in life; by this he clearly means the path of wife and mother, but she has in fact used it to reject social expectations and to follow a life of virginity.<sup>57</sup> Yet while this use of *paideia* might appear to be one of self-assertion, it remains confined to the sphere of sexual conduct; both Charicles' intention in educating Charicleia, and Charicleia's use of that education, thus reinforce the notion that female *paideia* is circumscribed in a way that male *paideia* is not.<sup>58</sup> Charicleia goes on to use her *paideia* in a manner very similar to that of Callirhoe, dissimulating before suitors in order to preserve her chastity,<sup>59</sup> and thus again conforming to the standard uses of female *paideia* that we have seen in other texts. However, it is important to note that in a genre whose focal point is romantic love, the relationship of *paideia* to sexual conduct is perhaps inevitable; indeed, we have already observed that a connection exists between *paideia* and *sōphrosynē*, and while the former term may not be used by Heliodorus, the latter certainly is.<sup>60</sup> Although for men *paideia* may be related to their public lives in a way that it is not for women, it does also constrain them in their private, romantic lives, as we shall see in the case of Dionysius: it is not only women whose sexual behaviour is governed by *paideia*.

---

the Platonic wings of the soul), and to turn upon Charicles the verbal weapons he himself equipped her with.

<sup>56</sup> Hld. 2.33.3ff. Other references to her education and intelligence are made in the text: in begging Calasiris to assist him in steering Charicleia away from a life of virginity, Charicles refers to her as not unaccustomed (ἀπρόσμικτος) to τοὺς λογίους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, and indeed as having spent considerable time as an associate (συνόμιλος) of such men (2.33.7); Calasiris goes on to use the same language of her at 3.19.3; at 2.35.3 Calasiris tells Cnemon that Charicleia had asked him questions about sacred writings, and at 6.8.1 Nausicles praises her for being γενναία μὲν τὸ λῆμα συνετὴ δὲ τὸ φρόνημα.

<sup>57</sup> 2.33.5. On the implications of this scene, Maguire (2005: 180ff.) is good.

<sup>58</sup> If Heliodorus' text is to be given a late date, the use of *paideia* to maintain virginity might have significance from a Christian perspective, in which case it once more upholds an idealised female role.

<sup>59</sup> At 1.21.3ff. she feigns consent to marriage with Thyamis; her deception is so convincing that she even has Theagenes fooled (1.25.1-2). Cf. Achilles Tatius' Leucippe, who conducts a spirited rhetorical defence of her chastity which seems indebted to some form of *paideia* (6.21-21); at a stretch one might even think Anthia's quick-witted yarn-spinning before the pimp to be evidence of a *paideia* of sorts (X. Eph. 5.7).

<sup>60</sup> 1.3.1; 1.8.3; 1.12.2; 2.4.2; 4.8.7; 5.22.3; 7.2.3; 8.6.4; 8.9.22; 10.9.4; 10.9.5. While *sōphrosynē* is applied to men, it is much more frequently used of Charicleia: one of the above references relates to Thyamis, one to Theagenes, and one jointly to Theagenes and Charicleia; with the exception of one sarcastic reference to Demaenete, all the others relate to Charicleia.

Chariton's second and final description of Callirhoe as *pepaideumenē* occurs when Chaereas has captured the island of Aradus, where Callirhoe, Stateira, and the rest of the Persian noblewomen have been left for their safety. Callirhoe is said to be best able to comfort Stateira, 'being a Greek woman, *pepaideumenē*, and not inexperienced with regard to suffering'.<sup>61</sup> Again, in one short line Chariton speaks volumes about the nature and power of *paideia*. Callirhoe's *paideia* here goes hand-in-hand with her identity as a Greek. As we have noted, *paideia* was often considered a mark of 'Greekness',<sup>62</sup> and although Chariton generally characterises Persians favourably – Artaxerxes and Stateira have many 'Greek' characteristics – they remain barbarians;<sup>63</sup> Chariton's emphasis on Callirhoe's *paideia* at the precise moment when she and Stateira are spotlighted cannot help but act as a cultural differentiator between the two women, thereby elevating Callirhoe.<sup>64</sup> It is also significant that Callirhoe has developed a friendship with the queen. We have observed that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and Hellenistic kingship discourse associated *paideia* and its accompanying virtues with kingship. We have also noted that Callirhoe's *paideia* elevates her status and is one of the factors that make her best qualified to console the queen. Gleason (1995: 162) has highlighted the ability of *paideia* to act as a marker of social class. Is it possible that Callirhoe's possession of *paideia* is socially empowering, enabling her to move in royal circles and to become the confidante of the Persian queen?<sup>65</sup> Here, then, perhaps we see a side of female *paideia* that is not connected with chastity, a side that offers a form of social advancement more akin to that provided by male *paideia*; we shall see later that Dionysius' *paideia* is certainly socially and politically empowering, and closely connected to royalty. As well as being related to her race and her friendship with the queen, Callirhoe's *paideia* is here attached to her experiences, suggesting the

<sup>61</sup> Chariton 7.6.5: ... ὡς ἂν Ἑλληνίς καὶ πεπαιδευμένη καὶ οὐκ ἀμελέτητος κακῶν.

<sup>62</sup> See above, p.38, with n.45.

<sup>63</sup> The cultural stereotype is evident in Callirhoe's expectation that Stateira will be insanely jealous if she finds out about her husband's feelings for her (6.6.5); Chariton takes pleasure in subverting this expectation and surprising both Callirhoe and the culturally-conditioned reader.

<sup>64</sup> *Paideia* is later at work implicitly in Callirhoe's rejection of Chaereas' suggestion that she keep Stateira as a slave: while *paideia* elevates her above the queen, as Greek over barbarian, it also enables her to show clemency and to recognise that it would be inappropriate to enslave the Persian queen (8.3.2). We shall return to the relationship between *paideia* and clemency at the end of this chapter, and in connection with Hydaspes' *andreia* in Chapter 2.

<sup>65</sup> In this regard it may be significant that Heliodorus' Thisbe, the pale imitation of Charicleia and clearly lacking *paideia*, never reaches Ethiopia, where Nausicles was hoping to send her to become the queen Persinna's confidante; this of course also relates to Heliodorus' ranking of Athens at the bottom of a moral and cultural hierarchy (see also below, p.118, n.124).

common (particularly in tragedy) notion of learning through suffering: although she is described as φρονήματος πλήρης early on,<sup>66</sup> Callirhoe is only said to be *pepaideumenē* after undergoing many sufferings.<sup>67</sup> Her own endurance of misfortune enables her to empathise with Stateira and thus to comfort her. We may think at this point of Borgogno's observation of Menander's *paideia*,<sup>68</sup> which fosters empathy and respect for others' suffering. We might see Chariton's reference to *paideia* here as the central element that dictates Callirhoe's behaviour towards the queen, functioning symbiotically with her race and her life experiences, and serving to create her identity.<sup>69</sup> Callirhoe's *paideia* may in fact be understood as the quality that dictates her behaviour throughout the novel; indeed, Kaimio (1995: 127) regards it as her survival strategy. Time and again we see her as conversant with appropriate action, and as the possessor of both wit and behavioural *paideia*, thinking through her situation before deciding her course, and taking into account the possible consequences of her actions.<sup>70</sup>

Both Callirhoe and Charicleia clearly possess *paideia*, the former explicitly and the latter implicitly. However, this female *paideia* does appear to be to some extent qualitatively different from male *paideia*. While it enables Callirhoe to socialise with royalty and Charicleia to quiz learned men on sacred texts, its ultimate goal is the preservation of chastity, and it is therefore tied firmly to the sanctity of the female body. Even the sage military advice that Callirhoe gives Chaereas is delivered within the confines of the bedroom after she has resumed her role as his wife: it too is contextualised within the conjugal sphere. Yet, like male *paideia* in other writings, and in the novels as we shall see, it entails an acute awareness of oneself and one's own emotions, of the feelings of others, and of how one should conduct oneself in relation to those feelings. We shall observe that *both male and female forms of paideia* reinforce gender roles within normative spheres of action: the female within marriage or where chastity is concerned, and the male in the social

<sup>66</sup> 1.3.6.

<sup>67</sup> We shall return later to the possibility that, as argued by (Couraud-)Lalanne (1998, 2006), the protagonists' experiences constitute a form of *paideia*.

<sup>68</sup> See above, p.31.

<sup>69</sup> The central position of the adjective πεπαιδευμένη in the syntax of the clause seems to confirm its interdependent relationship with Ἑλληνίς and οὐκ ἀμελέτητος κακῶν.

<sup>70</sup> E.g. 1.11.2; 2.11.1-4; note also that she upbraids Chaereas for lack of forethought, and assists him with military strategy (8.2.4).

and political arena. But one thing is worthy of note: for men as well as for women, *paideia* dictates behaviour with regard to love and sex. It is to the discourse of male *paideia* in the novels that we now turn. As we noted in the Introduction,<sup>71</sup> the presence of a discourse is not signalled solely by the use of specific language, so it will also be necessary to examine scenes from which that language may be absent, but in which *paideia* is implicit, as we have done in the case of Charicleia. The following discussion focuses primarily on Chariton, whose overwhelming application of *paideia* to male characters suggests that he sees it predominantly as a marker of masculinity.

#### *The age and aspect of the pepaideuomenos.*

In the first chapter of *The Dream* Lucian recalls the discussion held by his father and his father's friends concerning the path Lucian should take at the end of his basic schooling. Lucian remarks that most of them believed *paideia* to require 'great labour, much time, considerable expense, and conspicuous social position'.<sup>72</sup> This is a picture he goes on to undercut ironically, as we have seen, but it is instructive for the image it presents of *paideia* as something developed over time and through effort, and as something to which only men of a certain social and financial standing may lay claim. *Paideia* (the *paideia* of old, at least) is a process, not an overnight acquisition, suggesting that it cannot be possessed by the young.<sup>73</sup> This separation of *paideia* from youth is also suggested by the timing of the discussion: Lucian has finished his schooling (τὰ διδασκαλεῖα), and is now on the verge of manhood (τὴν ἡλικίαν πρόσθηβος ὤν); this is apparently the time to begin the laborious development of *paideia*. In Cebes' *Tabula* we also find *paideia* detached from youth and acquired with age: true *paideia* is represented by a woman who has reached 'an age of maturity and judgment' (μέσῃ δὲ καὶ κεκριμένη ἤδη τῇ ἡλικίᾳ).<sup>74</sup> *Paideia* may be a process that *begins* while the subject is reasonably young (and the fact that it is cognate with παῖς would suggest as much), but it is only developed as the subject matures.

<sup>71</sup> See above, p.7.

<sup>72</sup> *Somn.* 1; Loeb trans.: τοῖς πλείστοις οὖν ἔδοξεν παιδεία μὲν καὶ πόνου πολλοῦ καὶ χρόνου μακροῦ καὶ δαπάνης οὐ μικρᾶς καὶ τύχης δεῖσθαι λαμπρᾶς ...

<sup>73</sup> Unlike the '*paideia*' of which Lucian dreams, which is indeed literally an overnight acquisition.

<sup>74</sup> Ceb. 18; trans. Fitzgerald & White.

Chariton seems to reflect this association of *paideia* with maturity. Dionysius, for example, Chariton's most notable possessor of *paideia*, has clearly reached some form of 'middle age', having been married previously, and having fathered a child. Of course, 'middle age', both at the story's dramatic date and at the time of authorship, was very likely attained at a far younger age than it is today. There is, however, a clear age distinction between Dionysius and Chaereas, whose jealous anger marks him out early on as a hot-headed youth.<sup>75</sup> Dionysius is first described as ἀνήρ ἡλικία καθεστώς,<sup>76</sup> which suggests that he has reached a certain (though unspecified) age. Similarly, Demetrius, the Egyptian charged with returning Stateira to the Great King at the end of the military conflict, is ἡλικία προήκων,<sup>77</sup> while Heliodorus' Calasiris, though not explicitly called *pepaideumenos*, has many of the qualities one might expect of such a man,<sup>78</sup> and is elderly to boot. Further, Longus' Philetas is clearly conceived as *pepaideumenos*, though again is not specifically labelled as such. His status as a πρεσβύτερος is emphasised,<sup>79</sup> and distinguishes him from the run-of-the-mill γέροντες of the countryside (Morgan 2004: 177): he is an 'elder', rather than simply an 'old man'. The kind of *paideia* that interests Longus is of course somewhat different from that in other novels,<sup>80</sup> so the implicit *pepaideumenos* Philetas is not quite the same as other *pepaideumenoι*; we shall see, however, that in other texts too, knowledge of the nature of love does qualify as an element of *paideia*. The erotic advice Philetas offers to Daphnis and Chloe is termed a παιδευτήριον and a παιδεύμα,<sup>81</sup> but such advice is evidently not the limit of his *paideia*: as an elderly man, respected for his *dikaïosynē*, he is called upon to adjudicate in the dispute between the locals and the Methymnaeans;<sup>82</sup> *dikaïosynē*, as we have noted, is a quality related to *paideia*. These references imply that *paideia* is an attribute developed over time, and thus something that comes with maturity. This argument would seem at first glance to be contradicted by Chariton's sole reference

<sup>75</sup> We shall explore this anger at the end of the chapter.

<sup>76</sup> Chariton 1.12.6.

<sup>77</sup> 8.3.10. We have observed the particular connection of *paideia* with 'Greekness'; although Egyptian, Demetrius notably has a Greek name, and like other of Chariton's non-Greeks, he appears rather Greek. Demetrius outstrips the other Egyptians in *paideia* and *aretē*, and his development of these qualities seems to have enabled him to break through the confines of his ethnicity.

<sup>78</sup> For a list of Calasiris' sophistic *pepaideumenos* qualities, see Anderson (1989: 184-185).

<sup>79</sup> Longus 2.3.1-2.

<sup>80</sup> For more on Longus' *paideia*, see below, p.73-75.

<sup>81</sup> 2.9.1, 3.14.1.

<sup>82</sup> 2.15.1.



to Chaereas' *paideia*.<sup>83</sup> But for Chariton maturity seems to reside not only in age but also in character. It is significant that Chaereas' *paideia* is mentioned only towards the end of the novel, when, firstly, a substantial amount of time has elapsed since he and Callirhoe were first married,<sup>84</sup> and, secondly, he has undergone a considerable amount of 'life experience'. The *paideia* he now has is clearly not the result of formal education, but of his experiences. In this regard, the argument of Couraud-Lalanne (1998: 532), that Chaereas undergoes a rite of passage, is persuasive.<sup>85</sup>

So *paideia* is generally not something a man may claim at an age of immaturity. Xenophon of Ephesus, however, refers to Habrocomes' *paideia* when the young man is at the tender age of sixteen.<sup>86</sup> The activities in which Habrocomes engages are truly classical, on the model of Cyrus' *paideia*. Xenophon lists the three elements of which the educational form of *paideia* was typically comprised: rhetoric (signified by the verb μελετάω), the arts (μουσικῆν ποικίλην ἥσκει), and physical exercise in the form of hunting, horsemanship, and fighting under arms (all enumerated and then summed up by γυμνάσματα). If *paideia* is something that one only possesses after much effort and experience, how is it that Habrocomes can be described in these terms? Although he is said to have developed both body and soul, this reads rather as tokenism. It seems that the focus here is on the educational aspect of *paideia*, rather than its moral and ethical side: Habrocomes may have had an educational *paideia* – he may have begun his *meletē* and *askēsis* – but education alone does not a *pepaideumenos* make. It is quite possible that if, as has been suggested, Xenophon was imitating Chariton,<sup>87</sup> he recognised the significance of the concept of *paideia* in Chariton's work, and therefore paid lip-service to it, without fully developing the theme.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Chariton 7.2.5.

<sup>84</sup> The amount of time Chaereas and Callirhoe are separated has been the subject of discussion (e.g. Couraud-Lalanne 1998: 536). It is worth noting that Callirhoe's child is old enough to require a *paidagōgos*, and for Dionysius to try to use him as a messenger to Callirhoe when the trial is postponed (5.10.4-5).

<sup>85</sup> For Chaereas' experiences as rites of passage, see also Schmeling (1974), Lalanne (2006), and below, p.83-84.

<sup>86</sup> X. Eph. 1.1.2.

<sup>87</sup> See Anderson's introduction to his translation in Reardon (1989), but cf. above, p.16, n.37.

<sup>88</sup> Or the lack of development may simply be the result of the text not being in its original form.

Achilles Tatius, on the other hand, implicitly casts the young Cleitophon as *pepaideumenos*, knowing full well that the hero's age (not to mention his behaviour) may make the reader question the legitimacy of this casting. When Cleitophon is first introduced the narrator makes a point of highlighting his youth.<sup>89</sup> He then draws him into the Platonic *locus amoenus* in order to hear his story, thus casting Cleitophon as a sort of Socrates-figure.<sup>90</sup> That is a role that Cleitophon readily accepts when he begins his story, referring in Socratic style to the swarm of stories being roused, and to a premonitory dream he had as having been sent by τὸ δαιμόνιον.<sup>91</sup> This inevitably calls to mind Socrates' *daimonion*, thereby ironically casting Cleitophon as the arch-*pepaideumenos*, Socrates – 'ironically', because his youth has just been stressed. During his narration, a picture accretes of a Cleitophon who is conspicuously lacking in the moral essence of *paideia*, and in the virtues to which it gives access. However, a distinction might be made between Cleitophon as actor and Cleitophon as narrator of his own story: if experience contributes to maturity of character and thus to *paideia*, then by the time of Cleitophon's narration, the experiences he has had might be thought to qualify him as *pepaideumenos*, and to entitle him to present himself as such. But it is very difficult for the reader to maintain a constant separation between Cleitophon the actor and Cleitophon the narrator, particularly given that the narrative frame is never resumed: Cleitophon is stuck in the time-warp of his story, learning nothing and never changing. The claim to *paideia* that the indirect equation to Socrates implicitly makes can therefore only be read ironically, as it is so heavily undercut by the behaviour which Cleitophon narrates, and by the difficulty of distinguishing between Cleitophon's two personas. Cleitophon may have studied his philosophy,<sup>92</sup> but as we have seen, education alone does not constitute *paideia*; we shall observe repeatedly that he is pathologically unable to demonstrate the moral and ethical substance of true *paideia*.

The literature of the Second Sophistic demonstrates an intense interest in physiognomy, a pseudo-science which purported to read a man's character and

<sup>89</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.2.1-2.

<sup>90</sup> Pl. *Phdr.* 229a-b; 230a.

<sup>91</sup> 1.2.2; 1.3.2. Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 2) discusses Cleitophon's (and the anonymous narrator's) status as a Socrates-figure, and observes the impact of Cleitophon's emphasised youth on his authority. He does not note the use of τὸ δαιμόνιον.

<sup>92</sup> On Achilles Tatius' use of philosophy, see Repath (Forthcoming a).

intentions through external signs given by dress, gait, and physical features.<sup>93</sup> Lucian shows the influence of physiognomy in his description of the new teachers of rhetoric, whose appearance belies their lack of manliness.<sup>94</sup> If *paideia*'s absence may be proclaimed by a man's outward appearance, presumably so may its presence.<sup>95</sup> We first meet Dionysius in a scene that is focalised through Theron: Dionysius is at the centre of a crowd, but Theron's eyes are drawn to him, and the sight makes him rise to his feet and ask who the man is.<sup>96</sup> Leonas is surprised that Theron has never heard of Dionysius, since his wealth, birth, and *paideia* put him far ahead of other Ionians. We have observed from Lucian that wealth and good birth were generally believed necessary for the cultivation of *paideia*; thus the man who is blessed with more wealth and better birth has the potential to develop more and better *paideia*.<sup>97</sup> Dionysius' wealth, birth, and *paideia* here function together to characterise him, and literally to mark him out from the crowd, for Theron notices him over the many people with him: these attributes give him a bearing which attracts Theron's attention, alerting him to the possibility of selling Callirhoe for a high price – the appearance of *paideia* implies the possession of money. The competitive nature of *paideia* (as well as of wealth and social standing) is emphasised by Dionysius' 'outstripping' (ὑπερέχοντα) of other Ionians. Given this competitiveness, and the fact that *paideia*'s primary context – at least in the Second Sophistic – was the arena of public display, it seems reasonable to surmise that one's *paideia* might be declared to the world through visual means: in addition to rhetorical ability and noble comportment in dealings with others, a man's physical appearance and bearing might act as a further medium for the display and performance of *paideia*; in an era whose elite was obsessed with physiognomy, a man's *paideia* might show itself before the eyes of the watching world, either consciously or unconsciously on the part of the *pepaideumenos*.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> For a useful overview of the significance of physiognomy in the Second Sophistic, see Barton (1995: 95-131); for exhaustive studies, see Evans (1935, 1969), Gleason (1990, 1995, esp. 55-81), and Swain (2007c).

<sup>94</sup> See above, p.36.

<sup>95</sup> Indeed, we shall observe in Chapter 2 that the presence of *andreia* is something visible in a man's appearance.

<sup>96</sup> Chariton 1.12.6.

<sup>97</sup> Wealth has an intimate relationship with *paideia*: T. Morgan (1998: 125ff.) shows that the positive nature of wealth is stressed in the school texts that featured in a young man's *enkyklios paideia*.

<sup>98</sup> This is the essence of many of Gleason's (1995) observations on the performance culture of the Second Sophistic. Borg's (2004) volume works with the premise that *paideia* may be expressed

***The pepaideuementos and kingship.***

We have remarked that *paideia* acted as an index of social status: not only did its cultivation generally require a certain social status, as Lucian noted, but the achievement of the rank of *pepaideuementos* also admitted a man to certain social privileges. It is interesting to note in this regard that when Dionysius is first described, Leonas mentions his wealth, birth, *paideia*, and his friendship with the Persian king. While, as we have observed, wealth and birth are generic prerequisites in descriptions of protagonists, the reference to Dionysius' *paideia* and friendship with Artaxerxes does more than simply fulfil the demands of the genre. It also informs the reader that he has spent much time at his own moral and intellectual improvement, and is thus fit to keep the acquaintance of a king. This seems to have some basis in kingship discourse, wherein a good king was the ultimate possessor of *paideia*,<sup>99</sup> suggesting that to be the friend of a king one must possess *paideia* oneself. This is borne out by the application of the term *paideia* to Chaereas and Demetrius. When Chaereas is said to have *paideia*, he has just become the friend of the Egyptian king, and when he addresses the Syracusans on his triumphant return at the end of the novel, he concludes his speech by claiming to have acquired the Persian king as a friend to the Syracusan populace.<sup>100</sup> Likewise, Demetrius is described as 'known to the king', and as 'marked out from' or 'surpassing' the other Egyptians in his *paideia* and *aretē*.<sup>101</sup> The competitive nature of *paideia*, as well as its capacity to augment social status, and to transcend the restrictions of ethnicity, thus conferring an honorary Greek identity, are all emphasised by this brief description of Demetrius.<sup>102</sup> So *paideia* and friendship with kings appear closely related. The fact that Dionysius, Chaereas, and Demetrius have all become friends with kings suggests that they have reached some standard of *paideia* that entitles

---

through visual media, specifically material culture. See also Trapp (Forthcoming, 2007), who refers to membership of a philosophical school as bestowing a certain appearance.

<sup>99</sup> See above, p.29 and p.33-34, on Xenophon's Cyrus (the royal *pepaideuementos par excellence*) and Dio's kingship orations. We have already noted Chariton's tendency to present his barbarians as honorary Greeks, and we shall consider further shortly the implicit *paideia* of his Persian king.

<sup>100</sup> 7.2.4-5; 8.8.10.

<sup>101</sup> 8.3.10: ... βασιλεῖ γνώριμος, ... παιδεία καὶ ἀρετῆ τῶν ἄλλων Αἰγυπτίων διαφέρων. *Aretē* is a quality frequently said to be possessed by Hellenistic kings (Farber 1979: 499).

<sup>102</sup> Demetrius is labelled φιλόσοφος, which also confers upon him a certain 'Greekness'. The introduction of this *pepaideuementos* adds considerable retrospective irony to the false identity claimed by Theron earlier: he called himself Demetrius (3.4.8). On the characterisation of Demetrius from a philosophical perspective, see Morgan (Forthcoming, 2007).

them to such friendship, just as we noted that Callirhoe's status as *pepaideumenē* seemed to give her access to royal circles.

The connection between kingship and *paideia* is again reflected in Chariton's next reference to Dionysius' *paideia*. Dionysius learns of Leonas' purchase of Callirhoe, but the fact that he is an ἀνὴρ βασιλικός, and διαφέρων ἀξιώματι καὶ παιδείᾳ τῆς ὄλης Ἰωνίας, precludes him from keeping a slave as a concubine.<sup>103</sup> Here the competitive nature of reputation and *paideia* is stressed once more. The adjective βασιλικός suggests not merely that Dionysius is of noble birth, but that he is of noble bearing: he behaves as it is fitting for a king to behave, and is thus 'kingly'.<sup>104</sup> The implicit opposite in the discourse of kingship is the behaviour of the tyrant,<sup>105</sup> who takes advantage of his power to indulge his pleasures, committing *hybris* simply because he can. It would not be fitting for Dionysius to take a slave as concubine both because she would be of lower rank, and because he might be construed as having used his position to take advantage of her.<sup>106</sup> His *paideia* ensures that he behaves in a kingly manner befitting his reputation, and he himself underscores this later, in his response to the news that Leonas bought Callirhoe and that she is thus subject to his will:

ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλευθέρου, καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη περιβόητος ἄκουσαν ὑβριῶ, ἣν οὐχ ὑβρισεν οὐδὲ Θήρων ὁ ληστής;

Am I to become a tyrant over a freeborn person? Shall I, Dionysius, famed for my self-control, violate an unwilling woman whom not even the pirate Theron violated? (Chariton 2.6.3; trans. Goold).

In the characterisation of the king, Artaxerxes, the reader is presented with a paradox. While, as a *pepaideuēnos* himself, the reader knows well that a king should epitomise *paideia*,<sup>107</sup> Artaxerxes is nonetheless a barbarian, and some level

<sup>103</sup> 2.1.5.

<sup>104</sup> At 2.4.4 Dionysius highlights the relationship between his behaviour and his public reputation, specifically the esteem with which he is regarded by satraps, kings, and cities. We shall return to this scene later.

<sup>105</sup> The opposition is found everywhere in Greek ethical writings; see, e.g., Arist. *Pol.* 3.9.6. Heliodorus also engages with the kingship/tyranny theme, as we shall observe in Chapter 2.

<sup>106</sup> We shall return to this notion in discussion of Thersander in Chapter 3.

<sup>107</sup> As noted in the Introduction (above, p.19, n.49), I subscribe to Bowie's belief in a predominantly educated readership.

of ‘barbarian’ behaviour is thus anticipated. However, the Persian king is strongly modelled on Xenophon’s Cyrus, and on Hellenistic ideas of kingship, and although he is never explicitly said to be *pepaideumenos*, he prides himself on his *sōphrosynē* and *dikaiosynē*, and, like Dionysius, is insulted at his slave’s suggestion that he take advantage of Callirhoe:

μηδὲ σύ γε ... τοιοῦτο μηδὲν εἶπης, ἵνα γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν διαφθείρω.  
 μέμνημαι νόμων οὓς αὐτὸς ἔθηκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἣν ἐν ἅπασιν ἀσκῶ.  
 μηδεμίαν μου καταγνώξῃς ἀκρασίαν. οὐχ οὕτως ἐάλωκάμεν.

Never suggest such a thing as seducing another man’s wife. I am mindful of the laws I have myself imposed and the justice I exercise in all matters. Do not accuse me of lacking self-control. I am not overcome to that extent (Chariton 6.3.7-8; trans. Goold, modified).

Here we see that, as mentioned earlier, in some circumstances barbarians might possess *paideia*, thereby transcending ethnic constraints.<sup>108</sup> Artaxerxes’ response forces his eunuch to advise him to apply the ‘kingly’ (βασιλικήν) remedy of fighting his desires.<sup>109</sup> This leads to an elaborate hunting expedition, that classic Xenophontean element of *paideia*,<sup>110</sup> but, as we shall see in the case of Dionysius too, striving to maintain *paideia* becomes the king’s downfall, as Eros uses the occasion of the hunt to awaken in him fantasies of Callirhoe. A cynical mind might conjecture that the final remark in Artaxerxes’ reply to his eunuch, ‘I am not overcome to that extent’, plants a seed of doubt as to the strength of the king’s resolve, suggesting that there is a point at which he might indeed resort to seduction, thus becoming the tyrant. It can therefore only confirm the reader’s suspicions when

<sup>108</sup> The evident possession of *paideia* by non-Greeks in Chariton’s novel seems to reflect the post-Hellenistic construction of *paideia*: in a Greek world which ‘included and assimilated so many foreign elements ... [u]nity could only come from sharing a single ideal, a common attitude towards the purpose of existence and the various means of attaining it – in short, from a common civilization, or rather, culture’ (Marrou 1956: 99). So *paideia* appears to function as a shared ideal which can be recognised in others. This seems to be the sense in which Callirhoe appeals to Dionysius’ *paideia* when she first reveals her true identity: he encourages her to tell her story by referring to a ‘kinship of character’ (ἔστι γὰρ τις καὶ τρόπου συγγένεια); she is then prompted to beg him, as a Greek, a citizen of a civilised place, and a possessor of *paideia*, to return her to Syracuse (2.5.8-12): it is all three of these things that the two of them share. Note, however, that while these attributes are enough to ensure that he behaves honourably towards her, they are not sufficient to induce him to do as she asks here: *paideia* is not all-powerful, as we shall see further shortly.

<sup>109</sup> 6.3.8.

<sup>110</sup> 6.4. See Roy (1998: 113) on the projection of the Hellenistic king’s masculinity through the motif of the royal hunt.

Artaxerxes concedes to Artaxates' observation that Callirhoe's apparent widowhood makes her fair game: while the king is not prepared to use the force initially proposed by the eunuch, he *is* willing to apply persuasion in secret,<sup>111</sup> as the victory of love over his *paideia* transforms him from king to tyrant.<sup>112</sup>

***The public display of paideia: the symposium.***

Dionysius' attempts to preserve the *sōphrosynē* for which he is famed are initially played out in a very public context, that of the symposium. As an all-male gathering at which men were accustomed to display their learning and social standing, the symposium was clearly a site for the exhibition of *paideia*, whose relation to *sōphrosynē* we have observed. Brown (1992: 45) notes that *paideia* was often manifested through the 'carefully nurtured art of friendship'. It is thus not surprising that Chariton refers to Dionysius' exercise of *paideia* in the symposium context. As Whitmarsh (2000: 306) remarks, however, although the emphasis of the symposium was on friendship and equality, such an occasion was also a 'theatre of social hierarchy', at which offence could easily be caused or status damaged. Having just arrived on his estate from the city, Dionysius entertains his friends and, struck by love for Callirhoe, he tries to disguise his emotions:

Διονύσιος δὲ ἐτέτρωτο μὲν, τὸ δὲ τραῦμα περιστέλλειν ἐπειρᾶτο, οἷα δὴ πεπαιδευμένος ἀνὴρ καὶ ἐξαιρέτως ἀρετῆς ἀντιποιοῦμενος. μήτε τοῖς οἰκέταις θέλων εὐκαταφρόνητος δοκεῖν μήτε μειρακιώδης τοῖς φίλοις, διεκαρτέρει παρ' ὅλην τὴν ἑσπέραν, οἰόμενος μὲν λαυθάνειν, κατάδηλος δὲ γινόμενος μᾶλλον ἐκ τῆς σιωπῆς.

... Dionysius, love-smitten, tried to conceal the wound, as became a *pepaideumenos* who made especial claim to virtue. Not wanting his servants to look down on him, or his friends to think him puerile, he endured the whole evening, thinking he would not be noticed, but making himself more noticeable by his very silence (Chariton 2.4.1; trans. Goold, modified).

<sup>111</sup> 6.4.7-8. The reader's expectation that a barbarian should behave tyrannically is played up to in Chaereas' first words to the Egyptian king, whose forces he joins in the belief that Artaxerxes has given Callirhoe to Dionysius: Artaxerxes, Chaereas claims, has treated him as a tyrant would (7.2.4: τετυράννηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης); ironically, of course, the tyranny the king has practised is not quite of the nature Chaereas has been led to believe.

<sup>112</sup> This is a transformation we shall see taking place in Dionysius' case too.

There are several interesting features in this passage's presentation of *paideia*. Firstly, by giving *paideia* a privileged position in the passage, Chariton seems to give authorial approval to Dionysius' attempt to hide his feelings and maintain self-control: this is the behaviour of a *pepaideumenos*; thus, from the moment Dionysius falls in love, his status as *pepaideumenos* is established as the primary factor – and a commendable one – informing his decisions. Secondly, the passage reflects the notion that *paideia* gives access to *aretē*, the use of the verb διακατερέω evoking the virtue of *karteria*;<sup>113</sup> as a *pepaideumenos*, Dionysius is entitled to make 'especial claim' to *aretē*.<sup>114</sup> This *aretē* is something for which he has competed: ἀντιποιέομαι suggests a claim laid to something through competition,<sup>115</sup> and as we have seen before, the acquisition of *paideia* and *aretē* involves a man in rivalry with others. Thirdly, Chariton's description of the thought-process that leads to Dionysius' silence implies the ability to take counsel with oneself; this is a matter to which we shall return shortly. Finally, and most importantly, is the sense the passage conveys of *paideia* – and masculinity more generally – as something that demands display, a performance that must be enacted and maintained. Dionysius endeavours to use the concealing power of *paideia* – as we have seen Callirhoe do before Artaxates<sup>116</sup> – in order to hide the fact that he is in love with someone he believes to be a slave. The language used here is rather telling, for περιστέλλω, while meaning 'conceal', and also 'wrap', 'protect', and 'attend to', thus suggesting the tending of a wound, is in addition a technical rhetorical term, meaning to compress one's speech and be economical with words in order to avoid prolixity.<sup>117</sup> So Dionysius applies skills developed through rhetorical *paideia* with the intention of masking his besotted condition. Ironically, however, his *paideia* works against him, for while it may help him *try* to conceal his emotions, it also demands its own display at social gatherings such as this: *paideia* is, to use Brown's (1992: 43) phrase, 'an education

<sup>113</sup> We saw above that *karteria* was a virtue associated with *paideia* (see p.32 on Cebes and p.35 on Lucian).

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Demetrius, whose *paideia* and *aretē* are also entwined (8.3.10).

<sup>115</sup> *LSJ s.v.* The phrase ἀρετῆς ἀντιποιέομαι may have been thought a particularly Isocratean one: it is used by him, in specific connection with masculinity, in the *Archidamus*, one of his most highly respected works (*Archidamus* 7; see Philostr. *VS* 505 for the reverence with which this speech was viewed in antiquity). We shall meet further hints of Isocrates later in the chapter.

<sup>116</sup> See above, p.40-41.

<sup>117</sup> *LSJ s.v.*



for public performance'.<sup>118</sup> So, Dionysius' introversion attracts the attention of his friends, and his *paideia* traps him in a double bind.<sup>119</sup> The use of the adjective πεπαιδευμένος (a marker of maturity, as we have seen), followed closely by μειρακιώδης, establishes an antithesis, two poles between which Dionysius flounders: he imagines that silence will protect his status as *pepaideumenos*, but since, as we have seen, the *logos* is the symbol of *paideia*, silence in fact pushes him perilously close to the status of *meirakion*.<sup>120</sup> The focalisation through Dionysius of these references to *paideia* and immaturity highlights the performative nature of masculinity. In his critique of performance theory, Carlson (2004: 4) observes that actions may be done without thought, but when they are thought about, they acquire the quality of performance. Dionysius is conscious of the image he presents to his friends: he is aware of trying to live up to a standard, and of the potential for, and consequences of, failure; this consciousness of doubleness, of the disparity between the ideal and the reality, gives the scene an air of performance, an air underscored by the use of the vocabulary of rhetoric and competition.<sup>121</sup> In his analysis of the 'self-fashioning' of Renaissance authors, Greenblatt (1980: 9) notes that consciousness of the manipulability of human identity necessarily involves the experience of a threat to that identity, 'some effacement or undermining, some loss of self'. It is precisely this loss of self that Dionysius fears at the symposium, but the self-fashioning he attempts in order to deflect it only brings it closer.<sup>122</sup>

We encounter a very similar scene in Heliodorus, who presents the implicitly *pepaideumenos* Theagenes as likewise unable to mask his love at a symposium of

<sup>118</sup> See also T. Morgan (1998: 226ff., esp. 234-239) on the relationship of a rhetorical education to a man's capacity for government, and the ability to speak as a 'determinant of power' (*ibid.* 236).

<sup>119</sup> Cf. 6.3.3, where Artaxerxes gives himself away to Artaxates by his silence.

<sup>120</sup> The notion that a man's speech could betray his character became a rhetorical axiom (see, e.g., Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.30: ut vivat, quemque etiam dicere), and all the more important at a time when physiognomy was flourishing (see Connolly 2001: 80).

<sup>121</sup> We find a neat parallel to Dionysius' fears of appearing juvenile in the king's concern for his own status during the Egyptian revolt: he keeps quiet about Callirhoe lest he should appear thoroughly παιδαριώδης (6.9.5). Like Dionysius, he fears for the image he may present to his contemporaries, and the similar focalisation of the passage again shows the interiorisation of *paideia* and the consciousness of trying to live up to an ideal; the fact that he remains driven by the force of his passion (βίαιζομένης δὲ τῆς ὀρμῆς) despite his silence emphasises the impossibility of achieving that ideal.

<sup>122</sup> Johnes's (2003: 175) remark that the Greek novels' protagonists 'do not have identity crises like the main figures of the modern middle-class novel' is patently incorrect when we consider Dionysius.

his own arranging.<sup>123</sup> The language of display and concealment marks the presence of performative *paideia* as Theagenes battles unsuccessfully with his ailment, which is detected first by Calasiris and then by the others present:

Ὁ Θεαγένης ἐνδείκνυτο μὲν ἰλαρὸς εἶναι καὶ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι τοὺς παρόντας ἐβιάζετο, ἠλίσκετο δὲ πρὸς ἐμοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ὅποι φέροιτο, νῦν μὲν τὸ ὄμμα ἠνεμωμένος νῦν δὲ βύθιον τι καὶ ἀπροφάσιστον ἐπιστένων καὶ ἄρτι μὲν κατηφῆς τε καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπ' ἐννοίας ἄρτι δὲ ἀθρόον ἐπὶ τὸ φαιδρότερον ἑαυτὸν μεταπλάττων, ὥσπερ ἐν συναισθήσει γινόμενος, καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακαλούμενος καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν μεταβολὴν ῥαδίως ὑποφερόμενος ... Ὡς δὲ καὶ χάσμη ἀδημονούσης ἀνάπλεως ἐφαίνετο, τότε δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν παρόντων κατάδηλος ἦν οὐχ ὑγιαίνων ...

... Theagenes kept up the pretense of being in high spirits and forced himself to be hospitable to his guests, but he could not disguise the true tendency of his thoughts from me. At one moment he would stare into space and the next heave a deep sigh for no apparent reason; he would be gloomy, seemingly lost in thought, and then the next minute he would seem to become conscious of his state, recall his thoughts, and affect a more cheerful expression; it seemed to take very little to produce these changes of mood, which covered the whole spectrum of emotions ... But eventually the listless melancholy that filled his heart could be concealed no longer, and then it became obvious to the rest of the company that he was unwell (Hld. 3.10.4-3.11.1; trans. Morgan).

The verb ἐνδείκνυμι stresses Theagenes' need to display a certain face to his watching guests, and φιλοφρονέομαι the imperative to demonstrate one's *paideia* through the cultivation of friendship. His συναισθήσις denotes a pervasive self-consciousness, while the verb μεταπλάττω could not be more indicative of the use of sophistic *paideia* to remodel and conceal, presenting to the audience an image that disguises what truly underlies it. Again, however, *paideia* is unable to hide the truth, as the 'painful emptiness' (χάσμη ἀδημονούσης) with which Theagenes is paradoxically 'filled' (ἀνάπλεως) becomes (again paradoxically) 'visible' (ἐφαίνετο). Connolly (2001: 80) observes that 'the eyes of an ancient audience were expert in decoding the motions and expressions of performers according to an alphabet of moral character'; it is not so much Theagenes' moral character that is

<sup>123</sup> Theagenes' youth might seem to preclude him from *paideia*, but his heightened awareness of *sōphrosynē* characterises him as mature beyond his years; we shall return to this *sōphrosynē* in connection with his *andreia* in Chapter 2.

given away here, as his emotional state, as, like physiognomists, his guests are able to read his internal condition from his facial expressions. Like Dionysius, Theagenes is caught in a *paideia* trap: the status of *pepaideumenos* demands the display of *paideia* at such social events, and although he applies its concealing power in an attempt to suppress his emotions, those emotions get the better of him, revealing an aberration from the normal behaviour of the *pepaideumenos*.<sup>124</sup>

### *The self as audience.*

We observed in the Introduction that while performative actions are always performed with an eye to an audience, that audience is not necessarily discrete from the performer himself: occasionally the subject may play the role of *both* performer *and* audience.<sup>125</sup> This is the case when Dionysius withdraws to bed after the symposium, and deliberates within himself over his feelings for Callirhoe. Chariton leaves no doubt that this is laudable behaviour, appropriate for a *pepaideumenos*:

Τότ' ἦν ἰδεῖν ἀγῶνα λογισμοῦ καὶ πάθους. καίτοι γὰρ βαπτιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας γενναῖος ἀνὴρ ἐπειρᾶτο ἀντέχεσθαι. καθάπερ δὲ ἐκ κύματος ἀνέκυπτε λέγων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν “οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ, Διονύσιε, ἀνὴρ ὁ πρῶτος τῆς Ἰωνίας ἔνεκεν ἀρετῆς τε καὶ δόξης, ὃν θαυμάζουσι σατράπαι καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ πόλεις, παιδαρίου πράγμα πάσχων; ...”

Then you could observe a struggle between reason and passion, for although engulfed by desire, as a noble man he tried to resist, and rising above the waves, as it were, he said to himself, “Are you not ashamed, Dionysius, the leader of Ionia in worth and reputation, a man whom governors, kings, and city-states admire – are you not ashamed to be suffering the heartache of a boy? ...” (Chariton 2.4.4; trans. Goold).

We have noted that the *logos*, the combined force of speech and reason, stood at the heart of *paideia* from the classical period on. We also remarked on the importance

<sup>124</sup> We find an interesting twist on the symposium scene in Achilles Tatius (5.21.2). Cleitophon has dinner with Melite, having just learned that Leucippe is alive. He tries to force his face to look as it did before he received the news, but is unable to do so, and is compelled to try to mask his emotions by faking an illness. If the reader associates this sort of concealing behaviour with the practice of a moral *paideia*, then Cleitophon’s imminent sex with Melite will carry a strong subversive sense. Alternatively, if, like Lucian, the reader thinks of concealment as the sign of a fraudulent or inferior *paideia*, then Cleitophon’s dalliance with Melite will fulfil expectations. Either way, Cleitophon’s image cannot but be damaged. *Metiochus and Parthenope* also contains an intriguing dinner party scene that engages with the concept of *paideia*; this will be touched on later in the chapter.

<sup>125</sup> See above, p.15.

placed by Isocrates in particular on the ability of the *pepaideumenos* to ponder his troubles in his own mind.<sup>126</sup> Dionysius' ability to internalise rhetoric and to debate his concerns with himself surely reflects this Isocratean doctrine.<sup>127</sup> The presence of *logismos* thus exemplifies the effort of his *paideia* to surmount his emotions, as Callirhoe had used the reasoning power of *logos* to rein in her feelings of anger. Although Dionysius is alone and acting as his own audience, the reader is implicated as a second audience by the use of ἰδεῖν,<sup>128</sup> and is thereby drawn in to the performance of *paideia*: while Dionysius is judging his own performance, he is also exposed to the judgement of the watching reader. The reference to the influence of his nobility on his attempt at resistance suggests that he is being presented as a model for the behaviour of the *pepaideumenos* – implicitly the reader himself. However, Dionysius' exhibition of *paideia* through the interiorisation of his problems exposes a slippage of identity of the kind we saw in the symposium scene: his status as a mature *pepaideumenos*, which involves relations with other *pepaideumenoι*, such as governors and kings, is threatened by emotions he considers juvenile. Thus we see the paradoxical nature of Dionysius' *paideia*: while it is the very thing that constitutes his identity and reputation, it is also the faculty that enables him to deliberate with himself, a deliberation that reveals the fragility of his identity and reputation under love's onslaught. Balot (1998: 147) makes the astute observation that when Dionysius initially tries to fight his feelings for Callirhoe, Eros interprets his *sōphrosynē* as an act of *hybris*, thus transforming what was usually an elite virtue into a characteristic tyrannical vice.<sup>129</sup> As at the symposium, Dionysius' efforts to exercise *paideia* actually work against him, as Eros is prompted to redouble his own efforts; ironically, his insistence on the preservation of his *paideia* consigns him to further turmoil, instead of reinforcing his identity.<sup>130</sup> We have seen that Dionysius is esteemed by others on the basis of his possession of *paideia*: his *paideia* forms a major part of his reputation, and thus of his public

<sup>126</sup> See above, p.30-31.

<sup>127</sup> Ruiz Montero (1989: 137) notes the influence of Isocrates in Chariton; Reardon (1971: 350) observes that the second century, and post-classical Greece in general, found Isocrates, Menander, and Xenophon to be the most accessible of classical writers. Isocrates is not the only presence in this passage: see Repath (Forthcoming, 2007) on Platonic resonances in Dionysius' behaviour here and in other scenes.

<sup>128</sup> Which also emphasises the fact that *paideia* has a visible quality.

<sup>129</sup> 2.4.5. Cf. Pl. *Smp.* 219c, where Alcibiades characterises Socrates' resistance to his sexual overtures as *hybris*.

<sup>130</sup> We see this turmoil enacted in the gradual changes in Dionysius' character, as he becomes jealous, suspicious, deceitful, and doubtful of his own position: see, e.g., 3.9.4ff.; 3.10.1; 4.7.7; 7.1.3-4.

identity and self-image. Love's assault, which prompts him to fear for his status, is therefore an assault on his *paideia*. The impossibility of meeting the standards of ideal masculinity is suggested by the fact that there is a clear limit to Dionysius' capacity for inner debate, and thus to his *paideia*: we are told that he sends for Leonas in order to set up a meeting with Callirhoe when he is unable to bear this inner debate any longer:<sup>131</sup> the interiorisation of *paideia* can only do so much.<sup>132</sup>

Dionysius' deliberation here is prompted by the need to meet certain standards of behaviour: he considers his reputation to have been compromised by the suddenness with which he has fallen in love, by the fact that he has done so while still in mourning for his dead wife, and by Callirhoe's apparent slave status, which makes her a socially inappropriate object of his love. After he discovers her true identity and she accedes to marriage, he must again bring his *paideia* to bear to ensure that he behaves honourably in what has now become a love of a more socially appropriate kind:

Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐρωτικὸν πάθος ἔσπευδε [δὲ] καὶ ἀναβολὴν οὐκ ἐπέτρεπε τοῖς γάμοις· ταμιεύεσθαι γὰρ δύσκολον ἐξουσίαν ἐπιθυμίας. Διονύσιος δὲ ἀνὴρ πεπαιδευμένος κατείληπτο μὲν ὑπὸ χειμῶνος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐβαπτίζετο, ὅμως δὲ ἀνακύπτειν ἐβιάζετο καθάπερ ἐκ τρικυμίας τοῦ πάθους.

Dionysius's passion raged fiercely and would not suffer the wedding to be delayed; self-control is painful when desire can be satisfied. He was a man of *paideia*; he had been overwhelmed by a storm – his heart was submerged, but still he forced himself to hold his head above the towering waves of his passion (Chariton 3.2.6; trans. Reardon, modified).

Now that he has discovered that Callirhoe is of noble blood, he must once more debate within himself, and he proceeds to apply his *logismos* (καὶ τότε οὖν ἐπέστησε τοιούτοις λογισμοῖς) in order to decide the best means of both honouring the social standing of his wife-to-be, and responding to any challenge that might arise over possession of her.<sup>133</sup> He tells himself to prepare for a potential trial,

<sup>131</sup> 2.4.6: Μηκέτ' οὖν φέρων μόνος αὐτῷ διαλέγεσθαι, Λεωνᾶν μετεπέμψατο ...

<sup>132</sup> At 6.1.6ff. both Artaxerxes and Stateira conduct similar nocturnal deliberations, described as λογισμούς, but while Stateira is preoccupied with a twinge of jealousy over the attention her husband is paying Callirhoe, he himself has more weighty problems on his mind.

<sup>133</sup> 3.2.7ff.

anticipating that he may have to defend his right to Callirhoe before the Persian king, (μελέτα, Διονύσιε, τὴν δίκην. τάχα δὲ ἔρεῖς αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως). As well as being unwittingly proleptic, Dionysius' words underscore the relationship between the interiorised performance of *paideia*, with the self as audience, and the display of *paideia* in a public, oratorical context: through a private, mental *meletē* he must prepare himself to persuade (πείσω) Hermocrates of his worth and to provide the strongest arguments possible in a public trial (πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν).<sup>134</sup> As at the symposium, Dionysius' *paideia* enables him to draw on reserves of *karteria* (καρτέρησον, ψυχῆ), and thus to endure a small delay rather than arrange a speedy wedding which might appear illegitimate; but, again as at the symposium, it also alerts him to the insecurity of his position.

The use of *paideia* in deliberation with oneself is displayed subversively by Achilles Tatius.<sup>135</sup> After being advised by Satyrus to be bold in his approach to Leucippe, Cleitophon, left alone, tries to prime himself for the task. While the scene is peppered with military language,<sup>136</sup> the use of the verb ἀσκέω is suggestive of the application of *paideia*. Indeed, the *askēsis* on which he embarks is designed to increase his *eutolmia* towards Leucippe, *tolma* being a quality much-needed for rhetorical display, as we have noted from Isocrates, and as we shall see shortly in Chariton. Like a student of forensic oratory, Cleitophon argues from both perspectives, first berating himself for his cowardice, and then considering that he ought to be able to exercise *sōphrosynē* and be content with the marriage that has been arranged for him. He claims to think that he has persuaded himself to the latter course of action (clearly the one expected of him as *pepaideumenos*), but this interiorised display of *paideia* is suddenly overturned as he proceeds to voice Eros' offence at his *sōphrosynē*. The notion that Eros may perceive a positive quality negatively is one we have seen already in Dionysius' and Artaxerxes' attempts at *sōphrosynē*. However, the fact that the perception is here focalised through Cleitophon, rather than through an external narrator as in Chariton, gives it an air of tokenism, as if Cleitophon only adopts this stance in order to justify his imminent

<sup>134</sup> We shall return to the trial itself in Chapter 2.

<sup>135</sup> Ach. Tat. 2.5.

<sup>136</sup> We shall consider this further at the end of Chapter 2.

lack of *sōphrosynē*.<sup>137</sup> This impression is reinforced as he immediately proceeds to use his *paideia* not to behave properly, but to pursue Leucippe with intricate *logoi* (περιέπλεκον λόγους ἐκ λόγων).<sup>138</sup> Achilles characterises Cleitophon with an awareness of *paideia*'s value as a tool for self-reflection, and yet deliberately has him misuse it.<sup>139</sup> Cleitophon perhaps epitomises those rhetoricians for whom Lucian expresses such distaste – men for whom *paideia* has no moral dimension, and is purely concerned with image and acquisition. The proliferation of this form of *paideia* in Achilles' novel makes us question its purpose. As we noted in the Introduction,<sup>140</sup> Butler observes that gender is constituted by repeated performance, that the accepted ideal is an impossible goal, and that an opportunity for resistance is presented by the gap between ideal and reality. The novel's lack of frame-resumption means that no comment or judgement is ever passed, either on Cleitophon's oratorical performance or on his performance of masculinity more generally. It is tempting to think that this absence of judgement amounts to an acquittal. By having Cleitophon repeatedly fail to exhibit a moral *paideia* and yet never be judged for it, is Achilles questioning the attainability, the maintainability, and thus the validity, of such a *paideia*? Is he resisting the hegemonic ideals of masculinity?

*The display of paideia before family and superiors.*

Three further scenes in Chariton draw out the complexity of *paideia* and emphasise the relationship between its interiorisation and the image it enables a man to convey to external audiences. We have seen that *paideia* comprises both skilful and persuasive speech and respect for the feelings of others. The first scene to be discussed here shows both of those features. Dionysius is compelled to present Callirhoe before the court in Babylon; fearing her reaction should he not forewarn her, he asks for an overnight postponement of the trial, and then broaches the subject with her:

---

<sup>137</sup> The same occurs at 1.11.3: by referring to Eros' superior strength, Cleitophon acquits himself of responsibility for his actions; *cf.* also 5.27.2, where an alleged fear of Eros' wrath results in his capitulation to Melite's advances.

<sup>138</sup> 2.6.3.

<sup>139</sup> It is in the public display of *paideia* that Cleitophon is most at home, but here again, as we shall see, he misappropriates what ought to be a positive characteristic.

<sup>140</sup> See above, p.9-10.

ἀφικόμενος δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ὁ Διονύσιος, οἷα δὴ φρόνιμος ἀνὴρ καὶ πεπαιδευμένος, λόγους τῇ γυναικὶ προσήνεγκεν ὡς ἐν τοιούτοις πιθανωτάτους, ἐλαφρῶς τε καὶ πρῶως ἕκαστα διηγούμενος.

Arriving home Dionysius, being an intelligent man and *pepaideuomenos*, put forward the arguments to his wife as persuasively as possible under the circumstances, setting out each detail both deftly and gently (Chariton 5.5.1).

Here we find Chariton presenting marriage as a site for the practice of male *paideia*, apparently reflecting the imperial orientation of *paideia* toward the conjugal bond: as we noted earlier, it was not only female *paideia* that was marked by a concern for marital status and comportment in erotic contexts.<sup>141</sup> In this passage *phronēsis* and *paideia* combine: Dionysius has thought through his situation, and that reasoning now governs his approach to his wife. Chariton does not describe *what* is said, but *how* it is said, his vocabulary showing *paideia* in action. As though already performing in court, Dionysius puts forward his *logoi* methodically, trying to make them persuasive.<sup>142</sup> The phrase ἐλαφρῶς τε καὶ πρῶως seems to denote two contrasting (but not contradictory) styles, with two contrasting (but not contradictory) purposes, the former deft and nimble, aiming to win Callirhoe's confidence, and the latter smooth and pacifying, aiming to comfort her.<sup>143</sup> The passage thus demonstrates the importance of both masterly rhetoric and concern for the feelings of others as elements of *paideia*. In the application of *paideia* with the aim of protecting his marriage, Dionysius redirects the skills he would use in public, rhetorical contexts towards a private, emotional goal. In the end, however, although Callirhoe's anger is deflected, Dionysius' *praotēs* is not sufficient to comfort her, and she falls to weeping, lamenting her fate, and finally dreaming of Chaereas;<sup>144</sup> we are left with the impression that *paideia* can only do so much in the face of love.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>141</sup> See above, p.40 and p.44-45.

<sup>142</sup> Persuasion is a feature not only of *paideia*, but also of depictions of love in much literature (see Gross 1985); it is thus doubly meaningful in an erotic novel.

<sup>143</sup> Lucian identifies *πραότης* as an element of *paideia* (see above, p.35); it is also applied to Cyrus (see X. *Cyr.* 3.1.41, with Farber 1979: 510).

<sup>144</sup> 5.5.1.

<sup>145</sup> The shortcomings of *paideia* here are foreshadowed by Dionysius' earlier failure to persuade the judges that Callirhoe did not need to appear before the court: although he is said to make his plea skilfully, those present are so desperate to see Callirhoe that they cannot be persuaded; beauty thus overcomes the power of *paideia*: Ταῦτα δεικνυμένως μὲν εἶπεν ὁ Διονύσιος, πλὴν οὐδένα ἔπειθεν ἐπεθύμουν γὰρ πάντες Καλλιρόην ἰδεῖν (5.4.11).



The second example occurs when Dionysius learns of the postponement of the trial following Chaereas' miraculous appearance:

... Διονύσιος δὲ ἐπειράτο μὲν φέρειν τὰ συμβαίνοντα γενναίως διὰ τε φύσεως εὐστάθειαν καὶ διὰ παιδείας ἐπιμέλειαν, τὸ δὲ παράδοξον τῆς συμφορᾶς καὶ τὸν ἀνδρειότατον ἐκστῆσαι δυνατὸν ὑπῆρχεν.

Dionysius tried to bear the events nobly through the steadfastness of his nature and the application of his *paideia*, but the unexpectedness of the misfortune had the power to drive even the most *andreios* man out of his senses (Chariton 5.9.8).

Dionysius' attempts to handle the situation are here attributed to a combination of *physis* and *paideia*: he has a naturally robust and upright character, but a man is better equipped to deal with life's misfortunes if he also has a doughty cultural and intellectual education,<sup>146</sup> ἐπιμέλεια suggesting both the application of his *paideia* in this particular circumstance and the extent of his investment in that *paideia*. The passage also demonstrates *paideia*'s relationship to other virtues, here specifically *andreia*, to which Dionysius' acculturation has evidently given him access.<sup>147</sup> But even the man with the most *andreia* could not endure this turn of events.<sup>148</sup> This observation underscores the fact that while *paideia* and its concomitant virtues may help a man to cope with difficult circumstances, their power is ultimately limited, a limit that is revealed by Dionysius' subsequent outburst at Aphrodite and his desperate plea to 'his' small child to intercede with Callirhoe on his behalf. The whole of this episode is said to be a 'fight between *erōs* and *logismos*', which is 'umpired' by Dionysius himself;<sup>149</sup> the impression given is of a man balancing on a knife-edge between a behavioural ideal and an uncontrolled display of emotion which threatens to damage his public image.

It is in the third of these scenes, when Dionysius learns of his loss of Callirhoe, that he is said to show his *paideia* most:

<sup>146</sup> We have noted (above, p.30) that Isocrates emphasises the advantages to the public speaker of having both a natural bent and an intensive training; we shall return to this in relation to Chaereas' *paideia*.

<sup>147</sup> The military *andreia* Dionysius goes on to display will be examined in the next chapter.

<sup>148</sup> This remark might be thought to imply that Dionysius is *not* the bravest man, and thus to foreshadow the imminent eclipse of his military achievements by those of Chaereas.

<sup>149</sup> 5.10.6: ... μάχην βραβεύων ἔρωτος καὶ λογισμοῦ ...

ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὴ τῷ καιρῷ μάλιστα φρόνησιν Διονύσιος ἐπεδείξατο καὶ παιδείαν ἐξάριετον. ὥσπερ γὰρ εἴ τις κεραυνοῦ πεσόντος πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ μὴ παραχθείη, οὕτως κάκείνος ἀκούσας λόγων σκηπτῶ βαρυτέρων ... εὐσταθῆς ἔμεινε ...

At this point especially Dionysius displayed his intellect and exceptional *paideia*. Like a man unperturbed by a thunderbolt falling at his feet, so he, on hearing words more violent than any thunderbolt ... stood there without flinching ... (Chariton 8.5.10-11; trans. Goold, modified).

Here we see again the familiar pairing of *phronēsis* and *paideia*, whose epideictic character is emphasised (ἐπεδείξατο): these qualities are to be displayed, whether in debate with oneself or before an external audience. The internalisation of *paideia* is suggested by the fact that Dionysius does not think it safe to express grief for his own sake at a time when Stateira has just been rescued:<sup>150</sup> he has evidently reasoned through his situation and come to a conclusion which now dictates his action. Like Callirhoe before Artaxates, Dionysius uses *paideia* to conceal his emotions before the king and queen, and waits for privacy before expressing them.<sup>151</sup> Chariton's remark that this is the point at which Dionysius most shows his *paideia* suggests that the primary purpose of *paideia* is not to conquer emotions completely, but rather to control and bear them, so that they are expressed to the right degree and in the right contexts.<sup>152</sup> Indeed, as Brown (1992: 49) states, and as we have noted to some extent, *paideia* enjoined upon its possessor a strict self-control, both verbal and physical: for the *pepaideumenos* before his ruler, loss of this control was highly undesirable.<sup>153</sup> Dionysius' loss of Callirhoe prompts Artaxerxes to give him the ultimate reward that *paideia* can bring, political power:<sup>154</sup> reflecting, perhaps, the imperial *pepaideumenoι* of Chariton's own day, Dionysius is granted gubernatorial

<sup>150</sup> 8.5.11: ... ὁμῶς εὐσταθῆς ἔμεινε καὶ οὐκ ἔδοξεν ἀσφαλὲς αὐτῷ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι, σωθείσης τῆς βασιλίδος.

<sup>151</sup> 8.5.12-13.

<sup>152</sup> We shall examine the control of emotion further at the end of the chapter.

<sup>153</sup> See Philostr. *VS* 556-557 and 560-561 on Herodes Atticus' grief-stricken outburst before the emperor after the loss of his foster-daughters.

<sup>154</sup> Dionysius is rewarded for the *eunoia* and *pistis* he has 'displayed' (ἐπεδείξω) towards the king; these qualities appear to be the result of his *paideia*; we shall see shortly that *pistis* certainly seems to be related to *paideia* in the case of Chaereas' relationship with the Egyptian king. Polycharmus is later said to have displayed exactly these qualities to Chaereas and Callirhoe (8.8.12).

status over the whole of Ionia, and a special rank with regard to the royal family.<sup>155</sup>

Brown observes that:

[t]he ideal of the cultivated governor, the carefully groomed product of a Greek *paideia*, was a commonplace of the political life of the eastern empire (Brown 1992: 38).

It seems that Dionysius' performance of *paideia*, while on occasion seeming to trap him in contradictory and image-threatening behaviour, has in the end fulfilled its social and political function as a vehicle for power.<sup>156</sup> Although his *paideia* could not help him to retain Callirhoe, the political power he has derived from it does give him considerable consolation (μέγα παραμύθιον) for her loss: for Dionysius, the performance of a hegemonic masculine ideal has led to literal hegemony (πολλῶν πόλεων ἡγεμονίαν).<sup>157</sup>

The only reference to Chaereas' *paideia* occurs, as we have noted, when he makes the acquaintance of the Egyptian king. It seems that up to this point Chariton

<sup>155</sup> With Jones (1992: 165), but *contra* Bowie (2002: 54), I am tempted to see the characterisation of Dionysius as inspired by the sophist from Miletus of the same name. In support of the identification Jones cites the extensive governorship given the sophist by Hadrian (Philostr. *VS* 524), which is paralleled by the fictional Dionysius' promotion by Artaxerxes. Jones is tentative, stating that he views the relation between the two figures as one merely of discreet literary homage, designed perhaps to flatter the sophist by means of a fabricated genealogy of the kind popular amongst imperial families. Arguing that Chariton's Dionysius predates Dionysius of Miletus, Bowie believes that if Jones were right, Chariton would run the risk of causing 'great offence to a man with some power in *provincia Asia*'. Given that the characterisation of Dionysius is far from unfavourable, and given the enormous and positive emphasis placed on his *paideia*, I am not convinced that any such offence would have been taken. Philostratus refers to a belief on the part of some that the sophist wrote a romantic piece about Xenophon's Panthea and Araspes, but he states somewhat uppishly that such people 'are ignorant not only of [Dionysius'] rhythms but of his whole style, and moreover they know nothing of the art of ratiocination' (*VS* 524; Loeb trans., modified). Philostratus is at pains to distance such eloquence of style and reasoning from romance, which he evidently considers immensely inferior: the implication is that no one with the *paideia* of Dionysius would engage in such trivial pursuits; this attitude accords well with Philostratus' derogatory reference to one Chariton at *Letter* 66 (though *cf.* Stephens & Winkler (1995: 317) for the opinion that what is being denigrated by Philostratus in the *VS* is not romance, but the style of the piece in question). In Chariton's location of his own Dionysius at the heart of an erotic story which owes much to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, and in the marked importance of *paideia* to his character, can we identify Chariton as one of those who believed the sophist to have authored an erotic tale of his own? The identification of Chariton's Dionysius with the sophist would put Chariton a little later than is usually suggested. See Courtney (2001: 16-17) for the argument that Persius 1.134 does not refer to Chariton's novel, and that Chariton may therefore be placed later than the first half of the first century A.D.; Courtney (*ibid.* 25) does, however, still seem to incline towards a date in the first century, on the grounds of Chariton's language and style. Repath (Forthcoming b, *non vidi*) argues for a connection between Adrastus, a lawyer mentioned by Chariton (2.1.6), and the second-century philosopher, Adrastus of Aphrodisias.

<sup>156</sup> On *paideia* as a 'vehicle for imperial power', see Whitmarsh (1998: 203).

<sup>157</sup> 8.5.15.

establishes Dionysius as *pepaideumenos* to act as a foil to Chaereas, so that we may see more easily the absence of a mature *paideia* in the latter. For example, Dionysius' concern with being thought *μειρακιώδης*, and his self-chastisement for falling in love at first sight,<sup>158</sup> turn the reader's thoughts to Chaereas, the only young man the reader has observed fall in love at first sight; Chariton thereby makes a comparison between the two men inevitable.<sup>159</sup> But Chaereas does not necessarily emerge from this comparison in an unfavourable light, since the fear of appearing immature is focalised through Dionysius himself: love at first sight is not frowned upon by the author (or narrator), but by a man striving to live up to an ideal that will always be just out of reach; although his *paideia* is clearly a positive and powerful quality, it is not one that can (or should) overpower love, as we shall see again when we turn to Chaereas' erotically-driven jealous violence. We have observed that *paideia* is something associated particularly with maturity; it is not surprising, then, that Chaereas seems not to possess it at the beginning of the novel. We have also noted that his experiences might be understood (as Lalanne understands them) as rites of passage which constitute the *paideia* he is later said to possess: *paideia* is thus the result of a process of maturation that may be age-related or simply experience-related. In view of the huge amount of 'life experience' that Chaereas has packed in to a relatively short time period, his acquisition of *paideia* is perhaps not as sudden as it seems. But there is another reason for seeing this acquisition as not inconsistent with his earlier characterisation. We have seen that *paideia* is closely related to the intellect, and is inherently competitive. With this in mind, Chaereas appears to have the potential for *paideia* at a very early stage in the proceedings: when urged by Polycharmus to prepare an elaborate funeral for Callirhoe, Chaereas is said to be persuaded by the argument and inspired with a sense of *φιλοτιμίαν καὶ φροντίδα*.<sup>160</sup> While it is Polycharmus who applies the persuasive *logos* here, it is Chaereas who is inspired with a competitive love of

---

<sup>158</sup> 2.4.1, 2.4.4.

<sup>159</sup> A similar effect is achieved at 4.4.2, when Chaereas has just learned of Callirhoe's marriage to Dionysius, and wants to go straight to Miletus to take her back: Mithridates advises him to deliberate (*βουλευόασθαι*) more wisely (*φρονιμώτερον*), as he is acting more through passion than through reason (*πάθει μάλλον ἢ λογισμῶ*); the vocabulary used here calls Dionysius to mind.

<sup>160</sup> 1.6.2; *cf.* Dionysius, who is *φιλότιμος* by nature (6.9.2). Note that *φροντίς* was frequently attributed to Hellenistic kings (Farber 1979: 507).

honour and the careful reflection necessary to lay his wife to rest with the dignity befitting her station – both attributes associated with a man of *paideia*.<sup>161</sup>

This *paideia* is evident when Chaereas begins the route to his glorious *aristeia*. Just as we have seen that Dionysius' *paideia* leads to political promotion, so Chaereas' *paideia* leads to military promotion, from soldier, to sharing the king's table, to advising him on strategy:

... ἐπεδείκνυτο γὰρ φρόνησίν τε καὶ θάρσος, μετὰ τούτων δὲ καὶ πίστιν, οἷα δὴ καὶ φύσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ παιδείας οὐκ ἀπρονόητος.

... for he displayed intelligence and courage, and trustworthiness besides, for he had a noble nature and was not unacquainted with *paideia* (Chariton 7.2.5; trans. Goold, modified).

We have seen that *paideia* is related to a man's reputation, and that this gives it a very public sense: as in the case of Dionysius, it is something a man becomes known for. We have also seen that it gives a man access to other virtues, which augment his reputation and announce his character to the watching world.<sup>162</sup> The public, performative essence of *paideia* and its concomitant virtues is stressed when we learn here of Chaereas' *paideia*. *Phronēsis*, *tharsos*, and *pistis* are all qualities that are to be displayed (ἐπεδείκνυτο) before an audience. They are also attributes to which Chaereas has access thanks to a combination of natural nobility and acquired *paideia*; we might think back to Dionysius' attempt to cope with the delay in the trial through a combination of *physis* and *paideia*,<sup>163</sup> and to Isocrates' emphasis on a fusion of the two in the production of the best orator:<sup>164</sup> nature and culture both have roles to play in the formation of the adult male. It is interesting to note, though, that Chaereas is not said to be *pepaideumenos*, like Dionysius; rather, *paideia* is something with which he is 'not unacquainted'. The ἀπρονόητος of the manuscript has been emended, but neither of the suggestions, ἄπειρος and ἀμελέτητος, seems any more appropriate; whichever is accepted, we are left with a remark that has a

<sup>161</sup> Chaereas is persuaded to postpone suicide in order to give Callirhoe a fitting funeral rather as Dionysius persuades himself to postpone the wedding in order to do it properly.

<sup>162</sup> E.g. Dionysius is περιβόητος for his *sōphrosynē* (2.6.3).

<sup>163</sup> See above, p.63.

<sup>164</sup> See above, p.30.

somewhat tentative tone to it. It seems to suggest that Chaereas has the rudiments of *paideia*, but not the whole package; or perhaps it indicates the inherently unstable and partial nature of *paideia* – it is something a man may be ‘acquainted’ with, but which cannot cope with all situations and emotions, and on which he can never rely completely, as we have seen with even the mature *pepaideumenos*, Dionysius. It seems that the *paideia* with which Chaereas is ‘not unacquainted’ is of the experiential kind: indeed, the use of οὐκ ἀπρονόητος in relation to *paideia* parallels that of οὐκ ἀμελέτητος in the description of Callirhoe’s suitability to the task of comforting the queen, where we noted that Callirhoe’s *paideia* appeared to be connected to her experiences.<sup>165</sup> So Chaereas’ experiences have apparently built on natural aptitude to form a young man of *phronēsis*, *tharsos*, and *pistis*, whose potential for such noble attributes was suggested from the moment of Callirhoe’s funeral. The competitive, performative, and display-oriented sense of this passage is continued as Chaereas is said to be driven not only by the desire to defeat Artaxerxes, but by the desire ‘to show’ (δείξει) his worth: he is ‘not contemptible, but worthy of honour’,<sup>166</sup> this remark suggesting that *paideia* has instilled in him an awareness of his public image, and thus of the need for some ‘impression management’.<sup>167</sup>

#### *The display of words.*

We have noted that Second Sophistic *paideia* was especially associated with public speaking, and we shall see this association with regard to Achilles Tatius shortly. However, Haynes (2003: 87ff.) has argued that the novels tend almost to discount rhetoric as a defining male characteristic. She offers two examples of Chaereas’ behaviour in support of this: firstly, when he is reluctant to address the assembly upon the capture of Theron, and secondly, when he is initially reticent before the Syracusans on his return. I would suggest that, rather than deliberately diminishing the importance of rhetoric as an element of masculinity, when their text is examined these examples in fact seek to emphasise more generally Chaereas’ development of *paideia*. We have already observed the influence of Isocrates in Chariton’s novel,

<sup>165</sup> 7.6.5 (see above, p.43-44); Cobet’s suggestion that οὐκ ἀπρονόητος be emended to οὐκ ἀμελέτητος is based on the use of the latter in this earlier scene.

<sup>166</sup> 7.2.6.

<sup>167</sup> We shall consider this scene further in Chapter 2.

and these two scenes also appear to show Isocratean traces. In the first of Chaereas' rhetorical challenges, he is said to be unable to utter a sound, in spite of a desire to do so (φθέγξασθαι θέλων οὐκ ἰδύνατο).<sup>168</sup> We recall here Isocrates' assertion that in the absence of *tolma*, a man of *paideia* will be unable to speak before the crowd (οὐδ' ἂν φθέγξασθαι δυνηθείη).<sup>169</sup> Can this sharing of vocabulary be a mere coincidence, or is Chariton once more pinning his colours to the Isocratean mast? If he is deliberately intertexting with Isocrates, then we should note that Isocrates himself often admitted to a youthful lack of both voice and courage.<sup>170</sup> Given his own enormous transformation, perhaps the reader is directed to expect a similar transformation on Chaereas' part: it is no mean thing if Chariton is implying that Chaereas is following an Isocratean trajectory. We also recall that Isocrates used the phrase οὐδ' ἂν φθέγξασθαι δυνηθείη of a man who had *paideia* alone, but no natural ability; Chaereas, however, seems, as we have seen, to have positive qualities by nature, and while he may at first lack the courage to speak before the crowd, that courage is soon provided by the crowd itself (τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐβόα "θάρρει καὶ λέγε."). In the second example, when Chaereas has returned to Syracuse, he is hesitant and must be encouraged by Hermocrates to relate his experiences to the people.<sup>171</sup> But in both instances Chaereas is *willing* to speak, and it is concern for proper behaviour that seems to prevent him: in the first, at a time when Callirhoe is still presumed dead, as soon as he begins he states that it is really a time for mourning rather than public speaking ("ὁ μὲν" εἶπε "παρῶν καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν δημηγοροῦντος ἀλλὰ πενθοῦντος ..."); and in the second, he does in fact begin his story with no qualms, and only hesitates because he does not want to cause grief to his audience with the recollection of the unhappy events that caused his departure from Syracuse (λυπεῖν οὐ θέλων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ σκυθρωποῖς τὸν λαόν). By his reluctance, then, he demonstrates neither inadequacy in public speaking, nor evidence of an authorial depreciation of the particularly masculine field of rhetoric, but an emerging *paideia*, in the sense that he is able to read the demands of a situation and show concern for the feelings of others. Chaereas'

---

<sup>168</sup> 3.4.4.

<sup>169</sup> See above, p.30.

<sup>170</sup> E.g. Isoc. *Panathenaicus* 10; *To Philip* 81.

<sup>171</sup> 8.7.4.

behaviour in these scenes thus shows the importance of both rhetoric and careful thought in the performance of *paideia*.<sup>172</sup>

For Cleitophon, by contrast, *paideia* barely extends beyond superficial display. One might argue that Achilles' choice of ego-narrative inevitably casts Cleitophon as something of a declaimer: in a public context he readily embarks upon a performance for his anonymous narratee, a performance which comprises the ingredients (pirates, tyrants, virgins, and oracles) recognisable as those of the imperial schools of rhetoric.<sup>173</sup> Of course, the subject-matter of the genre as a whole implies a relationship between romance and rhetoric,<sup>174</sup> but the use of an ego-narrator who is telling his story not to the reader, but to an audience within the novel, exaggerates the air of sophistry in this novel in particular: the multiple layers of narrative emphasise the sense of performance, at whose heart stands Cleitophon. Indeed, his first words to the primary narrator locate him very much in the world of performance: standing before the painting of Europa and the bull, he says, Ἐγὼ τὰυτ' ἄν ἐδείκνυυ.<sup>175</sup> It must be noted that there is a textual problem here, as only one manuscript reads ἐδείκνυυ, while all others read εἰδείην. I would suggest, however, that given the performative context of Cleitophon's narration, and given the style in which he delivers it, δείκνυμι is a far more appropriate and more likely verb than εἶδαι.<sup>176</sup> I would also argue that the truth-value of Cleitophon's narrative is severely (and deliberately) compromised by both the layers of narrative and the atmosphere of declamation, which give it an air of artificiality from the outset.<sup>177</sup> My feeling is that Cleitophon offers to 'show' (ἐδείκνυυ) the main features of the painting through a fabricated oral narrative whose *ex tempore* nature inevitably results in inconsistencies and inaccuracies. This interpretation must also extend to the primary narrator, himself the 'declaimer' of the whole story.<sup>178</sup>

<sup>172</sup> De Temmerman (2006: 209-212) observantly highlights several parts of Chaereas' narrative where he appears to distort the truth deliberately, suggesting that he has successfully harnessed the power of rhetoric, and is able to control his audience.

<sup>173</sup> As Petronius' Encolpius laments (Petr. 1).

<sup>174</sup> A relationship observed by Reardon (1974).

<sup>175</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.2.1.

<sup>176</sup> The reading ἐδείκνυυ is found only in manuscript F, which is to some degree independent of the two main families of manuscripts; it might therefore be thought to preserve readings with some authority.

<sup>177</sup> Morales (2004: 55-56) also suggests the possibility that Cleitophon may be inventing his narrative.

<sup>178</sup> The reliability of Cleitophon, and thus of the primary narrator, is explored in Jones (Forthcoming, 2009).



Russell (1983: 88ff.) and Connolly (2001: 84-85) stress the increasing emphasis on the narrative element of imperial orations, which included embellishments such as *ekphrasis*, and the addition of ‘strong color to [the orator’s] own dramatic self-characterization’ (*ibid.*). Cleitophon’s use of both of these effects has been much commented upon,<sup>179</sup> and seems to identify him as the product of a rhetorical *paideia*. But this implicit *paideia* is an educational one in the narrowest sense of the word; it is only skin-deep, and lacks the moral quality that we have observed to be so important in Chariton, Isocrates, Lucian, and others. For example, having fallen for Leucippe, Cleitophon gives a lengthy disquisition on the peacock, and its place within the erotics of the natural world, with the sole intention of turning Leucippe on:<sup>180</sup> the goal of his display of *paideia* is no more profound than sex; indeed, his interpretation of the purpose of *paideia* is epitomised when he ambles around the house ostensibly reading a book, but in reality ogling Leucippe over the top of it:<sup>181</sup> like one of Lucian’s fraudulent teachers of rhetoric, Cleitophon uses *paideia* to conceal his true intentions. Just as we noted with regard to his deliberation with himself, his epideictic *paideia* is geared not towards the demonstration of virtue or the understanding of the feelings of others, but towards sexual gratification.<sup>182</sup> The fact that he himself recognises his use of *paideia* here as a performance is underscored by his reference to the peacock, which he says is at that very moment ‘displaying the theatre of its wings’ (τὸ θέατρον ἐπιδεικνύναι τῶν πτερῶν).<sup>183</sup> He is aided in the misuse of *paideia* by Satyrus, who, Cleitophon says, understands the ὑπόθεσις of his λόγος,<sup>184</sup> again fixing the scene in the context of rhetorical display.<sup>185</sup>

Russell (1983: 87ff.) observes a growing tendency in imperial declamation for the declaimer to assume characters with whom his audience could not truly sympathise, and in which cases oratory’s ‘educational usefulness takes second place to its amusement value [and] there is no pill inside the sugar coating’ (*ibid.* 88). It is

<sup>179</sup> E.g. Bartsch (1989), Morales (2004).

<sup>180</sup> 1.16.1: Βουλόμενος οὖν εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι ...

<sup>181</sup> 1.6.6.

<sup>182</sup> In fact, where Leucippe’s feelings are concerned, he professes total ignorance (2.8.1).

<sup>183</sup> 1.16.2. Morales (2004: 185) also notes the epideictic significance of the peacock here, and points to Dio Chrysostom’s explicit connection between the peacock and sophistry (*Or.* 12.2-5).

<sup>184</sup> 1.17.1.

<sup>185</sup> Marinčič (2007: 194) views ‘[t]he whole narrative ... as an exemplary seduction speech’ with Cleitophon as orator.

impossible to know how Achilles' readers would have reacted to Cleitophon's use and abuse of *paideia*; neither do we have any sense of the reaction of the novel's internal audience, since the frame is never resumed and there is never a glimpse of the primary narrator in the course of Cleitophon's performance. To the modern reader, however, Cleitophon's almost proud 'misperformance' of *paideia* gives him the quality of a loveable buffoon. There is certainly no pill inside Cleitophon's sugar-coated *paideia*, but that may not have made him an unsympathetic character to an ancient audience. If the achievement and maintenance of an ideal moral and intellectual *paideia* was as difficult as we have observed it to be in the case of Dionysius (and as we shall see it to be for Chaereas), then Cleitophon's unashamed misappropriation of *paideia* may well have come as a refreshing (and realistic) change to the reader. Achilles may have been swimming against the stream, but in characterising Cleitophon as he did, he was perhaps offering an alternative to which the average reader could relate in a more meaningful way than he could to Chariton's *pepaideumenos*. In misperforming *paideia*, Cleitophon misperforms a major element of Second Sophistic masculinity; however, by failing to be a 'real man', he ironically becomes more real.

#### **Paideia as erotic education.**

We have seen that *paideia* may be drawn upon either to aid proper self-comportment in erotic contexts, or, in Cleitophon's case, to aid the very opposite. *Paideia* in the novels is thus closely related to love – no surprise, one might think, when the genre's focal point is an erotic relationship. But the connection between *paideia* and love is more complex than this: *paideia* admits a man to an understanding of the very nature of love. This is a motif we find several times in Chariton. When Dionysius arrives in Babylon and is congratulated by the populace on the beauty of his wife, we learn that he is distressed by the admiration, and that by virtue of his *paideia* he is able to ponder on the inconstant nature of love:

μακαριζόμενος δὲ Διονύσιος ἔλυπεῖτο, καὶ δειλότερον αὐτὸν ἐποίει τῆς εὐτυχίας τὸ μέγεθος· ἀνὴρ γὰρ πεπαιδευμένος ἐνεθυμείτο ὅτι φιλόκαινός ἐστιν ὁ Ἔρως· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τόξα καὶ πῦρ ποιηταί τε καὶ πλάσται περιτεθεικάσιν αὐτῷ, τὰ κουφότατα καὶ στήναι μὴ θέλοντα. μνήμη δὲ ἐλάμβανεν αὐτὸν παλαιῶν διηγημάτων, ὅσαι μεταβολαὶ γέγονασι τῶν καλῶν γυναικῶν.

The congratulations heaped upon Dionysius caused him pain, and the extent of his good fortune made him all the more fearful, for as a man of *paideia* he pondered that Love is fickle. That is why poets and sculptors equip him with bow and flame, of all things the most light and unstable. He was visited by the remembrance of ancient stories which told of the inconstant ways of beautiful women (Chariton 4.7.6-7; trans. Goold, modified).

Here we see again the power of *paideia* to internalise one's concerns: Dionysius' *paideia* enables him to think deeply (ἐνεθυμῆτο) about love, whose character it has taught him through the study of literature and art. But, as we saw earlier, his *paideia* works against him: while it is the attribute on which he calls in order to consider his situation, and on which his identity depends, it is also the thing that reveals the precariousness of that situation and identity. Indeed, rather than shoring up his confidence, his *paideia* in the nature of love results in his destabilisation, as he becomes even more concerned for his position.<sup>186</sup>

We observed earlier that the symposium was a prime site for the display of *paideia*. Since Plato's *Symposium*, that *paideia* had been connected with the erotic.<sup>187</sup> *Metiochus and Parthenope* offers a fascinating twist on the all-male symposium at which the nature of love is discussed. There, Metiochus argues against the traditional representations of Eros, stating that those who believe in such representations must be uninitiated in true *paideia*,<sup>188</sup> a distinction that calls to mind Cebes' *Tabula*. Metiochus' speech seems to be geared towards disguising his feelings, but it is cut short by the surprising presence of Parthenope, who is apparently encouraged to join the debate, and who refers to a 'door to *paideia*', and to the work of poets, painters, and sculptors.<sup>189</sup> Evidently this text engaged with the role of *paideia* in erotic education. Longus' Gnathon has undergone just such an

<sup>186</sup> Like Dionysius, the implicit *pepaideumenos* Artaxerxes has 'heard in stories and poems who Love is, and that he rules all the gods, even Zeus himself' (6.3.2; trans. Goold). At 4.4.5, when Chaereas wishes to rush to Miletus and take back Callirhoe from Dionysius, Mithridates remarks on his ignorance of the nature of love: an indication, perhaps, that Chaereas' *paideia* is not yet fully-formed; we shall return to this notion shortly. See also Hld. 4.2.3, where Theagenes refers to the way painters represent Eros.

<sup>187</sup> See Goldhill (1995: 47).

<sup>188</sup> II.40 (Stephens & Winkler 1995).

<sup>189</sup> II.70-71. The fragments of the Persian verse version of the story cast the heroine as a highly intellectual young woman in the vein of Charicleia. Stephens & Winkler (1995: 92) remark that 'it seems likely that Parthenope speaks here as one already skilled in traditional male public discourse, not as a shy and tongue-tied miss normally confined to the women's quarters'.

erotic *paideia*: he is said to have been made *pepaideumenos* in all kinds of erotic mythology through his attendance at drink-soaked symposia, and this *paideia* enables him to make a symposium-style oration in defence of his lust for Daphnis;<sup>190</sup> Astylus underscores the performative context with a sardonic comment on the sophistry induced by Eros.<sup>191</sup> Rather than using the mythology learned at the symposium as a positive influence on his erotic behaviour, Gnathon perverts it, appropriating it as an excuse for the desire he has for Daphnis. In a similar way, and again with a dinner-party as backdrop, Cleitophon uses mythology to justify his decision to try to gratify his lust.<sup>192</sup> *Paideia* is knowingly misappropriated by both Gnathon and Cleitophon, so that it becomes not a means of right behaviour in love, but a legitimisation for the acquisition of a kind of sex that does not receive generic sanction.<sup>193</sup>

The erotic *paideia* to which Gnathon wants to expose Daphnis is clearly not the right one, as we shall see further in Chapter 3. In fact, Daphnis has already received a heterosexual erotic *paideia* earlier in the story, and it is to this that we now turn. Because of the richness of the tokens Lamon and Dryas find with Daphnis and Chloe, they give them an education, reflecting that they are of a higher social class.<sup>194</sup> If *paideia* involves knowledge of the nature of love, then (the reader assumes) the education they receive must be extremely basic, given their later ignorance of love.<sup>195</sup> It is, however, sufficient to enable Daphnis to display some rhetorical skill at the beauty-contest with Dorcon.<sup>196</sup> But it is Daphnis' experience with Lycaenion that is most significant in terms of *paideia*. The whole scene, in fact, is cast as a form of *paideia* which gives Daphnis both the physical ability and the

<sup>190</sup> Longus 4.17.3ff.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Ach. Tat. 1.10.1 and 5.27.4, where Eros is also called a sophist. See Morgan (2004: 234-236) on the superficiality of Gnathon's *paideia*.

<sup>192</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.5.5ff.

<sup>193</sup> In Gnathon's case that is homosexual sex, and in Cleitophon's premarital.

<sup>194</sup> 1.8.1.

<sup>195</sup> It appears that it is Lamon and Dryas who teach the children (γράμματα ἐπαίδευσον), but that raises the question of how the foster-fathers can be so ignorant of love if they have received some education themselves; again this must have been the simplest of reading and writing; on the education of Daphnis and Chloe, see Herrmann (Forthcoming, 2007).

<sup>196</sup> 1.15.4ff.; see Morgan (2004: 165-166). See also Daphnis' well-structured response to the Methymnaeans' accusations, complete with a cutting reference to the Methymnaeans' dogs as the possessors of a substandard *paideia* (2.16, with Morgan, *ibid.* 188).

intellectual comprehension necessary to progress to manhood.<sup>197</sup> Lycaenion first offers to ‘teach’ (διδασκαλέω, διδάσκω) Daphnis how to have sex, asking him to be her ‘pupil’ (μαθητήν). He responds enthusiastically and she then begins ‘to educate’ him (παιδεύειν), but, paradoxically, it is nature that rounds off his *paideia* (αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ φύσις λοιπὸν ἐπαίδευε τὸ πρακτέον).<sup>198</sup> As Whitmarsh observes (2001a: 82), Longus engages here with contemporary debate on the roles of nature and culture in the formation of identity. Lycaenion herself informs Daphnis of the identity this fusion of nature and culture has newly given him: ‘And do not forget that I have made you a man before Chloe’. Daphnis has been made a man, and the *paideia* that *physis* and *technē* have brought him has itself brought that other symbol of masculinity, the ability to reason: having been warned by Lycaenion that Chloe will bleed if he tries to put what he has learned into practice, he resolves (γνοῦς) to restrain himself,<sup>199</sup> and even prevents Chloe from taking her clothes off very often, fearing that his *logismos* will be defeated.<sup>200</sup> Daphnis’ fear of course ensures that Chloe remains a virgin until marriage, when Daphnis may teach her what he has learned from Lycaenion.<sup>201</sup> So *paideia* for Longus seems to consist in the learning of proper sexual conduct which will guarantee the maintenance of social proprieties: while Daphnis may have had a rudimentary education in childhood which enables him to construct effective rhetorical arguments in public contexts, only when he is able to comport himself according to accepted codes of sexual behaviour will he truly have *paideia*.

### **Paideia and anger.**

We have observed that *paideia*, especially as represented by Chariton, is an attribute that governs a man’s self-comportment and dealings with others. It is time now to consider one event in Chariton’s narrative where appropriate self-comportment is seemingly lacking. Although explicitly said to possess *paideia* towards the end of novel, and apparently having the rudiments of it at the time of Callirhoe’s funeral, at the beginning of the narrative Chaereas so lacks control over his performance of

<sup>197</sup> This scene is analysed in detail in Chapter 3. As noted earlier, Philetas is also characterised as a teacher of *paideia* (see above, p.46).

<sup>198</sup> 3.17.2ff.

<sup>199</sup> 3.20.2.

<sup>200</sup> 3.24.3. He is also concerned for Chloe, lest he hurt her; we have seen that empathy for the suffering of others is an important component of *paideia*.

<sup>201</sup> 4.40.3.

masculinity that he is moved to physical violence against his wife. Chaereas' jealous anger towards Callirhoe should be considered in relation to his emerging *paideia* and consciousness of masculine ideals, and would, to a contemporary reader, have been intelligible. To some extent, it is only to be expected, as rash and violent behaviour was commonly attributed to the young, who were believed less able to control their impulses.<sup>202</sup> As Roisman (2005: 14) observes in relation to classical oratory, anger-driven misdemeanours did not receive approval, but they were somewhat mitigated if their perpetrators were young. The tyrant of Acragas anticipates Chaereas being easy to make jealous, and even identifies such jealousy as a characteristic of youth (νεωτερικὴν ζηλοτυπίαν).<sup>203</sup> What is more, Chaereas is in love, a condition perceived to destabilise a man's self-control, as the tyrant suggests when he promises that jealousy will work in tandem with love to bring Chaereas down.<sup>204</sup> Indeed, the anger and jealousy that Chaereas exhibits should be seen as part of a tradition that regarded such emotions as signs of intense love.<sup>205</sup>

Chariton is somewhat unusual in his attribution of intense erotic jealousy and anger primarily to men: elsewhere in Greek literature, women are overwhelmingly the jealous and angry sex.<sup>206</sup> Chariton is more than willing to draw on the stereotype of

<sup>202</sup> See Ach. Tat. 8.18.2, where Callisthenes is said to have accounted for his kidnapping of Calligone by reference to his youth: 'Of my actions ... the aggressive ones were motivated by youthful nature, violent as it is ...' (trans. Whitmarsh). Aristotle states that the young and wealthy are those most prone to the commission of hybistic acts (*Rh.* 1378b); see Murray (1990). Youth was so strongly associated with violent acts that the verb νεανιεύομαι was used principally to denote the perpetration of such acts (*LSJ* s.v.).

<sup>203</sup> Chariton 1.2.6. Chaereas behaves in a manner similar to the jealous and violent young men of New Comedy; on Chariton's use of Menander, see Borgogno (1971), and on jealous anger in Menander, see Fantham (1986).

<sup>204</sup> 1.2.5.

<sup>205</sup> So Morgan (1996: 177); see, e.g., Lucian *DMeretr.* 8, and Roman elegy, where jealous anger is often welcomed as an index of passion (see Caston 2000). See Allen (2000: 52) on anger and love as isomorphic in Greek thought, with ὀργή denoting both anger and sexual passion; and Lloyd (1995: 7) on jealousy and love as entailing identical psychological conditions. Chaereas himself attributes his jealousy to his love for Callirhoe (4.4.9); see also 5.1.1, where Chariton refers to Chaereas' attack on Callirhoe as 'a lover's fit of jealousy' (trans. Goold). Jealousy and love have a symbiotic relationship: jealousy is said to increase Dionysius' love for Callirhoe (5.9.9). On love and jealousy in Chariton's male characters, see Pagliarlunga (2000a).

<sup>206</sup> See Fantham (1986) and Harris (2001: 274ff.). Cf. the other extant novels, where jealousy is a womanish emotion: X. Eph. 2.5 (Manto); Ach. Tat. 5.24.3, 7.3.7, 7.9.12 (Melite); Heliodorus applies all his instances of jealousy to women or feminised men, such as barbarians or eunuchs, and even Charicleia suffers from 'the congenital sickness of womankind – jealousy' (τὴν γυναικῶν ἔμφυτον νόσον ζηλοτυπίαν, 7.21.5; trans. Morgan); the most striking occurrence of female jealousy in the novels comes from Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*, where Sinon's jealous rage drives her to attempt murder (fragment 61, Stephens & Winkler). On the novels' stereotyping of women and barbarians as jealous, see Pagliarlunga (2000b), and on the weight Chariton accords to jealousy, see Roncali (1991).

the jealous woman,<sup>207</sup> but in general he transposes such womanish emotions to the masculine sphere. But Chaereas' experience of emotions usually associated with women does not feminise him; rather, it is suggestive of the limited power of masculinity and *paideia*. Indeed, fearing the prospect of Stateira's jealousy, Callirhoe notes that Chaereas could not bear the emotion, *despite* being a man and a Greek,<sup>208</sup> and even Dionysius succumbs to jealousy, for all his *paideia*.<sup>209</sup> Masculinity, and that marker of masculinity, *paideia*, are not all-powerful, and if Dionysius, with his mature *paideia*, cannot fight off jealousy, then the immature Chaereas is likely to be even more susceptible to it. Yet it is worth noting that despite being both young and in love, and thus doubly prone to jealousy and anger, Chaereas is not as easy to bring down as his rival expects, and it requires two attempts for the adultery allegation to succeed. In the first of the suitors' attempts, traces of revelling can be disbelieved; it is only with the second, when seemingly undeniable physical evidence is produced, in the form of the supposed *moichos*, that Chaereas succumbs irreparably to his anger, kicking and apparently killing Callirhoe. He might therefore be thought somewhat less volatile and more open to reasoned thought than his violence makes him appear when considered in isolation.

In formulating his plan, the tyrant draws a clear distinction between Chaereas and Callirhoe, and the key distinguishing factor is Chaereas' experience of the gymnasium:

Καλλιρόη μὲν οὖν εὐσταθῆς καὶ ἄπειρος κακοήθους ὑποψίας, ὁ δὲ Χαϊρέας, οἷα δὴ γυμνασίοις ἐντραφεὶς καὶ νεωτερικῶν ἀμαρτημάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος, δύναται ῥάδιως ὑποπτεύσας ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς νεωτερικὴν ζηλοτυπίαν ...

Callirhoe, I know, is sensible, and she doesn't know what malice and suspicion are. But Chaereas has been brought up in the gymnasium, and he does know how young people misbehave; it will be easy to arouse his

<sup>207</sup> See 1.12.8, 2.1.9, 2.5.5, and 6.6.5.

<sup>208</sup> 6.6.5.

<sup>209</sup> When Dionysius first learns of Chaereas' existence, we are told ἤπτετο ... αὐτοῦ ζηλοτυπία (3.7.6); and hearing that two strangers (Chaereas and Polycharmus) have admired Callirhoe's statue, he is said to be εὐθὺς ἐνεπλήσθη ζηλοτυπίας (3.9.4); cf. also Artaxates' description of both Chaereas and Dionysius as ὑπὸ ζηλοτυπίας (6.6.7), conveying a certain loss of autonomy, an inability to dictate one's own actions and make one's own decisions.

suspicious and make him jealous, as young men are liable to be (Chariton 1.2.6; trans. Reardon).

The tyrant apparently expects the fact that Chaereas has been raised in the gymnasium to assist in the production of suspicion: Callirhoe is unacquainted (ἄπειρος) with malice and suspicion (κακοήθους ὑποψίας), but because of Chaereas' experience of the gymnasium, he is not unacquainted (οὐκ ἄπειρος) with the mistakes made by the young (νεωτερικῶν ἀμαρτημάτων). It is unclear precisely what these mistakes are, but, implicitly, they involve κακοήθης ὑποψία; he either has personal experience of, or has heard about, love affairs which have involved such suspicion. We have noted that gymnastic training formed part of the *paideia* of a young man.<sup>210</sup> We have also observed that *paideia* is something like a journey, which may be commenced when the subject is young, but which is especially associated with maturity.<sup>211</sup> The emphasis on Chaereas' time spent in the gymnasium might be thought to suggest that he has begun the journey to *paideia*, but is not yet very far along the road. Ironically, an element of his *paideia* – his experience in the gymnasium – is expected to work against him to undermine his relationship and his self-image, rather than to protect and promote his masculinity: as we saw in the case of Dionysius at the symposium, and in the case of his knowledge of love, *paideia* (even of the mature variety) may trap a man into undesirable behaviour. Callirhoe is said to be εὐσταθής, an attribute which may well be part of her nature, if we think of the later passage where Dionysius is said to bear events by virtue of the εὐστάθεια of his nature, which contrasts with his culturally acquired *paideia*.<sup>212</sup> While a contrast is made there between nature and culture, *eustatheia* and *paideia* nonetheless work in tandem, even if they cannot provide complete support and protection for Dionysius. The implication of the suitor's reference to Callirhoe's *eustatheia* is that Chaereas does not possess this seemingly natural quality. It will thus be easier to use his *paideia* of the gymnasium to undermine him. The presentation of anger and jealousy in Chariton's text is complicated and paradoxical. They are womanish emotions, felt by men. They are also emotions that are felt by

<sup>210</sup> See above, p.29, with n.8; see also Chapter 2, p.135, on Theagenes' experience of the gymnasium.

<sup>211</sup> See above, p.45ff.

<sup>212</sup> 5.9.8; see above, p.63. See also p.64 on 8.5.10-11, where Dionysius remains εὐσταθής on learning that he has lost Callirhoe.



men both despite *paideia* and because of it: Chaereas is overwhelmed by the force of his emotions *despite* his emerging *paideia*; but it is also in part *because* of an element of that *paideia* – his experiences in the gymnasium – that he is so susceptible to those emotions.

We have seen that speech and reason were the primary symbols of *paideia*. Brown (1992: 44ff.) argues that the *pepaideumenos* was able to command respect by means of his educated eloquence; such a man therefore had no need to resort to violence, and was thus distanced from it.<sup>213</sup> The fact that Chaereas does resort to violence might again suggest that his *paideia* is not yet fully-formed. The discovery of traces of a *kōmos* outside the door triggers intense emotions that attack his rational faculties, damaging his power of speech, and taking the form of a physical disorder that causes bodily shaking and bloodshot eyes:

πυθθανομένης δὲ τί γέγονεν, ἄφωνος ἦν, οὔτε ἀπιστεῖν οἷς εἶδεν οὔτε πιστεύειν οἷς οὐκ ἤθελε δυνάμενος. ἀπορουμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τρέμοντος ἡ γυνὴ μηδὲν ὑπονοοῦσα τῶν γεγονότων ἰκέτευεν εἰπεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ χόλου· ὁ δὲ ὑφαίμοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ παχεῖ τῷ φθέγματι “κλαίω” φησὶ “τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ τύχην, ὅτι μου ταχέως ἐπελάθου,” καὶ τὸν κῶμον ὠνείδισεν.

When she asked him what had happened, he was speechless, being able neither to disbelieve what he had seen, nor yet to believe what he was unwilling to accept. As he stood confused and trembling, his wife, quite unsuspecting of what had happened, begged him to tell her the reason for his anger. With bloodshot eyes and thick voice he said, “It is the fact that you have forgotten me that hurts so much,” and he reproached her for the reveling (Chariton 1.3.4-5; trans. Goold).

Chaereas’ nascent *paideia*, his emerging ability to speak and to reason, is overcome by the power of the emotions he suddenly experiences.<sup>214</sup> This happens again when he is informed of Callirhoe’s supposed infidelity: he is initially unable to speak, and even to open his mouth or raise his eyes (ἀχανῆς ἔκειτο, μήτε τὸ στόμα μήτε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπάραι δυνάμενος), and when he regains the ability, his voice is small and out of character (ἐπεὶ δὲ φωνὴν οὐχ ὁμοίαν μὲν ὀλίγην δὲ

<sup>213</sup> See also Harris (2001: 388).

<sup>214</sup> Cf. Ach. Tat. 2.29.2, where Cleitophon sententiously declares that *orgē* overwhelms the *logismos* with madness.

συνελέξατο).<sup>215</sup> Having seen what he believes to be the adulterer entering the house, he loses his voice completely (ὁ δὲ φωνὴν μὲν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὥστε λοιδορήσασθαι), and is overwhelmed by anger (κρατούμενος ... ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς).<sup>216</sup> The extent to which his reason has been overpowered is clear from the fact that he had intended to spare (φείσομαι) Callirhoe, even if she was discovered to be adulterous,<sup>217</sup> and had rushed in meaning to kill the *moichos*, not her.<sup>218</sup> In his discussion of anger's relation to *paideia*, Brown (1992: 55) notes that anger and clemency were counterparts, and that if a governor subdued his anger in response to pleas for mercy, his good reputation would be enhanced.<sup>219</sup> Chaereas' intention to show mercy to Callirhoe is therefore praiseworthy in terms of the *paideia* it implies,<sup>220</sup> but his emotions prove stronger than his good intentions: in the absence of the adulterer – the legitimate target for his anger – Chaereas' emotion boils over, and, as the only person within range, Callirhoe becomes the inevitable victim.

Although in literature we find the frequent stereotyping of women as angry and jealous, perhaps the best known angry figure was of course Achilles. The reader is to some extent prepared for Chaereas' impetuosity and anger by the numerous intertextual analogies made between him and the Iliadic warrior.<sup>221</sup> Despite the premium placed on anger-control that we have noted above, anger had a legitimate role in Greek and Roman society, as a masculine tool appropriate for use in certain agonistic circumstances (Allen 2000: 60 *et passim*), and as a prerequisite where punishment was needed (Galinsky 1988): in life, anger was in fact a male preserve. Furthermore, one of the defining features of the classical construction of masculinity was the ability to respond to and defend oneself against personal insults (Fisher

<sup>215</sup> 1.4.7.

<sup>216</sup> 1.4.12.

<sup>217</sup> 1.4.7.

<sup>218</sup> 1.4.10. Chaereas' anger reflects the Aristotelian interpretation of *orgē* as both psychological (a desire for retaliation) and physiological (a surging of blood and heat); see *de An.* 403a29-31.

<sup>219</sup> See below, p.136ff. for Hydaspes behaving in precisely this manner, and *cf.* above, p.43, n.64, on Callirhoe.

<sup>220</sup> See also his change of behaviour in response to Callirhoe's protestation of innocence after the suitors' initial attempt (1.3.7: μεταβαλλόμενος οὖν ὁ Χαίρεας ἤρξατο κολακεύειν, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ταχέως αὐτοῦ τὴν μετάνοιαν ἠσπάζετο), and his transformation of his anger into pain when he first confronts her (1.3.4: τὴν ὀργὴν μετέβαλεν εἰς λύπην); *cf.* above, p.40-41, on Callirhoe's anger-control (τὴν ὀργὴν μετέβαλε).

<sup>221</sup> Scourfield (2003: 167) rightly observes the allusion Chariton makes to both the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* through his foregrounding of anger. On Chaereas' assimilation to epic warriors, see below, p.111, with n.95.

1998: 70).<sup>222</sup> Chaereas' anger should be understood in this vein, as a response to a situation where his masculinity is seemingly being publicly insulted by a rival, and where punishment is required. When the suitors carry out their first plan, leaving traces of a *kōmos* at Callirhoe's door, Chariton states that passers-by stopped out of curiosity (καὶ πᾶς ὁ παριῶν εἰστήκει κοινῶ τινι πολυπραγμοσύνης πάθει), and that on his return from the country Chaereas encountered a crowd outside the door (τὸν ὄχλον πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν).<sup>223</sup> As part of the second plan, the suitors' crony tells Chaereas that he is being openly insulted (φανερῶς ὑβρίζη), and that Callirhoe's affair is common gossip (θρυλλεῖται πανταχοῦ τὸ δεινόν).<sup>224</sup> He must thus act quickly to protect his image, and the flaring of his jealous anger would seem to a contemporary reader a perfectly normal reaction.<sup>225</sup> Aristotle cited acts of *hybris* – whether proven or only imagined – as legitimate causes of anger, and defined anger as a cognitive response to perceived insult, and a desire for revenge.<sup>226</sup> Aristotle explains the proper place of anger in the male script: a man should feel anger 'on the right grounds and against the right persons, and also in the right manner and at the right moment and for the right length of time'.<sup>227</sup> He then finds something of a paradox in the description of the man who manages this: he is called 'gentle-tempered', though 'gentle' indicates that he may not 'seek redress for injuries'; if a man never becomes angry, 'he will not stand up for himself; and it is considered servile to put up with an insult to oneself'.<sup>228</sup> Chaereas' honour as a man lies partly in Callirhoe's fidelity to him; he has been led to believe that that honour has been publicly impugned and his masculinity challenged;<sup>229</sup> his jealous anger is therefore an appropriate response.

<sup>222</sup> See also Cairns (2003) on Iliadic anger as a response to affront.

<sup>223</sup> 1.3.3.

<sup>224</sup> 1.4.5.

<sup>225</sup> See Farrell (1980) on jealousy as a 'threat-response', a reaction to a potential threat to one's status.

<sup>226</sup> Arist. *EN* 1149a25ff.; *Rh.* 1378a ff.; see Fortenbaugh (1975: 11ff.). Cf. Chaereas' rival suitors, who are driven by ὑβρις and φθόνος, which provoke their anger (1.2.1ff.; the causal link between insult and anger is noted also by Scourfield 2003: 164-165); their means of saving face over the perceived insult is to plot revenge. Cf. Ach. Tat. 5.5.6ff., where ζηλοτυπία and ὑβρις mix, spurring on Procne and Philomela to avenge themselves on Tereus. The relation between *hybris* and jealousy is demonstrated when Plangon advises Callirhoe against keeping her baby: Dionysius' jealousy, she says, will not allow Callirhoe to keep another man's child under his roof, as he would consider it an act of *hybris* (2.10.1). See also Ach. Tat. 6.19 for Cleitophon's description of the functioning of anger and love, and their relation to perceived dishonour.

<sup>227</sup> Arist. *EN* 1125b; Loeb trans.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>229</sup> See Campbell (1964) on honour and adultery in modern Greece; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst (1982) on the modern widespread expectation of a husband's rage in response to his wife's adultery; and Buss (2000) on male jealousy as a cross-cultural evolutionary adaptation whose purpose is to

Paradoxically, while the *pepaideumenos* might ideally restrain his anger,<sup>230</sup> Aristotle's interpretation of anger as an emotion that comes about through reason suggests that *paideia* – at whose core is the *logos* – is the very catalyst for anger. The eruption of Chaereas' anger might therefore be interpreted as a sign of latent *paideia*, of the functioning of his reason, but he is presented with an impossible situation: accepted codes of masculinity, together with his intense love for Callirhoe, dictate that he be angry at being cuckolded, and that he seek revenge for this perceived act of *hybris*; but while he is perfectly within his rights to retaliate by killing the adulterer, there is in reality no adulterer to kill, and Callirhoe is thus in the firing line. His lack of restraint at this point might, in an Aristotelian light, be thought understandable: as well as defining anger as responsive to the rational faculties, Aristotle also stated that anger's own intensity prevented it from paying full attention to those faculties; because of this, an access of anger was less shameful than a lack of restraint in other areas of life.<sup>231</sup>

So Chaereas' anger and jealousy are not problematic in themselves.<sup>232</sup> But, as Roisman (2005: 72) notes, violence in the wrong context could be damaging to a man's masculinity, and Chariton seems to intend Chaereas' violence against Callirhoe to be interpreted by the reader as misdirected. Aphrodite, he says, had herself been moved to *orgē* against Chaereas because of his ἄκαίρος ζηλοτυπία, which had driven him to commit an act of *hybris*.<sup>233</sup> Ironically, a perceived act of *hybris* is what Chaereas must avenge in order to defend his masculine image, but the

---

protect paternity (cf. Konstan (2003), who argues against the possibility of a cross-cultural interpretation of jealousy). The protection of paternity may be an implicit element in Chariton's depiction of Chaereas' jealous anger: as Lysias 1.32-33 makes clear, a wife's infidelity reduces a husband's certainty of paternity regarding any children born, and concomitantly reduces his certainty of passing on his property to a child genetically his own; the inability of a man to be certain that his child is his own is clearly an issue in Chariton's mind, as he has Dionysius unwittingly raise Chaereas' child. On Lysias 1 and Chariton, see Porter (2003).

<sup>230</sup> As we saw the *pepaideumenē* Callirhoe do in response to Artaxates (see above, p.40-41).

<sup>231</sup> Arist. *EN* 1149a25ff; Cf. Sen. *de Ira* 1.3.2ff., where anger is both the enemy and the product of reason, and is a desire for vengeance; as a Stoic, however, Seneca condemns anger unequivocally.

<sup>232</sup> Describing the trial of Chaereas for Callirhoe's murder, Chariton mentions jealousy as a defence Chaereas could justly have used (1.5.4). Even Callirhoe's own father is able to comprehend Chaereas' jealousy (8.7.6-7): it came about on false grounds (ψευδῆ), and he was violent in an inappropriate manner (ἀκαίρως), but what happened was not intended (ἀκούσιον). Cf. Parrott (1991: 23), who observes that the hostility that often accompanies jealousy usually receives social sanction.

<sup>233</sup> 8.1.3.

intensity of his emotions traps him into committing *hybris* himself:<sup>234</sup> as we have already noted, attempts to behave according to ideals of masculinity have a habit of trapping the performer in a double-bind. The motive for Chaereas' anger is legitimate, but the target it finds is not (Scourfield 2003: 171). Plutarch, for example, argues that jealousy and anger have no place in marriage, and are destructive to it;<sup>235</sup> he even writes a tract on the *hamartēmata* that are caused by those who act *en orgē*.<sup>236</sup> Though Plutarch may not approve of anger in marriage, his repeated returns to the subject suggest that he sees it as a common problem.<sup>237</sup> The force of Chaereas' emotions prevents him from venting his anger in the correct circumstances: he cannot channel it in order to gain redress, and so it becomes destructive to his marriage rather than to his enemies.

But there is some evidence to suggest that Chaereas' experiences bring with them a greater ability to control his emotions, and we might for this reason see those experiences as a form of *paideia*.<sup>238</sup> Indeed, after he is said to possess *paideia*, several occurrences suggest his maturation. Firstly, he displays his anger in the appropriate context of warfare, during which he acts with *sōphrosynē*,<sup>239</sup> and to which Callirhoe later refers as having been inspired by his *orgē* towards Artaxerxes.<sup>240</sup> Secondly, Chaereas instructs his Egyptian comrade on the best way to treat women, which must exclude any sense of force or *hybris*:<sup>241</sup> followed almost immediately by the reference to Aphrodite's anger at Chaereas for his *hybris* against Callirhoe, this surely implies a new understanding on Chaereas' part; given that we have seen comprehension of the nature of love to form part of *paideia*, Chaereas'

<sup>234</sup> Love and jealousy make a potent admixture, causing aberrant behaviour; cf. *Babyloniaca* 74a9 fragment 4: 'Whenever jealousy is added to *erōs*, a king turns into a tyrant' (trans. Stephens & Winkler); and Callirhoe's suggestion that Chaereas' behaviour is out of character: he had never even struck a slave (1.14.7); see also Hld. 1.30.7, where Thyamis is spurred on by love, jealousy, and anger to kill what he thinks is Charicleia: this is presented as the action of an uncivilised, barbarian bandit, but Thyamis is in fact a high-priest-in-waiting, and is thus acting contrary to his true disposition as a result of this powerful blend of emotions (though the reader does not yet know this); cf. Hld. 7.29.1 on Achaemenes: 'Anger, jealousy, love, and disappointment combined to goad him to fury: emotions capable of turning anyone's mind, let alone a savage's' (trans. Morgan).

<sup>235</sup> Plu. *Coniugalia Praecepta* 141f; 144a; 144c.

<sup>236</sup> Plu. *Moralia* 452f-464d (*On the Control of Anger*); see 462a for the effect of anger on marriage.

<sup>237</sup> In a modern study, Paul, Foss, & Galloway (1993: 415) find that in instances of sexual jealousy, the partner is indeed the more usual focus for the jealous person's anger.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Couraud-Lalanne (1998) and Lalanne (2006).

<sup>239</sup> 7.4.9. See also Scourfield (2003: 172) on Chaereas' appropriate anger on the battlefield. We shall examine his behaviour in warfare in Chapter 2.

<sup>240</sup> 8.3.7.

<sup>241</sup> 7.6.10.

knowledge of how to treat women is presumably indicative of his possession of *paideia*.<sup>242</sup> Thirdly, we see him apparently able to control the pathological affliction of his ἔμφυτος ζηλοτυπία: when Callirhoe tells him about Dionysius, his jealousy resurfaces, but he is cheered to hear about his son;<sup>243</sup> there is thus an opportunity for his emotions to boil over, but they do not.<sup>244</sup> Fourthly, on learning that Artaxerxes had not wronged Callirhoe, Chaereas acknowledges that he had been too quick to anger with regard to the king.<sup>245</sup> And finally, when addressing his men, Chaereas states that in their warfare they have ‘learned by experience’ (πείρα γὰρ μεμαθήκαμεν):<sup>246</sup> if his military experiences have taught him something, perhaps this sense of education can be extended to his other experiences too.

### *Chapter summary.*

Novelistic *paideia* is a lifelong process; a man may be said to possess *paideia*, but this does not suggest that the process is complete, or that his masculinity is necessarily fixed or stable. *Paideia* is often associated with age, but it is also developed through a man’s experiences. It bestows upon him a certain bearing, and is something for which he is involved in competition with others. It acts as an index of social status, and brings with it social and political opportunities. It has a moral dimension that governs a man’s relations with others and admits him to the virtues. It demands to be publicly displayed, through refined speech in rhetorical contexts and in social gatherings, but also to be fostered privately, in deliberation with

<sup>242</sup> Note in this regard that the *pepaideumenos* Dionysius is referred to as φιλογύνης and φιλογύναιος (1.12.7, 2.1.5) which seems to suggest not simply a liking for women, but an understanding of how to behave towards them, as is evidenced by his treatment of Callirhoe at 5.5.1 (see above, p.61-62); Chaereas himself is described to the incognito Callirhoe as φιλογύναιος by his comrade (7.6.7), only after he has been said to have *paideia*.

<sup>243</sup> 8.1.15 (cf. Hld. 7.21.5 and 9.25.5, where jealousy is also presented as an innate and in some way natural quality). Pondering on the trial, the Babylonian women fear that Chaereas might give way to anger in the future (6.1.5); later, aware of Chaereas’ ἔμφυτος ζηλοτυπία, Callirhoe does not tell him about her letter to Dionysius (8.4.4). The women’s concern is based only on what they have heard about Chaereas’ earlier behaviour, and Callirhoe’s on a single experience of his jealousy; the focalisation of both references precludes an objective sense of whether Chaereas is truly likely to repeat his violent behaviour (the instances at 6.1.5 and 8.4.4 are noted also by Scourfield (2003: 175, n.58) and interpreted similarly). On the possibility that Chaereas is now better able to control himself, we might also refer to Plutarch, who states that when anger has been successfully fought off once, it thereafter becomes easier to manage (*On the Control of Anger* 454c).

<sup>244</sup> In fact, the presence of an innate jealousy might be viewed positively, providing it can now be controlled, as it enables Chaereas’ vigilance over Callirhoe’s fidelity; cf. Catul. 17, where the poet considers despicable a man who exhibits no interest in his wife’s conduct, and who is repeatedly being cuckolded.

<sup>245</sup> 8.1.16. Cf. Dionysius’ recognition of the futility of his own jealousy (8.5.15).

<sup>246</sup> 8.2.10.

oneself. It can act as a protective carapace, and can be used to conceal or disguise, and to present a particular image to the world.

But the external and internal, or public and private, aspects of *paideia* are to some extent in conflict, as a man's internalisation of *paideia* may mean that its public, display-oriented form is neglected. *Paideia* assists in the control of emotion, and its release in appropriate contexts, but some emotions may be too strong for *paideia* to control; *paideia* is also the very faculty that facilitates the recognition of those emotions. The fine line between control or concealment and display is one we have seen both Dionysius and Chaereas walk, and it is one also walked by imperial sophists.<sup>247</sup> With two conflicting ideals to live up to, it is no wonder, perhaps, that Dionysius suffers something of an identity crisis: while *paideia* is intended as a marker of identity, its practice can result in the destabilisation of that identity. Although *paideia* is a means of social advancement, a bringer of power, and a provider of protection, it is not all-powerful. Notably, though it governs a man's self-comportment in the erotic sphere, it is also limited by love, which may overcome both its concealing ability and its capacity to control emotion.

The performance of *paideia* involves a repeated oscillation between the poles of emotion and reason, puerility and maturity, and the constant implementation of strategies of impression management. While *paideia* is held up as an ideal by Chariton in particular, the *pepaideumenos* suffers a conflict between that ideal and his own experiences: as we saw in the Introduction, the standards of hegemonic masculinity may in reality describe the lives of very few men, and attempts to meet those standards almost inevitably fall short.<sup>248</sup> In both Dionysius and Chaereas, Chariton demonstrates the limitations of *paideia* and the impossibility of maintaining a perfect performance of masculinity. He does not judge negatively his characters' failings as men, but neither does he question the ideals for which they strive. It is seemingly left to the subversive Achilles Tatius to challenge those impossible ideals, using Cleitophon to demonstrate the potential *paideia* holds to be misappropriated, manipulated, and misused, and thus exposing the flaws in that marker of elite masculinity.

---

<sup>247</sup> See Brown (1992), primarily on Libanius, and Whitmarsh (2001a).

<sup>248</sup> See above, p.10.

While Chariton may highlight the shortcomings of *paideia* and the difficulties of maintaining it, and while Achilles may contest its validity as an ideal to which elite men are expected to aspire, both writers reveal themselves to be *pepaideumenoι*: the emphasis they place on *paideia* marks their texts out as products of *paideia*. But it is not only this cultural artefact that concerns the novelists in their presentation of the performance of masculinity. In Chapter 2 we turn our attention to an aspect of masculinity that might, *prima facie*, be thought the polar opposite of culturally-produced, intellectual and moral *paideia*.



## Chapter 2: *Andreia*<sup>1</sup>

### *Introduction.*

Towards the end of their novels, both Chariton and Heliodorus engage their heroes in remarkable feats of bravery, Chaereas in a martial context, and Theagenes in an athletic one.<sup>2</sup> The ostensible purpose of these scenes would appear to be to create more rounded heroes at the culmination of the novels. There has been a tendency among modern scholars to regard the male protagonists of the genre as somewhat passive,<sup>3</sup> merely enduring the vicissitudes of separation from home and family, until they are finally restored to their rightful place in society, and reunited with the ones they love. The potentially negative value-judgement inherent in reading the ‘heroes’ as passive has since been renegotiated, and they have instead been read as a new heroic strain, whose heroism resides in that very endurance of circumstances ultimately beyond their control, and often divinely manufactured.<sup>4</sup> However, while such an assessment is undoubtedly valid, Chariton and Heliodorus, the authors of perhaps the earliest and the latest extant novels, seem almost to be responding to criticisms of passivity that might be levelled against their heroes. The feats of *andreia* accomplished by Chaereas and Theagenes overlay what might be thought a new formulation of the hero with a more traditional conception of what it meant to be a man.<sup>5</sup> Yet the ‘passivity’ of tears, self-pity, and introspection is not intended to be erased by last-minute ‘activity’, but provided with a counter-weight, or complement, in the creation of a rounded adult male. Furthermore, the identification of the enduring male as a new heroic strain deserves some qualification. The roots of this strain surely lie in Homeric epic, and particularly in the characterisation of Odysseus, frequently the bearer of the epithet πολύτλας/πολυτλήμων (‘much-enduring’).<sup>6</sup> Still more significant, perhaps, is Apollonius of Rhodes’ Jason,

<sup>1</sup> A more philosophically-angled version of this chapter can be found in Jones (Forthcoming, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Theagenes also demonstrates his athleticism in a foot race at the Pythian Games in Book 4, although the positioning of his bull- and giant-wrestling towards the climax of the work establishes these scenes as the most significant in terms of the construction of a ‘manly’ hero.

<sup>3</sup> The prime exponent of the view that the male protagonists are weakly and passive was Rohde (1914: 356).

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Konstan (1994b) and Haynes (2003).

<sup>5</sup> The *Ninus* and *Sesonchosis* fragments also seem to present a traditional military *andreia* as an indispensable element of masculinity.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Hom. *Il.* 8.97; *Od.* 18.319, amongst many others. On Odysseus as a model for the novels, see Lalanne (2006: 128).

described by Heiserman (1977: 13) as a ‘curiously unheroic ... morose [and] uncertain’ hero of an epic which might be thought the Hellenistic precursor of imperial novelistic sensibilities.<sup>7</sup>

In this chapter I shall explore, in wider literature and then in the Greek novels, the ways in which *andreia* is conceived as a gendered virtue, belonging primarily to men, and the extent to which it is portrayed as a product of nature or of culture, examining in this context its relation to *paideia*. It is necessary also to consider the uses of some semantic relations of *andreia*: *tolma*, for example, frequently carries the negative implication of recklessness or audacity – a sense of overstepping the boundaries of right behaviour – and yet sometimes denotes positive courage;<sup>8</sup> *aretē*, while carrying the general meaning ‘virtue’, had a near-synonymous relationship with *andreia*, and consequently this too will enter the discussion.<sup>9</sup> However, as Sluiter & Rosen (2003: 4) remark, and as we have noted in the Introduction,<sup>10</sup> it would be erroneous to focus solely on the actual attestations of the terms in question. While such an approach may yield valuable results, it is necessary to look at the wider picture. Hence, as well as identifying examples of *andreia* by the occurrence of the term or its cognates, I shall also examine those passages that appeal to notions of *andreia* by means of their content, rather than their vocabulary. Given that Chaereas and Theagenes are the only two heroes granted explicit feats of *andreia*, the focus will be on their exploits, although we shall also pay attention to Cleitophon’s conspicuous lack of *andreia*. Interestingly, Longus’ novel is the only one in which neither *andreia* nor any of its cognates is found. The idyllic pastoral setting of *Daphnis and Chloe* renders it an anomaly in the corpus, so perhaps it

<sup>7</sup> See also Lawall (1966), who regards Jason as undergoing a form of *paideia* through his experiences in the first two books, which enables him to become a more independent figure later on; we have noted Lalanne’s contention that the experiences of the heroes and heroines of the novels are a form of *paideia*.

<sup>8</sup> *LSJ s.v.* While ἀνδρεία may also imply a sense of unwarranted boldness, τόλμα seems to have been employed more often for this purpose; on the sometimes subtle differences between *andreia* and *tolma*, see Roisman (2005: 110-111, 190-192).

<sup>9</sup> See Hobbs (2000: 83). Dover (1974: 164) notes that ἀγαθός and ἀρετή often indicated the combination of bravery and skill exhibited by a fighter; see *LSJ s.v. ἀγαθός*, and the well-known exhortation ‘Be good men!’, which amounted to an admonition to fight bravely, e.g. Th. 5.9.9: καὶ αὐτός τε ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός γίγνου ...; see also Chariton 8.8.13, where the Syracusans acknowledge Polycharmus as an ἀγαθός ἀνὴρ. Cf. the frequency of the Iliadic phrase ἀνέρες ἔστε (‘Be men!’), used with reference to strength and fighting spirit: *Iliad* 5.529, 6.112, 8.174, 11.287, 15.487, 15.561, 15.661, 15.734, 16.270, 17.185; the Homeric ἀγαθός refers not to moral character, but to physical action (see Adkins 1960: 31-33).

<sup>10</sup> See above, p.7.

should come as no surprise that explicit references to *andreia* are lacking: warfare and athletics – which we shall see constitute the primary contexts of *andreia* – are urban concerns; consequently we shall consider Longus to a far lesser extent.<sup>11</sup>

### *Defining and contextualising andreia.*

Like παιδεία, ἀνδρεία does not lend itself to straightforward translation or definition (Hobbs 2000: 10ff.). Its etymological derivation from ἀνήρ links it tightly to masculinity, but its most common translation, ‘courage’, fails to convey this masculine sense. Other translations, such as ‘manliness’ and ‘manly spirit’,<sup>12</sup> while carrying the term’s gendered signification, raise the question of what exactly constitutes ‘manliness’ at any particular time. This is especially pertinent in the case of the novels, where, as readers, we are potentially dealing with three separate conceptions of *andreia*: our own understandings of ‘manliness’, the values of an author’s own period, and those of the era in which he sets his story. Grounding *andreia* is thus no easy task. ‘Courage’, the translation of ἀνδρεία that we meet most frequently, is a slippery concept, but, as Walton suggests, most of us would accept that it carries a sense of:

... keeping one’s head and doing a creditable job of deliberately acting sensibly and appropriately despite dangerous, painful, or very adverse circumstances (Walton 1986: 2).

He refers to the soldier fighting an enemy in a context of extreme danger as a common image of courage in the modern world (*ibid.* 32).<sup>13</sup> Such a conception was as prevalent in ancient sources as it is today, as we shall see. In their contextualisation of *andreia*, Sluiter & Rosen (2003: 6) employ the theory of the

<sup>11</sup> Longus’ novel is primarily one of sexual maturation; as a result, masculinity is important in a sexual context more than anywhere else. The expected generic *topos* of warfare is miniaturised (represented by the Methymnaeans’ brief incursion into the countryside), and courage tends to be transposed from military to erotic contexts; indeed, Daphnis is conspicuously fearful in other situations (*e.g.* at 2.20 he hides in a tree trunk as Chloe is kidnapped). Longus uses terms such as *tolma* and *thrasos* instead of *andreia* to describe Daphnis’ erotic boldness: he exhibits *tolma* by daring to pick the highest apple for Chloe (3.34.3); and he shows *thrasos* in his petting when reunited with Chloe after the winter (3.13.4). However, his erotic courage – like his courage in other circumstances – often fails him (*e.g.* 2.9.1, 2.10.3). Chapter 3 addresses issues of erotic masculinity in *Daphnis and Chloe* in more detail.

<sup>12</sup> *LSJ s.v.*

<sup>13</sup> See also Morgan (1994).

‘prototype’ from cognitive psychology: while, for instance, an apple may be no better an example of a fruit than a plum, the majority of westerners consider it so; the apple is therefore the prototypical example of a fruit. Similarly, ancient sources suggest that warfare was the prototypical arena in which *andreia* might be exhibited: *andreia* prototypically required an agonistic context (*ibid.* 8). I argue here that the classical interpretation of *andreia* as bravery or courage in combat is much in evidence in the Greek novels; however, Stoic endurance of personal suffering is also an implicit element of *andreia* for the novelists, and we shall even see that suicide may constitute an act of *andreia*.

### ***i. Andreia and warfare.***

Plato’s *Laches* provides us with a starting point for a consideration of the context of *andreia* in antiquity, and in particular its construction as a masculine discourse. This will have a bearing on our discussion of *andreia* in the novels. Just as we today might find it impossible to simplify and reify the concept of courage or manliness, so too it was no easy task for Laches and Nicias in Plato’s dialogue. The dialogue begins with the intention of deciding the best means of instilling virtue in the young, but it is soon agreed that for this purpose the interlocutors must first define virtue. With the aim of simplifying the issue, they decide to reduce virtue to one of its constituent parts, *andreia*.<sup>14</sup> Laches’ initial optimism at the prospect of defining *andreia* is soon shown to be misplaced, as what he thought would prove an easily definable term refuses to fit his suggestions.<sup>15</sup> In Platonic dialogues, Socrates’ *elenchos* encourages his interlocutors to look beyond the superficial to establish more profound definitions of common concepts, for the benefit of their souls; however, the immediate and superficial responses of his fellow speakers still hold value, for they expose the ways in which the majority interpret those common concepts. The conservative *stratēgos* Laches’ first definition of *andreia* is valuable for precisely this reason, since it betrays the normative cultural assumption that *andreia* is primarily and fundamentally concerned with military duty: according to Laches, a man is *andreios* if he is willing to stand his ground in battle.<sup>16</sup> The assumption of an inextricable link between *andreia* and warfare appears common in

---

<sup>14</sup> Pl. *La.* 190e.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* 194b.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* 190e.

Greek ethical discourse: for Aristotle too, the truly *andreios* man is one who confronts a noble death (καλὸς θάνατος), while the best circumstances for such a glorious end are offered by warfare.<sup>17</sup>

The warfare-dominated Homeric world might therefore seem to be the perfect *milieu* for the exhibition of manly courage, the quest for *aretē* and *kleos* lending itself to feats of *andreia*. While such feats are doubtless much in evidence, Smoes (1995: 33) notes that *andreia* is in fact a post-Homeric word, appearing in Herodotus.<sup>18</sup> Bassi (2003: 33) observes another early instance of the word, in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*,<sup>19</sup> where warfare is explicitly drawn as the archetypal home of *andreia*; indeed, Bassi (*ibid.* 38) notes that the language surrounding the use of ἀνδρεία here is pointedly Homeric, suggesting that the Homeric world, with its perpetual *agōnes*, was conceived as a prototypical *locus* for the display of *andreia*, even though Homer himself may not have employed such language; *andreia* is thus the implicit quality that pervades the conflicts of that legendary time. By the classical period the Homeric ἀρετή had perhaps shifted in signification, taking on the more general sense of 'virtue', and leaving a semantic gap which ἀνδρεία was coined to fill. Of all the extant novels, Chariton's appeals most overtly to a traditional military *andreia*,<sup>20</sup> for Chaereas is granted a fantastic *aristeia* in the latter stages of the work, establishing him as a hero capable of excelling on the battlefield. Haynes (2003: 85) suggests that Chariton's likely position as the author of the earliest extant novel may have made him more disposed to draw on historiographical works such as Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, and consequently more inclined 'to give his hero military experience at the expense of consistent characterisation'. While Chaereas' characterisation may appear inconsistent by modern standards,<sup>21</sup> I will suggest that Chariton's primary readership may not have considered it so.

---

<sup>17</sup> Arist. *EN* 1115a30ff.

<sup>18</sup> Hdt. 7.99.

<sup>19</sup> A. *Th.* 52-53. As Bassi (2003: 33) notes, the uncertainty of Herodotus' dates means that the earliest extant reference to *andreia* may be that in Aeschylus.

<sup>20</sup> We shall observe later the ways in which Chariton uses Homeric allusion and intertextuality in order to characterise Chaereas in particular.

<sup>21</sup> See Helms (1966).

## ii. *Andreia and athletics.*

It is not only warfare that allows a man to demonstrate his *andreia*, in the novels or in other literature. While classical figures like Laches and Aristotle might have located *andreia* on the battlefield, there is some evidence to suggest that in protracted periods of peace, athletics might serve as a simulation of warfare, providing a substitute *locus* for the display of *andreia*. *Andreia*'s early connection with the battlefield seems to have endowed it with connotations of physical courage and strength, facilitating its transference to athletics. So, we find imperial texts citing a man's involvement in sport as proof of his possession of *andreia*.<sup>22</sup> Dio Chrysostom eulogises a recently deceased boxer as follows:

Μάλιστα δ' ἂν τις θαυμάσειε Μελαγκόμαν, ὅτι μορφῇ τοιοῦτος ὢν τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ διήνεγκεν. δοκεῖ γὰρ ἔμοιγε τῇ ψυχῇ φιλονικῆσαι πρὸς τὸ σῶμα καὶ σπουδάσαι ὅπως ἂν διὰ ταύτην ἐνδοξότερος γένηται. γνοῦς οὖν τῶν πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἔργων κάλλιστον ἅμα καὶ ἐπιπονώτατον τὴν ἀθλησιν, ἐπὶ ταύτην ἦλθεν. τῶν μὲν γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὃ τε καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν ἢ τε ἄσκησις ἐλαφροτέρα. φαίην δ' ἂν ἔγωγε καὶ ταύτη ἥττονα εἶναι, μόνης γὰρ εὐψυχίας ἐπίδειξις ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς, ἢ δὲ ἀθλησις ἅμα μὲν ἀνδρείαν, ἅμα δὲ ἰσχύον, ἅμα δὲ σωφροσύνην ἐμποιεῖ.

One would admire Melancomas especially because, as well as being of such a kind [*sc.* beautiful] in outward form, he excelled in *andreia*. For it seems to me that his soul competed with his body and endeavoured that, thanks to it, he should become still more esteemed. And so, understanding that, of the actions leading to *andreia*, the finest and also the most arduous is athletics, he made that his goal. For there was no opportunity for military activity, and moreover the training [for war] is easier. I would say that it is inferior in this respect also, that in military matters there is a display of courage alone, while athletics simultaneously instils *andreia* and strength and *sōphrosynē* (D. Chr. *Or.* 29.8ff.).<sup>23</sup>

Dio's praise of athletics as an arena for *andreia* is of course motivated by his duty as eulogist in this oration, but it is nonetheless revealing for the assumption it makes that its audience will understand a connection between warfare and athletics as the primary *loci* for *andreia*. It is interesting to note here that *andreia* is something that

<sup>22</sup> See Connolly (2003: 312) on the imperial period as one which offered an elite male relatively few opportunities to be *andreios* in battle, and which consequently saw a migration of *andreia* from the battlefield to the stadium.

<sup>23</sup> See König (2005: 146-157) on Dio's Melancomas orations.

involves competition, and something by which a man may distinguish himself from others (διήνεγκεν), just as we saw in the case of *paideia*. Dio makes a distinction between outward form and inner qualities, of which *andreia* is one. Like *paideia*, *andreia* is goal to be striven for, a performative quality that one reveals through certain actions, and through inner struggle. Through athletics, one may develop and display a wider range of virtues than through warfare, for sport generates both *andreia* and *sōphrosynē*,<sup>24</sup> while warfare allows for the display of *eupsychia* alone (note the vocabulary of performance again). Furthermore, a little later in the oration, Dio explicitly states that athletics ranks higher than warfare in its capacity to stimulate *andreia*.<sup>25</sup> Dio's elevation of athletics might give us a means of interpreting Heliodorus' endowment of Theagenes with incredible athletic success, first at the Pythian Games, then later in his bull-wrestling and his victory over the Ethiopian giant. While open battle may be rare in the novels, and the chances to display Homeric-style military *aretē* concomitantly scarce, athletics can be understood as a substitute arena in which a hero is able to show himself a man. However, Dio's apparent belief that warfare does not offer scope for other virtues seems to place him in the minority: as we shall observe, it is through warfare that Chaereas shows his virtuous character.

Lucian's *Anacharsis* is also useful here. It takes the form of a dialogue between the sixth-century Athenian lawgiver, Solon, and the Scythian from whom the piece takes its name. The subject is the merit of athletics in the formation of good men, a merit Anacharsis does not recognise, but which Solon is keen to defend. According to him, athletes are ἀρρενωποί ('manly looking') and they display (ἐπιφάινοντες) τὸ ἀνδρωῶδες ('manliness'),<sup>26</sup> suggesting that manliness is a quality to be demonstrated before others. As we noted in the last chapter,<sup>27</sup> gymnastic training regularly accompanied the rhetorical and literary *paideia* that was a central component of elite identity from the classical period on. It was also frequently

<sup>24</sup> An imperial Greek inscription from Smyrna honours a pancratiast for his ἀνδρεία τε καὶ σωφροσύνη (see van Nijf 2003: 263ff.). See Scanlon (2002: 14) on the opportunity athletics afforded competitors to display their *aretē*, including their *andreia*, *ponos*, and *karteria*. I shall return shortly to the connection between *andreia* and other virtues.

<sup>25</sup> D. Chr. Or. 29.15ff.

<sup>26</sup> Lucian *Anach.* 25.

<sup>27</sup> See above, p.29.

presented positively as having military value (König 2005: 45ff.). Indeed, Solon explains the relation of athletics to warfare, stressing that the primary advantage of athletic training lies its nature as a ‘transferable skill’: athletics prepares young men for warfare, and allows them to outstrip their enemies in military ability:

νῦν δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων εἰκάζειν παρέχοιεν ἄν σοι, ὅποιοι ἐν πολέμοις ὑπὲρ πατρίδος καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ἱερῶν γένοιεντ’ ἄν ὄπλα ἔχοντες ...

... even from these contests they give you an opportunity to infer what they would be in war, defending country, children, wives, and fanes with weapons and armour ... (Lucian *Anach.* 36; Loeb trans.).

The *andreia* inherent in athletic training serves as a preparation for men to assume roles as citizens, fulfilling their political and military potential; *andreia* is therefore tied firmly to public functions.<sup>28</sup> At the end of the dialogue Solon asks Anacharsis to tell him in return how the Scythians’ young men ‘become good’.<sup>29</sup> Demonstrating the classic opposition between *andreia* and *deilia* (‘cowardice’), Anacharsis proudly announces, ‘We are cowards!’<sup>30</sup> König (2005: 51) remarks that although positive attitudes towards the value of athletics are common, the scepticism with which Anacharsis regards it is paralleled in other texts, both imperial and earlier. As König (*ibid.* 93) notes, ‘[i]t is hard for us to know how exactly each of these two men [*sc.* Solon and Anacharsis] relates to contemporary cultural categories and how their visions and valuations of athletic activity relate to contemporary ‘reality’’. It seems impossible to attribute either stance of the dialogue unequivocally to Lucian himself; the author does, however, appear to be joining a widespread imperial debate on the value of athletics: the number of inscriptions commemorating athletic victors, together with treatises and other texts on athletics,<sup>31</sup> suggest a contemporary concern with the display of masculinity through physical endeavour in the gymnasium; this is a concern that is still relevant for Heliodorus in the third or fourth century, as we shall see. The widely held ideal of the *andreios* warrior was a role which legitimated

<sup>28</sup> See also *Anach.* 24 and 30.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* 40: ... ὅπως ὑμῖν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γίγνονται.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*: δειλοὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν.

<sup>31</sup> Of which Dio’s Melancomas orations are just two; see also Philostratus’ *Gymnasticus*. König (2005) is the most important recent treatment of the phenomenon, but see also van Nijf (2003 and 2004).



controlled violence;<sup>32</sup> in peacetime athletics offered an outlet for such violence, requiring, as did battle (notwithstanding Dio's opinion), the exercise of additional virtues such as *sōphrosynē* and *karteria*.

### iii. *Andreia* and other virtues.

The particular connection of *andreia* to battle and athletics characterises it as a very public, performative quality. Yet, as in the case of *paideia*, that does not preclude it from having other dimensions. Returning to the *Laches*, we find an illustration of the slipperiness of the concept of *andreia* and its inseparability from and near-synonymity with other virtues. According to the *Laches*, while *andreia* may be exhibited in war by combating pain and fear, it may also manifest itself in the metaphorical battle to overcome desires and pleasures.<sup>33</sup> In both of these cases *karteria* is vital. Laches is prompted to declare that *andreia* is 'a kind of perseverance of soul',<sup>34</sup> to which Socrates responds that it is indeed possible that *karterēsis* is *andreia*.<sup>35</sup> We find something similar in the *Symposium*, where Alcibiades refers to Socrates' resistance to his seduction efforts as an example of *sōphrosynē* and *andreia*, *phronēsis* and *karteria*.<sup>36</sup> He goes on to cite Socrates' endurance at Potidaea, which far surpassed that of his comrades, as proof of how futile it is to attempt to get the better of him.<sup>37</sup> Here, behaviour in battle is taken as indicative of a man's moral quality in other spheres of action, and in both of these Platonic texts the virtues required on the battlefield are equally relevant to struggles of a more personal and emotional kind. This will be especially pertinent when we examine Theagenes' exercise of *andreia* later. A certain blurring of boundaries is also evident in Aristotle, who includes *karteria* amongst *andreia*'s elements, albeit seemingly grounded in a military context:

Ἄνδρείας δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ δυσέκπληκτον εἶναι ὑπὸ φόβων τῶν περὶ θάνατον καὶ εὐθαρσῆ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς καὶ εὐτολμον πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους, καὶ τὸ μᾶλλον αἰρεῖσθαι τεθνάναι καλῶς ἢ αἰσχρῶς σωθῆναι, καὶ τὸ νίκης αἴτιον εἶναι. ἔτι δὲ ἀνδρείας ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ πονεῖν καὶ καρτερεῖν καὶ

<sup>32</sup> See Alston (1998) on the status of the Roman *vir* as a wielder of legitimate power through military service.

<sup>33</sup> Pl. *La.* 191d-e.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 192b: ... καρτερία τις ... τῆς ψυχῆς.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 194a.

<sup>36</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 219d.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* 219e5ff.

ἀνδραγαθίζεσθαι. παρέπεται δὲ τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ ἢ τε εὐτολμία καὶ ἢ εὐψυχία καὶ τὸ θάρσος, ἔτι δὲ ἢ τε φιλοπονία καὶ ἢ καρτερία.

To courage it belongs to be undismayed by fears of death and confident in alarms and brave in face of dangers, and to prefer a fine death to base security, and to be a cause of victory. It also belongs to courage to labour and endure and play a manly part. Courage is accompanied by confidence and bravery and daring, and also by perseverance and endurance (Arist. *VV* 1250b4ff.; Loeb trans.).

The sources do not make it clear whether *andreia* is distinct from *karteria*, whether they are one and the same, or whether *karteria* is a form of *andreia* with slightly different connotations. The *aporia* with which Plato's *Laches* concludes is indicative of the extent of the confusion: no definition of *andreia* is achieved which will satisfy all parties, and *andreia* is never convincingly detached from its fellow virtues.

Yet philosophical and ethical treatises do appear to agree that *paideia* plays a vital role in the acquisition or development of *andreia*. Cebes, the pupil of Socrates and alleged author of the *Tabula*, lists *andreia* (and *karteria*) amongst the many virtues to which true *paideia* admits a man.<sup>38</sup> On this point we might cite Xenophon's reference to Socrates' belief in *andreia* as a meld of nature and culture; some men naturally possess more *andreia* than others, although training can increase a man's share:

Πάλιν δὲ ἐρωτώμενος, ἢ ἀνδρεία πότερον εἶη διδακτὸν ἢ φυσικόν, Οἶμαι μὲν, ἔφη, ὥσπερ σῶμα σώματος ἰσχυρότερον πρὸς τοὺς πόνους φύεται, οὕτω καὶ ψυχὴν ψυχῆς ἐρρωμενεστέραν πρὸς τὰ δεινὰ φύσει γίγνεσθαι. ὁρῶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς νόμοις τε καὶ ἔθεσι τρεφομένους πολὺ διαφέροντας ἀλλήλων τόλμη. νομίζω μέντοι πᾶσαν φύσιν μαθήσει καὶ μελέτη πρὸς ἀνδρείαν αὐξέσθαι.

When asked again whether Courage could be taught or came by nature, he [*sc.* Socrates] replied: "I think that just as one man's body is naturally stronger than another's for labour, so one man's soul is naturally braver than another's in danger. For I notice that men brought up under the same laws and customs differ widely in daring. Nevertheless, I think that every man's

<sup>38</sup> See above, p.32. See also Plutarch's assertion that philosophy (undoubtedly an element of *paideia*) 'alone can array young men in the manly [ἀνδρείος] and truly perfect adornment that comes from reason' (*On Listening to Lectures* 37f; Loeb trans.); cf. D. Chr. *Or.* 1.4: Dio hopes that his words will inspire *andreia* in their hearers.

nature acquires more courage by learning and practice” (X. *Mem.* 3.9.1; Loeb trans.).

The notion that training can make a man more *andreios* is implicit in Plato’s *Laches* too, which functions on the premise that *andreia* may be taught. On the subject of the naturalness of *andreia*, we might refer to Aristotle’s opinion that virtue is a natural part of all human beings:

πάσι γὰρ δοκεῖ ἕκαστα τῶν ἠθῶν ὑπάρχειν φύσει πῶς· καὶ γὰρ δίκαιοι καὶ σωφρονικοὶ καὶ ἀνδρείοι καὶ τᾶλλα ἔχομεν εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς ...

All are agreed that the various moral qualities are in a sense bestowed by nature: we are just and capable of temperance, and brave, and possessed of the other virtues from the moment of our birth (Arist. *EN* 1144b1ff.; Loeb trans.).

However, he goes on to state that any of these virtues may in fact be harmful without the application of *phronēsis*. For Aristotle, courage is a mean between cowardice and overboldness,<sup>39</sup> governed and maintained by *phronēsis*,<sup>40</sup> that capacity of mind that we observed to be a counterpart to, or element of, *paideia*. So, while *andreia* is conceived as natural to mankind, as an essential quality of the human species, it is also envisaged as responsive to *paideia*, and as entailing an internal dialogue between instinct and intellect, or heart and head – just such a dialogue as we have seen to operate under the auspices of *paideia*. Schmid (1992: 108) notes that Socrates’ relation of courage to the workings of the soul in the *Laches* is nothing new, and that ‘the model of courage as involving a struggle and dialogue between soul or mind and heart already had its classic expression in Homer’. Both he and Smoes consider Odysseus to be the archetypal purveyor of this ‘thinking man’s *andreia*’. In him we find a courage which replaces the unmeasured violence of Achilles:

Un autre modèle exemplaire de courage se met en place; il s’agit désormais d’un courage intérieur, d’un courage “moral”, différent du courage

<sup>39</sup> Arist. *EN* 1107b1ff.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* 1144b; see Smoes (1995: 256ff.).

“physique” et militaire, et qui consiste à résister à un “ennemi” interne: passions, souffrances, malchance (Smoes 1995: 65).

It should be noted that we cannot be sure that a Greek of any period would actually have referred to Odysseus’ actions as ἀνδρεία, though we have observed that classical Greeks seem to have viewed the male behaviour of the Homeric world as belonging to the semantic system of *andreia*.<sup>41</sup> In Odysseus, then, implicit *andreia* becomes the ability to negotiate and endure one’s situation intellectually, morally, and with oneself alone.<sup>42</sup> Of course, this does not abrogate *andreia*’s position as a virtue equated with battle and athletics; rather it bestows upon it an additional moral and internal dimension, and fuses it still further with other virtues, and especially with *paideia*. The close relationship between *andreia* and *paideia* is illustrated by Dio’s mock dialogue between Alexander and the Cynic Diogenes, in which the latter speaks of a divine variety of *paideia*, sometimes called *andreia*; those who had received this form were considered ‘manly of soul’, for they had been educated like Heracles, a hero commonly perceived as the embodiment of *andreia*.<sup>43</sup>

#### iv. *Andreia as metaphor.*

We have seen that *andreia* was believed to belong predominantly to combative contexts such as warfare and athletics. Such contexts were not always literal, however, as both Greek and Latin authors used language drawn from the battleground and stadium to articulate love affairs.<sup>44</sup> Given the emphasis on the gymnasium as a hub of elite relations in Greek life, it is perhaps unsurprising that Greek literature shows a predilection for the use of wrestling and sporting imagery for such purposes,<sup>45</sup> although in earlier Greek texts we do find the representation of Eros as an invincible warrior, against whom it is futile to fight.<sup>46</sup> It is of course the

<sup>41</sup> See above, p.91.

<sup>42</sup> For examples of Odysseus’ thoughtful *andreia*, see *Il.* 11.404ff. and *Od.* 20.9ff.

<sup>43</sup> D. Chr. *Or.* 4.29ff.; see also Chapter 1, p.33-34. See below, p.107, n.73, for an alternative view of Heracles.

<sup>44</sup> Sappho 1.28 offers the first such example, overturning gender stereotypes by calling upon Aphrodite to be her ally (σύμμαχος).

<sup>45</sup> This predilection is noted by Preston (1916: 51), Henderson (1975: 169), Lyne (1980: 295 n.13), and Barsby (1999: 10), amongst others. For examples, see A. A. 1206, S. Tr. 441, and Ar. *Pax* 894ff. with García Romero (1995: 67ff.) and Olson (1998: 241-242).

<sup>46</sup> E.g. S. *Ant.* 781 (cf. Calasiris’ words to Charicleia on the power of Eros at *Hld.* 4.10.5); E. *Hipp.* 525ff. For reference to the agonistic nature of love, see S. *Ant.* 799-800. In Hellenistic epic, Eros is powerful and destructive: A.R. 3.297 and 3.1078.

Roman elegists who most develop the love-as-warfare motif, casting themselves as soldiers in a particular form of self-fashioning that consciously flouts their society's expectations of the elite male. The elegists establish love as their *raison d'être*, abandoning the military and political roles expected of them,<sup>47</sup> and presenting love as an alternative to the battlefield, a substitute for the usual *locus* of the testing of *andreia* or *virtus*. In such representations Cupid may be depicted as victorious over the lover, and success in love as a spoil of war or a triumph, for which the lover must work as hard as any real soldier.<sup>48</sup> Elegy's focalisation through the poet gives the reader access to his feelings alone, and through the medium of the military metaphor he presents a particular understanding of the male role in an erotic relationship: whether or not the poet emerges triumphant, he inscribes himself as a combatant in a relationship that appears strikingly unequal because of its expression in terms of victory and defeat (Cahoon 1988: 303). We shall see at the end of this chapter that both the *militia amoris* figure and the image of the lover as an athlete are found in abundance in the Greek novels, and that focalisation is also important there. Roman elegy will provide a suitable comparandum because it shares with the novels a conventionalised erotic system that is ironic in its exploitation of war as a metaphor. Although the novels do not reject traditional masculine roles in quite the manner of elegy, they do employ military and athletic metaphor in a way which conveys their male characters' understandings of their own erotic roles, and perhaps their authors' world-views.

### *The gendering of andreia.*

The classical construction of warfare and athletics as the prototypical arenas for the exhibition of *andreia* serves to identify *andreia* as a male virtue, since involvement in these pursuits was a male preserve.<sup>49</sup> Not only do *andreia*'s associations with warfare and athletics brand it as masculine, but so too does its etymology, as we have noted.<sup>50</sup> Hobbs rightly observes a problem that arises when the association between manliness and courage becomes a part of the language: when an act of

<sup>47</sup> See, e.g., Baker (1968: 325) and Alston (1998: 213ff.).

<sup>48</sup> E.g. Prop. 1.1; Ov. *Am.* 1.2, 1.9, 2.12.

<sup>49</sup> Excepting, of course, the athletics system at Sparta, which in any case trained young women in the same way as young men predominantly to improve them as potential mothers; while superficially Spartan women's involvement in athletics might appear unusual, its ultimate goal was highly conventional (Scanlon 2002: 121ff.).

<sup>50</sup> This gendering is also inherent in the Latin *virtus*, derived from *vir*.

*andreia* is undertaken, it is difficult to determine how far the subject's maleness is an issue; as she stresses:

... in the vast majority of cases it is ... ambiguous whether the author is consciously appealing to notions of maleness, or whether they are thinking primarily of the virtue of courage – or even just effectiveness in action – and simply taking the masculine connotations of the word for granted (Hobbs 2000: 70).

While in Latin texts *virtus* expands to mean 'virtue' more generally, thus becoming less bound to maleness, ἀνδρεία undergoes only the semantic broadening that we have noted above, and retains its gendered quality (Ferguson 1958: 41).<sup>51</sup> However, masculine connotations do not exclude women from the exhibition of *andreia* altogether, although it appears that a woman's *andreia*, like her *paideia*, was generally conceived as fundamentally different from that displayed by a man.

#### ***Female andreia.***

Looking to the ethical writings of Aristotle and to Platonic dialectic, we find a strong assumption of inherent difference between male and female *andreia*. Aristotle understands all male and female virtues in terms of dominance and submissiveness respectively:

... καὶ οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ σωφροσύνη γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς οὐδ' ἀνδρεία καὶ δικαιοσύνη, ... ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ἀρχικὴ ἀνδρεία, ἡ δ' ὑπηρετικὴ, ὁμοίως δ' ἔχει καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας.

... the temperance of a woman and that of a man are not the same, nor their courage and justice, ... but the one is the courage of command, and the other that of subordination, and the case is similar with the other virtues (Arist. *Pol.* 1260a21ff.; Loeb trans.).

Similarly, Plato's Meno identifies a man's *aretē* as judicious management of the city's affairs,<sup>52</sup> while he believes a woman's consists in running the household and showing obedience to her husband. While, according to Aristotle, Socrates believed

<sup>51</sup> After the expansion of *virtus*' meaning, *fortitudo* took its place. Cicero discusses the relation of *fortitudo* to *virtus* in the construction of masculinity (*Tusc.* 2.18.43).

<sup>52</sup> Pl. *Meno*. 71c.

that a man's and a woman's virtue were identical,<sup>53</sup> Meno is more likely to be representative of the popular view. For Aristotle, male and female *andreia* differ not only qualitatively, but also quantitatively:

... ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἕτερα σωφροσύνη καὶ ἀνδρεία (δόξαι γὰρ ἄν εἶναι δειλὸς ἀνὴρ εἰ οὕτως ἀνδρείος εἶη ὥσπερ γυνὴ ἀνδρεία ...).

... temperance and courage are different in a man and in a woman (for a man would be thought a coward if he were only as brave as a brave woman ...) (Arist. *Pol.* 1277b20ff.; Loeb trans.).

Furthermore, in his discussion of the qualities of character admissible in drama, Aristotle states that 'there is courage of character, but it is inappropriate for a woman to be courageous or clever in this way'.<sup>54</sup>

Aristotle's view may be extreme, and yet Hobbs (2000: 71) notes that even when an author expresses approval of female *andreia*, he nonetheless casts it as unusual. Here she cites Thucydides' account of the involvement of the Corcyraean women in their civil war:

αἱ τε γυναῖκες αὐτοῖς τολμηρῶς ξυνεπελάβοντο βάλλουσαι ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκιῶν τῶν κεράμω καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ὑπομένουσαι τον θόρυβον.

The women also joined in the fighting with great daring, hurling down tiles from the roof-tops and standing up to the din of battle in a manner beyond their sex (Th. 3.74; trans. Warner, modified).

Although Thucydides does not use the word ἀνδρεία itself, the women's involvement in the exclusively male sphere of war suggests that they are partaking to some extent in *andreia*. Hobbs reads the passage as an endorsement of the women's efforts, while acknowledging the qualification implicit in *para physin* that

<sup>53</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1260a22-23; see also Socrates' response to Meno at *Meno* 72e ff.; cf., however, the ambiguity of Socrates' words at X. *Smp.* 2.12, when he sees a female acrobat jumping among swords: 'Witnesses of this feat, surely, will never again deny, I feel sure, that courage, like other things, admits of being taught, when this girl, even though she is a woman, leaps so boldly in among the swords!'; Loeb trans., modified: this seems to suggest that because of her sex the girl does not have innate *andreia*, but has learned it.

<sup>54</sup> Arist. *Po.* 1454a21ff.; Loeb trans.: ... ἔστιν γὰρ ἀνδρείον μὲν τὸ ἦθος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀρμόττον γυναικὶ οὕτως ἀνδρείαν ἢ δεινήν εἶναι.



their actions are strange.<sup>55</sup> However, in addition to the notion that the women are acting in a manner beyond their nature, I would suggest that there are two further elements in the passage that detract from a positive reading. First, Thucydides describes their actions in terms of *tolma*: as we have noted, the concept of *tolma* is often favoured over *andreia* when a writer wishes to convey a sense of crossing boundaries;<sup>56</sup> such a reading would accord with the sense of *para physin*, for while it might be helpful to their men, the women are acting in a manner that is overbold, and *beyond* what is proper for their sex. Second, while the women's endurance of the noise of battle is *beyond* their nature, the specific act of throwing improvised missiles at the enemy from a distance might be construed as *typical* of their nature: whereas men can engage in true warfare, women can only throw roof tiles; this detail seems to imply a value-judgement on the different abilities of men and women in time of war.<sup>57</sup>

Heliodorus has a remarkably similar scene, this time using *andreia*, rather than *tolma*. The Delphians believe Charicleia to have been kidnapped by the Thessalians, and they agree on an expedition to recover her, with even the women becoming involved. We are told that:

Πολλὰ δὲ γυναῖκες ἀνδρειότερον τῆς φύσεως ἐφρόνησαν καὶ τὸ προστυχὸν εἰς ὄπλον ἀρπασάμεναι μετέθεον ἀνήνυτα καὶ τὸ θῆλυ καὶ οἰκτεῖον ἀσθενὲς ὑστερίζουσαι τῶν ἔργων ἐγνώριζον ...

Many women too thought in a way more manly than their nature; they seized whatever came to hand as a weapon and ran after the men, but to no avail, for they could not keep up and had to admit the inherent weakness of the female sex (Hld. 4.21.3; trans. Morgan, modified).

<sup>55</sup> See also Harvey (1985: 83): Thucydides' use of *παρὰ φύσιν* implies 'guarded admiration'; the women endure the battle 'surprisingly well for people who, by definition, could not be *ἀνδρεῖοι*'. For a slightly more nuanced reading of the Thucydidean scene, see Wiedemann (1983).

<sup>56</sup> This appears to be the sense in which *τόλμα* is most often employed in the novels; the noun and its cognates are often used to indicate criminal behaviour, or behaviour which exceeds the acceptable: e.g. Ach. Tat. 8.8.1, 8.15.1, 8.19.1; Chariton 3.3.11, 4.2.8, 4.2.9; X. Eph. 2.5.7, 2.6.1, 4.2.1; Longus 2.27.1, 3.2.3.

<sup>57</sup> See also Th. 2.4, where the Plataean women and slaves throw stones and tiles from the roofs at the invading Thebans; on the military value of tile-throwing women, see Schaps (1982). Cf. Ach. Tat. 3.13.2ff., where Egyptian bandits hurl lumps of earth at the attacking soldiers: it is women, slaves, and barbarians who fight in this improvised manner.



It is therefore possible for women to display a certain amount of *andreia*, but, as we have seen from Aristotle, it will never equal that possessed by men. Like that of the Corcyraean women, the behaviour of the Delphian women is praiseworthy but anomalous: they are attempting to engage in warfare, a traditionally male sphere of activity, and are thus laying claim to an *andreia* that is out of keeping with female *physis*; small wonder, then, that the masculinity they have appropriated is temporary and cannot be maintained. Moreover, while the Corcyraeans get within roof tile distance of the enemy, the Delphians give up before they have a chance to employ their makeshift weapons.<sup>58</sup>

As we might expect, Plutarch has something to say on the subject of female daring. His *Γυναικῶν Ἀρεταί* presents a series of vignettes intended to demonstrate the potential of women for exhibiting a variety of virtues, including *andreia*, *phronēsis*, and *dikaioynē*. McInerney's (2003) assessment of this text is astute. He notes that Plutarch rarely explains which virtue is being illustrated by any one story, and that '[w]hen no specific virtue is ever identified the women's actions are simply, self-evidently, and generically virtuous' (*ibid.* 322). Lutz (1947: 44) notes that in this tract, Plutarch 'consistently avoids using the word [ἀνδρεία], and is obliged to use the general word for virtue (ἀρετή)'; his avoidance of the term, except for its use in the introduction, suggests that he felt a difficulty in discussing female *andreia*, perhaps because of its inherently masculine nature. McInerney (2003: 334) remarks that Plutarch also uses *τόλμα* rather than *ἀνδρεία* in relation to women, on occasion even qualified as *ἀλογίστος*; he does refer to *τὸ ἀνδρεῖον* in the case of women at *Amatorius* 769b-c but, as Goldhill (1995: 157-158) states, his words ultimately serve to reinforce traditional gender roles.<sup>59</sup> Plutarch's examples of female virtue present women as more likely to spur men into action than to act in their own right, and the virtues themselves are inextricably bound up with notions of shame (McInerney 2003: 337). McInerney observes that the stories are often characterised by

<sup>58</sup> The anomaly of women in warfare is raised by Chaereas when he arrives at the king's palace and finds Callirhoe missing: 'Where is Callirhoe? What has become of her? Surely she, too, has not taken the field? [οὐ δῆπου γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ στρατεύεται]' (7.1.2; trans. Goold). The thought is so preposterous that it cannot possibly be true. However, *cf.* the *Calligone* fragment, which features the apparent heroine wearing a sword in what seems to be a military context, and likening herself to an Amazon (Stephens & Winkler 1995: 267-276).

<sup>59</sup> *Cf.* X. *Oec.* 10.1: Ischomachus has demonstrated his wife's 'manly' attitude by showing the manner in which she maintains her husband's household.

‘[s]ecrecy, trickery, lies, abuse, concealment and the occasional burst of impulsive action: these are the spheres in which female virtue operates’ (*ibid.* 333). Even though *andreia* may be praiseworthy in a woman, her specific actions serve to ‘qualify the reader’s response to female bravery in a way that distinguishes it from the open *andreia* of men’ (*ibid.* 335).<sup>60</sup> A woman’s *aretē* is therefore cast in a rather traditional mould.<sup>61</sup>

In Stobaeus’ record of the work of the first-century Stoic philosopher, Musonius Rufus, we find that educated women are expected to possess more *andreia* than the uneducated, and particularly so those women who have studied philosophy.<sup>62</sup> So *paideia* is believed to instil *andreia* even in women. Whitmarsh (2001a: 112ff.) notes, however, that while Musonius takes very seriously the existence of female virtue, he also expresses the normative view that men and women have ‘naturally’ different goals to which their virtue should be directed. Musonius clearly appreciates the gender-bias implicit in the concept of *andreia*, for he says, ‘Perhaps someone may say that courage is a virtue appropriate to men only’.<sup>63</sup> He goes on to urge women ἀνδρίζεσθαι, which has been deemed a radical recommendation, given the

<sup>60</sup> Cf. S. Tr. 1062: Heracles, suffering from the wounds (unintentionally) caused by Deianeira’s gift to him, says ‘But a woman, a female and unmanly in her nature [θῆλυς οὔσα κἄνανδρος φύσιν], alone has brought me down, without a sword’. In Heracles’ perception, Deianeira has acted in an *anandros* fashion: she has not attacked him in the way a man would, with arms, but has behaved in an underhand manner; while this is presented as typical of a woman by the emphasis on Deianeira’s sex, it is also subject to an implicit negative value-judgement in the use of ἀνανδρος: she is unmanly in her nature, and this has led her to use unmanly tactics against him. It seems especially fitting that Heracles, the embodiment of physical manliness, should brand his wife *anandros*: she is his polar opposite; yet see below, p.107, n.73, for the potential ambiguity in Heracles’ *andreia*.

<sup>61</sup> In his introduction, Plutarch refers to a conversation he had had with his addressee, Clea. He purports now to write down for her τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν λεγομένων εἰς τὸ μίαν εἶναι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἀρετὴν (242f-243a). The clause is generally taken to indicate that Plutarch conceived of male and female virtue as identical: the Loeb translates it as ‘the remainder of what I would have said on the topic that man’s virtues and woman’s virtues are one and the same’. McInerney (2003) observes that Plutarch never demonstrates this equivalence. I suggest, however, that a possible initial misunderstanding of τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν λεγομένων has culminated in a misunderstanding of Plutarch’s overall purpose, and the assumption that he fails in his task. In the absence of ἄν, it seems to make more sense to read τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν λεγομένων as ‘the remainder of what *is* said’, rather than ‘the remainder of what *I would have* said’; this would then suggest merely that Plutarch intends to relate stories that are sometimes used as examples of female virtue – *not* that he is expressing a personal view that male and female virtues are identical. We should note that he mentions ‘the similarity *and the difference* between the virtues of men and of women’ (243b; Loeb trans., emphases mine), and remarks that the same virtue may take on a different nature from person to person (243d); he does not intend, therefore, to prove that male and female virtues are the same, but only to ensure that any differences from example to example do not prevent the subject from receiving her share of recognition (242f, 243d).

<sup>62</sup> Muson. 3.33ff.

<sup>63</sup> Muson. 4.23; trans. Lutz.

masculine and sometimes sexual charge of the verb (Goldhill 1995: 137). Whitmarsh (2001a: 113) reads the passage as suggestive of the ‘potentially transformative powers’ of *paideia*, which can ‘lead the subject to transgress the boundaries of his or her ‘natural’ disposition’. But we must remember the goals for whose sake Musonius would urge women to *andreia*: the best woman (τὴν ἀρίστην) is encouraged to act in a manly fashion (ἀνδρίζεσθαι) and to be cowardice-free (καθαρεύειν δειλίας), so that she may have *sōphrosynē*, and not be coerced into shameful behaviour.<sup>64</sup> The assumption of *andreia*, which she is able to achieve by means of her *paideia*, is therefore absolutely directed towards the maintenance of social norms: a woman ought ἀνδρίζεσθαι in order to be able to present to the world a chaste image.<sup>65</sup>

While Musonius’ application of the verb ἀνδρίζεσθαι to a woman may be unusual, the application of the concept of *andreia* to women is not uncommon. Xenophon’s Anthia perfectly fulfils Musonius’ recommendations that a woman exhibit *andreia* in defence of her chastity. In Xenophon’s third book, Anthia faces a threat to her chastity from her imminent marriage to Perilaus. Death is now her only means of protecting her chastity and preserving herself for Habrocomes, whom she believes she will join in the afterlife; she steels herself for suicide by telling herself that she is not *anandros* or *deilē*, and that Habrocomes must be her only husband, even if he is dead.<sup>66</sup> Her *andreia* consists in the maintenance of her chastity and her fidelity to

<sup>64</sup> Muson. 4.24ff.

<sup>65</sup> With a similar conservative bent, Musonius advises that the study of philosophy, with its development of the virtues, will help a woman ‘be a good housekeeper ..., be chaste and self-controlled ... [and] an untiring defender of husband and children’; in fact, ‘such a woman is likely to be energetic, strong to endure pain, prepared to nourish her children at her own breast, and to serve her husband with her own hands, and willing to do things which some would consider no better than slaves’ work’ (Muson. 3; trans. Lutz). Like the virtues of Plutarch’s text, and the education that Xenophon’s Ischomachus recommends for wives, Musonius’ female *paideia* and *andreia* are predicated on a woman’s role within the household, and are tied to notions of honour and shame. For the similar attachment of masculine virtues to women in a Roman context, see Valerius Maximus, who, describing Lucretia’s post-rape suicide, states that she was possessed by an *animus virilis* (6.1.1); and Ap. *Met.*, where, upon killing herself after avenging her husband’s death, Charite is said to breathe out her *animam virilem* (8.11ff.). Only in instances such as these is it tolerable for a woman to exercise masculine virtues; nonetheless, it apparently causes Valerius Maximus some discomfort to apply the phrase ‘masculine spirit’ to a woman: he must explain it away by remarking that the spirit had inhabited Lucretia’s body by mistake.

<sup>66</sup> X. Eph. 3.6.3. The paradox of a woman behaving with *andreia*, even if protecting her chastity, is expressed later, when Anthia laments her fate and refers to the stratagems she has employed to maintain her *sōphrosynē* for Habrocomes as being ὑπὲρ γυναικάς (5.8.7).

Habrocomes, even if that means she must die.<sup>67</sup> Anthia takes a rather less self-sacrificing stance in the preservation of her chastity in the fourth book where, while held by Hippothous' robber band, she is the victim of an attempted sexual assault by one of the robbers, Anchialus, and is forced to turn a bandit sword upon him, killing him.<sup>68</sup> Xenophon never refers to the incident as an example of *andreia*, though in the light of Musonius' piece we might read it as such. The scene is rather reminiscent of the examples we have seen in Thucydides and Heliodorus, where the Corcyraean and Delphian women seize whatever comes to hand to use as a weapon. Anthia's implicit *andreia* is not calculated, but reactive and the product of desperation. She grabs a sword that just happens to be lying beside her (ἡ δὲ ἐν ἀμηχάνῳ κακῶ γενομένη, σπασσαμένη τὸ παρακείμενον ξίφος παίει τὸν Ἀγχιάλον). After the murder she reverts to her 'natural' state, becoming fearful and contemplating suicide or flight. She concludes that she cannot run away, for there is no-one to show her the way, and decides to wait and see what fortune is dealt her: having done its job of protecting her chastity, her *andreia* appears to have deserted her. The purpose of a woman paradoxically 'playing the man', and assuming apparently masculine qualities, is thus merely to reinforce the socially normative functions the reader expects of her.<sup>69</sup>

Charicleia too displays *andreia* in defence of her chastity. In an effort to deflect Charicleia's marriage to Trachinus, Calasiris urges the hero and heroine to take control of the situation and either to regain their freedom or to die σωφρόνως καὶ ἀνδρείως in the attempt.<sup>70</sup> The reference to a chaste death can only be directed at Charicleia, as hers is the only chastity under threat at this point; her courageous death would therefore serve to protect what we have been told by Persinna's embroidered band is 'the sole mark of virtue in a woman'.<sup>71</sup> Yet the nature of

<sup>67</sup> Konstan (Forthcoming) also notes this instance of *andreia* directed towards the preservation of chastity.

<sup>68</sup> X. Eph. 4.5.4ff.

<sup>69</sup> Even Iamblichus' highly active heroine Sinonis, who seemingly goes so far as to marry another man in a fit of erotic jealousy, occasionally behaves in ways that reinforce her status: she apparently protects her chastity by feigning love for Setapus, getting him drunk, and then killing him with a cleaver as he tries to have sex with her; to judge from Photius' summary and the remaining fragments, however, her actions after the killing are much more independent and determined than those of Anthia (76b31, Stephens & Winkler 1995).

<sup>70</sup> Hld. 5.29.6.

<sup>71</sup> 4.8.7; trans. Morgan.

Calasiris' plan seems at first to grant a broader scope to Charicleia's *andreia*, as she is required to assume the manly task of battle with the pirates, and Heliodorus tells us that 'neither Theagenes nor Charicleia held back from the action'.<sup>72</sup> But Charicleia's fighting style differs significantly from Theagenes', for while he arms himself with a sword and fights hand-to-hand, she fires arrows from a hidden position, a method of warfare that had a very mixed reputation.<sup>73</sup> Charicleia's archery is perhaps the intelligence that complements Theagenes' physical strength and prowess in hand-to-hand combat, that traditionally Homeric context for the display of *aretē*.<sup>74</sup> Nonetheless, an educated contemporary reader would be hard-pressed to read it without consciousness of its ambiguities.<sup>75</sup> It is fitting, then, that the battle is reduced to one-on-one combat between Theagenes and Pelorus, with Theagenes required to demonstrate his traditional *andreia* by vanquishing his Homeric opponent.<sup>76</sup> Ultimately, Charicleia's access to *andreia* here is limited, for she must stop firing arrows lest she injure Theagenes: like the Delphian and Corcyraean women, she must admit defeat, and it is up to Theagenes to finish the

---

<sup>72</sup> 5.32.3; trans. Morgan.

<sup>73</sup> 5.32.4. To fight with arrows from a distance, although a regular part of Greek warfare, was often construed as less than *andreios* – suitable for a woman, perhaps: see Hom. *Il.* 11.384ff., where Diomedes likens Paris to a woman or a child for wounding him with an arrow from a hidden position; see also E. *HF* 162-164, where Lycus claims that Heracles lacks *eupsychia* because he fights with bow and arrow, rather than sword and shield: although Heracles was frequently used as a symbol of *andreia*, his manliness was a bone of contention amongst ancient authors (see Loraux 1990). Paradoxically, archery was also sometimes presented as an especially wise method of fighting. So, for example, at D. Chr. *Or.* 58 Achilles complains that archery is the coward's resort, but Cheiron retorts by asking him if he finds women more courageous (ἀνδρειοτέρως) because they fight at close quarters; the proposition that women might possess more *andreia* than men is so far-fetched that it serves as proof that close-quarters combat is not the sole or even the primary *locus* of *andreia*; Cheiron's final words to Achilles are a warning which draws a distinction between Iliadic brute force and a more sophisticated style of combat which relies on intelligence: Achilles will easily kill those who are brave and mindless (τοὺς ἀνδρείους καὶ ἀνοήτους) like him, but he himself will be killed by a man who is intelligent (φρονίμος) and warlike (πολεμικός), and will not see it coming. Cf. Heracles' father Amphitryon's reply to Lycus that bow and arrow are the weapons of the wise, allowing the archer to inflict wounds while preserving his own life (E. *HF* 198ff.). See also Ach. Tat. 2.22.1ff., which plays metaphorically with 'gendered' styles of fighting and the ambiguity of archery: in the fable of the lion and the gnat, the gnat questions in what the lion believes his *alkē* resides, since the lion fights by scratching and biting like a woman; the gnat, by contrast, has superior *alkē*, because he can attack like bow and arrow, without being seen; he is, however, bested by the greater cunning of the spider.

<sup>74</sup> The entirety of the scene is replete with Homeric allusion, not least in the name of Theagenes' final opponent, Pelorus: see Dowden (1996: 278) and Jones (2003: 79).

<sup>75</sup> The men from the Land of Cinnamon are also presented as archers (Hld. 9.19.2ff.) and, like Charicleia, are not evaluated negatively; they are, however, barbarians: as the warfare of women and barbarians, archery is a rather grey area.

<sup>76</sup> It is relevant in a Homeric context that Theagenes claims descent from Achilles; we shall return to this issue later in the chapter.

fight by traditional one-on-one combat, spurred on by Charicleia's cries of Ἄνδρίζου, φίλτατε.<sup>77</sup>

There are two final references to female *andreia* in Heliodorus, both relating to the sacrifice of Charicleia and Theagenes. Despite the discovery that Charicleia is his daughter, Hydaspes insists that her sacrifice must go ahead.<sup>78</sup> He exhorts her, 'now if ever before display that courageous and royal spirit of yours'.<sup>79</sup> *Andreia*'s performative quality comes through here: it is something that one must 'display' (ἐπιδείκνυσο). And here it is tied not to Charicleia's chastity, but to what is perceived as her duty to her native land: to give up her life as a sacrifice.<sup>80</sup> In referring to her 'royal spirit', Hydaspes voices an issue which perhaps explains Charicleia's relatively broad access to *andreia*: in the philosophical and ethical literature it is especially appropriate for kings to possess *andreia*, just as we saw in the case of *paideia*;<sup>81</sup> Charicleia's status as the newly-recognised daughter of a king is enough to make us expect that she show *andreia* in the face of death.<sup>82</sup> When Charicleia has been exempted from sacrifice by the will of the Ethiopian people, Hydaspes is still resolved to sacrifice Theagenes. Charicleia asks to perform the sacrifice herself, thus earning the admiration of the Ethiopians for her *andreia*.<sup>83</sup> The expectation of being admired (περίβλεπτον) again conveys the performativity of *andreia*. Charicleia's words evoke those of Electra to Chrysothemis: Electra refers to the *andreia* for which she and her sister will be praised if they kill Aegisthus and

<sup>77</sup> Hld. 5.32.5. Charicleia is, however, clearly a formidable archer: at 1.1.5, most of the dead on the beach are said to be 'the victims of arrows and archery' (trans. Morgan).

<sup>78</sup> 10.16.4.

<sup>79</sup> 10.16.9: ... ἄλλα τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἐκεῖνό σου φρόνημα καὶ βασιλείου νῦν εἴπερ ποτὲ καὶ πρότερον ἐπιδείκνυσο.

<sup>80</sup> Heliodorus alludes strongly to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* here. Iphigenia's sacrifice is perceived as a noble act on behalf of her homeland (*IA* 1419ff., 1557ff.), and in reporting Iphigenia's steadfastness in the face of imminent death, Euripides' messenger refers to her εὐψυχία and ἀρετή (1561-1562).

<sup>81</sup> See, e.g., Muson. 8, which states that kings more than anyone else should possess *andreia*, and D. Chr. Or. 62.4, which asks, 'Who needs greater courage [ἀνδρεία] than he who is the preserver of all?' (Loeb. trans.).

<sup>82</sup> The possibly first century B.C. anonymous tract, *Γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι* (*Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare*), also appears to relate *andreia* to royalty: the text enumerates fourteen women – and specifically queens – who have distinguished themselves in war (see Gera 1997). As Gera (*ibid.* 4) notes, however, the text's air of paradoxography implies that the women are unusual in their involvement in war. Gera (*ibid.* 206) also observes that the author seems to find the application of ἀνδρεία and its cognates to women somewhat unsettling: with the exception of the title, the word features only three times in the whole text, used of Artemisia, Atossa and Rhodogyne.

<sup>83</sup> Hld. 10.20.2.

avenge their father.<sup>84</sup> Bassi (2003: 42) observes the ambiguity in the *Electra* scene, as Chrysothemis responds by advising Electra to remember her sex: *andreia* is not something a woman may lay claim to lightly.<sup>85</sup> There is a similar difficulty in Heliodorus' scene, as Charicleia's precise intentions are ambiguous, and Hydaspes cannot see how her sacrifice of Theagenes could possibly be *andreios*.<sup>86</sup> Her request to dispatch Theagenes herself has been interpreted as a means of acquiring a sword in order to commit suicide.<sup>87</sup> It is rather unclear why specifically Charicleia feels her suicide would be considered an act of *andreia* by the Ethiopians, but the answer may be easier to fathom if we suppose that she expects her death to act as a substitute for Theagenes'. Her death in her beloved's stead would assume an Alcestis-like tone, making a statement which the hellenised Ethiopian spectators would doubtless apprehend as an *andreios* one.<sup>88</sup> The female *andreia* of the entire sacrifice scene is thus carefully nuanced with echoes of classical Greek tragedy, appropriate to its classical setting.

From the few examples of female *andreia* in the novels, we have seen that the concept is employed in a gender-specific manner, which reinforces normative gender roles and socio-cultural beliefs about the nature of women. Anthia's intermittent *andreia* is directed towards the preservation of her chastity, and abandons her once the immediate threat has been tackled. Charicleia's *andreia* is rather more abundant and complex, as we might expect from a later and more sophisticated author, yet it retains many normative assumptions. The *andreia* she is encouraged to display is that of noble (self-)sacrifice and the protection of her chastity, in the vein of Plutarch's virtuous women. Her *andreia* is related to her strength of spirit, her *phronēma*,<sup>89</sup> rather as we saw that Callirhoe's moral *paideia* was inextricably linked to her intelligence.<sup>90</sup> Like Musonius' educated woman, the

---

<sup>84</sup> S. *El.* 975ff.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.* 992ff.

<sup>86</sup> Hld. 10.21.1-2.

<sup>87</sup> See, for example, Morgan (1978: 405).

<sup>88</sup> Female suicide is also framed in terms of courage in the *Babyloniaca*, though this time using *tolma* rather than *andreia*: Sinon's refers to an earlier suicide attempt as a mark of her *tolma*, and is keen to display her wound as indication of her moral fibre (fr. 61, 11ff., Stephens & Winkler 1995; see also fr. 61, 58-59); she seems to contrast her *tolma* with the *deilia* of the farmer's daughter (fr. 61, 15). On the display of wounds as proof of *andreia*, cf. below, p.114-115. We shall return to the relation of suicide to *andreia* later on in the chapter.

<sup>89</sup> See above, p.108, n.79.

<sup>90</sup> See above, p.44.

supremely educated Charicleia has more access to *andreia* than other women. In the classical tradition *andreia* is activated, enhanced, and negotiated by means of the intellectual and rational faculties,<sup>91</sup> and we shall observe that this ‘thinking’ *andreia* is apparent in the presentation of the novels’ male characters too. However, there are many other aspects to the novels’ engagement with the discourse of *andreia*, and it is to these that we now turn.

#### ***Andreia by allusion and appearance.***

As mentioned earlier, it has been suggested that Chariton’s characterisation of Chaereas is inconsistent, and that he is transformed from naïve teenager to accomplished military leader almost overnight. However, we noted at the end of Chapter 1 that his experiences may be viewed as a maturation of sorts. We are given a glimpse of Chaereas’ potential for *andreia* at the very beginning of the novel. Chariton tells us that once love-struck, Chaereas neglects the gymnasium, of which he is clearly a devotee.<sup>92</sup> We have observed the perceived relationship between training in the gymnasium and military service: the former was effectively considered preparation for the latter, and a skilled athlete might therefore be deemed to have great potential as a soldier. In his references to the importance of the gymnasium in Chaereas’ life, Chariton is perhaps laying the foundations for Chaereas’ later military success.<sup>93</sup> This would in all likelihood have been more obvious to his intended readership than it is to the modern reader, for whom there is no intrinsic relation between athletics and the military; Chaereas’ blossoming into a military leader would thus seem far less abrupt two thousand years ago than it does now: the potential for *andreia* was always present within him, needing only the appropriate context in which to manifest itself fully.

When Chaereas first sees Callirhoe, he is said to be ‘like a hero mortally wounded in battle, ... too proud to fall but too weak to stand’.<sup>94</sup> This simile does double-duty, as

---

<sup>91</sup> See above, p.96-97.

<sup>92</sup> Chariton 1.1.10. Indeed, as we saw at the end of the last chapter, he is said by one of Callirhoe’s suitors to have been ‘brought up in the gymnasium’.

<sup>93</sup> It may be significant that on his triumphant return to Syracuse, Chaereas is greeted by συνέφηβοι καὶ συγγυμνασταί (8.6.11), perhaps suggesting a link between military and gymnastic training, two formative phases in a young man’s life.

<sup>94</sup> 1.1.7; trans. Goold: ... τις ἀριστεύς ἐν πολέμῳ τρωθεὶς καιρίαν, καὶ καταπεσεῖν μὲν αἰδούμενος, στήναι δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος.



an indicator of the nature of the hero and of the nature of Chariton's text itself. First of all, the Homeric word ἄριστεύς locates Chaereas in the world of the epic hero, where death on the battlefield was a glorious end; indeed, on numerous occasions he is equated with Homeric heroes by means of allusion and intertextuality; such equations establish his credentials as a potential warrior.<sup>95</sup> Secondly, Russell (1983: 24ff.) observes that the figure of the *aristeus* was a favourite character in Greek declamation. This is a connection the educated reader would surely have made. By casting Chaereas as an *aristeus*, albeit a figurative one, Chariton places him at the centre not only of the highly performative Homeric world (a world of implicit *andreia*), but also of the equally performative world of declamation (a world of *paideia*). In so doing, Chariton inscribes in his novel a relationship between *paideia* and *andreia*, and identifies his text as performance and himself as sophist.<sup>96</sup> The use of the term *aristeus* in an erotic context underscores *andreia*'s role in the internal struggle with desires and passions that we noted in philosophical literature:<sup>97</sup> the literal battlefield was not the only home of *andreia*. Chaereas is here fighting his own feelings in order to maintain his outward appearance, and despite the fact that he is fighting a losing battle, he struggles on like a Homeric warrior. We have already observed Dionysius engaging in exactly this sort of battle through the application of his *paideia*: again Chariton emphasises the close relationship between the concepts and modes of functioning of *andreia* and *paideia*, and the importance of striving to maintain a particular image. We have seen that *paideia* gives access to other virtues, including *andreia*; we might thus assume that Dionysius possesses *andreia* on account of his status as *pepaideumenos*. I suggested in Chapter 1 that the potential for *paideia* is present in Chaereas from the outset, so we might say that *andreia* is present in him too, and waiting to be tapped.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Achilles: 1.1.3 (and Nireus), 1.4.6, 2.9.6, 4.1.5, 5.2.4, 5.10.9 (we have already noted the significance of Chaereas' likeness to Achilles with reference to his anger); Hector: 3.5.6, 7.2.4; Diomedes: 7.3.5, 7.4.6; Agamemnon: 8.2.13. Dionysius is equated with Homeric figures far less frequently, signalling, perhaps, a fundamental difference between the military capabilities of the two men; note, however, that in Dionysius' case, the emphasis is on interior qualities rather than physical prowess (see 6.2.5, where he addresses himself as ὡς Τηλέμον, the descriptor used of Odysseus at *Iliad* 10.231 and 10.498; see also 8.5.15, where Dionysius rocks his (though actually Chaereas') son in his arms, evoking the tender scene between Hector and Astyanax at *Iliad* 6.474).

<sup>96</sup> This passage might be cited in support of Hock's (2005) identification of Chariton as *pepaideumenos* and as familiar with the world of sophistry; see above, p.27.

<sup>97</sup> See above, p.95-96.

<sup>98</sup> Chariton first mentions Chaereas' *paideia* immediately after Chaereas himself has referred to his desire to exhibit *andreia* (7.2.4 and 7.2.5).

It is not only Chaereas who is like an epic hero. Theagenes is frequently equated quite seriously with Achilles, and this equation is mingled with an interest in the expression of *andreia* through physical characteristics: just as we observed in the last chapter that *paideia* may in some instances be a visible quality, so too may *andreia*; indeed, *andreia*'s relation to athletics and warfare makes it a much more physical quality than the rather nebulous *paideia*, so we might expect it to be something that can be seen in a man. Theagenes claims descent from Achilles, and his claim is true according to Charicles, for it can be seen in his appearance.<sup>99</sup> Calasiris then describes Theagenes:

... Ἀχιλλεῖόν τι τῶ ὄντι πνέων καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τὸ βλέμμα καὶ τὸ φρόνημα ἀναφέρων ὀρθὸς τὸν αὐχένα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μετώπου τὴν κόμην πρὸς τὸ ὀρθίον ἀναχαιτίζων, ἢ ῥίς ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ θυμοῦ καὶ οἱ μυκτῆρες ἐλευθέρως τὸν ἀέρα εἰσπνέοντες, ὄφθαλμὸς οὐπω μὲν χαροπὸς χαροπώτερον δὲ μελαινόμενος σοβαρὸν τε ἅμα καὶ οὐκ ἀνεραστον βλέπων, οἷον θαλάσσης ἀπὸ κύματος εἰς γαλήνην ἄρτι λεαινομένης.

... who really did have something redolent of Achilles about him in his expression and dignity. He carried his head erect, and had a mane of hair swept back from his forehead; his nose proclaimed his courage by the defiant flaring of his nostrils; his eyes were not quite slate blue but more black tinged with blue, with a gaze that was awesome and yet not unattractive, rather like the sea when its swelling billows subside, and a smooth calm begins to spread across its surface (Hld. 2.35.1; trans. Morgan).

Calasiris' description shares linguistic similarities with Philostratus' description of Achilles in the *Heroicus*,<sup>100</sup> and employs the Homeric noun *thymos* to ally Theagenes with epic heroes. Most interestingly, it is rooted in physiognomy, which, as we noted in the last chapter, enjoyed especial popularity in the first few centuries after Christ, and was particularly symptomatic of the performative culture of the Second Sophistic, whereby elite males were constantly subject to the scrutiny of their peers.<sup>101</sup> Looking to Adamantius' synopsis of Polemon's *Physiognomy*, we find

<sup>99</sup> Hld. 2.34.4.

<sup>100</sup> Philostr. *Her.* 19.5 (= p.200 Kayser).

<sup>101</sup> See above, p.48-49, with n.93. On the sophist-cum-physiognomist Polemon's focus on *andreia*, see Swain (2007a: 192).

that flaring nostrils are a sign of *thymos* and *alkē*.<sup>102</sup> But it is not just Theagenes' nose that announces his courage: we find in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomonica* that an ὄμμα which is χαροπὸν is characteristic of a man who is *andreios*.<sup>103</sup> It also seems significant from the standpoint of physiognomy that Heliodorus uses the words ὀρθός and τὸ ὀρθιον: Adamantius emphasises uprightness as the mark of the man who is *andreios*.<sup>104</sup>

There are other moments when Theagenes' *andreia* is evident in his appearance. At the very beginning of the novel, when he lies wounded on the beach, the watching brigands are able to see his 'radiant, manly beauty':<sup>105</sup> injured in battle with the pirates, Theagenes' *andreia* may be seen simply by looking at him. In the Delphic procession he is again equated with Achilles by means of his spear,<sup>106</sup> and the spectators 'all awarded the young man the prize for manhood [ἀνδρεία] and beauty':<sup>107</sup> in this most performative context, his *andreia* manifests itself in his appearance. Finally, when captured by the pirates, his *andreia* displays itself to Trachinus, who says to Charicleia, 'I can see that he is a young man full of courage [ἀνδρεία] and well fitted to share our way of life'.<sup>108</sup> Bassi (2003: 41), Sluiter & Rosen (2003: 8), and Roisman (2005: 111) all make the point that *andreia* is not something a man may claim for himself; it must instead be attributed to him by

<sup>102</sup> Adam. B25: μυκτηῖρας ἀναπεπταμένους θυμοῦ καὶ ἀλκῆς μάρτυρας τίθεσο ... Although Heliodorus' description of Theagenes' nostrils 'freely breathing in the air' is not a precise verbal echo of the physiognomical text, the meaning is clearly very close; for a reproduction and translation of Förster's text, see Repath (2007). If Heliodorus was writing in the fourth century, Adamantius' text may have been known to him; in any case he is likely to have known the name of Polemon, whose fame was widespread (see Swain 2007c).

<sup>103</sup> Ps.-Arist. *Phgn.* 807b1; see also 812b, where such eyes are indicative of εὐψυχία; see Elsner (2007: 218ff.) on Polemon's obsession with eye-colour, including χαροπός and μέλας. Evans (1969: 57) remarks that 'to the physiognomists keen and piercing eyes are a good sign of courage'; note that Heliodorus refers to the striking effect of Charicleia's eyes too (2.31.1).

<sup>104</sup> Adam. B44: Εἶδος οὖν ἀνδρείου ὀρθιον τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα ...; see also Ps.-Arist. *Phgn.* 807a30.

<sup>105</sup> Hld. 1.2.3; trans. Morgan: ... ἦνθει δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀνδρείω τῷ κάλλει ...; cf. 1.2.1, where the brigands can see that Charicleia has *phronēma*, and 1.3.6, where the second band of brigands reacts similarly.

<sup>106</sup> In like manner, the reference to Charicleia's breastband (3.4.2) recalls Odysseus' description of the baldric worn by the ghost of Heracles (Hom. *Od.* 11.613), indirectly equating Charicleia to Heracles, with his *andreia* and skilled bowmanship.

<sup>107</sup> Hld. 3.3.8. Theagenes' horse is well-matched to its master: several items of vocabulary from the physiognomical description of Theagenes are found here first; the sense seems to be that the horse absorbs Theagenes' *andreia*. See J.R. Morgan (1998) on the way in which Heliodorus links scenes together by theme and vocabulary. We shall return to the connection between Theagenes and his horse later in the chapter.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. X. Eph. 2.14.2, where Hippothous can see instantly that Habrocomes is ἀνδρικός; this adjective, in contrast to ἀνδρείος, is perhaps more indicative of physical strength than of moral virtue.

others. This seems to be demonstrated in the above scenes, where in each case the hero is labelled *andreios* by a watching audience. The attribution of *andreia* by others thus acts as validation of a successful performance of masculinity.<sup>109</sup>

While Theagenes' *andreia* and *thymos* are so striking as to be visible, and are traits that serve to place him on a level with Achilles, Calasiris is keen to point out that he does not share the negative elements of Achilles' temperament:

ἀναφέρει δὲ ἑαυτὸν εἰς Ἀχιλλέα πρόγονον καὶ μοι καὶ ἐπαληθεύειν ἔοικεν, εἰ δεῖ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τοῦ νεανίου τεκμαίρεσθαι, πιστουμένων τῆν Ἀχιλλεῖον εὐγένειαν· πλὴν ὅσον οὐχ ὑπέρφρων οὐδὲ ἀγῆνωρ κατ' ἐκείνον ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας τὸν ὄγκον ἠδύτητι καταπραΰνων.

The young man traces his lineage back to Achilles, and I think he may well be right, if his stature and looks are anything to go by; they are a sure sign of a pedigree worthy of Achilles – except that Theagenes has none of his conceit or arrogance; his character has a gentle side to temper his pride (Hld. 4.5.5; trans. Morgan).

In Homeric usage ἀγῆνωρ may mean 'manly' or 'courageous', but frequently carries the collateral pejorative sense of 'arrogant' or 'headstrong'.<sup>110</sup> Heliodorus' equation of Theagenes with Achilles is intended to suggest only the positive associations of *andreia*. These references to the 'visibility' of *andreia* in Theagenes' appearance, together with the likeness he bears to Achilles, inform the reader of his potential in the traditional spheres of *andreia*, warfare and athletics; for not only was Achilles an accomplished warrior, but he was also a skilled athlete. Theagenes is aligned with Odysseus too, with whom he shares a scar on his leg, acquired while hunting boar.<sup>111</sup> This underlines not only his status as a warrior in the epic vein, but also his capacity for endurance and wily thinking, which will come into play when

<sup>109</sup> It perhaps also suggests a sense of *andreia* as a culturally-acquired virtue; we shall return to the nature/culture issue later in the chapter. Similar examples of externally-attributed *andreia* are found in Chariton, where Chaereas does not describe himself as *andreios*, but instead the navy is said to be enthused at having the *andreiotatos* man as their leader (7.5.11); shortly thereafter the Egyptian guard tells Stateira that Chaereas is *andreios* (7.6.7); and when Chaereas relates his military victory to the Syracusans, he calls his 300 troops στρατὸν ἐμὸν ἀνδρεῖον (8.8.13). With reference to Plutarch's tract on the problems associated with praising oneself, Gleason (1995: 20) notes that '[p]raise bestowed by the self on itself has no value – it is indeed self-canceling'; see Plu. *Moralia* 546c.

<sup>110</sup> See, for example, Hom. *Il.* 9.699, used of Achilles.

<sup>111</sup> Hld. 5.5.2; cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.392ff.

he later fights the giant. Ever the performer, Cleitophon also implicitly equates himself with Odysseus when he attempts to prevent Leucippe being kidnapped, and receives a wound on the thigh, which he is then eager to display.<sup>112</sup> We shall see, however, that such an equation can only ever be wishful-thinking, as Cleitophon never really demonstrates the substance of *andreia*, but merely its superficial trappings. Similarly, Cnemon is ironically likened to Odysseus indirectly when he escapes from Thermouthis and spends the night hidden under a pile of leaves:<sup>113</sup> like Cleitophon, Cnemon has only the surface appearance of *andreia*, as we shall see shortly.

### **Andreia and deilia.**

While Heliodorus clearly considers it important to demonstrate his hero's *andreia*, at no point does he involve Theagenes in full-scale warfare; in fact, with the exception of his battle with the pirates, Theagenes is consistently kept away from warfare, and his *andreia* is most explicitly and dramatically exhibited in athletic rather than military contexts, as we shall see. But long before involving Theagenes in athletics, Heliodorus begins to engage with the discourse of *andreia* by ironically removing his hero from the usual arenas of *andreia*, and by appealing to the classic opposition of *andreia* and *deilia*. This opposition is prominent in philosophical and ethical texts, where those with knowledge of how to respond in the face of danger possess *andreia*, while those who do not possess *deilia*.<sup>114</sup> In Heliodorus' second book, the bandits' island is attacked; Theagenes and Cnemon flee, although Heliodorus remarks that 'their withdrawal was not entirely due to fear'.<sup>115</sup> Believing Charicleia dead, Theagenes criticises his own retreat from the fighting:

<sup>112</sup> Ach. Tat. 5.7.2. He immediately displays it to the *stratēgos* of the island (5.7.3: δεικνύω δὴ τὸ τραῦμα), and later to Sostratus and the priest of Artemis (8.5.1: ἔδειξα τὴν οὐλήν).

<sup>113</sup> Hld. 2.20.3; cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.485ff. Allusion to Odysseus is not unambiguous, as his willingness to avoid action might be interpreted as cowardice (see Stanford 1954: 72ff.). It is possible that by equating Cleitophon and Cnemon with Odysseus, Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus intended the reader to recall this ambiguity, while in Theagenes' case the allusion was designed to evoke Odysseus' quick wit, which marked him out from other epic heroes, of whom brash recklessness was more characteristic (on this idiosyncrasy, see again Stanford *ibid.*).

<sup>114</sup> X. *Mem.* 4.6.11; see also Arist. *Rh.* 1366b, where *andreia* equates roughly to noble behaviour in dangerous circumstances, and *deilia* is the opposite.

<sup>115</sup> Hld. 1.31.4; trans. Morgan. This of course implies that fear was at least a partial cause of their retreat.

Οἴχεται Χαρίκλεια, Θεαγένης ἀπόλωλε. Μάτην ὁ δυστυχῆς δειλὸς ἐγενόμην καὶ δρασμὸν ὑπέστην ἄνανδρον σοί, γλυκεῖα, περισώζων ἑμαυτόν.

Charicleia is dead, and Theagenes is no more. Fate is against me. I became the coward, but in vain. In vain did I endure unmanly flight, trying to save my life for your sake, my love (Hld. 2.1.2; trans. Morgan, modified).

Heliodorus here seems to use the performance of *andreia* in wry and playful manner. It is rather as though Theagenes has suddenly become conscious of how his flight might appear to another man,<sup>116</sup> and is attempting to account for the conspicuous absence of *andreia* in his behaviour. He seems almost aware that his behaviour is being ‘read’, not only metaphorically by those inside the text, but also literally by the reader. We noted in Chapter 1 that the kind of threat to identity experienced by Dionysius at the symposium was akin to the threat that Greenblatt argues was experienced as part of elite self-fashioning in Renaissance literature.<sup>117</sup> Theagenes here seems to feel a similar undermining of identity, for which he must compensate quickly. He says he ‘became’ (ἐγενόμην) the coward, as if to emphasise that this is contrary to his usual behaviour, and that ‘unmanly flight’ (δρασμὸν ἄνανδρον) is merely a temporary and calculated deviation from the norm: he performed the role of coward solely to preserve himself for Charicleia, sacrificing his *andreia* for her alone. From this we understand that to flee from battle is to be *anandros*, but that love might require a man of *andreia* to assume the appearance of *deilia*, and to flee in a manner contrary to his beliefs. But there is perhaps a twist here, if we think of *andreia* in Socratic and early Stoic terms, as knowledge of how to react to danger, and knowledge of those things to be and not to be endured.<sup>118</sup> Theagenes has decided that the battle is something that is not to be endured, while ‘unmanly flight’ for Charicleia’s sake is something to be endured; one could therefore argue that he has exercised his *andreia* precisely by enduring the appearance of *deilia*; this, of course, is an appearance that belies his true

<sup>116</sup> Cf. 8.16.3, where the Persians retreat from the Ethiopians more slowly than they are able, so that their flight should not be obvious: even naturally cowardly barbarians are aware of the stigma inherent in retreat from battle, and feel obliged to engage in a little impression management.

<sup>117</sup> See above, p.55.

<sup>118</sup> See Cullyer (2003: 216ff.) on Chrysippus’ definition of *andreia*. Perkins (1995: 77ff.) has shown that Stoic motifs are common in the novels; see also Doulamis (Forthcoming, 2007).

character.<sup>119</sup> This consciousness of performance sets the scene for a succession of occurrences in the cave which underline the fact that masculinity cannot be taken for granted, but must be displayed.

In order to engage with notions of courage, Heliodorus has ironically removed Theagenes and Cnemon from the prototypical context of *andreia*; by means of the two men's juxtaposition, the reader may see the differences between them. In the last chapter we saw that when a speaker or author highlights the absence of *paideia*, he implicitly suggests that, by contrast, he himself possesses that quality.<sup>120</sup> The same may be said of *andreia*: Heliodorus does not need to involve Theagenes in warfare to prove his *andreia*; he is able to imply the hero's *andreia* by reference to its opposite, Cnemon's *deilia*.<sup>121</sup> This construction of opposites lays the groundwork for Theagenes to come into his own later in the novel, and suggests that his characterisation – like that of Chaereas discussed earlier – is not as inconsistent as it might seem to the modern reader. When Theagenes and Charicleia have been reunited in the cave, Cnemon expresses shame at the way in which Theagenes had reacted to the discovery of Thisbe's body: he had lamented 'ignobly' (ἀγεννώζως) over a stranger. This condemnation does not seem directed at the specific act of emotional lamentation, however: Cnemon is apparently riled because Theagenes had not waited to discover for certain the identity of the woman over whom he was lamenting, and had in fact ignored Cnemon's assertions that Charicleia was still alive (ταῦτα περιεῖναι καὶ ζῆν σοι τὴν φιλτάτην ἐμοῦ διατεινομένου); it is pique at being sidelined that motivates Cnemon's comments here.<sup>122</sup> Theagenes, again conscious of his image, asks Cnemon not to slander him in front of Charicleia, and rejoins by heaping scorn upon Cnemon for his own response to the sight of the dead Thisbe:

---

<sup>119</sup> Goffman (1969: 30ff.) remarks that individuals may sometimes perform roles that do not reflect their characters truthfully. We shall see something similar in the case of Cnemon shortly; he, however, does not emerge favourably from the disparity between external and internal characteristics.

<sup>120</sup> See above, p.33 and p.37.

<sup>121</sup> Lalanne (2006: 186) phrases this in reverse, arguing that Theagenes' *andreia* highlights Cnemon's cowardice. Cf. Greenblatt's observations regarding Renaissance texts: self-fashioning is achieved in relation to an 'other' (1980: 9); see also above, p.4-5, on identity through alterity.

<sup>122</sup> Hld. 2.7.2.

... ὥρα σοι σαυτὸν ὑπομῆσαι τῆς ἄγαν ἀνδρείας ... ἔνοπλος καὶ  
 ξιφῆρης τὴν γυναῖκα, νεκρὰν καὶ ταύτην, ὑποφεύγων ὁ γενναῖος καὶ  
 Ἀττικὸς πεζομάχος.

... it is time for you to be reminded of your own remarkable display of  
 bravery: ... though you were armed and had a sword in your hand, you fled  
 from a woman, and a dead one at that! The intrepid Athenian warrior turned  
 tail and ran! (Hld. 2.7.3; trans. Morgan).<sup>123</sup>

Theagenes here stresses the difference between appearing to be *andreios* and truly  
 possessing *andreia*, his words highlighting the potential of the body not only to  
 mask the soul's true characteristics, but to present to the world another image  
 entirely: though Cnemon looks the part of the *andreios* Athenian footsoldier,<sup>124</sup> he is  
 unable to play it convincingly.<sup>125</sup> While we noted that Theagenes' appearance  
 declared his inner *andreia* to the watching world, and his flight from battle belied  
 that *andreia*, here Cnemon's macho garb belies the coward within: not only has he  
 run away from the fighting outside the cave, but he has even fled from a dead  
 woman.<sup>126</sup> Cnemon goes on to express his suspicion of Thisbe, despite her death,  
 and Theagenes retorts with the sarcastic remark, 'Won't you stop being so manly?'  
 ('Οὐ παύσῃ ... ἄγαν ἀνδριζόμενος ...;').<sup>127</sup>

Here we might turn briefly to consider Cleitophon who, like Cnemon, displays only  
 the trappings of *andreia*, and never its substance. We have noted that Cleitophon is  
 keen to appear *andreios*, displaying his wounds at every opportunity. However,  
 when battle is imminent, he is notably distanced from it. When the Egyptian bandits

<sup>123</sup> A theatrical reference, ὡς περ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δαίμονας ἀπεδίδρασκες, emphasises the  
 performative context here.

<sup>124</sup> Despite Athens' fame for maritime warfare, the Athenian hoplite was an enduring symbol of  
*andreia* (von Reden & Goldhill 1999: 268). Heliodorus toys with the reader's expectation that an  
 Athenian will possess *andreia* by creating a character entirely devoid of it; this perhaps forms part of  
 what may be a serious polemic against Athens in this novel (see Morgan (1989) and Dowden (1996)  
 on Athenian immorality in the *Aethiopica*, in contrast to the presentation of Ethiopia).

<sup>125</sup> Bassi (2003: 46) notes that classical Athenian comedy and tragedy play on the distinction between  
 being a man and merely seeming to be one. The *Iliad* offers an early example of ancient anxiety over  
 the body's ability to conceal or misrepresent its true nature: according to Hector, the enemy would  
 think from external appearances that Paris was one of the Trojans' best men, but in truth he lacks  
 courage (Hom. *Il.* 3.39-45); he is an example of a 'mismatch between appearance and inner nature:  
 Paris *looks* like a brave warrior, but he *acts* like a coward' (Duncan 2006: 8).

<sup>126</sup> Cnemon is the butt of this joke again later, when he is frightened at the sight of a crocodile;  
 Calasiris teases him for his *deilia* at this, as well as at the name of the dead Thisbe: he is afraid not of  
 a man of *andreia*, but of a dead woman (6.1.4).

<sup>127</sup> Hld. 2.11.3. Bassi (2003: 43-44) remarks that *andreia* and its cognates are often used ironically in  
 comedy and tragedy to imply 'the irrevocable absence of a 'true' or unambiguous manliness'.



seize Leucippe as a virgin sacrifice, she clings on to Cleitophon but is dragged away; he states that the bandits hit him, but he makes no reference to any attempt to protect Leucippe, despite being in the perfect position, as ego-narrator, to recount an *andreios* effort.<sup>128</sup> After this conspicuous absence of *andreia*, Cleitophon is rescued by the army, and proceeds to show off his horsemanship before the general, Charmides:

ἐγὼ δὲ ἵππον ἦτουν, σφόδρα γὰρ ἦδειν ἵππεύειν γεγυμνασμένος. ὡς δὲ τις παρῆν, περιάγων τὸν ἵππον ἐπεδεικνύμην ἐν ρυθμῷ τὰ τῶν πολεμούντων σχήματα, ὥστε καὶ τὸν στρατηγὸν σφόδρα ἐπαινέσαι.

I asked for a horse, being well versed in the art of riding, and when one came, I rode him about and displayed the various evolutions of cavalry fighting, so that the general was greatly pleased with me (Ach. Tat. 3.14.2; trans. Gaselee, modified).

It is not hard to see that Cleitophon's display here is just that: display. Again we find his favourite verb, ἐπιδείκνυμι,<sup>129</sup> drawing attention to the superficiality of the scene. The use of τὰ σχήματα adds to this sense of shallow pomp: while it can be used of military tactics, it also frequently indicates surface appearance, but no content, or an exterior that belies what is beneath it.<sup>130</sup> Cleitophon's display of *andreia* is geared to nothing more noble than impressing the general and thus coming to benefit from his friendship;<sup>131</sup> *andreia* for him is simply a literal performance enacted for personal gain. With Cleitophon's horsemanship we might contrast the appearance of Theagenes on horseback in the Delphic pageant, where his horse is aware of the nobility of its rider. The result of that scene is that Theagenes is proclaimed *andreios*,<sup>132</sup> and while it too is a highly performative and

<sup>128</sup> Ach. Tat. 3.12.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. above, p.70-71, and p.115, with n.112.

<sup>130</sup> *LSJ* s.v. τὸ σχῆμα. It and its cognates are also used in rhetorical contexts (see Goldhill 2001b: 165), so the reader is also reminded of Cleitophon's own dubious brand of *paideia*.

<sup>131</sup> He is quickly promoted to the general's table and given his own Egyptian servant (3.14.2ff.). He also gives a brief disquisition at this point on the value of a sob-story to the generation of friendship. His words make him sound very much like a parasite, who wheedles his way into social circles by recounting his hardships (cf. Lucian *Par.* 22, on the importance to the parasite of the cultivation of friendship). If it is right to think of Cleitophon as a parasite, then we might retrospectively apply the comments he makes here to his approach to the primary narrator at the beginning of the novel: is his entire narration of his misfortunes simply the calculating move of a parasite? On the figure of the parasite, see also below, p.202-203.

<sup>132</sup> See above, p.113-114.

spectacular event, it lays the groundwork for Theagenes to display more than just the appearance of *andreia* later in the narrative. Cleitophon, on the other hand, never demonstrates *andreia* beyond play-acting at being a cavalry soldier. This does not prevent him from expounding on the *deilia* of Egyptians and what he sees as their mistaken belief that military victory by trickery amounts to *andreia*;<sup>133</sup> we shall see from Chariton and Heliodorus, however, that a vital part of *andreia* is the use of intelligence and cunning, and an understanding of when to avoid using brute force.

Returning to Heliodorus, we find that his series of applications of *andreia* and its cognates in the cave scene forms a prelude to the appearance of the Egyptian bandit Thermouthis, in a scene which confirms the reader's doubts about Cnemon's *andreia*, and reaffirms his faith in Theagenes'. Here Charicleia retreats deeper into the cave, partly as a precautionary measure, but mostly because she feels modesty at the sight of a naked man. Cnemon, we are told, 'subtly made off too' (ἡρέμα καὶ ὑπεδίδρασκε),<sup>134</sup> recognising Thermouthis and expecting him to launch an attack. Theagenes, by contrast, is not at all perturbed, and threatens the bandit with his sword, quite prepared to kill him if he makes a wrong move.<sup>135</sup> Heliodorus cleverly constructs this scene to present the reader with a three-tier hierarchy of *andreia*, at the bottom of which stands Cnemon. By describing Cnemon's retreat after Charicleia's, Heliodorus forces the reader to align Cnemon with a woman, implicitly casting aspersions on his *andreia*. But Charicleia is said to retreat more because of modesty than caution: her behaviour is thus appropriate for a woman, and is therefore laudable. Cnemon's retreat, however, is governed by fear that Thermouthis will attack: he is less manly than Charicleia is womanly. Theagenes, on the other hand, is prepared to display his *andreia* in the prototypical context of hand-to-hand combat, placing him at the top of this hierarchy of *andreia*. While the reader is undoubtedly amused at the characterisation of Cnemon in this scene, he has been prepared for it by the recurrence of the discourse of *andreia* up to this point. The simultaneous alignment and differentiation made between Cnemon and Charicleia

<sup>133</sup> Ach. Tat. 4.14.9. Cf. Cleitophon's aphorism on the *deilia* of slaves (7.10.5).

<sup>134</sup> Hld. 2.13.2ff.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. 5.24.3: when the Tyrian ship is attacked by Trachinus' pirate gang, Charicleia and Calasiris must restrain Theagenes, who is 'spoiling for the fight' (ἐνθουσιῶντα πρὸς τὴν μάχην).

might remind us of Aristotle's remark that 'a man would be thought a coward if he were only as brave as a brave woman'.<sup>136</sup>

The final example of Cnemon's dearth of *andreia* in this episode comes upon Thermouthis' request that Cnemon accompany him on his reconnaissance mission:

Ἀποδειλιῶντα δὴ πρὸς ταῦτα τὸν Κνήμωνα θεασάμενος ὁ Θεαγένης, καὶ γὰρ φράζων τὰ λεχθέντα πρὸς τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου δῆλος ἦν ὑπεραγωνιῶν, “σὺ δὲ” ἔφη “τὴν μὲν γνώμην ἐρρωμένος τις ἄρα ἦσθα, τὸ λῆμα δὲ ἀσθενέστερος· γνωρίζω δέ σε ἄλλοις τε καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῖς νῦν. Ἀλλὰ θῆγε τὸ φρόνημα καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀνδρειότερον ὀρθοῦ τὴν γνώμην ...

Seeing that Cnemon was flinching from this – for he was obviously distressed as he reported the Egyptian's words – Theagenes said, “You always were the sort of person who is vigorous of mind, but weaker of spirit. I know what you're like particularly from your present behaviour. Whet your resolve! Direct your mind to the more manly course! ...” (Hld. 2.18.3-4).

Just as we observed that Theagenes' *andreia* was a visible quality, so here Cnemon's *deilia* is apparent (Ἀποδειλιῶντα ... τὸν Κνήμωνα θεασάμενος ὁ Θεαγένης, ... δῆλος ἦν ὑπεραγωνιῶν),<sup>137</sup> and it is his current behaviour that most serves to characterise him before others (γνωρίζω δέ σε ἄλλοις τε καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῖς νῦν). We have seen that *andreia* was conceived as a fusion of wise thought and physical action, and this is precisely the conception that Theagenes enunciates here; in his combined criticism and exhortation of Cnemon, Theagenes offers a holistic definition of *andreia*, comprising γνώμη, φρόνημα, and λῆμα: it is all very well for Cnemon to possess the first of these qualities, but if he is unable to direct it and unwilling to act, he cannot be said to be *andreios* – he may have γνώμη, but even that requires channelling. The qualities listed here correspond to those later attributed to Hydaspes, Theagenes, and Charicleia; poor Cnemon, however, is a pale imitation of these higher beings; he may have presence of mind, as his escape from Thermouthis will show,<sup>138</sup> but he lacks the gumption to tackle a

<sup>136</sup> See above, p.101.

<sup>137</sup> Is there perhaps a play-on-words here? Δῆλος sounds very much like δειλός.

<sup>138</sup> 2.19.6-7. Note, however, that even this is not without qualification: the excuse he invents of having loose bowels characterises him more as a figure from the comic stage than the epic battlefield;

physical threat: being truly *andreios* requires a combination of intellect and daring. Cnemon, then, has only the external appearance of *andreia*, and Heliodorus' implicit comparison of him with Theagenes informs the reader that the latter has both the appearance and the substance of *andreia*, a fact that will be demonstrated beyond doubt by his exploits in the final book.

### ***Suicidal andreia.***

Aristotelian ethics did not honour suicide for love as an *andreios* end, considering its goal ignoble.<sup>139</sup> The novels, however, are full of suicide attempts made for precisely this reason: suicide for love is a generic motif.<sup>140</sup> Both Theagenes and Chaereas exhibit forms of *andreia* which might be thought to live up to classical ideals, but what is the reader to make of their willingness to die for love? Haynes (2003: 92) suggests that Chariton's primary readership may not have viewed Chaereas' repeated recourse to suicide negatively, and that the text makes 'no criticism either implicit or explicit of behaviour we might choose to term cowardly' (*ibid.* 93). Only Charicles casts aspersions on the merit of suicide, saying that he did not commit suicide after the death of his daughter and wife, as he had been taught that it was sinful.<sup>141</sup> If we accept that suicide attempts are the novelistic hero's expression of an inability to live without his beloved,<sup>142</sup> and therefore of the depth of his love, then Charicles' words read more as a response to a possible question from the reader, 'Why did he not kill himself after a loss of this kind?', than as a straightforward condemnation of suicide on religious or ethical grounds.<sup>143</sup> I would argue that the novels deliberately take a markedly anti-Aristotelian position on this matter. For the novelistic hero or heroine, *not* to seek suicide (whether one goes through with it or not) after the death of or separation from one's beloved is tantamount to *deilia* – a neat reversal of the Aristotelian view. Chaereas, for instance, curses himself as

---

coming hard on the heels of a Homeric simile (2.19.5) and an epic-style time-check (2.19.6), the effect of the diarrhoea pretext is even more ironic.

<sup>139</sup> Arist. *EN* 1116a13ff.; not all suicides are ignoble, but only those done to escape from certain circumstances (see Garrison 1991: 18-20).

<sup>140</sup> Chaereas attempts suicide at 1.4.7, 1.5.2, 1.6.1, 3.3.1, 3.5.6, 5.10.10, 6.2.8, 6.2.11, and 7.1.6, and Theagenes at 2.2.1 and 2.5.1. Dionysius does so too at 2.6.2 and 3.1.1.

<sup>141</sup> Hld. 2.29.5. MacAlister (1996: 69) sees Charicles' view of suicide as a reflection of Neoplatonist belief.

<sup>142</sup> See MacAlister (*ibid.* 49).

<sup>143</sup> His words also suggest that his love for his wife and child was not the equal of the hero and heroine's love for each other.

*deilos* for not taking his own life when separated from Callirhoe and subject to what he sees as the tyranny of others,<sup>144</sup> while, as we have seen, Charicleia anticipates being praised for her *andreia* following (perhaps) her suicide in Theagenes' stead,<sup>145</sup> and Anthia decides that she is not so *anandros* or *deilē* that she would choose life over fidelity to Habrocomes.<sup>146</sup>

Chaereas' attempt to drown himself when implored by his parents not to leave them should also be interpreted with sensitivity, rather than written off as cowardice or passivity.<sup>147</sup> His mother's exposure of her breasts equates her with Hecuba and by extension equates Chaereas with Hector. This both aligns him with epic heroes in terms of military potential, and endows him with an emotional dimension that such heroes might be thought to lack,<sup>148</sup> for while Hector could not be persuaded by his parents, Chaereas is so emotionally affected that he cannot refuse either of the obligations he feels – either that to his parents or that to his wife. MacAlister (1996: 54-55) notes that suicide for motives of honour and shame generally met with approval, and I would suggest that Chaereas' indecision and resultant suicide attempt in this scene should be interpreted in precisely this way. To give in to his parents' pleas would give rise to shame at his abandonment of Callirhoe; equally, to ignore those pleas would be to dishonour his parents. Chaereas thus finds himself at an impasse that only a suicide attempt can resolve; the forcible rescue by his fellow sailors then enables him to go against his parents without really dishonouring them.<sup>149</sup> If we read further we might understand Chaereas' suicide attempt as a noble act of *philia*: Chariton describes Polycharmus' hoodwinking of his own parents in order to sail with Chaereas as 'another' (τι ... ἄλλο) example of φιλία that is οὐκ ἄγεννές;<sup>150</sup> this seems to imply that Chaereas' action is the first such example, since behaving with honour toward one's parents and one's wife would indeed constitute *philia*. Chaereas' attempt at self-drowning thus allows him to break a stalemate without dishonouring the bonds of *philia*.

<sup>144</sup> Chariton 5.2.5.

<sup>145</sup> See above, p.108-109.

<sup>146</sup> See above, p.105-106.

<sup>147</sup> Chariton 3.5.6.

<sup>148</sup> van Wees (1998), however, emphasises the often extrovert nature of male emotion in Greek epic.

<sup>149</sup> MacAlister (1996: 29) suggests that Chaereas' behaviour here may be an assertion of identity in the face of his parents' attempt to control him; this may be correct, as we shall see shortly that autonomy plays a part in the ability to display *andreia*.

<sup>150</sup> 3.5.7.

So the novels do not seem to relate suicide to *deilia*, and it does not seem to matter whether or not death is actually achieved: a suicide attempt may be said to constitute an act of *andreia*. Achilles, however, takes the motif of abortive suicide to an ironic extreme which works to characterise Cleitophon as *deilos*, and clearly engages with the Aristotelian concept of the noble death. Thinking he had seen Leucippe sacrificed, Cleitophon prepared to stab himself, but stalled the blow when he saw two men approaching; he states that he had presumed them to be bandits, and had delayed so that he ‘might die at their hands’.<sup>151</sup> Rather than simply being thwarted by a friend (the usual pattern in such situations), Cleitophon actually hopes that someone else will do the deed for him: if novelistic suicide may be understood as an *andreios* act, then Cleitophon is conspicuously *deilos*; the placement of the scene shortly after Cleitophon’s exhibitionistic cavalry manoeuvres gives it an additional piquancy. The two supposed brigands, Menelaus and Satyrus, then fulfil the expected function of ‘hero’s friend’, physically restraining Cleitophon from suicide. He begs them not to prevent him from seeking his *kalos thanatos*, which he states is a response to the loss of Leucippe, and which he expects to be a cure for his troubles (φαρμάκου τῶν κακῶν); in any case, he says, the ‘sword’ of his grief is already killing him.<sup>152</sup> Cleitophon’s words fix his actions in a specifically Aristotelian context: as with Theagenes after his flight from battle, it is as though he has suddenly realised the *deilia* apparent in his hesitation, and is now trying to recast his actions in an Aristotelian light, presumably hoping to give them a noble colouring. However, his use of Aristotelian terminology reveals a misunderstanding of Aristotle’s ethical arguments: for Aristotle, a *kalos thanatos* is found in battle; suicide for love, or as an escape from troubles or from grief, would be anything but a noble death. Cleitophon thus emerges as *deilos* whether he is viewed from the perspective of romantic fiction or from that of Aristotelian ethics. We saw in Chapter 1 that Cleitophon’s *paideia* is little more than superficial: he knows the words, but does not necessarily understand them or use them for the right purposes. Here he misappropriates the language of Aristotelian *andreia*, with the result that his understanding of the virtue appears significantly flawed.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Ach. Tat. 3.17.1.

<sup>152</sup> 3.17.3-4.

<sup>153</sup> We find another misunderstanding or perversion of *andreia* in the case of bandits in the novels. Thyamis’ gang praises him for his *andragathia* in capturing such a fine specimen as Charicleia: their topsy-turvy view of *andragathia* identifies as positive, manly behaviour the looting of a holy temple

We also find the generic suicide motif in Longus, although it is characteristically ‘downsized’ and given a pastoral spin. When Chloe and the animals are carried off by the Methymnaeans, Daphnis blames the Nymphs and resolves to wait in their sanctuary ‘either for death or a second war’.<sup>154</sup> In the final book Eudromus warns Daphnis that Gnathon plans to take him back to the city, and Daphnis determines either to flee or to make a suicide pact with Chloe.<sup>155</sup> Shortly afterwards, thinking that Astylus is about to seize him on Gnathon’s behalf, Daphnis runs away, intending to throw himself from the headland.<sup>156</sup> The motivations for these suicide threats are actually rather complex, and are related to Daphnis’ masculine status as it develops throughout the novel. We shall see in Chapter 3 that Daphnis gradually acquires a subliminal sense of elite masculinity and the values it entails. His contemplations of suicide seem to be a part of that sense. The first example is somewhat similar to Cleitophon’s suicide attempt: rather than actively seeking suicide, Daphnis decides to wait for death, or for a war which he presumably expects to kill him. His passivity here might be taken as a sign of his immaturity, but a hint is also given that he is acquiring an understanding of honour and shame – an understanding that is vital for his progression to the status of elite adult male: it is not only the loss of Chloe that makes him wish for death, but also the loss of his animals, which he interprets as a failure at his job and thus as a cause of shame before his parents;<sup>157</sup> his desire for death therefore has a positive motivation in classical terms. The final two references to suicide are again driven both by

---

(Hld. 1.7.2); of course, the irony here is that Thyamis turns out truly to be a man of *andragathia*. In Chariton we find Theron making up his bandit gang from men who can bring certain qualities to his criminal enterprise: he rejects one man on the grounds that he is συνετός μὲν ἀλλὰ δειλός (1.7.2), implying that successful tomb-robbery requires *andreia* rather than *deilia*; as this is a criminal gang, however, the word *tolma* is used: another man is rejected because he is τολμηρός μὲν ἀλλὰ προδότης (*ibid.*). On entering Callirhoe’s tomb and believing he has seen a ghost, one of the robbers is mocked by Theron as *deilos* for being afraid of a woman (1.9.5; cf. Cnemon’s fear of Thisbe); Theron’s sarcastic description of him as καλός ληστής further perverts the concept of moral manliness (1.9.7). Latin fiction presents bandits as similarly perverted versions of the heroic soldier (e.g. Ap. *Met.* 4.8ff.; see Santoro L’Hoir (1992: 184-187) on Apuleius’ subversion of the concepts of *vir/virtus* in the bandit scenes). See Hopwood (1998) for banditry as a dystopian version of the military. We will look in Chapter 3 at the assimilation of Cleitophon to a bandit.

<sup>154</sup> Longus 2.22.4.

<sup>155</sup> 4.18.2.

<sup>156</sup> 4.22.2.

<sup>157</sup> 2.22.3: Ποίοις ποσὶν ἄπειμι παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης, λειπεργάτης ἐσόμενος; ἔχω γὰρ νέμειν ἔτι οὐδέν. Morgan (2004: 190) notes that this is also a wry adaptation of a generic *topos* found at X. Eph. 5.10.4, where Habrocomes worries that his parents will see him return home without Anthia; the difference is that Habrocomes has undergone many ordeals, while Daphnis patently has not.

Daphnis' feared separation from Chloe, and by notions of honour and shame as they relate to the elite male sexual role.<sup>158</sup> It is interesting to note, however, that in the last of these suicide references, there is no indecision or passivity, no 'either-or' phrase: the perceived threat is imminent, and Daphnis opts immediately for suicide. This newfound activity may signify a transition to manhood, but the manner of death chosen is somewhat ambiguous in its connotations. MacAlister (1996: 54-55) remarks that contradictory and ambivalent attitudes toward suicide existed in the ancient world, and that the chosen means of suicide was considered significant. She suggests that death by jumping tended to brand the suicide a coward (*ibid.* 66), while swords and similar weapons may have been thought to bring a more manly death (*ibid.* 55).<sup>159</sup> The ambiguity of Daphnis' intention to jump from the headland may be a part of Longus' general atmosphere of enigma and subversion, but the reader might also consider that Daphnis has few options for suicide in a sword-free pastoral world.<sup>160</sup>

#### **Andreia and autonomy.**

Although suicide may constitute an *andreios* act in the world of romantic fiction, a more traditional conception of *andreia* as a physical quality linked to the agent's autonomy is still very much in evidence. While *andreia* came to be conceived as at least partially a form of endurance, in his examination of Plato's *Laches*, Schmid observes that Socratic *andreia*:

... must consist in something more than mere wise or prudent endurance ...; it must also involve the will to attack boldly and win the victory, and the power to move swiftly towards its object (Schmid 1992: 112).

---

<sup>158</sup> This role will be examined in detail in Chapter 3.

<sup>159</sup> As the weapon of hand-to-hand warfare, the sword might be seen as a symbol of *andreia*, and thus invested with manliness. It may be significant in this context that among Daphnis' recognition tokens is a small sword (1.3.3), which is mentioned again when the tokens are brought out before Dionysophanes to prove that Daphnis is not a suitable sexual amusement for Gnathon (4.21.2). Cf. Cleitophon's suicide attempt, where great emphasis is placed on the sword: the noun τὸ ξίφος is used five times in this short scene (Ach. Tat. 3.17.1-4). See also Petr. 82, where Encolpius' sword is confiscated, an occurrence that implies a negative evaluation of his masculinity.

<sup>160</sup> For literary models for this form of suicide, see Morgan (2004: 238).



This suggests the ability to be proactive when circumstances require it. Such a conception of *andreia* demands that, while passivity and the endurance of fate may be a legitimate aspect of a man's character, he must also willingly place himself in an agonistic context when he is not necessarily under any obligation to do so. When Chaereas believes Callirhoe to have been awarded to Dionysius by the king, he first contemplates suicide, and is then persuaded by Polycharmus to exact vengeance on the king with his own life.<sup>161</sup> To die ὡς ἄνδρες is an aspiration to which any Homeric warrior could have related wholeheartedly. As we saw in Chapter 1, the proper performance of masculinity required a man to defend himself against personal insults,<sup>162</sup> and Chaereas now begins to live up to this masculine image by his new commitment to revenge: he now has 'the two greatest incentives to bravery [ἀνδρείαν], desire for death and desire for revenge'.<sup>163</sup> It is not only the capacity to exact revenge upon an enemy that characterises the ideal Greek male, but also the maintenance of autonomy, the ability to retain independence of person (Fisher: 1998: 70).<sup>164</sup> In this regard it may be significant that Chaereas experiences a twofold loss of autonomy in the novel: firstly a metaphorical slavery to love, and secondly a literal slavery. Chariton first makes the connection between manliness and autonomy when Chaereas and Polycharmus are on the chain gang in Caria: Chaereas is unable to do his share of the work because his love for Callirhoe is sapping him of his strength; Polycharmus, by contrast, is said to be naturally *andrikos* and not enslaved by love, and is therefore able to both his own and Chaereas' work.<sup>165</sup>

Chaereas' enslavement to love appears to preclude him to some extent from displaying his manliness.<sup>166</sup> By the time of the Egyptian revolt, however, his metaphorical enslavement is over; he has abandoned all hope of winning Callirhoe back, and is thus able to perform incredible feats of *andreia*, driven by his newfound

---

<sup>161</sup> Chariton 7.1.7-8.

<sup>162</sup> See above, p.80-81.

<sup>163</sup> 7.2.4; trans. Goold.

<sup>164</sup> In discussing Artemisia's exhibition of *andreia* in Herodotus (Hdt. 7.99), Harrell (2003: 81ff.) argues that it is an absence of compulsion that enables Artemisia to show *andreia*: *andreia* is the mark of an autonomous being, and having succeeded her dead husband, Artemisia possesses this autonomy.

<sup>165</sup> 4.2.3.

<sup>166</sup> Alston (1998: 206ff.) observes that in Roman society the ability of a *vir* to wield power depended upon legal, financial, and personal autonomy; a threat to autonomy carried a concomitant threat to his status as a *vir*.

autonomy and desire for revenge.<sup>167</sup> His characterisation, then, is perhaps not as inconsistent as it has previously been thought, but might be seen as a reflection of the circumstances in which he finds himself.<sup>168</sup> We might compare the newly autonomous Chaereas with Dionysius, who is described as a ὑπήκοος, and is thus obliged to take part in the king's expedition.<sup>169</sup> By contrast, Χαίρεα παρήγγειλεν οὐδείς· βασιλέως γὰρ δοῦλος οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ τότε μόνος ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἐλεύθερος.<sup>170</sup> Although Dionysius quickly and eagerly assumes his military role, there is a suggestion of compulsion: as a subject of the Persian king, he has no choice but to fight,<sup>171</sup> while Chaereas is an autonomous warrior, bound not by subservience to another man, but by the conventions of classical masculinity; consequently, the extent of Dionysius' *andreia* is somewhat less impressive than that of Chaereas,<sup>172</sup> who successfully storms Tyre, the only city holding out against the Egyptians.<sup>173</sup> Autonomy is of great importance in Aristotelian *andreia*, where 'a man must not be *andreios* because of compulsion, but because it is noble to be so'.<sup>174</sup> And yet autonomy in the presentation of manliness can never be total, as cultural codes oblige men to behave in certain ways; as Greenblatt (1980: 256)

<sup>167</sup> In fact, at 7.2.4 Chaereas states, 'I continue to live only in order to inflict pain on my enemy' (trans. Goold); see Balot (1998: 157).

<sup>168</sup> Chaereas' *andreia* is made to appear natural by virtue of his ethnic origins: on his first address to his troops prior to his assault on Tyre, he claims to be of Dorian stock (7.3.8), just as Herodotus claims Artemisia is of Dorian descent; Harrell (2003: 83) remarks that 'At least by the time of the Peloponnesian wars, Dorians were considered superior in the manly arena of war'. We are also given an indication of Chaereas' capacity for military leadership in Book 3, when he sets out to search Libya for Callirhoe, while Hermocrates searches Syracuse (3.3.8); although Chaereas is presented as despairing at 3.3.14, he is soon capable of leadership once more when taking Theron back to Sicily (3.3.18).

<sup>169</sup> 6.9.1. See also 4.6.8, where the king summons Dionysius to Babylon for the trial, referring to him as his 'slave'.

<sup>170</sup> 7.1.1. In reading Chaereas' trials as a rite of passage, Couraud-Lalanne (1998: 544) sees the burning of Hermocrates' trireme, on which Chaereas had been travelling, as the point at which he acquires a decisive freedom of action.

<sup>171</sup> Dionysius is not only subject to the king's rule, but is also reliant on his favour, hoping that he will grant him Callirhoe in return for outstanding service (6.9.3).

<sup>172</sup> Dionysius commands 5,000 troops (7.5.14), while Chaereas achieves his success with only 300, a figure which of course equates him with Leonidas at Thermopylae (7.3.9).

<sup>173</sup> Note that the Tyrians are 'by nature a most warlike race, eager to maintain a reputation for bravery [ἐπ' ἀνδρείῳ] lest they be thought to disgrace Heracles, who is their chief deity' (7.2.7; trans. Goold); Chaereas' victory implies that he possesses more *andreia* than they. In light of the Tyrian reputation for fighting ability it is an amusing irony that the *deilos* Cleitophon is a native of Tyre (Ach. Tat. 1.3.1); given that Achilles problematises his hero's reliability by making him a Phoenician (Morales 2004: 48ff.), it does not seem far-fetched to think that the reader is intended to recall another great Phoenician stereotype, bellicosity. Heliodorus turns the Phoenicians' warlike reputation on its head by presenting his Phoenician merchants as somewhat cowardly when faced by pirates (Hld. 5.25). On Phoenician stereotypes, see Briquel-Chatonnet (1992); this is an issue to which we shall return in Chapter 3 and in the Conclusion.

<sup>174</sup> Arist. *EN* 1116b2: δεῖ δ' οὐ δι' ἀνάγκην ἀνδρεῖον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅτι καλόν.

observes in his study of Renaissance texts, any autonomy in acts of self-fashioning is necessarily limited, because the choice of action can only be made from a narrow set of possibilities authorised by the social and ideological system in which the man finds himself.

While perhaps not autonomous, Dionysius' *andreia* is presented as a quality to be performed, and he is clearly aware of its performative nature:

κοσμησάμενος δὲ ὄπλοις καλλίστοις καὶ ποιήσας στίφος οὐκ  
εὐκαταφρόνητον ἐκ τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ  
φανερωτάτοις κατέταξεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ δῆλος ἦν πράξων τι γενναῖον,  
οἷα δὴ καὶ φύσει φιλότιμος ἀνὴρ καὶ οὐ πάρεργον τὴν ἀρετὴν  
τιθέμενος, ἀλλὰ τῶν καλλίστων ἀξιώων.

Having arrayed himself in the finest armour and formed a formidable troop from those with him, he positioned himself in the vanguard and amongst those who were most conspicuous. It was clear that he would accomplish a noble deed, being by nature an ambitious man and one who did not treat *aretē* as a mere accessory, but deemed it one of the finest things (Chariton 6.9.2).

The display-oriented nature of Dionysius' approach to war is not difficult to see, but it is also not superficial: he both looks like, and intends to behave as, a man of *andreia*, proving his *aretē*. The performative adjective φανερωτάτοις seems to suggest both distinction for fighting ability and vulnerability to attack. In placing himself amongst these men in the front ranks, Dionysius is thus doubly praiseworthy, for he demonstrates prowess in battle and fearlessness in the face of danger: he is every inch the Aristotelian warrior, for although compelled to fight, he takes to the role enthusiastically, and is clearly undaunted by threat of death, going on to display his military ability in full view of the Persian king, and to prevent the escape of the Egyptian pharaoh.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>175</sup> 7.5.12-13; the profusion of display- and competition-oriented vocabulary is striking: τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ διέφυγεν, εἰ μὴ Διονύσιος ἔργον θαυμαστὸν ἐπεδείξατο· κἄν τῇ συμβολῇ <γὰρ> ἠγωνίαστο λαμπρῶς, αἰεὶ μαχόμενος πλησίον βασιλέως, ἵνα αὐτὸν βλέπη, καὶ πρῶτος ἐτρέψατο τοὺς καθ' αὐτόν ... Cf. the similarly competitive and performative spirit with which Chaereas' troops display their abilities to him at 7.5.11: ὀλίγον τε ἐπενόουν οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ ὠρμητο καὶ τριήραρχοι καὶ κυβερνήται καὶ ναῦται καὶ στρατιῶται πάντες ὁμοίως, τίς προθυμίαν ἐπιδείξεται Χαιρέα πρῶτος.

After describing Dionysius' eager assumption of a prominent military role, Chariton turns his focus to Chaereas, and again stresses the performativity of such a role. We noted in Chapter 1 both the Egyptian king's observation of Chaereas' *paideia*, and the fact that Chaereas appeared to realise the need for some impression management.<sup>176</sup> Let us return now to the vocabulary used there:

ἐπήγειρε δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν καὶ διαπρεπέστερον ἐποίησεν ἢ πρὸς βασιλέα φιλονεικία καὶ τὸ δεῖξαι θέλγειν ὅτι οὐκ ἦν εὐκαταφρόνητος, ἀλλ' ἄξιος τιμῆς.

But what spurred him on more and made him even more conspicuous was rivalry with the king and the desire to demonstrate that he was not contemptible, but worthy of honour (Chariton 7.2.6).

The sense of performance is emphasised not only by the verb δεῖξαι, but also by the adjective διαπρεπέστερος, which denotes a highly visual, eye-catching display.<sup>177</sup> We have observed the competitive nature of *andreia*,<sup>178</sup> and here we find Chaereas spurred on to show his *andreia* by the sense of rivalry he feels towards the Persian king. This drive to *andreia* is verbally linked with that of Dionysius by οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος, which was used of the troop Dionysius formed; we are thus led to believe that Chaereas' achievements will be no less spectacular than those of his older and more experienced rival, and that he is now as aware of his image before others as was Dionysius.<sup>179</sup> Moreover, Chaereas' father-in-law, Hermocrates, is established early on as a successful general (*i.e.* a man of *andreia*) and one who is οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος;<sup>180</sup> the use of the same vocabulary of Chaereas retrospectively identifies him with the illustrious general. The text continues its concentration on the performative quality of *andreia* by introducing Chaereas' success at Tyre with the words Εὐθύς οὖν ἔργον ἐπεδείξατο μέγα.<sup>181</sup>

<sup>176</sup> See above, p.67-68.

<sup>177</sup> *LSJ* s.v. διαπρεπής.

<sup>178</sup> See above, p.92-93.

<sup>179</sup> In Chapter 1 we saw that Dionysius was also concerned not to appear εὐκαταφρόνητος before his servants for having fallen in love with Callirhoe; see above, p.53.

<sup>180</sup> 1.2.4.

<sup>181</sup> 7.2.6. It may be relevant to their displays of military *andreia* and leadership that both Chaereas and Dionysius are fathers: military handbooks of the imperial period state that a good general should be a father of children; see Campbell (1987: 13) on Onasander's treatise on generalship.

So Chaereas' autonomy results in a grand display of military *andreia*. In Theagenes' case too, autonomy seems to play an important role, though this time in an athletic context. While we noted that Theagenes saw the need to be passive, and to retreat from battle in order to preserve himself for Charicleia, at the Pythian Games he recognises the need to be active. In the footrace scene there is no sense of compulsion: the decision to compete and to place himself in a perilous situation is entirely Theagenes' own. Unlike in warfare, the peril comes not from the possibility of death, but from the possibility of loss of reputation, a fact emphasised by Calasiris' reference to the ἄδοξία Theagenes will suffer should he lose the race.<sup>182</sup> The potential for loss of reputation is quite real, for his opponent is said to be extremely successful.<sup>183</sup> The fact that Theagenes has never been beaten on foot makes his loss of the race simultaneously less likely and more serious should it happen, since he has such a glorious reputation to maintain.<sup>184</sup> In our consideration of Lucian's *Anacharsis*, we saw that athletics was sometimes viewed as training for warfare.<sup>185</sup> The fact that the event in which Theagenes chooses to compete is the *hoplitodromos* underscores the close relationship between athletics and warfare in the construction of the *andreios* male.<sup>186</sup> Theagenes' victory is indicative of his potential skill in battle, a potential that is later fulfilled in his hand-to-hand combat with Pelorus.

### ***Wise andreia.***

We have discussed above some very physical military and athletic examples of *andreia*. As we noted earlier, however, *andreia* was not simply a physical virtue, but was also related to *paideia* and *phronēsis*.<sup>187</sup> It is this aspect that we now consider,

<sup>182</sup> Hld. 4.2.2.

<sup>183</sup> 4.2.1.

<sup>184</sup> 4.2.3: οὐδείς ἐς τὴν σήμερον ποσί με παρελθὼν ἐσεμύνατο. Theagenes' words here seem to be an amusing reversal of those of Odysseus at the Phaeacian Games: Odysseus is confident in every event *except* the footrace, where he fears he may be beaten (Hom. *Od.* 8.230-231: οἷοισιν δείδοικα ποσὶν μὴ τίς με παρέλθῃ Φαιήκων ...); on the Phaeacian Games as a particularly masculine, performative, and competitive context, see Doherty (1992). The claim never to have been beaten is common in imperial agonistic inscriptions (see König 2005: 148; see also Dio's Melancomas oration 29.11); it is one which allies Theagenes with the 'swift-footed' Achilles, and it is indeed immediately followed by Calasiris' statement that Theagenes looks exactly like Achilles (4.3.1). We shall return to the claim of invincibility shortly.

<sup>185</sup> See above, p.93-95.; cf. Philostratus' *Gymnasticus* 7ff., which relates the various athletic forms to specific military contexts of the Greek past (see also Anderson 1986: 269-270).

<sup>186</sup> Cf. the Delphic pageant, where Theagenes appears in battle gear, displaying his military potential; see also the *pyrrichē* of the young Thessalian men at 3.10.3.

<sup>187</sup> See above, p.95ff.

looking to Chariton first. The first half of Chariton's text focuses on *paideia*, as Dionysius struggles to maintain his accustomed character under the assault of his developing love and desire for Callirhoe. At the midpoint of the story we see a change in narrative focus, the result of which is a concentration on *andreia*. Chariton signals this new phase in the novel by a recapitulation of the story so far at the beginning of the fifth book, and our entry into a world of *andreia* appears to be flagged by his description of the Persian palace courtroom where the trial over Callirhoe is due to take place: as we might expect, the courtroom is assembled in an agonistic style, but this style is also specifically military, with a reference to the presence of *λοχαγοί* and *ταξίαρχοι*, both military positions.<sup>188</sup> After the sudden appearance of Chaereas at the trial, the king grants a five-day postponement,<sup>189</sup> and as we saw in the last chapter, Dionysius employs his *paideia* in an attempt to endure the delay, but we are told that even the most *andreios* man would not be able to tolerate the situation.<sup>190</sup> The passage suggests a latent interplay between *paideia* and *andreia* in matters of self-comportment, to the extent that the two concepts are near-synonyms, or at the very least operate in a synergistic relationship. We are reminded of Dio's Diogenes-Alexander dialogue in which Diogenes remarked that divine *paideia* was sometimes known as *andreia*.<sup>191</sup> In her discussion of philosophical conceptions of *andreia*, Cullyer (2003: 225) notes that Platonic and Stoic thought viewed *andreia* as a 'quieter' virtue, constituted by endurance and self-control as much as by perseverance in physical action. This is an interpretation apparent in Dionysius' efforts to cope with the delay in the trial.<sup>192</sup> Balot (1998: 156) notes the emphasis on martial valour in the latter part of Chariton's novel, but he does not, in my view, appreciate the link in socio-cultural thought between *andreia* and rational judgement. He sees Chariton's examination of 'self-mastery as a masculine ideal' (*ibid.*) as discrete from bravery, effectively amputating *andreia* from rationality and self-analysis. But we have observed that *andreia* was intimately connected to the rational faculties, and to such a degree that, I would suggest, Chariton has no need to

---

<sup>188</sup> Chariton 5.4.5. See also 5.4.1, where the run-up to the trial is described in military terms which serve to flag the shift of emphasis, and also to equate love and war, an equation we shall explore further at the end of this chapter.

<sup>189</sup> 5.9.8.

<sup>190</sup> See above, p.63.

<sup>191</sup> See above, p.98.

<sup>192</sup> Chariton's reference to *andreia* here may also imply that the contest for Callirhoe will in the last analysis come down to a display of *andreia*; yet we should note that it is not military victory that finally dictates who wins the prize, but love itself (Balot 1998: 159).

invest much energy in depicting the connection. He has not, therefore, abandoned his investigation into human psychology, as Balot would argue (*ibid.*), for the link between *andreia* and right judgement is for the most part implicit: *andreia* and *paideia* are not opposing concepts, as we see from Dionysius' efforts to endure the delay in the trial.

We also see the importance of right thinking and self-control as a complement to the physical side of *andreia* in the characterisation of Chaereas. We saw in Chapter 1 that when Chaereas joins the Egyptian army, the pharaoh recognises that he has *paideia*.<sup>193</sup> Chaereas then storms the city of Tyre, demonstrating his capacity for *andreia* in a traditional context, but also employing intelligence in order to inveigle his way into the city.<sup>194</sup> Chariton remarks quite pointedly that Chaereas is the only man able to show self-control in the thick of the fighting,<sup>195</sup> and after this incredible military success he is considered by his men to be τὸν ἀνδρειότατον καὶ κάλλιστον ...<sup>196</sup> As we have noted, Chaereas is to some extent modelled intertextually on Achilles;<sup>197</sup> rash behaviour and fighting ability are thus two qualities around which his characterisation is based. But even though warfare demands a very physical and aggressive attitude, Chaereas is able to restrain himself, and this self-restraint marks him out from others. So to be truly *andreios*, a man must demonstrate a fusion of physical strength and intellectual capacity, with self-control. Despite this self-control, Chaereas is later on the verge of making a rash decision to inform his troops of the Egyptian king's death, and must be counselled otherwise by Callirhoe.<sup>198</sup> Haynes (2003: 85) would interpret this in terms of

<sup>193</sup> 7.2.5.

<sup>194</sup> 7.4.5ff. Cf. Hydaspes' use of cunning in the siege of Syene: see below, p.136.

<sup>195</sup> 7.4.9: Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀδιηγῆται τούτῳ ταραχῶ μόνος ἐσωφρόνησε Χαιρέας; the phrase Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀδιηγῆται τούτῳ ταραχῶ is drawn from X. *Cyr.* 7.1.32. Cf. Artaxerxes, of whom the very similar phrase, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἀδιηγῆται ταραχῶ, was used, but who was displaying a lack of *sōphrosynē* by thinking of Callirhoe instead of the war (6.9.5). In his study of Attic orators, Roisman (2005: 110) notes that the possession of manly courage assumes the possession of other manly qualities such as reason and self-control.

<sup>196</sup> 7.5.11.

<sup>197</sup> See above, p.80 and p.111, n.95.

<sup>198</sup> 8.2.4. Chaereas also wishes to take the Persian queen and other notables as slaves, and must be dissuaded by Callirhoe's prudent advice to the contrary (8.3.1ff.). His willingness to heed Callirhoe's advice contrasts him with Hector, who refuses Andromache's advice (Hom. *Il.* 6.405ff.; see van Nortwick 2001); cf. Theagenes' similar willingness to accept Charicleia's counsel (e.g. *Hld.* 5.7). van Nortwick argues that Hector's rejection of Andromache's words derives from a need to define himself as autonomous, and that he cannot allow his autonomy to be compromised by intimacy; by contrast, Chaereas' and Theagenes' relationships with their beloveds seem to accommodate both autonomy and intimacy, with no sense of incompatibility between the two.

Chaereas' 'lack of independence and general initiative', though it may be more productive to see it as a mark of the quality of his relationship with Callirhoe, and of his inexperience. The salient point is that in the heat of battle, when he has no one to assist him and when it is most vital to be *sōphrōn*, he is able to retain clarity of thought and to act independently; he does not fail at the critical moment and is rightly 'proud of his achievements' as a military leader, and of the fact that he has not 'shamed' Callirhoe.<sup>199</sup>

Self-control and intelligence are evident in the case of Theagenes too, in his wrestling bout with the Ethiopian giant. The latter is said to be unrivalled both on the battlefield and in wrestling and boxing,<sup>200</sup> enabling us to read the scene as a conflation of warfare and athletics, similar to the earlier *hoplitodromos*. Theagenes faces up to the challenge with no qualms, assessing his situation and judging that cunning will serve him better than outright physical *andreia*:

Ὁ δὲ Θεαγένης, οἷα δὴ γυμνασίων ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀλοιφῆς ἐκ νέων ἀσκητῆς τὴν τε ἐναγώνιον Ἑρμοῦ τέχνην ἠκριβωκῶς, εἴκειν τὰ πρῶτα ἔγνω καὶ ἀπόπειραν τῆς ἀντιθέτου δυνάμεως λαβῶν πρὸς μὲν ὄγκον οὕτω πελώριον καὶ θηριωδῶς τραχυνόμενον μὴ ὁμόσε χωρεῖν, ἐμπειρία δὲ τὴν ἄγροικον ἰσχὺν κατασοφίσασθαι.<sup>201</sup>

Theagenes, who was a lifelong devotee of the gymnasium and athletic endeavor and a past master in the art of combat whose patron god is Hermes, decided to give ground to start with: he had already experienced the power of his opponent and was resolved not to come to grips with such a monstrous hulk of a man in the full spate of his bestial fury, but rather to use skill to outwit brute force (Hld. 10.31.5; trans. Morgan).

We might relate the passage to Dio's dialogue between Achilles and Cheiron, in which Achilles is warned that his brawn will be defeated by wisdom.<sup>202</sup> Here the giant's strength is *ἄγροικος* ('crude', 'rustic'), while Theagenes' strength is

<sup>199</sup> 8.1.17; trans. Goold.

<sup>200</sup> Hld. 10.24.3. Cf. the athletic success of Theagenes' opponent in the race (4.2.1); see also the description of Pelorus, which similarly highlights his indefatigability: ... ἀνδρὶ τὰ πάντα γενναίῳ καὶ φόνοις ἐγγεγυμνασμένῳ παμπόλλοις ... (5.32.4).

<sup>201</sup> The use of *πελώριον* and *τραχυνόμενον* seems designed to evoke Pelorus and Trachinus in the reader's mind: those rivals were both defeated, suggesting that this one will be too.

<sup>202</sup> See above, p.107, n.73. Here, though, we have a clever reversal, as it is Theagenes, the Achilles-figure, who will defeat brawn with wisdom; cf. above, p.131, n.184, on Odysseus at the Phaeacian Games.



complemented by years of experience in the gymnasium: with the clause οἶα δὴ γυμνασίων ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀλοιφῆς ἐκ νέων ἀσκητῆς τήν τε ἐναγώνιον Ἑρμοῦ τέχνην ἠκριβωκῶς, Heliodorus emphasises just how much time and effort Theagenes has invested in his gymnastic training. König (2005: 47-63) has demonstrated the importance of such training in the education of the elite, stressing that the gymnasium was also ‘regularly associated with the inculcation of the rhetorical, literary and musical skills which were seen as central to civilized elite identity’ (*ibid.* 51). Indeed, we noted at the end of Chapter 1 that Chaereas had had some form of educational experience in the gymnasium.<sup>203</sup> But while that experience was presented as a potential contributory factor in his downfall, in Theagenes’ case a *paideia* of the gymnasium gives rise to an intelligent *andreia* which proves his saviour. His athletic education is thus not solely physical, but is also indicative of other skills suggestive of manliness, including an understanding of when to apply force, and when it is more prudent to use other methods to secure victory:<sup>204</sup> as König remarks (*ibid.* 132), athletic success was often taken as a metaphor for many different virtues. Theagenes may be equated with Achilles, but he is clearly not the unthinking Achilles of Dio’s dialogue, or the efficient but rash warrior of the *Iliad*. Indeed, we have noted that he is also equated with Odysseus, who was famed not only for his endurance, but also for his cunning. Theagenes’ triumph is thus the result of a combination of Achillean strength and Odyssean cunning and endurance. Heliodorus is at pains to demonstrate that his hero can be more than the extremes of passive and active, and is capable of combining a traditional, physical *andreia* with intelligence and foresight. Theagenes’ use of intelligence characterises him as a civilised Greek, in contrast to the brutish barbarian giant, thereby locating the scene in a literary and cultural tradition that presented Greek intelligence and civilisation as superior to barbarian brute force (J.R. Morgan 1998: 62).<sup>205</sup> In examining imperial inscriptions, König (2005: 60) observes that ‘athletic victory at the highest level could open doors to membership of cities other than one’s own native community’. It may be significant in this regard that after Theagenes’ striking

<sup>203</sup> See above, p.77-79.

<sup>204</sup> The patronage of Hermes, god of *mētis*, over athletics suggests that the use of cunning was acceptable in the gymnasium; Hermes was also notably the god of eloquent speech, thus later becoming the god of education: wisdom and athletics were clearly perceived as having a close bond.

<sup>205</sup> Cf. Polydeuces’ triumph by skill in the boxing match with Amycus at A.R. 2.20ff.: see Lawall (1966: 132), who interprets this scene as a victory of civilisation over barbarism and intelligence over brawn; for other examples, see J.R. Morgan (1998: 62).

display of wise *andreia*, he and Charicleia are accepted as heirs to the Ethiopian throne; while she is a native of Ethiopia, the status brought by his athletic victory seems to have the power to confer upon him a high social status in a country that is not his own.<sup>206</sup>

Although Ethiopia may be a barbarian land, its ruler is cast in the mould of Hellenistic kingship discourse, and as Lalanne (2006: 187) observes, Hydaspes' *andreia* is a model for Theagenes, who will succeed him to the throne. In the figure of Hydaspes, Heliodorus both explores *andreia* as a virtue of wisdom and self-control, and problematises the roles of nature and culture in its formation. In his intricately-conducted siege of Syene, Hydaspes demonstrates his military abilities, as well as his willingness to employ a cunning stratagem if the circumstances call for it. It is worth noting that imperial military handbooks gave instruction on tricking the enemy in battle and conducting a successful siege (Campbell 1987: 16): as apparently with athletics, trickery was an accepted element of sensible warfare, which perhaps suggests how little Cleitophon knows about such things.<sup>207</sup> Here we have a form of *andreia* of which Odysseus would have approved: a capacity to succeed in open warfare, accompanied by the use of wit and wisdom in an effort to achieve the best results with the fewest casualties. Hydaspes' sense of justice as a true king is demonstrated in his treatment of the people of Syene after their capitulation; the Ethiopians address the Syenians as follows:

Ἵδάσπης ὁ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολαῖς καὶ δυσμαῖς Αἰθιοπῶν νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ὑμῶν βασιλεὺς πολεμίους τε ἐκπορθεῖν οἶδε καὶ ἰκέτας οἰκτεῖρειν πέφυκε, τὸ μὲν ἀνδρείον, τὸ δὲ φιλόανθρωπον δοκιμάζων καὶ τὸ μὲν χειρὸς εἶναι στρατιωτικῆς, τὸ δὲ ἴδιον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης.

Hydaspes, King of the Ethiopians who dwell to the East and to the West, and now your sovereign also, has the capacity to destroy his enemies utterly but is naturally inclined to take pity on suppliants. While he adjudges the former course a mark of strength befitting the act of a soldier, he considers the latter to show a love of humanity germane to his own character (Hld. 9.6.2; trans. Morgan).<sup>208</sup>

<sup>206</sup> Cf. the new political power that Dionysius' *paideia* brings him after the loss of Callirhoe (see above, p.64-65), and the εὐδοξία that Heliodorus' Tyrian merchant thinks his athletic victory at the Pythian Games has brought him, expecting it to win him Charicleia's hand (Hld. 5.19.2).

<sup>207</sup> See above, p.120.

<sup>208</sup> The Ethiopians go on to state that Hydaspes does not behave like a tyrant in times of victory, and Hydaspes himself later advises the captive Oroondates on the contrast between true kingship and

This seems to make two distinctions, the first between brute force and considered reaction, and the second between learned behaviour and nature. On the one hand, destroying one's enemies utterly is associated with *andreia*, and on the other, being lenient towards a conquered people is a mark of *philanthrōpia*. The latter is said to be Hydaspes' natural response (πέφυκε), which in turn suggests that *andreia*, by contrast, is learned behaviour, and therefore not natural; indeed, the use of οἶδε, while denoting ability, also suggests acquired knowledge.<sup>209</sup> However, while clemency and philanthropy are said to be natural, and things quite personal to Hydaspes himself (τὸ δὲ ἴδιον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης), we noted in Chapter 1 that clemency in response to appeals for mercy was in fact a mark of the *pepaideumenos* – the man of *culture*:<sup>210</sup> brute force and rational thought were usually equated to nature and culture respectively, but here Heliodorus seems to want to reverse this equation, making rational thought a natural part of Hydaspes' character, and brute force (implicitly) something learned. The import of the passage is that *andreia* is something that Hydaspes has learned to exhibit as a warrior, but that, as a good king and responsible man, he holds the force of *andreia* in check by the application of cultured, wise thought: a real man does not act on his impulses simply because he can.<sup>211</sup> But by attributing Hydaspes' clemency to nature, Heliodorus leaves the reader with the impression that the king has learned so well how to make wise decisions that the application of that cultured, wise decision-making to learned *andreia* assumes the appearance of the natural. Heliodorus makes much of the Greekness of his Ethiopians, and Hydaspes' hellenisation may be significant here: as a hellenised Ethiopian, he is able to apply learned standards of Greekness to his behaviour in such a seamless manner that they appear natural. Here we might think

---

tyranny (9.21.3). Hydaspes' characterisation in these scenes is foreshadowed by Thyamis' words to Arsace, concerning her intention to treat Theagenes and Charicleia as prisoners of war: 'And while it is in the nature of war to make slaves, it is in the nature of peace to set them free; the former act is a tyrant's whim [βούλημα τυραννικόν]; the latter shows the judgment of a true king [δόγμα βασιλικόν]. The true distinction between peace and war resides less in the inherent meaning of the words than in the deportment of the agents concerned' (8.4; trans. Morgan).

<sup>209</sup> Thanks to Ken Dowden for alerting me to the connotations of οἶδε here.

<sup>210</sup> See above, p.80.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Dionysius' reaction to Leonas' suggestion that he should have his way with Callirhoe because he is now her master (Chariton 2.6.3); see also Artaxerxes' response to a similar suggestion made by Artaxates (6.3.7): as we saw in Chapter 1, although a Persian, Artaxerxes is presented in a favourable light, a depiction that again draws heavily on Hellenistic ideas of kingship. Chariton's presentation of the Persian king contrasts markedly with Heliodorus', which in turn contrasts with the characterisation of Hydaspes: Oroondates refers to his king as punishing *deilia* more vigorously than he rewards *andreia* (Hld. 9.21.4), suggesting a man who lacks the balanced and circumspect outlook of the Ethiopian king.

of Butler's argument, cited in the Introduction,<sup>212</sup> that the cultural construction of gender is obscured by the credibility of gender performances: those performances make gendered behaviour seem necessary and natural.

When Charicleia's identity is revealed, we again encounter the nature/culture dichotomy. Hydaspes is torn between his newfound role as father, and his decision, as king, to sacrifice his daughter. We are told that his interior conflict is one of 'fatherly love and manly resolve [ἀνδρείῳ τῷ λήματι]', and that when he submits to those fatherly feelings, he is submitting to nature.<sup>213</sup> The scene thus establishes an opposition between private paternal feelings and the public duties of an *andreios* man, nature's victory implying that paternal feelings are more natural and stronger than the responsibilities of *andreia*. However, although Hydaspes acknowledges his paternity, he is committed to those responsibilities, which include the sacrifice of Charicleia. Yet we soon learn that his address to the Ethiopian populace is cleverly designed to cause the people to oppose his apparent will:<sup>214</sup> his rhetorical skill (his culturally-acquired *paideia*) therefore enables him to maintain his reputation for *andreia*, an *andreia* which partially consists in the fulfilment of his duties to his people.

We noted above that Hydaspes functions as a model for Theagenes,<sup>215</sup> and Heliodorus indeed makes a connection between the two men by problematising Theagenes' *andreia*. In describing Theagenes' response to the runaway bull, Heliodorus expresses uncertainty as to the origin of his hero's *andreia*: 'I cannot say whether what Theagenes did next was the product of his own innate courage [οἴκοθεν ἀνδρείῳ τῷ λήματι κινούμενος] or the inspiration of some god or other'.<sup>216</sup> Here we have precisely the vocabulary used of Hydaspes earlier. While we might think that οἴκοθεν implies a natural quality, the equation drawn between Theagenes and Hydaspes through the repetition of the phrase *andreion lēma* suggests that, as with Hydaspes, we are dealing with an *andreia* that is learned. *Oikothen* is simply intended to contrast with the possibility that Theagenes' exploits

<sup>212</sup> See above, p.9-10.

<sup>213</sup> 10.16.2; trans. Morgan.

<sup>214</sup> 10.17.1; on the design of this address, see Morgan (2006).

<sup>215</sup> See above, p.136.

<sup>216</sup> 10.28.4; trans. Morgan.

might be divinely-inspired: he is acting either because of an external impetus, or because of a learned *andreia* that has become an internal part of him.<sup>217</sup> In fact, this learned *andreia* is so much a part of Theagenes' make-up that, as we have seen, it is visible to onlookers.<sup>218</sup> When it comes to Theagenes' final chance to display his *andreia* in his fight with the giant, the reader has been prepared for his victory by means of his assimilation with Hydaspes: Theagenes may not be as strong as his Ethiopian opponent, but he will triumph by wit and cunning, becoming, by means of a display of wise *andreia*, the intellectual equal of his future father-in-law.<sup>219</sup> The question Heliodorus raises over the origin of Theagenes' action deliberately draws the reader's attention to the possible reasons for Theagenes' behaviour. This attention is then focused still further as the onlookers at first think he is trying to escape, but then gradually realise that his action is not an example of cowardice.<sup>220</sup> Finally, even Charicleia wonders what the purpose of Theagenes' behaviour might be.<sup>221</sup> The term τὸ ἐγχείρημα is used twice of Theagenes' action, suggesting that both the crowd and Charicleia see him as having chosen to act in this way, literally taking the situation in hand; in fact, the spectators are so impressed that they consider him divine (τὸν Θεαγένην λαμπρῶς ἐκθειάζειν).<sup>222</sup> A point is made of the precise moment at which Theagenes brings the bull down: right in front of the place where Hydaspes is sitting.<sup>223</sup> He then deliberately whips up the enthusiasm of Hydaspes and the crowd (συνεχῆς ἐπισειῶν εἰς τε τὸν Ὑδάσπην καὶ τὸ ἄλλο πλῆθος ἰλαρὸν ἀπέβλεπε). This is clearly a deliberate performance which influences the spectators' perception of him: a chance occurrence presents Theagenes with the opportunity to display his *andreia* before an audience which he is able to win over. Ironically, however, he has impressed his audience so much that they demand an encore, requesting that he fight the giant. It is then that we learn the

<sup>217</sup> Heliodorus' uncertainty as to the origin of Theagenes' *andreia* allows him to sustain the pose of non-omniscient narrator. In Theagenes' response to the runaway bull, the reader may be intended to see echoes of Jason's yoking of the fire-breathing bulls (A.R. 3.1306ff.), Theseus' slaying of the bull of Marathon, and perhaps even Mithras' tauroctony.

<sup>218</sup> See above, p.112ff.

<sup>219</sup> And also of his future wife, who used the (somewhat ambiguous) cunning of archery against the pirates on the beach.

<sup>220</sup> 10.28.5: ... μὴ ἀποδειλίασις ... This word serves to colour the scene with the classic opposition of *andreia* and *deilia*.

<sup>221</sup> 10.29.2: ... τό τε ἐγχείρημα ὃ τι καὶ βούλοιτο διαπορούσα ...

<sup>222</sup> 10.29.1. The use of ἐκθειάζειν may be a pun on Theagenes' name, which does indeed suggest descent from the gods; on the hero's name, see further Jones (2003: 24ff., 68ff.; 2006: 550ff.).

<sup>223</sup> 10.30.3.

reason for his displays of *andreia*: Charicleia has remained silent about their relationship.<sup>224</sup> Here we might think again of Greenblatt's argument that in acts of self-fashioning a choice of action can only be made from a limited set of socially-sanctioned possibilities.<sup>225</sup> Now, in the absence of Charicleia,<sup>226</sup> Theagenes *must* act, and the bolting of the bull enables him to produce a display of *andreia* which is bound to find favour with the populace because it restores their safety by bringing under control a rampaging animal; Theagenes' options for self-fashioning are limited, but he uses them well. It is not only in such public performances of masculinity that Theagenes excels, but also in private, erotic contexts. In the next section of this chapter we turn our attention to those contexts.

### *Erotic andreia.*

We have observed that Chaereas exhibits a form of *sōphrosynē* in his attack on Tyre, restraining his aggression at a time when no one else is capable of self-control. We have also observed something similar in the case of Hydaspes, exercising leniency towards the people of Syene. An association between *andreia* and *sōphrosynē* is common in texts with a philosophical or ethical element. We saw, for example, that Dio praised athletics as conducive to the development of both virtues: fighting skill must be complemented by self-restraint. But self-restraint in warfare and athletics was not the only form of *sōphrosynē* that the philosophical ideal demanded in a man. In the case of women, we noted that *andreia* was very much directed towards a sexual *sōphrosynē*, and this is true also of men, in whom *andreia* plays a part in the battle against desires and pleasures, as we saw from Plato's *Laches*. Similarly, as we observed in the *Symposium*, Alcibiades characterises Socrates' chaste response to him as evidence of his *sōphrosynē*, *andreia*, *phronēsis*, and *karteria*.<sup>227</sup> We said that athletic success is indicative of the possession of other virtues. Theagenes' first success comes at the Pythian Games, and it is after that that he displays his possession of sexual *sōphrosynē*, when he and Charicleia are alone in the Egyptian cave. The erotic charge of this scene is emphasised by the proliferation of semi-sexual vocabulary; in a manner similar to Longus, Heliodorus' stress on his

<sup>224</sup> 10.31.1.

<sup>225</sup> See above, p.128-129.

<sup>226</sup> She had been on the point of revealing their relationship, but was sent into the pavilion by Hydaspes (10.22); she has been able to see Theagenes' exploits, but not to participate.

<sup>227</sup> See above, p.95.

protagonists' chastity makes the reader culpable for the way in which he (almost inevitably) reads that vocabulary.<sup>228</sup>

τότε γὰρ πρῶτον ἰδίᾳ καὶ παντὸς ἀπηλλαγμένοι τοῦ ὀχλήσοντος ἀλλήλοις ἐντυχόντες ἀπαραποδίστων καὶ ὀλοσχερῶν περιπλοκῶν τε καὶ φιλημάτων ἐνεπίμπλαντο. Καὶ πάντων ἅμα εἰς λήθην ἐμπεσόντες εἶχοντο ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀλλήλων οἰονεὶ συμπεφυκότες, ἀγνεύοντος μὲν ἔτι καὶ παρθενεύοντος ἔρωτος κορεννύμενοι δάκρυσι δὲ ὑγροῖς καὶ θερμοῖς εἰς ἀλλήλους κεραυνύμενοι καὶ καθαροῖς μόνον μιγνύμενοι τοῖς φιλημασιν· ἢ γὰρ Χαρίκλεια τὸν Θεαγένην εἴ τι παρακινουῦντα αἰσθοίτο καὶ ἀνδρίζομενον ὑπομνήσει τῶν ὀρκῶν ἀνέστελλεν, ὁ δὲ οὐ χαλεπῶς ἐπανήγετο καὶ σωφρονεῖν ῥαδίως ἠνείχετο ἔρωτος μὲν ἐλάττων ἡδονῆς δὲ κρείττων γινόμενος.<sup>229</sup>

Now, for the first time, they were alone in one another's company with no one to interrupt them as they hugged and kissed to their heart's content with nothing to restrain or distract them. They instantly forgot their plight and clasped one another in a prolonged embrace so tight that they seemed to be of one flesh. But the love they consummated was sinless and undefiled; their union was one of moist, warm tears; their only intercourse was one of chaste lips. For if ever Charicleia found Theagenes becoming too ardent in the arousal of his manhood, a reminder of his oath was enough to restrain him; and he for his part moderated his conduct without complaint and was quite content to remain within the bounds of chastity, for though he was weaker than love, he was stronger than pleasure (Hld. 5.4.5; trans. Morgan, modified).

Having himself been turned on by this surfeit of sexy words, the reader is all the more impressed by Theagenes' self-restraint, coming as it does at the climax of the episode. The reader remembers that it was in this very cave that the discourse of *andreia* was first activated, with Theagenes' *andreia* being implied by reference to Cnemon's *deilia*. Now, Theagenes proves his possession of *andreia* in a sexual context by demonstrating *sōphrosynē*. In the case of Musonius' virtuous woman, the verb ἀνδρίζομαι referred to the defence of *sōphrosynē*, while here it obviously denotes a sexual demonstration of masculinity, which must be restrained by the application of *sōphrosynē*, rather as *andreia* must be controlled by *sōphrosynē* in

<sup>228</sup> See Morgan (2004: 148) on Longus' prologue, where the narrator's prayer to maintain *sōphrosynē* can be seen as 'a duplicitous indemnity clause, which alerts the reader to the fact that there is prurient material to come, and challenges him to find it by disingenuously suggesting that smut is in the eye of the beholder'.

<sup>229</sup> I have underlined those words with an attested sexual sense, or which might possibly be read as having such a sense.

battle and sport. This scene forms a sexual parallel to Theagenes' flight from the fighting outside the cave; there we saw a conscious decision not to show his masculinity in a military context, in order to preserve himself for Charicleia. Here he again retreats from the fray, and for the same reason: he must preserve himself for Charicleia's sake, for he has vowed to respect her chastity until they are married, and that promise entails respecting his own; a sexual demonstration of his *andreia* – his manliness – is thus out of the question.<sup>230</sup> Theagenes is conscious of the ideal he must try to live up to: it is acceptable for him to be 'weaker than love', but vital by the ethics of the masculine ideal that he prove himself stronger than his desire for pleasure, that he exhibit *sōphrosynē* in a situation where he has the power to indulge his desire – we should note that much is made of the couple's isolation (παντὸς ἀπηλλαγμένοι τοῦ ὀχλήσοντος; ἀπαραποδίστων), suggesting that Theagenes could easily take advantage of Charicleia, should he so desire. But he is sufficiently in control of himself that he needs only to be reminded of his oath in order to rein himself in. In the earlier swearing of that oath he had anticipated this precise scene:

... ἐπώμνυεν ὁ Θεαγένης, ἀδικεῖσθαι μὲν φάσκων εἰ προλήψει<sup>231</sup> τοῦ ὄρκου τὸ πιστὸν τοῦ τρόπου προὔποτέμεται, οὐ γὰρ ἔχειν ἐπιδείξειν προαίρεσιν φόβῳ τοῦ κρείττονος κατηναγκάσθαι νομιζόμενος ...

... Theagenes swore his oath, protesting that it was not fair that by a preemptive oath aspersions should be cast on his probity of character before it could be put to the test; he would not be able to display the power of moral choice, for people would think that he was acting under the compulsion of fear of heaven's wrath (Hld. 4.18.6; trans. Morgan).

Here again there is a strongly performative element: Theagenes wants to display (ἐπιδείξειν) his autonomy, and is concerned about how his motives for any future *sōphrosynē* might be perceived (νομιζόμενος). This concern in turn guides the reader in his interpretation of the later cave scene: Theagenes is *not* being *sōphrōn*

<sup>230</sup> The correlation between this erotic scene and the earlier military scene is emphasised by the description of Theagenes' self-restraint with ἐπανήγετο: ἐπανάγωμα can be used of military retreat.

<sup>231</sup> There is a metaliterary wink from Heliodorus in the use of προλήψει: this is indeed a prolepsis of the erotic cave scene. Theagenes seems almost conscious of his status as a romantic hero, whose devotion to his beloved is bound to be tested; for self-awareness under the gaze of the reader, see also his flight into the cave with Cnemon (above, p.116).



because of the oath, but because he *chooses* to be so,<sup>232</sup> and the ease (οὐ χαλεπῶς) and contentment (ἡνείχεται) with which he restrains himself contribute to his construction as a *sōphrōn* male. The decision *not* to show *andreia*, *not* to ‘be brave’ or ‘play the man’ in a sexual context, paradoxically invests Theagenes with *andreia*, with manliness, just as we observed in the presentation of his flight from battle: the man who is truly *andreios* exercises *sōphrosynē* by choice.

On that note, let us turn to Cleitophon, of whom the verb ἀνδρίζομαι is also used in a sexual sense, but who once again shows himself conspicuously *deilos*. After Cleitophon has kissed Leucippe for the first time, Satyrus sees an opportunity for his master to secure his desires: now is the ideal time ἀνδρίζεσθαι,<sup>233</sup> he advises Cleitophon, for he can take advantage of Leucippe’s mother’s illness, which is currently confining her to her room and rendering Leucippe more accessible. The recommendation may be interpreted at two levels. Firstly, we could understand it simply as an injunction for Cleitophon to take a more active role in wooing Leucippe. Secondly, the verb may be read as an encouragement for Cleitophon to give a physical demonstration of his masculinity by having sex with Leucippe. Indeed, if we understand the first sense of the verb, it naturally leads us to the second. Achilles establishes a contrast between the *andreia* he expects Cleitophon to show and the *malakia* of Leucippe’s mother (ἡ γὰρ μήτηρ τῆς κόρης ... μαλακίζεται).<sup>234</sup> To the reader versed in the erotic code of the genre, however, it will be Cleitophon who will show *malakia* if he should sleep with Leucippe before they are lawfully married. Achilles again uses ἀνδρίζομαι after Leucippe and Cleitophon have eloped together, and it is noteworthy that it occurs in a military context. The protagonists have fled the Egyptian bandits and joined the army, and they are assigned a house while the general awaits the arrival of reinforcements. As soon as they enter the house, Cleitophon grabs Leucippe and endeavours ἀνδρίζεσθαι,<sup>235</sup> but is easily rebuffed. The use of a verb that evokes *andreia* gives a

<sup>232</sup> The use of the term *proairesis*, a Stoic watchword, seems to suggest Stoic influence, making a distinction between what the body is forced to do and what the soul remains free to do (see Sandbach 1975: 165); can we see a similar influence in the bull-capturing scene, where we noted that Heliiodorus ponders whether Theagenes is divinely-inspired or acting freely? On this Stoic distinction, see also below, p.145, n.241, and on Stoic *proairesis* in Xenophon of Ephesus, see Doulamis (Forthcoming, 2007).

<sup>233</sup> Ach. Tat. 2.10.1.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.* This is a contrast found in Heliiodorus too, as we shall see shortly.

<sup>235</sup> 4.1.2.

metaphorical military gloss to Cleitophon's actions that complements the military context; similarly, battle had been raging outside Theagenes and Charicleia's cave shortly before the use of the same verb. Just as Theagenes is able to play the man in the cave, should he choose to do so, so too is Cleitophon (οἶός τε ἦμην). We have seen from Theagenes' behaviour that a *sōphrōn* form of *andreia* is exhibited paradoxically by *not* playing the man sexually. But whereas Theagenes made a conscious choice (underscored by his reference to *proairesis*) to act in that manner, Cleitophon is forced to do so by Leucippe's rejection of him, and unlike Theagenes, he protests at having to restrain himself.<sup>236</sup> He either misunderstands or deliberately flouts the codes of erotic *andreia*, presenting that *andreia* not as sexual self-restraint, but as the fulfilment of sexual desire. His fear, expressed in conversation with Satyrus, that he will prove *atolmos* and *deilos* in the service of Eros emphasises his failure to behave as a romantic hero should.<sup>237</sup> Both the unabashed way in which Cleitophon narrates his misperformance of masculinity, and the lack of censure he receives for it, might suggest that Achilles is questioning the attainability and the legitimacy of ideal masculinity. Meanwhile, the reader is able to derive humour at the expense of – and perhaps even sympathise with – a man for whom military *andreia* consists solely in showing off his horsemanship, and erotic *andreia* in nothing more than having sex – notably, he fails to live up to even that mistaken ideal of masculinity.<sup>238</sup>

Returning now to Theagenes, we find his *sōphrōn andreia* reinforced when he is tortured to elicit submission to Arsace's sexual advances. Cybele arrives on the pretext of bringing him food:

... τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς ἀποπειρωμένη ποίαν τινὰ γνώμην ἔχει πρὸς τὰ παρόντα καὶ εἴπερ ἐνδιδοίη καὶ μαλάσσοιτο πρὸς τῶν στρεβλώσεων. Ὁ δὲ ἦν πλέον ἀνὴρ τότε καὶ πλέον ἀπεμάχετο πρὸς τὰς πείρας, τὸ μὲν σῶμα καταπονούμενος τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ ῥωννύμενος, καὶ μεγαλαυχούμενος ἅμα πρὸς τὴν τύχην καὶ γαυριῶν εἰ λυπούσα τὸ πλείστον μέρος τῷ καιριωτάτῳ χαρίζοιτο, ἐπιδείξεως ἀφορμὴν τῆς εἰς τὴν Χαρίκλειαν εὐνοίας τε καὶ πίστεως παρεσχημένη ...

<sup>236</sup> 4.1.2-3.

<sup>237</sup> 2.4.4.

<sup>238</sup> We shall see in Chapter 3 that Cleitophon's narration of the Thersander episode suggests that he is in fact familiar with the protocols of masculinity, but is either unwilling or unable to apply them to his own behaviour.

... but, in fact, she had come to gauge his reaction to his present condition and see whether the rack had brought about any submission or softening of his resolve. But on the contrary he was more of a man than ever and rebuffed her advances with redoubled firmness. Though his body was in torment, his spirit had the strength of virtue, and he refused to bow his head to fortune, proclaiming proudly that despite her hostility in all else she had shown him kindness in the one thing that mattered by presenting him with an opportunity to display his love and devotion to Charicleia ... (Hld. 8.6.3-4; trans. Morgan).

Cybele hopes that torture will have resulted in Theagenes' capitulation, but it has had the opposite effect. The use of *μαλάσσοιτο* and *πλέον ἀνὴρ* creates an antithesis: the concept of softness implies a lack of sexual self-restraint,<sup>239</sup> which is what Cybele wants to induce in Theagenes, but his refusal to play a manly role with Arsace makes him appear more manly, just as we saw in the earlier cave scene with Charicleia.<sup>240</sup> His soul is strengthened in its urge toward *sōphrosynē*,<sup>241</sup> so much so, in fact, that he is prompted to boast (*μεγαλαυχούμενος*) and bear himself proudly (*γαυριῶν*) in the face of fortune's treatment of him. Indeed, that treatment has resulted in the opportunity to display (*ἐπιδείξεως*) his feelings for Charicleia by means of this exhibition of *sōphrosynē*. Theagenes is 'big-necking' (*μεγαλαυχούμενος*),<sup>242</sup> the use of this verb connecting the scene to Calasiris' physiognomical description of Theagenes, where the set of his neck was highlighted (*ὀρθὸς τὸν ἀχένα*), and of his horse, which arched its neck (*οὔτω τὸν ἀχένα κυμαίνων*) in response to the nobility of its rider.<sup>243</sup> The neck is a matter of concern to ancient physiognomists, for whom a long and thin neck, or a short one, is a sign of *deilia*.<sup>244</sup> By 'big-necking', Theagenes is therefore flaunting his *andreia*, this time in the context of *sōphrosynē*. Once more the performance of manliness is clear.<sup>245</sup>

<sup>239</sup> As we shall see further in Chapter 3.

<sup>240</sup> The parallel between military and sexual *andreia* is emphasised by the use of *ἀπεμάχητο*.

<sup>241</sup> Another suggestion, perhaps, of the Stoic differentiation between the enslaved body and the free soul.

<sup>242</sup> The verb is based on *ἀχέω* ('boast'), but, given the Greeks' rather fluid approach to etymology, it seems reasonable to think that Heliodorus may intend a pun on *ἀχίην* (see Jones 2003 and 2006 on ancient attitudes to etymology, and on Heliodorus' use of etymology in his character names).

<sup>243</sup> 2.35.1; 3.3.7. His horse was also said to bear itself proudly (*γαυρούμενος*).

<sup>244</sup> Adam. B21, where *τράχηλος* rather than *ἀχίην* is used, although the distinction between the two is not entirely clear (*LSJ* s.v. *τράχηλος*).

<sup>245</sup> Theagenes' endurance of torture may have been thought an important marker of masculinity by an elite Second Sophistic reader: Brown (1992: 64) states that '[i]n a society where cruelty was so pervasive, we should never underestimate the political weight of physical courage. A primal awe surrounded those who were known to have withstood torture'.

*The lover as soldier and athlete.*

We have seen, then, that *andreia* has an erotic aspect, in that it may be constituted by a sexual *sōphrosynē*. In the final part of this chapter we turn to one further use of the language of *andreia* in erotic contexts. We observed earlier that both Greek and Latin texts use military and athletic language in the description of erotic relationships.<sup>246</sup> Warfare and athletics were governed by specific *nomoi*, to which soldiers and athletes were expected to adhere; I would suggest that military and athletic language was suited for metaphorical use in erotic description not only because courtship could end in victory or defeat, and sex itself could be physically demanding, but also because love, too, was subject to certain *nomoi*, and might be thought to constitute an *agōn* in its own right. Here I shall discuss examples from Chariton, Heliodorus, and Achilles Tatius which illustrate the use of the motif of the lover as soldier or athlete, and which, through this motif, appear to meditate on the male role in an erotic relationship, and on the relative value of public competition for love and public displays of *andreia*. I shall also speculate briefly on the possibility that the authors of the novels may have been familiar with the *militia amoris* figure as employed in Roman elegy.<sup>247</sup>

From the very beginning of his novel, Chariton locates love in an agonistic context, describing Eros as φιλόνεικος,<sup>248</sup> this contentiousness is predictive of the series of contests that will be fought over Callirhoe in the course of the novel.<sup>249</sup> We noted in

<sup>246</sup> See above, p.98-99.

<sup>247</sup> The pastoral setting and deliberate erotic naïveté of Longus' novel tend to preclude the use of urbane and sexually-knowing military and athletic *topoi*. On the rare occasions that Longus uses this kind of erotic metaphor, he voices it through urban and sexually-experienced characters: Lycaenion speaks of the 'wrestling' Daphnis and Chloe will do together (3.19.2), and Gnathon begs Astylus to give him Daphnis as a present, hoping in this way to overcome 'unconquerable Love' (4.16.3). However, cf. Daphnis' journey to Chloe's house in the depths of winter (3.5), which Pattoni (2004: 343) suggests is framed as a military expedition: a suggestion, perhaps, of the elite male Daphnis must learn to be? Although we find the *militia amoris* motif quite prolifically in Xenophon of Ephesus, its use offers little of particular interest, as it is designed merely to establish the love of the hero and heroine, and seems to lack any wider significance: Habrocomes is the victim of Eros' warfare (1.2.1); in his stubborn pride he considers himself to have been rendered *anandros* by Eros (1.4.1-3), but must ultimately admit defeat (1.4.4); ironically, Anthia considers Habrocomes *anandros* and *deilos* for not having declared his feelings sooner (1.9.4).

<sup>248</sup> Chariton 1.1.4. The manuscript reads φιλόνεικος, but Reardon prefers φιλόνικος; however, *LSJ* seem to imply that the two words are to some extent interchangeable. Whether Eros is a 'lover of strife' or a 'lover of victory' makes little difference to the discussion here, as both readings suggest a contentious god. Cf. X. Eph. 1.2.1, where Eros is also φιλόνεικος.

<sup>249</sup> Balot (1998: 144) rightly considers that the description of Eros as φιλόνεικος 'underlines the connection between erotic passion and martial contest which plays a central role throughout the novel'.

the introduction to this chapter that the Roman elegists employed military metaphor in a conscious rejection of the military life. The *aristeia* enjoyed by Chaereas and Dionysius suggests that Chariton is not similarly rejecting military life, but his use of military and athletic metaphor in erotic contexts does imply that he rejects competition as a means of deciding erotic matters. While we find in Chariton some traditional and straightforward uses of the military metaphor,<sup>250</sup> it is in the focalisation of the more elaborate instances of the figure that Chariton allows his male characters to construct and project themselves as erotic subjects, simultaneously revealing their misconception of the nature of love. Such metaphor is first used of Callirhoe's rejected suitors. Having initially fought each other (μαχόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους), they are now driven by Envy, who enlists them in a war against Chaereas (ἐστρατολόγει δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ Χαιρέου πόλεμον ὁ Φθόνος):<sup>251</sup> erotic competition has become a metaphorical war, and indeed will escalate to a full-scale and very real war later in the novel. The fact that the suitors view themselves as competitors in a contest is made clear by the speech of one of them, the son of the tyrant of Rhegium:

εἰ μὲν τις ἐξ ἡμῶν ἔγημεν, οὐκ ἂν ὠργίσθην, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἕνα δεῖ νικῆσαι τῶν ἀγωνισαμένων· ἐπεὶ δὲ παρευδοκίμησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ μηδὲν ὑπὲρ γάμου πονήσας, οὐ φέρω τὴν ὕβριν ... πόσον χρόνον δεδουλεύκαμεν; ... ὁ δὲ πόρνος<sup>252</sup> καὶ πένης καὶ μηδενὸς κρείττων βασιλέων ἀγωνισαμένων αὐτὸς ἀκονιτὶ τὸν στέφανον ἤρατο. ἀλλὰ ἀνόνητον αὐτῷ γενέσθω τὸ ἄθλον ...

If any of us had married her, I should not have been angry, for, as in athletic contests, only one of the contestants can win; but since we have been passed over for one who has made no effort to win the bride, I cannot bear the insult ... How long have we been slaves? ... And now, competing with kings, this rent-boy, this good-for-nothing wretch, has carried off the victory crown without fighting for it. Let the prize be of no profit to him ... (Chariton 1.2.2-4; trans. Goold, modified).

<sup>250</sup> E.g. love as wounding: 1.1.7 (of Chaereas), 2.4.1 (of Dionysius), 4.1.9, 4.2.4, and 5.5.9 (all of Mithridates); the *agôn* between Love and the lover: 2.4.5 (of Dionysius) and 6.4.5 (of Artaxerxes).

<sup>251</sup> 1.2.1.

<sup>252</sup> I prefer (as does Reardon) the manuscript's πόρνος to Praechter's emendation, ἄπορος, which has none of the opprobrium we might expect from embittered suitors. The suggestion that a man has chosen a passive sexual role in his adulthood, and particularly for financial remuneration, is a serious charge and an effective way to damage his masculine reputation (see Edwards 1993: 70ff.). Of course, the suitors are not genuinely claiming that Chaereas has prostituted himself, but soothing their bruised egos by impugning his masculinity in as extreme a manner as possible amongst themselves. Cf. Ach. Tat. 8.10.9, where Cleitophon is labelled πόρνος when accused of having committed adultery with Melite. We shall return to the implication of such terms in Chapter 3.

Here, the suitor understands marriage to be akin to athletics: a competition between men, with a wife as figurative prize. In Heliodorus' footrace we see that Ormenus cannot be declared the winner because he has not been challenged;<sup>253</sup> likewise, on the suitor's understanding of marriage, Chaereas ought not to have been proclaimed victor without getting dirty (ἀκονιτί) in the metaphorical arena; by not competing, Chaereas has flouted the rules of the *agōn*. Bauman (1989: 264) notes that acts of communication are often framed in such a way that the audience is guided in its interpretation of them; such framing, he adds, might include the use of stylised language, or 'appeals to tradition as the standard of reference for the performer's accountability'. The suitor's use of figurative language drawn from a long and familiar literary tradition can be seen to fulfil this function, though at two different levels. Firstly, by projecting himself and his fellow suitors as erotic athletes, and by appealing to athletic *nomoi*, the suitor guides his internal audience (the other suitors) in its interpretation of the situation, in an attempt to gain support: the metaphor and the convention he cites are undoubtedly familiar to them. But secondly, by having the suitor project himself as a competitor for a mute prize, Chariton communicates to the external audience (the reader) the suitor's profound misunderstanding of love: Chaereas had no need to compete, because where love is reciprocal, contest is unnecessary. So, while the suitor's adoption of the athletic metaphor may positively influence his internal audience's response to him, it negatively affects the reader's reaction, because it emphasises the one-sided nature of his desire for Callirhoe. The same effect is achieved immediately afterwards, as the tyrant of Acragas frames the male erotic role in military terms, requesting that the other suitors appoint him to the position of *stratēgos* in the war against Chaereas.<sup>254</sup> By framing the performance of masculinity with familiar literary *topoi*, Chariton conveys to the reader his endorsement of reciprocal love, thus exalting Chaereas and Callirhoe's feelings for each other. In its use for polemical motives, the *topos* is similar to that found in Latin elegy. However, the author's construction of suitors who project themselves as soldiers and athletes serves not as a wholesale rejection of a life of *militia*, but as a small-scale rejection of the *agōn*'s intrusion into love.

---

<sup>253</sup> Hld. 4.2.1.

<sup>254</sup> 1.2.5.

The elegiac *amator* may present himself and his beloved as soldier and besieged town respectively.<sup>255</sup> A similar self-projection is found in Dionysius' case, although here it is he who is besieged.<sup>256</sup> Having acquired a kiss from Callirhoe by guile, he is 'completely taken by storm' (πανταχόθεν δὲ ἦν ἐκπεπολιορκημένος).<sup>257</sup> He is the defeated party and Callirhoe the victorious (though unwitting and unwilling) besieger. By means of the focalisation through Dionysius, Chariton conveys a singular perspective that excludes Callirhoe's feelings and conveys Dionysius' misconception of love and the male role in it. We saw in Chapter 1 that Dionysius was conscious of his image, and wanted to maintain a certain front before his friends and his servants, even though love was adversely affecting him.<sup>258</sup> We seem to see that consciousness when he approaches Plangon to ask for assistance, presenting to her the image of a soldier who is not yet completely defeated, despite the ruinous effect of the kiss. He casts Plangon as general in the campaign against Callirhoe (τὰ μὲν πρώτᾳ σοι ... ἐστρατήγηται), for it was she who engineered the kiss, and offers himself as an ally (σύμμαχον ἔχουσα κάμῃ),<sup>259</sup> in an effort to reverse the siege and launch an assault upon Callirhoe. Despite his and Plangon's combined assault, however, Callirhoe proves 'completely invincible' (πανταχόθεν ἀήττητος).<sup>260</sup> The military imagery is unmistakable, and neatly contrasts with the condition in which Callirhoe's kiss left Dionysius: while his erotic city was subjugated, his attempt to reverse the siege finds her citadel unassailable. Unusually in instances of erotic military imagery, it is not Eros or the lover who eventually triumphs, but Tyche. This twist on the *militia amoris* motif highlights the disparity between Dionysius' and Callirhoe's feelings: she is 'outgeneraled'

<sup>255</sup> E.g. *Ov. Am.* 2.12.1-8; see also *Ap. Met.* 9.18 for the storming of a figurative house.

<sup>256</sup> Murgatroyd (1975: 62) suggests that the elegists' *militia amoris* motif is modelled to some extent on New Comedy, although the extant comic fragments retain little of love's warfare; see, however, *Men. Pk.*, where Polemon's efforts to recover Glycera are evidently narrated in the language of a military siege; the surviving text preserves only the tail-end of the operation (468-469; 479), however. Chariton's use of the metaphor might be drawn from New Comedy rather than from elegy (see Borgogno (1971) on some of Chariton's borrowings from the former), although his elevation of love over public competition does seem to align him with elegy.

<sup>257</sup> 2.8.1; trans. Goold.

<sup>258</sup> See above, p.53ff.

<sup>259</sup> 2.8.1-2. Cf. the tyrant of Acragas, who expects Jealousy and Love to work as allies against Chaereas (1.2.5).

<sup>260</sup> 2.8.2; trans. Goold.

(κατεστρατηγήθη) not by Eros but by Tyche, when her pregnancy by Chaereas forces her to surrender to Dionysius' advances.<sup>261</sup>

On discovering that Chaereas is Callirhoe's first husband, Mithridates intends to use this information to sever Callirhoe's new marriage to Dionysius. He hopes to sit on the sidelines, as in athletic contests (καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῖς γυμνικοῖς), while Chaereas and Dionysius fight over Callirhoe, and take the prize (τὸ ἄθλον) himself without an effort (ἀκονιτί).<sup>262</sup> Chariton chooses his language carefully here, the words καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῖς γυμνικοῖς, ἀκονιτί, and τὸ ἄθλον recalling the suitor's ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν, ἀκονιτί, and τὸν στέφανον at 1.2.2-4. Like the suitors, Mithridates projects himself as an athlete, believing that love is something that belongs to the competitive sphere, and something whose return may be forced or won as a prize. Of course, as a barbarian, he hopes to flout the rules, winning Callirhoe without having to compete. But Chaereas alone could marry Callirhoe ἀκονιτί, because she reciprocated his love. When Mithridates and Dionysius come to court over Callirhoe, each side is said to prepare 'as though for the greatest war' (ὥσπερ ἐπὶ πόλεμον τὸν μέγιστον),<sup>263</sup> each believes that victory is his,<sup>264</sup> and the excited populace looks upon events as upon the Olympic Games.<sup>265</sup> Again, the misconception of love and of the male erotic role is clear.

But it is not only those whose love is unrequited who view love as something to be won through competition. Upon the revelation of Chaereas before the court, Chariton states that 'warfare between rivals in love is customary and close at hand' (Συνήθης μὲν οὖν καὶ πρόχειρος πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντερασταῖς πόλεμος), and then conveys the attitude of Chaereas and Dionysius by remarking that the sight of τὸ ἄθλον stimulates their sense of competition.<sup>266</sup> Despite the fact that his love was

<sup>261</sup> 2.8.3. Both Eros and Tyche are described as φιλόνηκος (Eros: 1.1.4, 2.4.5, 6.4.5; Tyche: 2.8.3, 5.1.4) and φιλόκαινος (Eros: 4.7.6; Tyche: 4.4.2).

<sup>262</sup> 4.4.1.

<sup>263</sup> 5.4.1.

<sup>264</sup> 5.4.3.

<sup>265</sup> 5.4.4.

<sup>266</sup> 5.8.4. See also 6.2, where Chaereas and Dionysius return to court like Olympic athletes competing for a prize: the simile reads in part as self-projection by the two men, and in part as the internal audience's interpretation of the situation.



reciprocated ἀκονιτί, Chaereas has been drawn into public competition for Callirhoe, and he, like the other men in the novel, resorts to objectifying Callirhoe as a prize, squabbling over her in court.<sup>267</sup> Balot (1998: 158-159) observes, however, that she ‘is not a prize to be won by an individual man’ and that ‘the original suitors’ view of [her] as an object of competition is a fundamental category mistake’. This argument seems to be supported by a small remark on the audience’s reaction to the stichomythic exchange between Chaereas and Dionysius: after calling the two men μαχόμενοι, thus connecting their behaviour to that of the suitors,<sup>268</sup> Chariton says that those present listened to the confrontation ‘not without pleasure’ (οὐκ ἀηδῶς).<sup>269</sup> It must be said that the exchange between the two rivals comes across as no more than petty name-calling, and the reaction of the internal audience appears designed to reinforce this reader response: the audience’s pleasure encourages the reader to view with amused contempt the men’s competition over Callirhoe, and their self-projection as soldiers and athletes of love.

What begins as erotic rivalry described metaphorically in the language of warfare, escalates to literal warfare, as Chaereas and Dionysius head off to fight for the Egyptians and Persians respectively. While this war is ostensibly between the mutinous Egyptians and their Persian overlords, it stands as a symbol of the erotic *agōn* between the two male protagonists.<sup>270</sup> Indeed, Dionysius hopes Artaxerxes will give him Callirhoe as a prize in return for his *aristeia* on the battlefield.<sup>271</sup> To his mind, the perceived certainty of battle will be a substitute for the uncertainty of the trial: the outcome of a trial could not be guaranteed, but Dionysius’ opinion of his own military ability convinces him that victory is within his grasp if he enters the fray. But the war, like the trial, does not produce a clear victor, implying that true love cannot be won through contest, either military or judicial. In the final book we

<sup>267</sup> The fact that Chaereas too has come to see the acquisition of Callirhoe as a form of victory in a competition between men is underscored when he receives the false news that the king has granted her to Dionysius (7.1.5-6). He refers to Dionysius’ apparent triumph as a ‘judgement by default’ (ἐρήμην δὲ κατεκρίθην), and a victory ‘won without speaking’ (νενίκηκε σιγῶν), and hopes that it will be of no advantage to him (ἀλλ’ οὐδεν ὄφελος αὐτῷ τῆς νίκης), all of which provides a parallel in legal terminology to the complaints made by the suitors in athletic language that Chaereas had won Callirhoe ἀκονιτί, and their hopes that his ἀθλον would not profit him.

<sup>268</sup> ... μαχόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους (1.2.1); cf. πρὸς ἀλλήλους μαχόμενοι (5.8.6).

<sup>269</sup> 5.8.6.

<sup>270</sup> On Chariton’s escalating series of *agōnes* and their role in the structure of the novel, see Reardon (1982).

<sup>271</sup> 6.9.3.

learn that Tyche had intended to make Chaereas unwittingly leave Callirhoe behind on Aradus ‘as booty for his enemies’.<sup>272</sup> Here Callirhoe is to be the spoil of a real war, and in so being she will also be the ‘spoil’ of Dionysius’ erotic battle to win her. Balot (1998: 158) quite rightly views Aphrodite’s intervention at this crucial point as a demonstration that love is not a prize to be won by competition between men, and as a rejection of the agonistic construction of Eros presented earlier in the novel. The lack of decisive victory, either in the courtroom or on the battlefield, implies that true love cannot be won through such masculine, public contest, and it is only the intervention of the goddess of love that can resolve the issue: while love may be articulated using the masculine and agonistic language of military and athletic *andria*, literal *agōnes* cannot secure love for the contestants. Chaereas gets the girl, not by military triumph, but by virtue of requited love.

In Heliodorus, we again find athletic and military metaphor used in order to elevate reciprocal love over public, masculine contest.<sup>273</sup> The first instance (chronologically, though not narratologically) of the motif occurs in Calasiris’ narration of the happenings at the Pythian Games:

Τῇ δὲ ὑστεραία ὁ μὲν Πυθίων ἀγὼν ἔληγεν ὁ δὲ τῶν νέων ἐπήκμαζεν ἀγωνοθετοῦντος, οἶμαι, καὶ βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος καὶ δι’ ἀθλητῶν δύο τούτων καὶ μόνων οὓς ἐξεύξατο μέγιστον ἀγώνων τὸν ἴδιον ἀποφῆναι φιλονεικήσαντος.

The following day was the last of the Pythian tournament, but for the young couple another tournament was still at its height, one presided over and refereed, it seems to me, by Love, who was determined to use these two athletes, in the only match he had arranged, to prove that his particular tournament is the greatest of all (Hld. 4.1.1; trans. Morgan, modified).

Again Eros is φιλόνηκος, casting Theagenes and Charicleia as figurative athletes in his erotic *agōn*, which is prioritised (μέγιστον) over the literal arenas of *andria*: although Theagenes engages in spectacular feats of *andria* at the end of the novel, Eros’ metaphorical *agōn* is specifically stated at this early point to be the greatest of

<sup>272</sup> 8.1.2; trans. Goold: ... λάφυρον δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολεμίοις.

<sup>273</sup> Heliodorus does not use *militia amoris* in his description of his protagonists’ love at first sight, but instead depicts a Platonic meeting of souls (3.5.4-5). J.R. Morgan (1998: 75-76) notes, however, that he does toy with the metaphors of erotic fire and arrows on the first two occasions that Theagenes and Charicleia see each other (3.5 and 4.4).

all, and the prowess of the two erotic athletes will prove it so. So, while it is clearly important to Heliodorus to display his hero's *andreia* in physical and competitive contexts, this is of less significance than his role in a love relationship: as in Chariton, literal *andreia* is not being rejected quite in the manner of elegy, but its significance in the construction of manliness seems to be being diminished. The characterisation of both sexes as athletes in Eros' game stresses mutual depth of feeling: Theagenes and Charicleia are players in the same game, players whom Eros joins together on equal terms. Theagenes' subsequent victory in the footrace is contrasted with Charicleia's erotic defeat: she has already been said to be 'completely enslaved by her passion',<sup>274</sup> and is now 'utterly vanquished, even more a slave to her passion than before',<sup>275</sup> but these descriptions only serve to match her feelings with those of Theagenes, who earlier experienced 'defeat at the hands of a girl'.<sup>276</sup> He and Charicleia have been proud and protective of their lack of erotic experience, and the onset of love leads them to conceive of themselves as adversaries.<sup>277</sup> The pseudo-kidnap of Charicleia from Delphi is presented as a military campaign led by Theagenes: 'The commander in this campaign of love was Theagenes, who had formed the young men from the procession into a squadron of soldiers'.<sup>278</sup> While we have observed that siege and conquest metaphors may convey inequality or lack of reciprocity, here, by contrast, Charicleia consciously plays the role of passive beloved to Theagenes' active lover, and her complicity in the kidnap betokens erotic reciprocity and equality;<sup>279</sup> she is emphatically not a helpless spoil of war.<sup>280</sup> The only true *agōn* Theagenes and Charicleia face is a mutual one, in which they are both engaged for the preservation of their *sōphrosynē* and *pistis*.<sup>281</sup>

<sup>274</sup> 3.19.1; trans. Morgan: Δεδούλωτο μὲν γὰρ ὀλοσχερῶς τῷ πάθει.

<sup>275</sup> 4.4.4; trans. Morgan: ἤττητο λαμπρῶς καὶ δεδούλωτο τῷ πόθῳ πλέον ἢ πρότερον.

<sup>276</sup> 3.17.4; trans. Morgan: ἤττηται κόρης.

<sup>277</sup> 4.11.1: Charicleia refers to Theagenes as τὸν ἐμοὶ πολέμιον.

<sup>278</sup> 4.17.3; trans. Morgan: ἐστρατήγει δὲ Θεαγένης τὸν ἐρωτικὸν τοῦτον πόλεμον εἰς λόχον ἀπὸ τῆς πομπῆς τοῦς ἐφήβους συντάξας. The metaphor is conflated with the image of the *kōmos* to the beloved's house: the young men are described as ἔνοπλος κῶμος.

<sup>279</sup> Charicleia is described as ἅπαντα προειδυῖαν (4.17.4). Lateiner (1997) suggests that Heliodorus' abduction scene reflects a real-life practice which, if the woman was complicit, allowed her to exercise choice in a matter over which she would usually have little or no control.

<sup>280</sup> Indeed, on learning that Charicleia returns his love, Theagenes must be held back by Calasiris with the words, 'Our undertaking is not plunder taking!' (4.6.5; trans. Morgan: οὐ γὰρ ἄρπαγμα τὸ πρᾶγμα). Charicleia is mistakenly considered a spoil of war by Thyamis (1.19.6) and by Pelorus and Trachinus (5.31.3).

<sup>281</sup> They engage in a form of erotic competition with each other in their endurance of captivity and punishment, wherein each believes that to undergo a lesser punishment than the other would constitute a symbolic defeat; they are each other's inspiration to bravely continue the *agōn* to maintain their *sōphrosynē* and *pistis* (8.9.22).

We have noted that Achilles Tatius' use of ego-narration casts Cleitophon as something of a sophist, performing for his internal audience a declamation with erotic subject matter.<sup>282</sup> As an ego-narrative, Cleitophon's romance comes closest to those of Latin elegy,<sup>283</sup> and Achilles seems to use military and athletic metaphor in as knowing and ironic a fashion as the elegists themselves. By having Cleitophon describe his first sight of Leucippe as a metaphorical wounding,<sup>284</sup> Achilles presents him as conscious of his role as romantic hero: Cleitophon's use of the metaphor offers his narratee exactly what he might expect in terms of narrative *topoi* from a tale about love at first sight, and Cleitophon thus frames his story for both internal and external audiences, projecting himself as erotic warrior, mortally wounded. Because Cleitophon is narrating his own story, other characters' speech is filtered through him. Consequently, he projects his own fondness for literary clichés onto others, so that they speak in the same way as he. For instance, when he consults Cleinias for advice, his cousin refers to a lover's 'long-range skirmishes';<sup>285</sup> Satyrus too falls easily into military metaphor, recommending that Cleitophon 'bring on the second engine of war'.<sup>286</sup> Cleinias and Satyrus, Cleitophon's *praeceptores amoris*, clearly conceive of Leucippe as an erotic city to be besieged and conquered. If Leucippe must be conquered, has she really fallen for Cleitophon at first sight, as he has fallen for her? Of course, there is no way to answer this question, and the use of ego-narrative is deliberately occlusive (as it is in elegy), denying both internal and

<sup>282</sup> See above, p.70ff.

<sup>283</sup> The ego-narrative form also suggests a certain proximity between Achilles' novel and the Latin novels of Apuleius and Petronius (although we of course have no way of knowing how unusual Achilles was in his use of that form: there are traces of ego-narration in the *Phoenicica*, for example). More interesting in its suggestion of proximity is the repeated recourse to notions of performance and truth-manipulation shared by Achilles and the Latin novels. This may imply cross-fertilisation between Latin and Greek novels, or it may simply be the result of a pervasive cultural preoccupation with such notions in the first and second centuries.

<sup>284</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.4.4: ... εὐθύς ἀπωλώλειν· κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ· ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῶν τραύματι.

<sup>285</sup> 1.10.4; trans. Gaselee: τοὺς ... ἔξωθεν ἀκροβολισμοὺς τῶν ἐραστῶν ...

<sup>286</sup> 2.4.3: πρόσαγε τὴν δευτέραν μηχανήν. Cf. the general Charmides who, besotted with Leucippe, describes his state of mind, deftly managing to pack in almost every cliché of *militia amoris*: the whole process of love as a battle; Eros as an armed soldier; the wounding and defeat of the subject; the equation of the sexual act with a military skirmish; and explicit reference to Aphrodite and Ares (4.7.3-5). Melite is as accomplished as Charmides at employing *militia amoris*: she appeals to Cleitophon to make a truce with her (σπεῖσαι), after allowing her one συμπλοκή (a noun with multiple meanings: a military engagement, a close hold in wrestling, and the sex act itself); she refers to the wounds caused by Eros' arrows; and she acknowledges her defeat (οἶδα νικωμένη) (5.26.2-4). Cf. Heliodorus' Arsace, who describes her attempts to seduce Theagenes using the military *topos* (Hld. 7.10.2).

external audiences access to Leucippe's feelings.<sup>287</sup> The elegiac *amator* must often battle the resistance of a beloved; the possibility that Cleitophon's feelings may not be returned contributes – perhaps inadvertently on his part – to his attempt to project himself as a soldier of love.

But it is not only the role of erotic soldier that Cleitophon performs. In his response to Satyrus' advice he declares:

Πιθανῶς μὲν ... νῆ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, εἰς τὸ ἔργον παιδοτριβείης· δέδοικα δὲ  
μὴ ἄτολμος ὦν καὶ δειλὸς ἔρωτος ἀθλητῆς γένωμαι.

By Athena! You're training me up for the task convincingly. But I fear that I may be a gutless and cowardly athlete of love (Ach. Tat. 2.4.4).

Here he moves into athletic territory, drawing on Greek texts' long history of erotic sport. Cleitophon casts Satyrus in the novel role of gymnastic trainer (παιδοτρίβης) in an erotic context, implying that Satyrus' advice will mould him mentally for an attempt on Leucippe, as a trainer would mould and manipulate his pupils physically; Leucippe is thus indirectly constructed as an opponent whose resistance must be overcome. But there is another possible meaning in the use of παιδοτρίβης. Athletic trainers were often suspected of having erotic relationships with their pupils (Hubbard 2003),<sup>288</sup> so Achilles' figurative use of παιδοτρίβης may well constitute a joke at the expense of Cleitophon's masculinity: our hero calls Satyrus his *paidotribēs* in matters of love without realising that it implies his willing submission to the sexual domination of his slave, thus suggesting his own effeminacy.<sup>289</sup> Although erotic 'athletics' are common, the precise 'athlete of love' figure is one I have been unable to find in other texts. It may be that Achilles alludes here to a phrase used by Plato of the guardians in the *Republic*, who are ἄνδρες ἀθληταὶ πολέμου σώφρονές τε καὶ ἀνδρεῖοι.<sup>290</sup> If ἔρωτος ἀθλητῆς is indeed a

<sup>287</sup> Cleinias' words on how to make a girl return one's desire by making her feel loved leave room for doubt as to Leucippe's immediate feelings for Cleitophon (1.9.6-7); after a kiss acquired by guile, Cleitophon admits total ignorance of her feelings (2.8.1); he only gains her consent to his nocturnal visit by persistent sweet-talking (2.19.2); her motive for elopement is rather the prospect of escape from an overbearing mother than love for Cleitophon (2.30).

<sup>288</sup> See, for example, *AP* 12.34 and 12.222; and see Aeschin. 1.9ff. on efforts made to prevent trainers from taking advantage of their pupils.

<sup>289</sup> We shall examine other examples of Cleitophon's self-feminisation in the next chapter.

<sup>290</sup> *Pl. R.* 416d; see also 403e ff. for the notion that athletic training serves as preparation for war.

deliberate allusion to the *Republic*'s 'athletes of war', then the allusion serves to highlight the very things that Cleitophon is not: *sōphrōn* and *andreios*. Achilles then reverts to military metaphor, as Satyrus assures Cleitophon that Eros does not admit of cowardice: Eros' appearance alone is στρατιωτικός, and full of *andreia* and *tolma*; when inspired by Eros it is impossible to be cowardly.<sup>291</sup> Here we have the Platonic conception of Eros as a promoter of *andreia* in the lover,<sup>292</sup> and a god whose weaponry further cements his association with *andreia*. Yet Satyrus' words debase the *andreia* that philosophy associates with erotic inspiration: Satyrus presents Eros as a god who will invest Cleitophon with the metaphorical *andreia* required simply to get Leucippe into bed;<sup>293</sup> Cleitophon's efforts to aggrandise his performance by casting himself as an erotic warrior<sup>294</sup> and athlete are thus ironically undercut.<sup>295</sup>

After being urged ἀνδρίζεσθαι by Satyrus, and managing to secure a kiss from Leucippe, Cleitophon picks up the military metaphor as he describes the preparations for a second dalliance: he and Satyrus lay in wait (ἐφεδρεύομεν) for Leucippe and Cleio,<sup>296</sup> and once Cleio had been waylaid by Satyrus, Cleitophon waited for near-dark before making his move on Leucippe:

ἐπιτηρήσας οὖν ὅτε τὸ πολὺ τῆς αὐγῆς ἐμαραίνετο, πρόσειμι πρὸς αὐτὴν θρασύτερος γενόμενος ἐκ τῆς πρώτης προσβολῆς, ὥσπερ στρατιώτης ἤδη νενικηκώς καὶ τοῦ πολέμου καταπεφρονηκώς· πολλὰ γὰρ ἦν τὰ τότε ὀπλιζοντά με θαρρεῖν, οἶνος, ἔρωσ, ἐλπίς, ἔρημία ...

Having thus maintained a surveillance, when most of the sun's light had waned I advanced towards her, emboldened by my first assault, like a soldier already victorious and contemptuous of the war; for many were the arms that made me brave at that moment: wine, love, hope, solitude ... (Ach. Tat. 2.10.3).

<sup>291</sup> 2.4.5.

<sup>292</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 178e ff., 196c ff.

<sup>293</sup> Reardon (1994: 86) notes that Cleitophon's aim is sexual satisfaction, rather than ideal marriage.

<sup>294</sup> He proceeds to call himself precisely this, asking, τί δὲ δειλὸς εἶ στρατιώτης ἀνδρείου θεοῦ; (2.5.1).

<sup>295</sup> Christenson (2000) argues for just such an irony in his observation of intertextuality between Cleitophon's use of the *militia amoris* figure here and that of Callinus: while Callinus was exhorting his people to martial valour, Cleitophon is merely trying to summon the courage to approach Leucippe.

<sup>296</sup> Ἐφεδρεύω may refer to troops waiting for an opportunity to attack the enemy; cf. Chariton's use of ἔφεδρος in an athletic context, in relation to Mithridates (4.4.1).

Again seemingly conscious of his status as a literary lover, Cleitophon projects the image of the Ovidian *amator* who takes advantage of the cover of darkness, when the beloved is less easily defended against the erotic attack.<sup>297</sup> But Cleitophon, as we have seen, is nothing like a soldier, making doubly ironic his attempt to magnify his own standing before his audience through the adoption of the *militia amoris* figure. However, it is worth speculating on the precise link between Achilles' use of the metaphor and that of the Latin elegists. It is of course impossible to know whether Achilles (or any of the other novelists) is deliberately intertexting with elegy, or simply borrowing motifs already present in Greek literature. If the former is true, there are two possible effects: while the elegiac *amator* consciously manipulates *militia amoris*, using it to construct himself quite deliberately as *mollis*, Cleitophon might be understood as accidentally presenting himself as such by using a *topos* that emphasises his lack of *andreia*; alternatively (or perhaps in addition), Achilles may be constructing Cleitophon as a countercultural subversive who, like the *amator*, rejects the protocols of masculinity, causing the reader to question their validity.

#### *Chapter summary.*

Konstan (1994b: 22) states that 'overcoming opponents and rescuing his beloved are not the mode in which the novelistic hero operates, even if he can claim Achilles as an ancestor'. Yet we have seen that Chariton and Heliodorus clearly felt the need for their heroes to operate at least to some degree in this mode. Their *andreia* is most overtly associated with physicality, and is exhibited in battle and athletics. *Andreia* is evidently a visible quality, and can be seen in a man's external appearance even more than can *paideia*; in their emphasis on *andreia*'s visibility, the novelists clearly demonstrate the influence of contemporary physiognomy. But although *andreia* may be seen in a man when he is not performing some physical feat, he must not rely on it manifesting itself in his appearance: the heroes show themselves conscious of the need to display *andreia* in decisive action. Yet what seems the most obvious way of displaying manliness must sometimes be rejected, and a man must avoid physical action in the short term in order to protect his masculinity in the long term. Heliodorus is particularly interested in the traditional antithesis of *andreia* and *deilia*, and cleverly implies his hero's possession of *andreia* by reference to

---

<sup>297</sup> Ov. *Am.* 1.9.21-8. See also Ach. Tat. 2.20.1, where Cleitophon and Satyrus are planning another nocturnal attempt on Leucippe.

Cnemon's *deilia*. The discourse of *andreia* does not have to be engaged with directly; it may simply be alluded to by reference to its opposite, or by equating a man with a Homeric hero; it may even be implicit in the act of attempted suicide, which, in other genres, might be considered *deilos*.

But *andreia* in the novels is more than a physical virtue. The military and athletic exploits of Chaereas and Theagenes are constructed on the blueprints of heroes like Odysseus and Jason as much as, if not more, than they are on the blueprints of figures like Achilles. And so, while they may exhibit some of the qualities of Achilles, they are, like Odysseus and Jason, conscious of their weaknesses and their limits, and not ashamed to employ cunning or to accept the advice and aid of their lovers. Novelistic *andreia* functions in a synergistic relationship with *paideia*. It is physical strength complemented by wise thought and rational judgement, and closely connected to other virtues. It is a fusion of natural manliness and learned behaviour – both an essential element of masculinity and something constructed by culture. Despite *andreia*'s very public face, it has a private aspect. In the novels this is expressed within the erotic relationship, where *andreia* is exercised in sexual self-restraint: like *paideia*, *andreia* has a role to play in proper self-comportment in erotic contexts. The language of *andreia* may be adopted as part of a self-conscious self-projection in erotic matters, yet also used by authors to demonstrate the superior strength of erotic sentiment over more traditional realms of masculine performance. But while Chariton and Heliodorus may ultimately prioritise love over public displays of masculinity, they clearly still value such displays. Once more it is Achilles Tatius who exposes the potential superficiality of masculine display, and questions the validity of culturally-endorsed ideals.

We observed in the Introduction that male behaviour in erotic contexts was likely to loom large as a component of masculine identity in the novel because the genre is primarily concerned with romantic love. Indeed, although the focus of the first two chapters has not been on erotic contexts, we have seen that *paideia* and *andreia* frequently come into play in such contexts. In the final chapter, the focus *will* be on the erotic, and specifically on how masculinity is performed, and how it is threatened, by certain forms of sexual behaviour.



### Chapter 3: Sexual Identity

#### *Introduction.*

The novels of Xenophon, Achilles, and Longus all feature male characters who appear exclusively or primarily attracted to other men. These authors seem especially interested in how sexual and gender identity might be constituted or affected by potential or actual erotic relationships between men. The discourses of homosexuality and effeminacy are here analysed together, not because the Greeks necessarily made a connection between these concepts, but because *some* homosexual acts could be perceived as having a feminising effect on the participants. But while modern Anglo-American culture has tended to label homosexuality as effeminate, and effeminate men as homosexual, and to identify prolific heterosexuality as especially macho and masculine, Graeco-Roman sexual ideology viewed the latter as potentially feminising behaviour: though some homosexual behaviours might be thought effeminate, so too might an excessive interest in women, and other behaviours not obviously sexual. We have said that the performance of gender is often evidenced by consciousness of an ideal, and we shall see that consciousness of the ideals constructed around classical Greek paederasty is evident in the novels' depiction of homosexual males. We shall observe that the figure of the effeminate male, the opposite in Graeco-Roman thought of the truly masculine male, lurks behind Daphnis' and Habrocomes' reactions to the respective overtures of Gnathon and Corymbus, which have significant potential consequences for the heroes' emerging masculinity; it will also be important in the case of Achilles' Thersander, whose lusts characterise him as effeminate; and even in the case of Cleitophon, whose (unintentional?) self-presentation as effeminate will be explored.

This chapter's focus on homosexuality differs somewhat from the subjects of the previous two: whereas *paideia* and *andreia* are agreed to have been meaningful concepts in Greek thought, scholars are divided as to whether the notion of homosexuality, as we understand it today, would have had any such currency. We shall begin, therefore, with a discussion of recent scholarship on male-male sexual relationships in Greek and Roman antiquity, and an attempt to position this chapter

within it. The chapter will then set out the protocols which governed paederastic love, in the light of which we shall later read the novels' presentation of same-sex relationships, such as those between Hippothous and Hyperanthes in Xenophon, and Cleinias and Charicles in Achilles. Finally, before beginning the chapter proper, we shall outline the concept of effeminacy as it was understood in the ancient world.

*i. Homosexuality problematised.*

Homosexuality is a controversial and politically-charged subject. Although it is impossible to approach any concept entirely objectively, this is one whose debate attracts a larger degree of subjectivity than many others because sexuality is an issue that affects us all in some way. Almost thirty years ago, Foucault's *History of Sexuality* advanced the ground-breaking theory that sexuality was not an essential, immutable given; it was not something that one was born with, but rather something that was, at least in part, created and shaped by one's society and oneself: sexuality was engendered by discourse (Foucault 1979).<sup>1</sup> Thus, the semantics of sex vary across time and from culture to culture, with identical sex acts carrying radically different meanings at different periods. Writing on homosexuality, the social and political theorist Jeffrey Weeks expresses this phenomenon concisely:

In different cultures (and at different historical moments or conjunctures within the same culture) very different meanings are given to the same-sex activity both by society at large and by the individual participants. The physical acts might be similar, but the social construction of meanings around them are [*sic*] profoundly different (Weeks 1991: 15).<sup>2</sup>

It is easy to see the compatibility of these notions with Goffman's theory of identity as a performance influenced by and tailored to specific audiences, and Butler's arguments that gender itself cannot exist prior to the acting of it: gender is constituted by performance.

The large-scale jettisoning of essentialism in favour of a social constructionist view of gender and sexuality has necessarily led scholars of the ancient world to

---

<sup>1</sup> On Foucault, see Thorp (1992) and Weeks (2001: 112ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Walters (1993) illustrates this by examining the vastly different meanings ascribed by Apuleius and Boccaccio to what is essentially the same story (Ap. *Met.* 9.4ff.).

problematise homosexuality. Dover (1978) and Foucault (1987) both argued for the absence of a homo-/heterosexuality dichotomy in the ancient world, on the basis that Greek and Roman sexual classification systems tended to revolve around distinctions between sex *roles* (active/passive), rather than between sex *objects* (male/female). Following Foucault's lead, Halperin (1990: 7) pinpoints the creation of the category of 'the homosexual' to the late nineteenth century, claiming that '[n]othing resembling [homosexuality or heterosexuality] can be found in classical antiquity'.<sup>3</sup> Parker (2001) enlarges upon Halperin's thesis, arguing for the inapplicability of the terms 'homosexuality' and 'heterosexuality' to Greek and Roman society. Borrowing the language of cultural anthropology, he identifies 'homosexuality' as an 'etic' category vis-à-vis antiquity; that is, an extrinsic concept meaningful to external observers of a society, but not to the members of that society.<sup>4</sup> So, while modern Anglo-American culture sees meaning in the binary opposition of homosexuality and heterosexuality, considering the sex of the object-choice to be of prime importance, such a system of classification is rare in global terms and, for Parker, malapropos in historical terms: to assume the existence of that system in a culture and time period other than one's own would be merely to retroject one's own cultural constructs. Like Dover and Foucault, Parker instead identifies the active/passive polarity as the 'emic' distinction in Graeco-Roman terms; that is, the system of classification that has internal meaning for Greek and Roman society. Boswell's (1980) approach provides an example of the retrojection of modern cultural constructs, and of the dangers of imposing one's own subjectivity on the past. Throughout his survey of late antiquity, Boswell writes of 'gay people', as if there is some transhistorical and essential core of 'gayness', which makes the term suitable for any application. For Boswell, a 'gay' person is one who is 'conscious of erotic inclination toward [his or her] own gender *as a distinguishing characteristic*' (*ibid.* 44; emphases mine). This assumes that it is possible in every case for us to reconstruct such a person's self-definition, to discover that he thought

---

<sup>3</sup> See also Halperin *et al* (1990); while taking a Foucauldian constructionist stance, Winkler (1990) and Williams (1999) are less dogmatic.

<sup>4</sup> The opposite is an 'emic' category, one that can justly be said to have meaning within the cultural systems of a society, and not simply to external observers. These terms of reference derive from 'phonemic' and 'phonetic', used in the study of the sound systems of language. It should be noted that the definition offered by Parker and paraphrased here is not fixed, and the concept of emic/etic categories is differentially understood and employed by many disciplines. The emic/etic theory was first proposed by Pike (1967).

of himself as distinguished by his erotic inclinations.<sup>5</sup> Also difficult is MacMullen's (1982) identification in Roman sources of a pervasive disapproval of 'homosexuality'. MacMullen does not distinguish between 'homosexuality' and 'effeminacy',<sup>6</sup> and makes little attempt to nuance different forms of same-sex sexual behaviour.

The fact that Greek and Roman antiquity had no words corresponding to our 'homosexuality' is often raised in arguments against the use of the word in studies of ancient sexuality.<sup>7</sup> The absence of terminology does not mean, however, that (as Halperin would claim) there was nothing resembling it; rather, it simply means that a man's involvement in sexual activity with another male did not necessarily, or always, have the power to classify him as a 'homosexual', in the exclusive sense in which we might use the term today. While Parker is undoubtedly right to warn against the unqualified attribution of our own sexual categories to other cultures, he and Halperin take the exclusion of the terms 'homosexuality' and 'heterosexuality' from antiquity too far, assuming that they cannot be separated from their Anglo-American baggage and employed as useful descriptors without the full weight of their modern western semantics. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Boswell's use of the term 'gay' is clearly inappropriate, for, as he himself states (1980: 43, 45), it has a self-assigned sense, relaying the way in which the person in question wishes to be viewed. Can we really be sure of how a Roman or a Greek wished to be viewed? The use of such a loaded term in analyses of ancient sexuality unjustifiably presupposes an erotic subjectivity comparable with that of the modern west.

This chapter's approach lies somewhere between those of Halperin/Parker and Boswell, in the realm of arguments made by Cohen and Richlin. Cohen (1991: 171) argues that 'the normative categories of sexual roles associated with the dichotomy of homosexual/heterosexual were [not] entirely absent' from classical Athenian culture, and, *contra* Halperin, Richlin (1993) argues that Graeco-Roman sexual

---

<sup>5</sup> For a review of Boswell which succinctly explains the inherent problems of his approach, see Weeks (1980).

<sup>6</sup> See especially p.494.

<sup>7</sup> So Halperin (1990 *passim*); Parker (2001: 322).

categories did recognise distinctions on the basis of sexual preference.<sup>8</sup> When we turn to examine the Greek novels' presentation of same-sex love we shall see that such arguments are defensible. The novels do present us with men who seem to feel an exclusive attraction to other men (or an exclusive attraction to women), and – more importantly for a study of the performance of masculinity – men who seem to define themselves and others in part on the basis of such attractions. However, although we can find individual instances in the novels and related texts of men who seem to feel their own sexual preference to be a 'distinguishing characteristic' (to borrow Boswell's phrase), and who distinguish others on the grounds of such preferences, we cannot establish beyond doubt that sexual preferences in the ancient world gave rise to sexual identities that were *generally* recognised – for example in the way that 'homosexual', 'heterosexual', 'gay', 'bisexual', and so on are generally recognised as sexual identities today. By contrast, we shall see later on that certain forms of sexual *behaviour* (irrespective of the sexes of those involved) could and did ascribe generally recognised identities (*kinaidos*, *moichos*, etc.), but it is much harder to claim this capacity for sexual *preference*, which seems in imperial texts to have ascribed identities on a personal, individual level rather than a general, cultural level.<sup>9</sup> In what follows I shall use such terms as 'homo-/heterosexual' and 'homo-/heterosexuality' for the sake of convenience, though cautiously and non-substantively, and with the implicit caveat that they do not *necessarily* indicate an exclusive sexual preference or refer to a culturally delineated category of people.

---

<sup>8</sup> While I agree with Richlin's overall argument, the examples she cites seem to me to be misjudged. She states that in his imperial biographies, Suetonius 'includes ... a section on sexual identity', and that he effectively 'describes Claudius as a "heterosexual" [and] Galba as a "homosexual"' (1993: 531-532). Yet when we look at Suetonius' comments in context, we find that they are made amongst remarks on behaviour in other areas of life: for example, Claudius' lack of interest in male sex partners is made to contrast with his excessive lust for women, food, drink, and gaming (*Cl.* 33); Suetonius' words do not, therefore, grant Claudius a 'heterosexual' identity, but an all-or-nothing character. Similarly, Galba's inclination towards males (*Gal.* 22), and of them towards tough, full-grown men, is recounted together with his habit of eating excessively and at peculiar times of day: both in diet and in sex-object, Galba inclines to extremes. In the case of Suetonius, then, sexual preferences, whether exclusive or not, are employed not to delineate specific sexual identities, but as tools for more general behavioural characterisation.

<sup>9</sup> If this is right, it might be thought an aspect of the increased focus on the self that is widely accepted as apparent in imperial era literature: see Foucault (1990) and Swain (1996).

*ii. The paederastic ideal.*

I referred above to the differential meanings and values invested in homosexual activity by different cultures and in different historical periods. While modern western society endorses ‘compulsory heterosexuality’, marginalising homosexuality and rendering it a subordinate category of masculinity,<sup>10</sup> classical Greek antiquity privileged homosexual activity, recognising it as an elite and hegemonic expression of gender. But not just any form of homosexual activity. As Dover and others have shown,<sup>11</sup> male-male sexual behaviour was circumscribed by a multitude of conventions and a strict etiquette, which combined to promote a behavioural ideal. The classical Athenian model of homosexuality, which informed later Greek sources, was paederastic and hierarchical, with a younger *erōmenos* gradually submitting to the courtship of an older *erastēs* (though never for financial reward) through a process of pursuit and flight.<sup>12</sup> In this model, the emphasis was very much on the betterment of the younger partner, while any sexual element was downplayed and kept within strict boundaries, the *erōmenos* passively receiving the affections of the *erastēs*, who was the only partner expected to experience pleasure.<sup>13</sup> Ultimately, the *erōmenos* ought to leave behind this role and become an *erastēs* himself, his time as passive partner generally curtailed by the onset of facial hair. Furthermore, those involved in paederastic relationships were expected not to be exclusively homosexual, and to make their contribution to society by marrying and fathering legitimate children.

Yet it has only recently been fully acknowledged that the paederastic model is *idealistic* rather than *realistic*, and that it is extremely unlikely that every paederastic relationship conformed to this pattern.<sup>14</sup> Hubbard (2003: 16) cites erotic liaisons between trainers and athletes very close in age to argue that contravention of paederastic etiquette was a recognised occurrence. However, Golden (1984: 322) acknowledges that while some men must have been sexually involved with others of the same age, the textual and iconographic evidence is insufficient to warrant disavowal of the traditional paederastic model; similarly, Richardson (1984: 113-

---

<sup>10</sup> See Connell (1995, 2001).

<sup>11</sup> Dover (1978), Buffière (1980).

<sup>12</sup> See Dover (1978: 81-91).

<sup>13</sup> See Dover (*ibid.* 52-53, 96-97) on the literary and iconographic evidence for this.

<sup>14</sup> Ogden (1996: 109ff.), Davidson (2001).

114) notes that in the Greek evidence reciprocal desire between partners in the same age group is rare. Ogden (1996: 110 *et passim*) suggests that the practice of homosexuality between age-mates in military contexts does not corroborate the hierarchical terms and age boundaries of the model, an argument which seems problematic because military contexts are not necessarily comparable with other social contexts. Ogden also observes that the paederastic model is an Athenian one, and that we may be ill-advised to regard it as universally Greek. This is a fair point, and yet we shall see that there is some concern in the novels – which are of course not Athenian – with age and proper behaviour, and this concern seems to hinge on the Athenian paederastic model: the literary tradition with which the novels intertext is overwhelmingly Athenian, and Second Sophistic culture more generally is geared to the reproduction of Attic norms and trends, so we should not take the fact that the paederastic model is Athenian to be too much of a difficulty.

On the terminology applied to paederastic relationships, Davidson (2001: 40–41) argues that the assumed synonymy between *erastēs/erōmenos* and active/passive, common in studies of Greek homosexuality, is mistaken: *erastēs*, he suggests, denotes merely ‘a male who loves’, and *erōmenos* ‘a male who is loved’. Davidson’s point is that it is easy to read too much about sex roles and attitudes into the words *erastēs* and *erōmenos*, although his argument also appears to assume a synonymy, between the Greek ἐράω and the English ‘love’. It seems to me that, given the persistent influence of the paederastic model, when used in homosexual contexts the words *erastēs* and *erōmenos* must be taken as indicative of particular sex roles and attitudes – but that does not have to mean that those roles and attitudes are always adhered to in practice.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Cohen (1991: 174) highlights the significance of conflict and contradiction within a society’s understanding and representation of its own sexualities, whereby the theoretical ideals endorsed do not always reflect the realities of practice, but the members of a society are complicit in denying deviations from those ideals. When we examine the paederastic and otherwise

---

<sup>15</sup> The novels occasionally use these words in heterosexual contexts to denote parity of emotion: Callirhoe berates Aphrodite for apparently allowing Chaereas’ death at the hands of brigands, and thus depriving her of ‘τὸν ἡλικιώτην, τὸν πολίτην, τὸν ἐραστήν, τὸν ἐρώμενον, τὸν συμφίον’; she refers to Chaereas her ‘μειράκιον καλὸν, ἐρωτικόν’ (Chariton 3.10.7), a description which sounds very much like something a homosexual *erastēs* might say to his younger beloved. Anthia twice refers to Habrocomes as her *erōmenos* (X. Eph. 1.4.7, 3.6.3), while he thinks of himself as her *erastēs* (1.9.3); we shall return to the significance of this last reference later on in the chapter.

homosexual relationships of the novels, we shall meet just such conflict and contradiction.

The power of the paederastic ideal is suggested by Aeschylus' negotiation of the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus: although Homer never presented a homosexual bond between the two, and cast Patroclus as the older man,<sup>16</sup> in his *Myrmidons* Aeschylus eroticised the relationship and identified Achilles as older *erastēs* and Patroclus as younger *erōmenos*, apparently because of the perceived dominance of the Homeric Achilles. This causes difficulties for Plato's *Phaedrus*, who reproaches Aeschylus and restores the original Homeric age difference, making the younger Achilles Patroclus' *erōmenos*.<sup>17</sup> It is notable that *Phaedrus* sees no problem in Aeschylus' eroticisation of the relationship, but only in his reversal of its roles.<sup>18</sup> The constraints imposed by the paederastic ideal were clearly felt quite strongly in the classical age, and writers of that era saw no contradiction in retrojecting classical standards of behaviour onto the past.<sup>19</sup> The discussions in Plato's *Symposium* may be taken as evidence both of the paramount social importance of the paederastic paradigm, and of the existence of divergent views which should dissuade us from endeavouring to find in the sources 'a neatly coherent and internally consistent system' (Cohen 1991: 202). The Platonic

---

<sup>16</sup> Hom. *Il.* 11.786.

<sup>17</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 179e-180a.

<sup>18</sup> See Dover (1978: 197), Buffière (1980: 368-369).

<sup>19</sup> The assumption that Achilles and Patroclus were lovers seems to have been taken as read: see also Aeschin. 1.142ff., and for later examples see *AP* 12.217 (Strato) and Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 54; see Halperin (1990: 86) on post-Homeric authors' misidentification of Achilles and Patroclus as lovers because of the prevalence of homosexual relationships in the classical period; and for the view that the Homeric Achilles and Patroclus were indeed lovers, see Clarke (1978) and Cantarella (1992: 9-10). I see Chariton's equation of Chaereas' relationship with Polycharmus to that between Achilles and Patroclus (1.5.2) not as necessarily implying a homoerotic element, but as emphasising the importance of the hero: Patroclus' devotion to Achilles focuses the listener/reader on Achilles; likewise, Polycharmus' devotion to Chaereas emphasises Chaereas' importance in the narrative. The equation also underscores the strength of the bond between the two, and perhaps the characters of each: Chaereas (often likened to Achilles, independently of references to Polycharmus) is quick to anger, like Achilles, while Polycharmus is self-effacing, like Patroclus; the two also make a formidable team in times of war. But Chariton was clearly aware of the conception of the Homeric pair as lovers: he employs Achilles and Patroclus intertexts in cases where there is some erotic sentiment, although this is notably in heterosexual contexts (1.4.6, 1.6.4, 2.9.6, 4.1.3, 5.10.9 – all of Chaereas and Callirhoe; 6.1.8 – Artaxerxes thinking of Callirhoe). On Chariton's understanding of the Achilles-Patroclus relationship, see Sanz Morales & Laguna Mariscal (2003), though strikingly absent from their article is a consideration of Chariton's use of Iliadic intertexts in relation to Chaereas and Polycharmus. On the nature and interpretation of close male relationships in ancient and modern contexts, see Hammond & Jablow (1987), Sherrod (1987), and Fitzgerald's edited collection (1997).



Aristophanes remarks that some men desire to spend their lives with the same sex,<sup>20</sup> which Thorp (1992: 61) reads as implying that homosexual predilection did not always respect paederastic age limits, and that some same-sex relationships continued beyond normative boundaries; such boundaries were thus more idealistic than realistic. Thorp (*ibid.* 57) argues against Foucault's theories that definable categories of sexuality are modern phenomena, and that ancient Greek society viewed sexual preference as 'a superficial matter of taste and practice'. In support of his argument he cites Aristophanes' statement that men derived from double-males are driven to find their other halves not by a simple desire for somatic pleasure, but by a deep psychic longing for something they cannot explain.<sup>21</sup> For Thorp, such statements suggest that, *contra* Foucault, Greek antiquity did recognise categories of sexuality, and held sexual preference to be a profound matter, and one remarkably like our own. In recounting his creation myth, Aristophanes, Thorp suggests (*ibid.* 58), is attempting to explain not a simple sexual preference, but a whole way of life, a desire which leads men to wish to spend their lives with other males, and only to marry and have children under social duress.<sup>22</sup> Other of Aristophanes' comments testify to Cohen's suggestion of societal complicity in the denial of deviations from the norm: in his creation myth Aristophanes does not seem to credit the existence of same-sex, same-age lovers, despite the fact that, as Halperin (1990: 21) observes, of the original double-male split in two, each half must have been the same age.<sup>23</sup> Aristophanes' ability to ignore this fact speaks to the power of cultural ideology: the older *erastēs*/younger *erōmenos* protocol leads him to ignore same-age pairings. As Halperin (*ibid.*) notes, Aristophanes in fact specifies that males descended from double-males act as *erōmenoi* when young and *erastai* when older, thus marking out two distinct age-phases.<sup>24</sup> Yet an earlier assertion by Pausanias destabilises any sense we might have of a monolithic model: those inspired by Heavenly Aphrodite are interested only in boys, and then only when those boys are beginning to acquire facial hair; if a love is initiated at that age, says Pausanias, it will be eternal.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 191e-192c.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 192c-d.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 192b: it is not in such a man's *physis* to marry and have children, but he is compelled to do so by *nomos*. Cf. Callicratidas' remarks in Ps.-Lucian's *Amores*: marriage was only invented because of the need to procreate (33, 35, 38).

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 189d ff.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* 191e-192b.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* 181c-d; 183e. Cf. Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 48-49: Callicratidas advocates a long-term same-sex love; his love is a sexless one, founded on the Platonic model of Ἐρωὺς οὐράνιος (49).

*iii. Effeminacy.*

The dialectics of honour and shame associated with the paederastic ideal were based on the perceived opposition of masculinity and effeminacy.<sup>26</sup> Shame did not attach to just any homosexual act, but to those which threatened masculinity, exposing it to damaging accusations of effeminacy. To penetrate was the behaviour of the male; to be penetrated was the behaviour of the female.<sup>27</sup> Paederasty therefore walked a fine line, as it required the passivity of one partner, but that passivity was potentially feminising. A freeborn youth who succumbed too readily to, or sought out, the attentions of an *erastēs* invited shame,<sup>28</sup> as such behaviour implied an eagerness for the passive role, and was thus suggestive of effeminacy. Also shameful and potentially feminising was an *erōmenos*' submission to penetration by a social inferior. Furthermore, a youth who did not leave behind the role of *erōmenos* on attaining adulthood was guilty of shameful behaviour, and effeminate, as he ought now to be playing an active sexual role. Pausanias' recommendation that homosexual love begin when a boy is starting to grow facial hair – *i.e.* at the onset of adulthood – is thus a deviation from the ideal, and the power of such deviations to feminise the actors involved is evidenced by Aristophanes' pillory of Pausanias' long-term beloved, Agathon:<sup>29</sup> apparently because he had continued to play the passive sexual role into adulthood, Agathon had gained a reputation for effeminacy.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, the Platonic Aristophanes too is really rather keen on highlighting the knife-edge on which masculinity is poised in the practice of paederasty: he describes *erōmenoi* as 'ἀνδρειότατοι ὄντες φύσει', and driven to do what they do 'ὑπὸ θάρρους καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ ἀρρενωπίας'.<sup>31</sup> Given the fact that these assertions are placed in the mouth of a comic playwright fond of mocking those who engage in passivity beyond culturally-sanctioned age boundaries, it is very difficult to take them seriously: the claim to manliness seems rather to highlight the potential for effeminacy inherent in the way Aristophanes' culture constructs

<sup>26</sup> On the functioning of honour and shame within paederastic courtship, see Cohen (1991: 183ff.). For a useful comparative study of the operation of honour and shame in a modern culture, see Lancaster (2002).

<sup>27</sup> Dover (1978: 73-81) has discussed the perceived relationship between effeminacy and the passive homosexual role in classical evidence.

<sup>28</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 184a: according to Pausanias, to give in to the advances of a lover too quickly is shameful; see also Halperin (2002: 71).

<sup>29</sup> Ar. *Thesm.* 101ff.

<sup>30</sup> Another favourite victim in Aristophanic comedy is one Cleisthenes, presented in several plays as a habitual passive (see Thornton 1997: 109).

<sup>31</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 192a.

paederasty,<sup>32</sup> while a wry reference at the end of his speech to the masculinity of Pausanias and Agathon only adds to the irony.<sup>33</sup>

Edwards (1993: 63-97), Gleason (1995 *passim*), and Williams (1999: 125-159) have all identified effeminacy as a key concept in the construction of masculinity in the Graeco-Roman world. Edwards (1993: 81) notes that the effeminate was characterised by an excessive appetite for sex, and could play the role of both adulterer and catamite:<sup>34</sup> as she comments (*ibid.* 75), ‘men were often accused of being effeminate while having an excessive interest in penetrating women’. So, paradoxically, it was not only sexual passivity that could feminise a man, but also sexual hyperactivity: to fail to master one’s sexual urges – whether they were for males or females – was to fail to be a man, and by logical extension to be womanish. We have already observed such a discourse in operation in Heliodorus, in Theagenes’ resistance to Arsace: submission would have feminised him, but he reinforced his masculinity by means of his stalwart refusal to give in;<sup>35</sup> we shall encounter the concept again in relation to both Thersander and Cleitophon.

Williams (1999: 142) explores the construction in Graeco-Roman thought of oppositional pairs relating to sex and gender, such that masculinity is associated with the positive term in each pair, and femininity with the negative: moderation/excess, activity/passivity, and so on. These pairings also functioned outside matters of sex. A lack of moderation over the desire for food and drink, engagement in excessive grooming, or the sporting of clothing considered insufficiently masculine, might all easily label a man effeminate and imply passivity. Williams (*ibid.*) remarks that ‘in the balancing act of masculinity, one stumble can ruin the entire performance’, and this is precisely what we shall see occurring in the case of some of the novels’ male characters. Effeminacy will be a recurring theme in our discussion of homosexuality and paederasty in the novels, which betray a sharp awareness of the potential of sexual passivity to feminise. We shall also see the concept of effeminacy articulated through certain characters’ inability to master their heterosexual passions, and to present to the world a convincing masculine image. But we begin by examining

---

<sup>32</sup> See Dover (1980: 118) and Rowe (1998: 156).

<sup>33</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 193b.

<sup>34</sup> See also Dover (1978: 23).

<sup>35</sup> See above, p.144-145.

Xenophon's Hippothous, whose portrayal of his love for Hyperanthes shows a consciousness of both the theoretical ideals of paederasty, and the practical realities of homosexual love.

*Resisting the paederastic ideal?*

It is recognised that the Greek novels privilege heterosexual relationships, and it has often been argued that Hippothous' story stands as a negative contrast to that of Habrocomes and Anthia.<sup>36</sup> I shall argue that it is possible to read Xenophon as valorising Hippothous and Hyperanthes' relationship, and that any subordination is not of homosexual to heterosexual, but of hierarchical or unequal to reciprocal: what Xenophon seems to devalue are unequal, hierarchical relationships, such as characterise the classical paederastic ideal. We observed in the Introduction that discourses of masculinity are only ever partially recoverable.<sup>37</sup> This is especially so in the case of Xenophon, whose text raises more questions than it answers. We also noted that the disparity between ideals and reality may sometimes offer an opportunity for resistance.<sup>38</sup> I suggest here that Xenophon may be viewed as resisting the classical, unequal paederastic ideal, and as promoting a model of homosexual love analogous to reciprocal, heterosexual relationships. While several Second Sophistic texts use lack of reciprocity as an argument against paederasty, they seem to see only two options: love of boys or love of women.<sup>39</sup> Xenophon, by contrast, appears to advocate a third option: a reciprocal, equal homosexual relationship, unhampered by concerns over age and social hierarchy; where he does seem to endorse a relationship between an older and a younger male, he marks it out as different from classical-style paederasty, and more akin to reciprocal, heterosexual love.

But Xenophon's characterisation of Hippothous is contradictory and fraught with inconsistencies. On the one hand, he is a loyal friend who respects Habrocomes' marriage to Anthia,<sup>40</sup> and certain vocabulary shared by his story and that of

---

<sup>36</sup> Schmeling (1980: 54, 67-68); Konstan (1994a: 51; 1994b: 27, 48); O'Sullivan (1995: 52); Watanabe (2003a: 26ff.).

<sup>37</sup> See above, p.8.

<sup>38</sup> See above, p.10.

<sup>39</sup> We shall return intermittently to the debates on love in Plutarch, Ps.-Lucian, and Achilles Tatius, who all draw on arguments of this sort from a cultural store.

<sup>40</sup> X. Eph. 5.9.13.

Habrocomes and Anthia suggests that Xenophon wishes to put Hippothous' love for Hyperanthes on a par with the heterosexual love of the hero and heroine.<sup>41</sup> On the other, Hippothous is a bandit (always a semantically complex figure) with no compunctions about stringing up Anthia as a sacrifice to Ares or abandoning her to be mauled to death by dogs, and implicitly a coward, who throws away his weapons and flees from battle.<sup>42</sup> This inconsistent characterisation may be a reflection of the wide variety of attitudes towards homosexuality that co-existed in the early centuries A.D., evidenced in the novels, in moralising texts like those of Plutarch, and in deliberately provocative epigrams like those of Strato. Or it may be the product of a tension between classical models and the prevailing norms of Xenophon's own time. Xenophon may also be representative of the contradictory attitudes that might co-exist not only within a single society, but within a single individual. Furthermore, we should consider the possibility that the text we now have is some form of epitome, or at least not the original work as Xenophon wrote it, and that its apparent inconsistencies may be the result of its adulteration. As a consequence of these inconsistencies, the suggestions I offer regarding Hippothous' erotic relationships will necessarily be tentative.

Hippothous tells us that when young (νέος ὢν),<sup>43</sup> he had fallen in love with a youth (μειράκιον), Hyperanthes, having seen him wrestling in the gymnasium; unable to exercise *karteria*, he approached Hyperanthes at an all-night festival and begged his pity, which the youth duly granted, offering him kisses and touches at first. Thus far, we seem to be dealing with the pederastic ideal: an *erastēs* approaches an *erōmenos*, having spotted him in the archetypal homoerotic context, and the *erōmenos* accepts him, without allowing the relationship to progress too quickly.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Hippothous states that he and Hyperanthes 'were together for a long time, loving each other deeply' (3.2.4: Καὶ χρόνῳ συνῆμεν πολλῶ, στέργοντες ἀλλήλους διαφερόντως); cf. Anthia's use of the same words to acknowledge Habrocomes' feelings (2.4.5: "ἔχω μὲν" φησὶν, "Ἀβροκόμη, τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν σὴν καὶ στέργεσθαι διαφερόντως ὑπὸ σοῦ πεπίστευκα"). The use of στέργω and διαφερόντως seems to analogise the two relationships.

<sup>42</sup> Sacrifice: 2.13.1-2; dogs: 4.6.3; fleeing battle with weapons: 2.13.4; throwing away weapons and fleeing: 5.4.3. Hippothous' violent and apparently cowardly behaviour might be attributed the literary characterisation of bandits as often brutal and lacking in true *andreia* (cf. Apuleius' bandits (*Met.* 4), and the *Boukoloι* of Lollianus (B.1, Stephens & Winkler) and Achilles Tatius (3.15), who are murderous and cannibalistic); this is, however, complicated by Hippothous' true status as elite male. On the figure of the bandit in relation to male sexual behaviour, see below, p.217.

<sup>43</sup> X. Eph. 3.2.2ff. We are given no clear indication of Hippothous' age, or of how far in the past we are to locate his relationship with Hyperanthes. Do the words νέος ὢν suggest that he is now somewhat more mature, or do they indicate that he is *still* young?

But we are then presented with an interesting remark: the pair found an opportunity to be alone together καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἄλλοις ἀνύποπτον ἦν ('and the fact of our age was unsuspecting to others').<sup>44</sup> This leaves the question of what that age might be. The awareness of the classical paederastic paradigm apparent in Hippothous' description of the relationship prior to his reference to their age suggests that that reference also pertains to the paederastic ideal. If Hippothous and Hyperanthes were of different ages, they would conform to the paederastic model and an erotic relationship would thus be suspected. We must assume, therefore, that for their ages to be unsuspecting, the two young men must be approximate coevals.<sup>45</sup> Here we might think of Aeschines' speech against Timarchus, where Aeschines stresses that Misgolas, with whom Timarchus lived, was not a friend of his father, nor his age-mate; had he been either of these things, the relationship would apparently not have been suspicious, but Misgolas' status as an older man has the capacity to identify his relationship with Timarchus as erotic.<sup>46</sup> While Hippothous' initial description of the relationship suggests conformity to the ideal courtship roles of *erastēs* and *erōmenos*, he and Hyperanthes are able to spend time together precisely because they *do not* conform to the age criteria of the paederastic ideal, and so do not arouse suspicion. The ideal thus ironically facilitates a non-conformist relationship, and yet the reference to suspicion suggests that they are obliged to hide the true nature of that relationship if they are to maintain it. The reference also implies that if they were of different ages they would be subject to some level of social scrutiny to ensure that they behaved according to the accepted norms of paederasty.

Xenophon's inclusion in his novel of a same-sex, (probably) same-age sexual relationship must have held some level of plausibility with his audience, though perhaps also a sense of deviance: readers were surely aware that such relationships existed, but they were equally aware of the classical paederastic paradigm, even in

<sup>44</sup> 3.2.4, accepting Papanikolaou's printing of Hemsterhuis' emendation of the manuscript's ἀλλήλοισις to ἄλλοις: it makes no sense to think that the boys' ages should be unsuspecting to each other.

<sup>45</sup> The reference to age may possibly mean not that they were the same age, but that they were too young to arouse suspicion of a sexual relationship; this would then raise the question, 'How young is too young'? This interpretation seems less likely.

<sup>46</sup> Aeschin. 1.42. The reference also identifies Timarchus as the passive partner; the fact that Timarchus has deliberately sought out this role gives the observation of age difference its pejorative punch.

the imperial period.<sup>47</sup> Halperin (1990: 47) argues for a ‘twilight zone’ in sexual maturation, where erotic relations between coeval males occurred, but he states that even in such relationships one youth took a passive role and the other an active one, and that he knows of ‘no evidence suggesting that such lovers took turns or switched roles’ (*ibid.*).<sup>48</sup> In a note, Halperin refers to Hippothous and Hyperanthes, remarking that the text makes it clear that only Hippothous experiences *erōs*, prevailing upon Hyperanthes to pity him, and thus conforming, at least in outward appearance, to the conventional *erastēs/erōmenos* pattern (*ibid.* 169, n.9). While I would agree that the pattern is evident at surface-level, I would hesitate to extend it any further. The narrative form of Hippothous’ story precludes access to Hyperanthes’ feelings.<sup>49</sup> Hippothous’ status as non-omniscient narrator does not allow us to assign exclusively active or passive roles to the participants. What is more, if the relationship contravenes ideal paederastic age conventions, who knows what other conventions it may contravene? Konstan (1994b: 26ff.) reads *Hyperanthes*’ apparent passivity in everyday life and dependence upon Hippothous as the mark of an unequal relationship, but argues that *Habrocomes*’ passivity ‘is best understood as a function or condition of ... equivalence’ with Anthia. He identifies Hippothous and Anthia as active and resourceful, but ignores the appearance of weakness or passivity in them.<sup>50</sup> It seems to me, however, that Xenophon endeavours to present Hippothous and Hyperanthes as experiencing reciprocal, non-hierarchical love, on a par with that of the hero and heroine, in which both have periods of activity and passivity in their day-to-day life. While Xenophon clearly has knowledge of, and is influenced by, the paederastic ideal, he does not seem to wish the reader to identify

---

<sup>47</sup> In the novels and elsewhere, engagement with texts such as Plato’s *Symposium* and Aeschines’ speech against Timarchus testifies to the era’s acute awareness of the model of older *erastēs*/younger *erōmenos*.

<sup>48</sup> There is, however, an epigram attributed to Strato (who was famously enthused by boys) that, in an implicit analogy between humans and animals, refers to a tendency among young male dogs (οἱ κύναιοι πῶλοι) to mount each other and to alternate between the roles of active mounter and passive mounted. They are described as ‘playing the boy’, or ‘acting a youthful part’ (μειρακιευόμενοι), as if such behaviour is especially associated with youth (*AP* 12.238). Strato is not shy of self-contradiction: though advocating this behaviour here, at *AP* 12.245 he separates humans from animals by stating that humans are superior to beasts because they have invented buggery (*cf.* Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 36).

<sup>49</sup> Yet see above, p.171, n.41, for the suggestion that Hippothous, at least, thinks his feelings were reciprocated.

<sup>50</sup> Both shed tears upon their first lovemaking (1.9.2, 3.2.4); Anthia waits in the bandits’ cave after killing Anchialus as she has no one to lead her (4.5.6; see above, p.106); and Hippothous flees from battle (see above, p.171).

Hippothous and Hyperanthes unequivocally with the sexual roles of *erastēs* and *erōmenos*, or, more generally, as active and passive.

Hyperanthes' premature death has been interpreted as a contrast to the happy ending of the story of Habrocomes and Anthia, as well as to the natural death in old age of Thelxinoe in Xenophon's heterosexual inset tale.<sup>51</sup> Klabunde (2001: 29) and Watanabe (2003a: 75) offer an alternative explanation for the premature death of an *erōmenos*, suggesting that death at the height of beauty leaves a lasting and aesthetically pleasing memory, while also obviating the difficulty of how the homosexual relationship would proceed once the two youths were grown men. This analysis, which I find convincing, suggests that Xenophon may be acknowledging a very real problem almost inevitably faced by those involved in loving homosexual relationships from the advent of the paederastic paradigm. While we have noted that the paradigm was undoubtedly an ideal rather than a universal reality, we have also seen from our examination of the novels' construction of *paideia* and *andreia* that ideals of masculinity, and the ideology of which they form a part, could be extremely powerful and persuasive things: for the man who felt homosexual desire, the pressure to adhere to paederastic etiquette must have been intense. Hippothous and Hyperanthes have already transgressed social norms in terms of their age; Xenophon may perhaps reflect the cultural pressure of the paederastic ideal by killing off Hyperanthes before the relationship can further contravene paederastic *nomoi*.<sup>52</sup>

We see a similar reflection of such cultural pressure in Achilles Tatius' portrayal of Cleinias and Menelaus, who, like Hippothous, lose their beloved *μειράκια*

<sup>51</sup> See references at n.36, above. Watanabe (2003a: 76-77; 2003b: 13) notes a similarity between the circumstances of Hyperanthes' death and the death of Hadrian's young lover, Antinous; he does not note that if Xenophon was alluding to this historical incident, such an allusion would have consequences for his dating. However, potential death by shipwreck and drowning is a stock motif in the Greek novels, and may serve to draw an equivalence between Hippothous' homosexual relationship and the heterosexual relationships of the genre's heroes and heroines. Moreover, we have noted that Hippothous and Hyperanthes seem to be the same age, so their relationship is not paederastic in the way that Hadrian and Antinous' relationship was.

<sup>52</sup> In his *Amatorius*, Plutarch as interlocutor remarks that, in contrast to heterosexual pairings, there are few examples of long-lasting same-sex relationships (770c); he does not acknowledge the possible influence of the traditional paederastic model, which must surely have contributed to this dearth of examples: if it is not the done thing to continue a homosexual relationship beyond a certain age-boundary, then such a relationship will presumably either peter out or retreat underground, accounting for the shortage of overt instances – indeed, as we have noted, Hippothous and Hyperanthes seem to have to hide their relationship.



prematurely in tragic circumstances due, in part, to their own actions: Cleinias loses Charicles to the rampage of the horse he himself had given his beloved as a gift, and Menelaus loses his anonymous *μειράκιον* to his own spear, while attempting to save him from the charge of a wild boar.<sup>53</sup> Unlike Hippothous, Cleinias and Menelaus seem to conform to the paederastic model, yet in their cases too we find the homosexual relationships severed before the *erōmenoi* mature. Watanabe (2003b: 13) argues that paederastic relationships ‘were bound to end with the physical maturation of the *erōmenoi*’, but Pausanias’ statement in Plato’s *Symposium*, that the highest form of boy-love is that commenced when the boy is beginning to mature, evidenced by the growth of facial hair,<sup>54</sup> suggests that some such relationships did continue beyond that pivotal moment. However, the paederastic ideal seems to be conceived overwhelmingly as a rite of passage on the part of the *erōmenos* and an assertion of adult masculinity on the part of the *erastēs*, and is thus perhaps culturally inscribed with a sense of loss and transience that is then reflected in the stories of doomed love affairs like those of Hippothous, Cleinias, and Menelaus.

Konstan (1994a: 51; 1994b: 27) has argued that Hippothous and Hyperanthes’ relationship is an unequal one, and that Hyperanthes’ failure to ward off Aristomachus’ advances is symptomatic of that inequality, contrasting with Anthia’s stalwart and repeated defence of her chastity. But Hyperanthes does attempt to resist Aristomachus, and it is the fact that he is still subject to the whims of his father that makes that resistance unsuccessful, rather than any inequality.<sup>55</sup> It is Aristomachus

---

<sup>53</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.12, 2.34.

<sup>54</sup> See above, p.168. Pausanias also states here that the age at which boys first grow beards is also the age at which they are beginning to develop their own minds; those who are attracted to boys of this age are drawn by heavenly love. Pausanias’ reference to the development of the mind might suggest boys who have reached an age at which they are capable of exercising some autonomy within a relationship, and thus of being more than passive receivers of an *erastēs*’ attentions.

<sup>55</sup> In fact, Hippothous’ narrative uses vocabulary which echoes that used by Anthia of Habrocomes’ feelings for her, seeming to analogise the homosexual relationship with the heterosexual (see also above, p.171, n.41): Hyperanthes is said to resist Aristomachus’ advances because he feels *εὐνοία* for Hippothous (3.2.7); similarly, when suggesting to Habrocomes that he submit to Manto’s advances, Anthia refers to the *εὐνοία* he feels for her, Anthia (2.4.5), implying that, as in Hyperanthes’ case, it is that ‘good will’ that induces Habrocomes’ resistance to Manto. There is another possible explanation for Hyperanthes’ inability to preserve himself for Hippothous. Both this detail and the unhappy ending of the story may be intended to build tension, rather than to act as a counterpoint to the main story. Bartsch (1989) has argued that Achilles Tatius’ digressions guide the reader’s interpretation of the larger story, and often deliberately mislead. The two inset tales may be thought to serve a similar purpose: Hyperanthes’ powerlessness to preserve himself, together with his tragic death, all presented at the mid-point of the novel, could make the reader fear the same fate for Habrocomes and Anthia; likewise, the happier tale of Aegialeus and Thelxinoe, set near the novel’s

himself – the embodiment of hierarchical, unequal paederasty – who signals the real inequality in Hippothous' story, as Hyperanthes is effectively sold by his father to the λόγων τεχνίτης.<sup>56</sup> Aristomachus' motives are clearly other than education, and his characterisation employs the familiar *topos* of the philosopher or teacher of rhetoric who abuses his position in order to advance a paederastic relationship with his young and sexually-vulnerable charges. Plutarch's Daphnaeus, for example, claims that paederasty disguises itself as philosophy, while Petronius' Eumolpus bears this out by feigning disgust at homosexual love so as to be entrusted with the education of his host's beautiful son, and thus have the opportunity to sleep with him.<sup>57</sup> Aristomachus keeps Hyperanthes locked away, another stock motif used to symbolise love that is not reciprocated.<sup>58</sup> In short, all that may be thought negative about classical paederasty is figured in Aristomachus: it is hierarchical, unreciprocal, and its structure facilitates the abuse of power.

Compelled by love to follow Hyperanthes to Byzantium, Hippothous neglects his own affairs at Perinthus.<sup>59</sup> Edwards (1993: 85) has noted that imperial Roman texts often portrayed as effeminate any man distracted from his public responsibilities by private erotic desires, or considered to be excessively fond even of his wife. But we do not have to assume that Xenophon intends us to read Hippothous as effeminate. Hippothous in fact behaves in a way characteristic of besotted heterosexual lovers in the novels, again seeming to assimilate heterosexual and homosexual love, and emphasising strength of feeling: on falling for Callirhoe, Chaereas lets his usual pursuits lapse, while Dionysius, grieving for his dead wife, confines himself to the

---

climax, leaves a clue as to the actual outcome. As well as being analogous in the narrative purpose they serve, the two inset tales are also analogous in their strength of feeling: Hippothous' love for Hyperanthes is so enduring that he builds a tomb for him at the close of the novel (5.15.4), and Aegialeus' love for Thelxinoe so much so that he embalms her (5.1.10).

<sup>56</sup> 3.2.8.

<sup>57</sup> Plu. *Amatorius* 752a; Petr. 85ff.; see also Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 23-24, where Charicles mocks philosophers who claim to love only the souls of boys. The formula runs both ways: Aeschines presents Timarchus, ever-desirous of the passive sexual role, as prostituting himself while posing as a student in order to cloak his activities (Aeschin. 1.40); this will be relevant when we come to examine Thersander later in the chapter.

<sup>58</sup> X. Eph. 3.2.8: Παραλαβὼν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ μὲν πρῶτα κατάκλειστον εἶχε; cf. Thisbe's statement in a letter to Cnemon that Thermouthis is keeping her locked up: καμὲ κατακλείσας ἔχει (Hld. 2.10.2); and Sosthenes' proposition that Leucippe be kept locked up so that Thersander can take advantage of her: εἰ θέλεις, κατακλείσας αὐτὴν φυλάξω σοι, ὡς ὑπὸ σοὶ γένοιτο (Ach. Tat. 6.3.6). The impression of Hyperanthes as a prisoner is given again at 3.2.9: Hippothous is unable to spend much time with him because he is constantly being watched.

<sup>59</sup> 3.2.9: Εἰπόμην κάγω, πάντων καταφρονήσας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ...

house, ignoring his political duties in the city,<sup>60</sup> there is no indication in either case that the lover is in any way less masculine for failing to perform his accustomed public functions on account of love.<sup>61</sup> The subsequent scenario of Hippothous and Hyperanthes' elopement by night is later replicated in the story of Aegialeus and Thelxinoe, and both Hyperanthes and Thelxinoe are presented by the narrators as having agreed in advance to the proposed plan;<sup>62</sup> in both cases the consent of the beloved suggests an equality of mind and desire.

Watanabe (2003a: 86; 2003b: 9-10, 14) observes that Hippothous' murder of Aristomachus equates him with historical tyrannicides valorised in the Greek literary tradition, thus legitimising what is essentially an illegal act. This is a convincing argument, although I would suggest that Hippothous' enraged response to the sight of another man in bed with his beloved also parallels Chaereas' reaction to Callirhoe's alleged adultery: as we saw in Chapter 1, Chaereas' attack on Callirhoe is precipitated by anger, and Hippothous too is said to be 'filled with anger'.<sup>63</sup> We also saw that Chaereas' violence might be countenanced as the legitimate reaction of a cuckolded husband, avenging himself against another's insult.<sup>64</sup> Might we see Hippothous' violence in the same light, as reasonable in view of the offence he feels he has suffered? If his love for Hyperanthes may be read as the homosexual analogue of that between Habrocomes and Anthia, Aegialeus and Thelxinoe, or Chaereas and Callirhoe, it is worthy of the same protection; Hippothous thus avenges himself on an adulterer in an appropriate manner, asserting his masculinity in the mould of both classical tyrannicide and wounded novelistic lover.<sup>65</sup> Watanabe (2003a: 58, n.74)<sup>66</sup> notes that Hippothous here refers to Hyperanthes as παῖς, while

<sup>60</sup> Chariton 1.1.9-10; 2.1.1. See also Ach. Tat. 1.7.2: Cleitophon has previously teased Cleinias for neglecting his own affairs for love of Charicles; now that he himself is experiencing love, he is no longer able to mock his cousin.

<sup>61</sup> With this we might contrast the Roman elegists, who knowingly project as *mollis* the abdication of public duties in favour of a life of love.

<sup>62</sup> 3.2.10; 5.1.7.

<sup>63</sup> 3.2.10: ὀργῆς πλησθεὶς ...

<sup>64</sup> See above, p.82.

<sup>65</sup> Similarities may also be noted between Chaereas' response to his apparent murder of the innocent Callirhoe, and the reactions of Cleinias and Menelaus to the deaths of their beloveds: both Cleinias and Menelaus blame themselves, and like Chaereas, Menelaus begs the court to put him to death, but receives pity (Chariton 1.5.4ff.; Ach. Tat. 1.14, 2.34.6). Furthermore, like the heterosexual lovers, Leucippe and Cleitophon, Charicles appears to be considering nocturnal elopement as a means of avoiding an unwanted marriage: his enigmatic statement 'πολλὰ δὲ ἂν γένοιτο καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ μιᾷ' (1.8.10) seems to suggest that the cover of darkness may provide an escape.

<sup>66</sup> See also 2003a: 68, 85.

he had earlier called him μειράκιον, and this, for him, symbolises inequality, such that ‘Hyperanthes has slid down the scale of masculinity’. However, the use of πῶς seems to me intended to spell out the nature of the relationship between Hyperanthes and Aristomachus: Hippothous does not mean to slur Hyperanthes’ masculinity, but to make explicit the fact that Aristomachus has taken him as his boy lover. A homosexual or paederastic relationship between two willing participants who love each other equally is a positive thing, but here Hyperanthes is an unwilling *pais*. The inequality and lack of reciprocity in this new relationship stands in stark contrast with the kind of love we have heard described as existing between Hippothous and Hyperanthes.

We have observed several parallels between Hippothous’ story and those of Habrocomes and Anthia, and Aegialeus and Thelxinoe, and suggested that such parallels may be thought to analogise reciprocal homosexual and heterosexual love. Of course, given that Hippothous’ love for Hyperanthes is narrated by Hippothous himself, we might argue that it is in his interest to portray himself as a romantic hero on a par with his heterosexual counterparts. But other parts of the text suggest that we should read Hippothous’ story as part of the imperial debate – engaged in also by Achilles, Plutarch, Ps.-Lucian, and Longus, as we shall see – which negotiated the relationship between homosexual and heterosexual erotics. Having heard Aegialeus’ story, Habrocomes states that he has learned (μεμάθηκα) that true love (ἔρως ἀληθινός) has no boundary of age (ὄρον ἡλικίας),<sup>67</sup> meaning that it is everlasting, but also perhaps that anyone of any age can feel true love, and can feel it *for* anyone of any age.<sup>68</sup> At the end of the novel, Xenophon refers to Hippothous’ building of a tomb for Hyperanthes: although Hippothous has found a new love with Cleisthenes,<sup>69</sup> his feelings for Hyperanthes endure.<sup>70</sup> We are clearly intended to relate Aegialeus’ story to that of Hippothous, and both of those to that of Habrocomes. Habrocomes’ use of ἡλικία after hearing of Aegialeus’ love for Thelxinoe acts as a connector between all three stories, for we earlier heard

---

<sup>67</sup> 5.1.12.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Anthia’s perplexity at falling in love with Habrocomes at such a young age: παρθένος παρ’ ἡλικίαν ἐρῶ (1.4.6); in the same short soliloquy she questions where will be the limit (ὄρος) of her desire (1.4.7).

<sup>69</sup> Which we shall consider shortly.

<sup>70</sup> He also keeps a lock of Hyperanthes’ hair (3.3.3).

Hippothous use the same word in relation to Hyperanthes. There we saw that Hippothous (and so Xenophon) was conscious of the significance of age in homosexual relationships. If we relate Habrocomes' comment to Hippothous' story, it could be taken as a contestation by Xenophon (through his character) of some of the cultural constraints imposed on paederastic love, or indeed on any form of love: a love that is dictated by boundaries of age does not qualify as 'true love'; whether love is homosexual or heterosexual, what matters is that it is reciprocal and non-hierarchical. But we shall see later that although Xenophon might here be thought to reject the importance of age boundaries, he elsewhere strongly underpins culturally-determined elements of masculinity.

In the introduction to this chapter we noted both Richlin's belief that fixed sexual preferences were recognised in Graeco-Roman antiquity, and Thorp's contestation of Foucault's argument that definable sexualities did not exist in the ancient world.<sup>71</sup> At first glance Xenophon's narrative would seem to contradict this notion of fixed sexuality, as Hippothous is involved in a variety of relationships with both males and females, all of which potentially contain a sexual element: when we first meet him, he appears to be attracted to Habrocomes; he then relates his love for Hyperanthes; following his separation from Habrocomes he marries an elderly woman and later makes sexual overtures to Anthia; and finally he settles down with the young Cleisthenes. However, I would argue that despite this seeming fluidity of sexual preference, Hippothous in fact provides an example of a man with a fixed sexuality, whose relationships with women are merely performances of expected or necessary roles.

The first of these relationships with women is the result of constraint: a lack of resources forces Hippothous to marry an elderly woman who has fallen in love with him.<sup>72</sup> We might be reminded here of the words of Plato's Aristophanes, stating that some men would really rather spend their lives with males, but are forced to marry by social duress.<sup>73</sup> Hippothous marries not out of conformity to societal pressure to procreate, but in response to the immediate need to support himself; he is bound not

---

<sup>71</sup> See above, p.162-163 and p.167.

<sup>72</sup> 5.9.1.

<sup>73</sup> See also Protogenes' words at Plu. *Amatorius* 750c, and the references above, p.167, n.22.

by the demands of the life of an elite male, but by those of a life of brigandage, and is quite capable of performing the role of heterosexual male as a means of legacy-hunting. In the final book Hippothous is said to fall for Anthia. While this might be thought to denote the absence of a fixed sexuality, one could argue that it in fact serves to emphasise the heroine's beauty: she is so beautiful that even Hippothous – until now a lover of males – is won over. Konstan (1994b: 38, 41) sees a uniformity in Xenophon's depiction of love: taking the pirates Corymbus and Euxeinus as examples, he argues that Xenophon does not divide erotic sentiment into sexual desire and more profound attraction, and that he tends to present rivals as motivated by love (ἔρωσ), rather than by lust (ἐπιθυμία); ἐπιθυμία, Konstan argues, is merely a consequence of ἔρωσ, and 'everyone who conceives a passion for Habrocomes or Anthia appears to be moved by *erōs*' (*ibid.* 42). Yet Konstan can only make these claims by not taking into account the language used of Hippothous' feelings for Anthia,<sup>74</sup> which differs significantly from that used when others fall in love with Anthia or Habrocomes, and also from that used when Hippothous describes his feelings for Hyperanthes:

... ἐκ δὲ τῆς καθημερινῆς σὺν τῇ κόρῃ διαίτησ εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν Ἀνθίας καὶ Ἰππόθοος ἔρχεται καὶ συνελθεῖν ἐβούλετο καὶ πολλὰ ὑπισχνεῖται αὐτῇ.

... and through day-to-day living with the girl, Hippothous too entered upon a desire for Anthia, wanted to have sex with her, and promised her many things (X. Eph. 5.9.11).

Neither the verb ἐράω nor the noun ἔρωσ is ever used of Hippothous' inclinations towards Anthia: he responds to her only with ἐπιθυμία, which marks him out radically from every other rival. Is Xenophon deliberately employing the language of ἐπιθυμία rather than ἔρωσ because he wishes his readers to interpret Hippothous' desire as of a different breed from the novel's other love rivals? It is also worth asking what the import of the words 'καὶ Ἰππόθοος' might be. Is it simply that Hippothous is just another in a long line of admirers? Or might it carry the sense of 'even Hippothous', implying that Anthia's beauty and nature are such

<sup>74</sup> His feelings are in fact glossed over with one sentence (1994b: 45).

that even someone devoted to the love of males might have his head turned?<sup>75</sup> Certainly, the language chosen casts some doubt on Konstan's arguments: Hippothous seems at this point to feel no more than lust for Anthia, and to desire no more than sex, and his promises are made with a view to sweet-talking her into bed. But these feelings are apparently ephemeral and easily forgotten, for as soon as he learns that Anthia is Habrocomes' wife, he abandons his ἐπιθυμία and assists her in recovering her husband. The fleeting and crush-like nature of his ἐπιθυμία might be taken as an indication that his more profound homosexual feelings are in fact evidence of a fixed sexuality.

The suggestion of a fixed homosexual disposition brings us to Hippothous' other relationships with males. His initial meeting with Habrocomes has been thought indicative of homosexual attraction, but the scene is far from simple, and appears to invite several interpretations. Hippothous calls Habrocomes καλός and ἀνδρικός, and seems to be expressing erotic appreciation of his youthful beauty.<sup>76</sup> Schmeling (1980: 52) states that 'when Hippothous (the older man) meets Habrocomes (a youth) ..., they strike up a very natural homosexual relationship, temporary in nature, and aberrant from Habrocomes' natural instincts, but not from Hippothous', as the story will illustrate'. Schmeling sees between Hippothous and Habrocomes a sexual paederastic relationship which remains unnarrated 'because [Xenophon] supposes that every reader will understand what is happening' (*ibid.*). The text as it stands does not allow us to assume this.<sup>77</sup> The most we can say is that Hippothous appears to find Habrocomes physically attractive, perhaps because his youthful beauty reminds him of his lost love, Hyperanthes.<sup>78</sup> But might we also see something rather sinister in Hippothous' approach to Habrocomes? Habrocomes encounters a man who is possibly older than him, is specifically said to be armed (ὠπλισμένω), and who runs to him (προτρέχει), greets or embraces him (φιλοφρονεῖται), asks him – possibly with a sense of necessity or compulsion

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Hld. 8.9.4, where beauty and nobility are capable of moving even barbarians to pity, and 8.13.2, where the eunuch Euphrates similarly experiences a change of heart towards Theagenes and Charicleia as a result of their looks and characters.

<sup>76</sup> 2.14.2.

<sup>77</sup> Watanabe (2003b: 25) considers Hippothous to be attracted to Habrocomes, but does not see a sexual relationship between the two.

<sup>78</sup> Hippothous keeps a lock of Hyperanthes' hair as a memento: perhaps Habrocomes ('pretty hair') does indeed remind him of his beloved.

(δεῖται) – to join him on his travels, and praises his looks;<sup>79</sup> Habrocomes keeps quiet about his reason for being on the road, agrees to join Hippothous, apparently under duress (ἀναγκάζονται τῷ Ἴπποθῶ), and the two then swear oaths to cooperate in brigandage (συνεργήσειν τε καὶ συλλήψεσθαι).<sup>80</sup> The particular language used here seems to suggest an intimidating older man press-ganging a youth into joining him, and thus beginning to replenish his gang.<sup>81</sup> We shall observe that once the heroes of the novels have fallen for the heroines, they are no longer eligible for homosexual relationships; this alone makes a relationship between Hippothous and Habrocomes unlikely. If we are correct to see Xenophon as valorising *reciprocal* homosexual relationships, it seems even more unlikely given the sense of coercion in Hippothous' approach to Habrocomes. By this point in the narrative, the reader has already been given to understand that participation in a paederastic relationship would jeopardise Habrocomes' masculinity,<sup>82</sup> which is here stressed by Hippothous' use of the word ἀνδρικός. Burg (1984) has shown that homosexual behaviour was common among brigand groups in the seventeenth century. If the figure of the bandit with homosexual proclivities was also a familiar one to readers of the imperial period, whether from life or merely as a literary stereotype,<sup>83</sup> then the mere suggestion of Hippothous' sexual attraction to Habrocomes might be sufficient to serve the literary purpose of provoking a fear in the reader's mind for the integrity of the hero's masculinity, thus increasing suspense.

Upon the death of his elderly wife, Hippothous becomes the beneficiary of a large inheritance, and is motivated by a desire to recover Habrocomes, with whom he

---

<sup>79</sup> Hippothous' homosexual inclinations seem to drive him in his efforts to reconstitute his brigand gang; as well as praising Habrocomes on his looks, at 3.1.2 he is again on the look-out for νεανίσκους ἀκμάζοντας to add to his force.

<sup>80</sup> 2.14.1-4.

<sup>81</sup> This sense of threat, followed by a transition to friendship and benefaction, fits the generic pattern evidenced by characters such as Dorcon and Gnathon in Longus, Thyamis in Heliodorus, and Xenophon's own Lampon.

<sup>82</sup> This is the message conveyed by the Corymbus episode (2.1.3), which we shall examine shortly. Habrocomes' violent reaction to Corymbus' advances complicates immeasurably Schmeling's assumption of a sexual relationship between the hero and Hippothous.

<sup>83</sup> It is not clear whether brigands were commonly stereotyped as homosexual, though Xenophon's casting of both Hippothous and Corymbus as such might suggest that he was drawing on a recognisable type. Whether or not brigands were presented as paederasts, the sources certainly present paederasty as a figurative form of brigandage: see, e.g., Plu. *Amatorius* 751d, where Daphnaeus argues that paederasty without a boy's consent involves 'force and brigandage' (βίαις ... καὶ λεηλασίας).



hopes to share ‘his whole life and his possessions’.<sup>84</sup> Immediately thereafter we are introduced to Cleisthenes, an elite μειράκιον whom Hippothous takes with him to Italy, and who is said to be able to share Hippothous’ possessions on account of his good looks.<sup>85</sup> Xenophon seems to be making an equation between Hippothous’ feelings for Habrocomes and his feelings for Cleisthenes. This equation also extends to his feelings for Hyperanthes: Hippothous refers to both Habrocomes and Hyperanthes as φίλτατε, and Habrocomes, Hyperanthes, and Cleisthenes are each said to be a μειράκιον and to be καλός.<sup>86</sup> It seems that in Habrocomes and Cleisthenes, Hippothous is reminded of, and seeks a replacement for, his true love Hyperanthes.<sup>87</sup> Cleisthenes’ abrupt introduction gives pause for thought: has Hippothous been conducting a relationship with him while married to the elderly woman? Ogden (1996: 110) argues that paederasty did not necessarily cease upon the marriage of one of the partners, as the traditional paederastic model tends to assume;<sup>88</sup> perhaps Hippothous has been finding a sexual outlet with Cleisthenes while awaiting the death of a woman whom only financial constraints forced him to marry. O’Sullivan (1995: 49) considers that Cleisthenes’ first appearance clearly marks him out as Hippothous’ lover; an erotic undercurrent certainly seems implied by the reference to Cleisthenes’ beauty, which, as we have seen, echoes Hippothous’ compliment to Habrocomes, and his description of Hyperanthes. On Rhodes, Hippothous and Cleisthenes are said to rest together after the long reunion celebrations, and the impression given is very much of three couples: Leucon and

<sup>84</sup> 5.9.2: τοῦ βίου παντὸς καὶ τῶν κτημάτων.

<sup>85</sup> 5.9.3: καὶ πάντων μετεῖχε τῶν Ἰπποθοῦ κτημάτων, καλὸς ὢν.

<sup>86</sup> Φίλτατε: 3.2.15, 3.3.2; μειράκιον/καλός: 2.14.2, 3.2.2, 5.9.3.

<sup>87</sup> Alvares (1995: 403) views Hippothous’ desire to share his life with Habrocomes as a desire for a *particular type* of life: that of respectable elite male; for Alvares this marks a point of progress in Hippothous’ rehabilitative journey, during which he comes full-circle from respectable elite male, through violent bandit, and back to respectable elite male.

<sup>88</sup> The sources conflict on whether homosexual relationships ceased at marriage: Callirhoe suggests that Chaereas’ *erastai* might have taken umbrage at his marriage, implying that any paederastic liaisons in which he may have been involved had terminated at the point of wedlock (Chariton 1.3.6); similarly, Pusias, one of Bacchon’s suitors in Plutarch’s *Amatorius*, reacts negatively to Bacchon’s imminent marriage (749e); and, as we shall see shortly, Achilles Tatius’ Cleinias is anguished at the fact that Charicles’ father has arranged a marriage for him (Ach. Tat. 1.8), suggesting that it may oblige them to end their relationship. A (deliberately transgressive?) epigram attributed to Strato, however, implies that marriage was not necessarily an impediment to homosexual love: ‘Now thou art fair, Diodorus, and ripe for lovers, but even if thou dost marry, we shall not abandon thee’ (AP 12.9; Loeb trans.).

Rhode, Hippothous and the young and beautiful Cleisthenes, and Habrocomes and Anthia.<sup>89</sup>

At the end of the novel the group returns to Ephesus, but the final line on Hippothous' relationship with Cleisthenes is damaged: 'καὶ τὸν Κλειθένη παῖδα ποιησόμενος ὁ Ἰπποθόου'.<sup>90</sup> The phrase παῖδα ἐποιεῖτο is used of Araxus' treatment of Habrocomes,<sup>91</sup> providing a precedent for the supplement conjectured by editors for the gap in the line on Hippothous and Cleisthenes. That supplement is usually taken to mean that Hippothous adopts or looks upon Cleisthenes as a son. A father-son relationship would depend upon Hippothous' earlier words, νέος ὢν, meaning that he is now older – old enough to be thought of as father to a μειράκιον. Such a relationship also implies that although Xenophon might resist the hierarchical aspects of pederasty, he feels the pressure of certain of its protocols, such as the ending of the homosexual relationship before maturity, as we have observed in the story of Hyperanthes. But the use of παῖς here may be somewhat loaded, as we saw it to be in the Aristomachus episode. If it is correct to interpret παῖδα ποιησόμενος as signifying an adoption,<sup>92</sup> then Hippothous may be using the appearance of a father-son bond as a cover for prolonging what has begun as a pederastic relationship.<sup>93</sup> Konstan (1994b: 39) states that the adoption 'marks the termination of the pederastic relationship',<sup>94</sup> though I am not sure that we can be so confident, especially in view of the sense Xenophon has given shortly before of three couples. The 'adoption' of Cleisthenes – if this is what it is – enables Hippothous to circumvent pederastic age protocols, and to continue a loving relationship neatly analogous to those of Habrocomes and Anthia, and Leucon and Rhode. In contrast to the unequal, hierarchical, abusive pederasty between Aristomachus and

---

<sup>89</sup> 5.13.6.

<sup>90</sup> 5.15.4.

<sup>91</sup> 3.12.4.

<sup>92</sup> It may not be necessary to read the phrase in this way. It may instead indicate that Hippothous now considers Cleisthenes his *pais*, his boy lover, where up to this point the relationship was perhaps romantic, but not yet sexual.

<sup>93</sup> I would not want to suggest that this applies also to Araxus and Habrocomes, but rather that when the context is clearly pederastic, it is very difficult to read the word παῖς without homosexual overtones; cf. the use of παῖς in Longus' Gnathon episode (4.12.3), to which we shall return later.

<sup>94</sup> Konstan does not acknowledge the uncertain nature of the text here. Watanabe (2003a: 86-87) is more cautious, but he does not note the damage to the text either.

Hyperanthes, Cleisthenes is a replacement for, and reminder of, the true love Hippothous had, and still has, for Hyperanthes.<sup>95</sup>

The Platonic Aristophanes' creation myth suggests that we are all seeking the same thing in a sexual partner: a symbolic substitute for a part of ourselves that we have lost. In attaching himself to Habrocomes and subsequently adopting Cleisthenes, Hippothous seems to be seeking something similar: a surrogate for an original and true love. His enduring love for Hyperanthes appears to confirm Thorp's belief that Greek sexuality could be profound and like our own. The expediency of his marriage, and the apparent superficiality and ephemerality of his attraction to Anthia, only make Hippothous' feelings for males seem more profound and more like a fixed sexuality. Hippothous may be emblematic of a contemporary struggle to reconcile classical conceptions of sexual desire – wherein the erotic appeal of both boys and women is appreciated, and the paederastic ideal is powerful – with the emergence of more fixed (or at least less fluid) sexual dispositions. We now move on to explore the self-positioning of Achilles Tatius' characters, which also seems to suggest the recognition of more fixed sexual categories.

#### *Performing sexual identities.*

Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 2) observes that Achilles' novel deliberately draws attention to its Platonic models and presents the reader 'with characters playing Platonic roles in a Platonic setting'. This text, in other words, is defined by performance and role-play. In the context of homosexuality, the most obvious example of such performance, especially in a Platonic sense, is the debate on love in Book 2. We shall examine that shortly, but first we must consider the groundwork for it, which is laid in Book 1 when Cleitophon asks his cousin Cleinias for advice

---

<sup>95</sup> The fact that Xenophon seems to make Hippothous the subject of his final words is interesting in itself: are Hippothous and his relationship as important to the author as the hero and heroine? Another question the text raises (but does not enable us to answer) is whether the names of Xenophon's homosexual characters have any significance, and how this might fit his overall aims. When the reader meets Hippothous, he has twice heard Habrocomes refer to homosexual sex with the verb ὑποτίθημι (2.1.3-4: ὑποθῶ, ὑποθείην); as well as meaning 'swift horse', might the name Ἴππόθοος also suggest homosexual sex? As we noted earlier (see above, p.168, n.30), Cleisthenes was the name of an effeminate lampooned in several of Aristophanes' plays, which the educated reader would surely have known. Is Xenophon's positive portrayal of Cleisthenes' relationship with Hippothous an attempt to rehabilitate this figure; or is his choice of a name suggestive of effeminacy merely one of the many inconsistencies of Xenophon's text; or is the name of no significance at all? Hägg (2004 (1971)) is of no help on this matter.

on how best to approach Leucippe. As Cleinias is about to address the problem, his beloved Charicles bursts in to report that his father is planning to marry him to a rich but ugly girl.<sup>96</sup> Charicles' dramatic opening statement, "Οἴχομαί σοι" ("I am dead to you"), and Cleinias' equally dramatic reaction, suggest that they see themselves as classical paederasts whose relationship will be ended by marriage; but Cleinias urges Charicles to defy the ideal of progression from the role of *erōmenos* to that of *erastēs* in marriage by refusing the proposed match.<sup>97</sup> Cleinias and Charicles perform the stock roles of innocent men brought low by the evils of women, and Cleinias' use of literary quotations and references to poetry and the stage identify his words as part of a self-conscious performance.<sup>98</sup> While hating the female sex as a matter of principle, both men seem able to appreciate female beauty, considering the evil of women to be somewhat mitigated by a tolerable outward form.<sup>99</sup> But an appreciation of female beauty does not equate to sexual attraction towards women. Cleinias and Charicles seem rather to provide examples of men with fixed sexualities: like those descended from double-males in Aristophanes' creation myth, they would rather not marry at all, but if social duress constrains them to, a wife who is pleasant to look at can soften the blow.

While Cleinias is content to be a metaphorical slave to paederastic pleasure, he sees marriage to a woman as true slavery, and urges Charicles to avoid it at all costs.<sup>100</sup> He objects not only to the marriage *per se*, but also to the fact that Charicles is forced to marry at such a young age (Γάμον ... ἤδη σοι δίδωσιν ὁ πατήρ);<sup>101</sup> now is the time for him to play the role of *erōmenos*, not husband,<sup>102</sup> and if he marries young, the flower of his youth and beauty will be lost:

... μηδὲ τὸ ἄνθος πρὸ καιροῦ τῆς ἡβῆς ἀπολέσης· πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι τοῦ γάμου τὸ ἀτύχημα· μαραίνει τὴν ἀκμήν. μή, δέομαι, Χαρίκλεις, μήπω μοι μαρανθῆς· μὴ παραδῶς εὐμορφὸν τρυγῆσαι ῥόδον ἀμόρφῳ γεωργῶ.

<sup>96</sup> Charicles is being sold into an erotic relationship by his father in much the same way as Hyperanthes is sold to Aristomachus.

<sup>97</sup> Ach. Tat. 1.8.1.

<sup>98</sup> Or at least a self-conscious performance by Cleitophon, who narrates the incident.

<sup>99</sup> They both refer to the prospect of marriage as doubly negative if the woman is ugly: 1.7.4, 1.8.8.

<sup>100</sup> 1.7.2; 1.8.9.

<sup>101</sup> 1.8.1.

<sup>102</sup> We shall see a similar argument in Euxeinus' approach to Habrocomes on Corymbus' behalf.

... do not destroy the flower of youth before its time; for on top of all the rest, marriage has this misfortune too: it withers the bloom of vigour. Do not wither yet, Charicles, I beg you; do not give away a fair rose to be picked by an ugly farmer (Ach. Tat. 1.8.9).

Cleinius' words invert gender roles, playing on the *topos* of heterosexual sex as agriculture, and the virgin wife as soil to be ploughed, fertilised, and harvested by her farmer-husband.<sup>103</sup> Here, however, the bride-to-be is the farmer who will harvest the virgin rose.<sup>104</sup> Catullus constructs a similar inversion, comparing his love for his mistress to a flower cut down by a passing plough; he toys with the traditional use of ploughing as a metaphor for sexual penetration, reversing the genders of the parties involved, so that his mistress becomes the ploughman and he the flower cut down: suffering for a woman's sake detracts from masculinity.<sup>105</sup> Likewise, Cleinius presents marriage as an act that will feminise Charicles: it will terminate the androcentric role of *erōmenos*, forcing Charicles to assume a subordinate and thus feminised role in relation to his moneyed wife, who will effectively control her newly-enslaved husband. Plutarch's Picias and Protogenes express the same fear for the young Bacchon: should he marry the wealthy Ismenodora, he will be feminised by her wealth, which confers upon her a symbolic masculinity.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, in the Ps.-Lucianic *Amores* we again find the idea that paederasty enhances the masculinity of its practitioner, while a preference for women works to the detriment of gender: the paederast Callicratidas is hypermasculine, excelling in all spheres of male public life, while Charicles' orientation towards women feminises him, leading even to his use of cosmetics, a distinctly feminine practice.<sup>107</sup> But with these views we may contrast the equally common perception of paederasty as an effeminate pursuit. As we noted in the introduction to this chapter, paederasty – and especially the role of *erōmenos* – walked a fine line between masculinity and effeminacy.<sup>108</sup> Plutarch's Daphnaeus, for example, thinks that paederastic relations engaged in willingly are

<sup>103</sup> The examples from classical texts are too numerous to mention here; for references see DuBois (1988: 39ff., 65ff.).

<sup>104</sup> In the debate in Book 2 Menelaus also equates the beauty of the *erōmenos* to a rose (2.36.2); there is often an inherent sexual innuendo in references to the 'flower of youth': for a good example see Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 53.

<sup>105</sup> Catul. 11.21-24; see Williams (1999: 155). Cf. Virgil's use of the Catullan simile, this time in a paederastic context, of the death of Nisus' beloved, Euryalus (*A.* 9.435ff.).

<sup>106</sup> Plu. *Amatorius* 752e ff. See also 750f-751b: passion for women constitutes 'an effeminate and bastard love' (θηλυν καὶ νόθον), belongs to the women's quarters, and pursues τὰ μαλθακά.

<sup>107</sup> Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 9, 29, 38-41; see Halperin (1994: 27).

<sup>108</sup> See above, p.168-169.

‘effeminate and womanish’ (σὺν μαλακίᾳ καὶ θηλύτητι), and Ps.-Lucian’s Charicles considers passive homosexual sex to have a feminising effect (θηλύνεσθαι).<sup>109</sup> Even Cleitophon himself may insinuate that paederasty is effeminate. In narrating his arrival at Cleinias’ house after almost being caught *in flagrante delicto* by Leucippe’s mother, he states – for no obvious reason – that Cleinias’ bedroom is upstairs (ἐν ὑπερώῳ γὰρ τὸν θάλαμον εἶχε): upstairs was the usual location of women’s rooms.<sup>110</sup>

The contentious relationship between paederasty and heterosexual love is again raised by the advice Cleinias offers his younger cousin. The fact that Cleitophon happily seeks heterosexual erotic advice from a paederast suggests that he considers heterosexual and homosexual love to be homogeneous in their principles.<sup>111</sup> However, the debate in Book 2 seeks to differentiate between boys and women as love objects: it seems that while proponents of paederastic and heterosexual love might agree that the erotic theory is the same in each case, the aesthetic value of erotic practice in each case causes disagreement. Although ostensibly offering advice on heterosexual courtship, Cleinias’ words are in fact instructive on the subject of paederasty, for they are prefixed by the statement that shame affects boys and girls in the same way,<sup>112</sup> and may thus be taken as consonant with his approach to boy-love: Cleinias is merely grafting his experience with boys onto a heterosexual context.<sup>113</sup> Even if the object of desire returns the lover’s interest, he says, she (he) does not want it expressed aloud; she (he) will tolerate the initial advances of the lover as he tests the water, but blunt attempts will induce her (him) to feel shame; the best course of action is a softly-softly approach, followed by a tentative kiss,

<sup>109</sup> *Amatorius* 751d-e; *Am.* 28. Plato knowingly has the effeminate and homosexually-inclined Agathon eulogise the innate softness of Eros and his preference for all things μαλακός (Pl. *Smp.* 195e-196b: Agathon uses μαλακός and its cognates six times).

<sup>110</sup> 2.26.1. *LSJ* s.v. ὑπερώον; cf. Chariton 2.11.1. It might be argued that this seemingly superfluous detail is intended by Cleitophon as testimony to the authenticity of his narrative; however, if it is right to see an insinuation of effeminacy in it, it also prepares the ground for him to initiate the debate at the end of the book with the statement that he does not understand the preference for boys.

<sup>111</sup> Klabunde (2001: 31-32) makes the same observation. Cleinias is not said to have any sexual experience with women: he is ἔρωτι τετελεισμένος, but μειρακίου δὲ ὁ ἔρωτος ἦν (1.7.1); Cleitophon also considers him an ἀρχαιότερος μύστης and συνηθέστερος ἤδη τῇ τελετῇ τοῦ θεοῦ (1.9.7), but none of this is indicative of personal experience with women; even his tirade against women is drawn not from experience but from poetry (1.8.4).

<sup>112</sup> 1.10.3.

<sup>113</sup> Klabunde (2001: 29-31) also notes that Cleinias’ advice is founded on a paederastic model. Cleinias’ use of μαλαχθείη (1.9.6) and μαλθακώτερον (1.10.7) taps into the discourse of softness vs. manliness mentioned above.

which the eager beloved may read as encouragement, or the more reluctant as a form of supplication; even a willing beloved may wish to appear to have been coerced into submission, in order to maintain her (his) chaste reputation; if she (he) seems to be resisting, the lover should not use force; if she (he) is already softening, he must play his part properly. As well as exposing the sexual ends to which paederasty must often have been geared,<sup>114</sup> Cleinias' advice reveals a conception of both heterosexual and homosexual courtship as a performance, with lover and beloved playing roles which mask their true intentions and are designed to present an outward appearance of conformity to the protocols of appropriate behaviour. Cleinias borrows theatrical terminology to emphasise the performative nature of love: the lover must be like a *chorēgos* (χορήγησον), funding his erotic drama to completion; but he must also be willing to play a role (τὴν ὑπόκρισιν) on the erotic stage, in order to make his play (τὸ δρᾶμα) a success.<sup>115</sup>

So Cleinias is able to offer Cleitophon advice on heterosexual courtship which is apparently drawn solely from his experience with boys, and considered by both him and Cleitophon to be equally applicable to both heterosexual and paederastic contexts. But this does not mean that he and Cleitophon do not distinguish themselves from each other as having separate sexual identities. In fact, Cleitophon's initiation of the debate at the end of Book 2 suggests a very particular self-positioning in relation to Cleinias and Menelaus in matters of sexual preference. Cleitophon refers teasingly to Cleinias' penchant for anti-women philippics, saying that the latter will find it easier to air his views on women now that he has found an accomplice (κοινωνός), and that he himself does not understand the current

<sup>114</sup> Similar sexual motives are evident in Ps.-Lucian's *Amores*, where the candidly ambisexual Theomnestus gives a graphic description of the pleasures offered by sex with boys which seems equally applicable to female partners (53-54): the unisex nature of the account is implied by his ambiguous use of μαστούς, and by his subsequent swearing by the Cnidian Aphrodite, who had earlier been established as an archetype of heterosexual sex (11). Theomnestus sexualises paederasty and assimilates it to heterosexual sex in much the same way as Cleinias does, albeit more explicitly.

<sup>115</sup> 1.10.7; see O'Sullivan (1978: 322-323) and Morales (2004: 63) on the interpretation of this line. Ὑπόκρισις is also a rhetorical term, used of an orator's delivery (*LSJ s.v.*); again this stresses that love has a performative aspect, and foreshadows Cleitophon's *ex tempore* oratorical performance in the garden at the end of Book 1 (on which see above, p.70-72). The use of χορήγησον may reflect the classical belief that men in positions of power like the *chorēgos* might be tempted to abuse their authority for sexual ends: Aeschin. 1.9ff. refers to the measures set in place to prevent those responsible for training young men, including the *chorēgos* and the *paidotribēs*, from taking advantage of their charges. Cleinias, however, positively encourages Cleitophon to play the role of a corrupt *chorēgos* by seducing Leucippe; see above, p.155, for Achilles' potentially loaded use of the term *paidotribēs*.

popularity of love for males (οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ πῶς ἐπιχωριάζει νῦν ὁ εἰς τοὺς ἄρρενας ἔρωσ).<sup>116</sup> Cleitophon here seems to be drawing a clear boundary, and placing Menelaus and Cleinias on one side, and himself on the other:<sup>117</sup> the words κοινωνός and ἐπιχωριάζει have an almost territorial feel, as though Cleitophon sees Menelaus and Cleinias as together inhabiting an entirely different part of the erotic map; and ἐπιχωριάζει νῦν suggests that he views paederasty as something that comes in and out of fashion, a fashion to which he cannot relate at all. Cleitophon's ability to distinguish between himself and Menelaus and Cleinias on the basis of sexual object-choice suggests that it was conceivable in Second Sophistic Graeco-Roman thought to differentiate and categorise according to sexual preference. One might argue that Cleitophon utters these words merely to bait his friends, but that does not diminish their significance: for Menelaus and Cleinias to take the bait, they must see themselves as substantially different from Cleitophon, or there would be no debate to be had. It might perhaps be argued that each side in a debate must, in principle, be persuadable: either Cleitophon or Menelaus and Cleinias must be open to the possibility of being convinced by the other's view, and each side must therefore be able to change his sexual preference at will, in response to the other's stronger argument. But the lack of closure to the debate tells against this: each side is fixed in his beliefs. Another counter argument lies in the fact that the notion of debating is more often than not performative and display-oriented: the purpose of a debate is not for one side to change the other's opinion, but for the participants to exhibit their rhetorical skill and to 'win' not by converting the opponent, but by seeming to have the better argument, or simply more oratorical flair. A debate for exhibitionism's sake is just Cleitophon's style.

The existence of similar debates by Plutarch and Ps.-Lucian on the merits of boys and women lends weight to the notion that (some) men saw themselves as having fixed sexual identities.<sup>118</sup> Plutarch's Daphnaeus, for example, seems to define himself sexually by his preference for women, in opposition to his interlocutors, Pias and Protogenes: to him, same-sex love is παρὰ φύσιν, and carries

<sup>116</sup> 2.35.2-3.

<sup>117</sup> Something similar is found at Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 5, where different sexual passions are said to 'divide' Charicles and Callicratidas (διήρητο δ' αὐτῶν).

<sup>118</sup> On Plutarch and Ps.-Lucian, see Buffière (1980: 481-529).



connotations of effeminacy;<sup>119</sup> his acknowledgement that desire for boys is a form of love does not diminish the force of his self-positioning.<sup>120</sup> Similarly, an anonymous epigram grouped with the work of the avowed paederast Strato strenuously identifies its author as a lover of males only.<sup>121</sup> Such statements, made in opposition to an ‘other’ (love of males contrasted with love of females, and vice versa), read very much like expressions of sexual orientation. They imply that – *pace* Halperin – a heterosexual or homosexual consciousness could exist irrespective of the labels ‘heterosexual’ and ‘homosexual’. We may not be able to argue that every man understood himself to belong to a certain sexual category, or that the population at large recognised such categories, but debates like the one initiated by Cleitophon suggest that some men, at least, considered sexual preference to bestow membership of a group whose identity was constituted through alterity.

For our purposes there is no need to detail each argument made by Menelaus and Cleitophon; suffice it to say that their arguments are clichés that can be found in other similar debates.<sup>122</sup> I shall limit myself here to a consideration of the ways in which the self-positioning of Cleitophon and Menelaus implies their effeminacy. Achilles’ debate clearly takes its cue from Plato’s *Symposium*,<sup>123</sup> but the deeper philosophical sense of the original is sacrificed, as the two young men focus solely on superficial concerns.<sup>124</sup> They are too self- and sex-obsessed to understand the fundamental points of the philosophy on which they are basing their arguments, and their excessive interest in sex is suggestive of effeminacy.<sup>125</sup> Rising to Cleitophon’s bait, Menelaus proceeds to debase the Platonic theme of heavenly and pandemic love by applying the polarity to mere physical beauty,<sup>126</sup> and the debate is reduced to a discussion of the sexual pleasure to be found in women and in boys. Cleitophon then proves his preoccupation with sex by using his experience with prostitutes to

---

<sup>119</sup> Plu. *Amatorius* 751c-e. We shall return later to the idea of forms of love being in accordance with or contrary to nature.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* 751f.

<sup>121</sup> *AP* 12.17.

<sup>122</sup> For more detailed discussion of Achilles’ debate alongside the *Amatorius* and the *Amores*, see Klabunde (2001), and alongside Plato (with reference to Plutarch and Ps.-Lucian), see Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 3).

<sup>123</sup> See Goldhill (1995: 91).

<sup>124</sup> See Klabunde (2001: 40) and Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 3).

<sup>125</sup> See above, p.169, on the power of sexual hyperactivity to connote effeminacy.

<sup>126</sup> 2.36.2-3.

argue that women offer more sexual satisfaction than boys.<sup>127</sup> Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 3) wonders if his final remark, that sex with boys brings no pleasure (ἡδονῆς δὲ οὐδέν), suggests that he has some active paederastic experience. This is quite possible, though it does not necessarily imply only active experience. In Plutarch and Ps.-Lucian, much emphasis is placed on the one-sidedness of paederastic pleasure. According to Daphnaeus, for example, paederasty denies the *erastēs* pleasure because it is bound up with shame and fear, and excuses must be invented for approaching *erōmenoi*.<sup>128</sup> Similarly, despite being introduced as having no experience of the love of males,<sup>129</sup> Ps.-Lucian's Charicles claims that *erōmenoi* take no pleasure from homosexual sex.<sup>130</sup> He authoritatively describes the physical discomfort suffered by the *erōmenos* during sex, but is quick to frame his knowledge as hearsay with the words ὡς φασιν ('so they say').<sup>131</sup> As with his earlier disclaimer of knowledge about the nature of a young man's genitalia,<sup>132</sup> there is a certain disingenuous coyness here, as though he really does have first-hand experience of paederasty, but is keen to avoid the potential such experience holds to imply effeminacy.<sup>133</sup> The fact that these parallel texts consider pleasure, or the lack of it, from the perspectives of both the active and the passive partner suggests, perhaps, that Cleitophon's remark about there being no pleasure in boy-love might be taken to imply experience not only of the role of *erastēs*, but also of that of *erōmenos*. Such an implication raises the corollary danger of effeminacy; this is a danger that Cleitophon may well be aware of, as he glosses over boy-love in a manner whose brevity seems designed to distance him from any suggestion of personal experience.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> 2.37.5ff. Cleitophon seems unaware of the weaknesses of his argument here: firstly, a prostitute is hardly representative of the entire female sex (although he seems to think so); and secondly, a woman who has sex for a living is highly likely to be good at it, unless she does not object to giving refunds to disgruntled customers.

<sup>128</sup> Plu. *Amatorius* 752a.

<sup>129</sup> Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 5.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.* 27.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.* 26: ἃ δ' ἐστὶ τούτων ἀφανέστερα, τοῖς πεπειρακόσιν ὑμῖν εἰδέναι παρήγημι.

<sup>133</sup> And yet, as we have noted (above, p.187), Charicles may also be thought effeminate in his use of cosmetics to attract women.

<sup>134</sup> We saw at the end of Chapter 2 that Achilles may imply such a feminising experience in his use of the term *paidotribēs*.

In Cleitophon's description of sex with women,<sup>135</sup> the reader's attention is drawn quite deliberately to the centrality of pleasure. The reciprocal nature of this pleasure is intended to contrast with the perceived inequality of paederastic pleasure, and in this sense Cleitophon's words echo the common argument outlined above. But the most striking emphasis is on the woman's enjoyment of sex, and although this accords with a tradition of viewing women as revelling in being penetrated,<sup>136</sup> it also raises some ethical problems associated with the exchange of pleasure. First of all, Cleitophon states that his assertions are based solely on his experience with prostitutes; if true, the balance of power in his relations with these women seems to lie with them, as he appears to have spent his money learning how to give them pleasure more than taking pleasure from them. Secondly, Cleitophon's extensive technical knowledge of how to give a woman pleasure is in itself problematic and potentially feminising. Gleason (1995: 64-65) raises a passage by the Christian writer, Clement of Alexandria, on women's indulgence in luxury, in which some women are said to enjoy the attentions of *androgynoi* and *kinaidoi*, effeminate who engage in adultery and seek to please.<sup>137</sup> Gleason (*ibid.* 65) remarks: 'A man who aims to please – any one, male or female – in his erotic encounters is ipso facto effeminate'. Similarly, Halperin (1990: 133) comments that 'for the most part, erotic reciprocity was relegated to the province of women, who were thought capable of both giving and receiving pleasure in the sexual act at the same time and in relation to the same individual'. Seen in this light, Cleitophon's words on giving a woman pleasure might be thought rather instructive as to his masculinity.<sup>138</sup> Of course, the exceptionally conservative Clement should not be taken as a general representative of wider belief, and perhaps especially not in a period when reciprocity and mutual pleasure seem to have been increasing in importance, particularly within marriage. After all, we have observed that one-sided pleasure and lack of reciprocity were often raised in arguments against paederasty, and this is effectively the seam that Cleitophon is mining. But Clement's words should be seen as one possible perspective on the issue, even if a reactionary one; indeed, the novels in many ways

---

<sup>135</sup> 2.37.6ff.

<sup>136</sup> See Halperin (1990: 133).

<sup>137</sup> Clem. Al. *Paed.* 3.29.2-3.

<sup>138</sup> Gleason (1995: 64) notes that the word *androgynos* denoted a man of indeterminate gender, while *kinaidos* referred to sexual deviance, and implicitly to a man who sought the passive role in homosexual sex. She remarks, however (*ibid.* 65), that the two words seem often to have been used synonymously. We shall observe later that Cleitophon is branded *androgynos* by Melite.

reconstruct the classical past, so we should admit the possibility that more traditional protocols are in operation. Furthermore, it is not wives – or even just women in general – with whose pleasure Cleitophon is obsessed, but prostitutes! Cleitophon thus appears effeminate from both traditional and forward-looking perspectives. The reader’s probable reaction is given voice by Menelaus, as he exclaims that Cleitophon seems not like the *πρωτόπειρος* he claims to be, but like a man of some experience,<sup>139</sup> as he possesses such a vast amount of *γυναικῶν περιεργίας* (‘useless knowledge about women’). Although, given his sexual preferences, Menelaus is bound to consider such knowledge superfluous, his reaction is nonetheless likely to be close to that of the reader, who is forced to wonder just how many prostitutes it took for Cleitophon to learn these skills. The suggestion of sexual immoderation can only cast aspersions on Cleitophon’s masculinity,<sup>140</sup> particularly when he is measured against other generic heroes: he knows too much about pleasing women, and has talked himself into appearing effeminate.

But Cleitophon is not the only one to make potentially self-feminising arguments. Menelaus concludes the debate by returning to the subject of boy-love,<sup>141</sup> and here again, pleasure is the central concern.<sup>142</sup> According to Menelaus, one may road-test a boy’s body in the ostensibly innocent context of the *palaistra*.<sup>143</sup> This statement constitutes an unabashed acknowledgement of the gymnasium as a site for initiating homosexual relationships: it provides an opportunity to window-shop and test the ripeness of the merchandise, the like of which does not exist in the case of women.<sup>144</sup> For Menelaus, the lack of softness in a boy’s body makes physical

<sup>139</sup> 2.37.6, 2.38.1. Once Cleitophon has begun to talk about giving women pleasure, his claim to inexperience smacks of the *captatio benevolentiae*.

<sup>140</sup> Williams (1999: 39) notes that, to the Romans, ‘occasional visits to prostitutes’ were socially acceptable, but ‘men who made use of them to excess could be subject to moral criticism’ (*ibid.* 41). He observes that ‘an excessive indulgence in prostitutes could also be held to be incompatible with military discipline’ (*ibid.*); we have remarked on Cleitophon’s utter lack of military *andreia* (see above, p.119-120).

<sup>141</sup> 2.38.2ff.

<sup>142</sup> As it was in Menelaus’ first defence of paederasty at 2.36.1ff., where he referred to boy-love as ‘τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς ἡδονῆς’.

<sup>143</sup> Remembering Cleitophon’s use of the unusual expression ἔρωτος ἀθλητῆς, the reader may equate him with Menelaus, who pursues an erotic and feminising form of athletics; see also below, p.219, n.250.

<sup>144</sup> Plutarch’s Daphnaeus feels that the gymnasia have encouraged the spread of paederasty, with the result that it cannot now be restrained; paederasty visits places of physical exercise as a pretext for spending time with boys (*Amatorius* 751f-752a). Likewise, Ps.-Lucian’s Lycinus believes that Callicratidas was so fond of the *palaistra* simply because of his love of boys (*Am.* 9).

contact all the more enjoyable, as the two bodies offer each other a sensual resistance, vying for pleasure:

καὶ οὐ μαλθάσσει τὰς ἐν Ἀφροδίτῃ περιπλοκὰς ὑγρότητι σαρκῶν,  
ἀλλ' ἀντιτυπεῖ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ σώματα καὶ περὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἀθλεῖ.

... and he does not soften his holds in sex through fleshy voluptuousness, but the bodies strike against each other and compete over pleasure (Ach. Tat. 2.38.4).

The words Menelaus uses here are rather telling. We have noted that paederasty was often accused of being an unequal practice, with only one partner taking pleasure from it, and this is clearly the argument that Menelaus is trying to respond to. But, as we noted in the introduction to the chapter, by the codes of the classical paederastic ideal, *only* the active partner *ought* to take pleasure from the relationship.<sup>145</sup> Here, however, Menelaus suggests that *both* partners enjoy the experience, competing for pleasure. The notion of 'striking' often carries an obscene sense;<sup>146</sup> in the phrase ἀντιτυπεῖ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ σώματα καὶ περὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἀθλεῖ, the reader with a dirty mind might thus see a suggestion not merely of bodies striking against one another, but of an alternation of sexual roles, giving rise to pleasure. Menelaus thus leaves himself open to the accusation of effeminacy, and given the semantics of the notion of softness, his claim that boys do not soften their holds takes on a rather more ironic tone than he might have intended.<sup>147</sup> Although he is making the traditional argument that paederasty is manly and the love of women effeminate, his focus on the possibility of reciprocal pleasure within paederasty characterises him, like Cleitophon, as sexually immoderate and thus effeminate according to classical protocols.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>145</sup> See above, p.164.

<sup>146</sup> See Henderson (1975: 172); cf., e.g., χαμαιτυπέω, 'to be a prostitute', and τὸ χαμαιτυπεῖον, 'brothel', the latter found at Ach. Tat. 8.8.12.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Cleitophon, who revels in the concept of softness as applied to women (2.37.6).

<sup>148</sup> The charge of effeminacy is equally applicable to Ps.-Lucian's Charicles and Theomnestus, who are both obsessed with physicality: in arguing against paederasty, Charicles dwells on the physical act of anal sex (*Am.* 27), while in his response to Lycinus' adjudication on the debate, the self-confessedly and bisexually promiscuous Theomnestus describes in gratuitous detail the pleasures to be had from paederastic foreplay and the ultimate acquisition of sex (53). Theomnestus' remarks are rendered still more instructive as to his character by the fact that he makes them immediately after Lycinus has informed him of his own advocacy of philosophical paederasty, and of Callicratidas' impassioned speech on behalf of a sexless paederasty inspired by Socratic philosophy; Theomnestus, however, cannot believe in such magnanimous boy-love (54). Daphnaeus is similarly sceptical about

By participating in a debate on love that owes much to Plato's *Symposium*, Cleitophon and Menelaus position their arguments in a philosophical tradition. But the details of their debate undercut the philosophical stance assumed, and present both men as unashamedly preoccupied with sex, demonstrating just how far removed this debate is from its Platonic model.<sup>149</sup> The problematisation of paederasty and its coexistence with marriage were clearly popular topics of elite conversation in the imperial period,<sup>150</sup> but in none of the extant debates on the subject is any satisfactory conclusion reached. The debates of Ps.-Lucian and Plutarch conclude with the arbitrators, Lycinus and Plutarch, deciding in favour of a fusion of each type of love. So, Lycinus rules that all men should marry in order to perpetuate the human race, but that philosophers should also be permitted to practise a chaste paederasty, since women are incapable of demonstrating virtue;<sup>151</sup> and Plutarch advocates a similarly chaste love of boys,<sup>152</sup> but also values marriage highly, believing in female virtue. Halperin (1994: 33) argues that Ps.-Lucian's Charicles and Callicratidas are both figures of fun, whose exclusive sexual preferences would have seemed absurd to contemporary readers. It is certainly correct to see them as figures of fun, but for a different reason, which might also be extended to Achilles' text. Charicles, Callicratidas, Cleitophon, and Menelaus all appear to have fixed sexual identities, but humour is derived not from their exclusive sexual preferences, but from their lack of understanding of the other's perspective and of their philosophical subject matter.

But Achilles' abandonment of his debate, having given it no conclusion whatsoever, may suggest something more. Achilles takes pleasure in revealing what lies behind the outward image of both homosexual and heterosexual relationships, and in the process he challenges the ideal of a hierarchical and self-restrained relationship between an older and a younger man, or between a man and a woman. In their pretentious aspirations to philosophy and their ultimate self-characterisation as effeminate whose chief interest is sex, Cleitophon and Menelaus demonstrate the

---

whether a physically chaste paederasty exists, though he expresses himself in rather less libidinous terms (Plu. *Amatorius* 752a-b).

<sup>149</sup> Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 3) rightly observes that Cleitophon's use of knowledge gleaned from sex with prostitutes characterises him as a pandemic lover.

<sup>150</sup> Brioso Sánchez (2000); see also Brioso Sánchez (1999).

<sup>151</sup> Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 51.

<sup>152</sup> Sex between males amounts to ἀκρασία and ἐπιπήδησις (*Amatorius* 768e).

impossibility of meeting the ideals set for men by that philosophy. We observed earlier that the paederastic paradigm was more idealistic than realistic, and the same may surely be said for paradigms of heterosexual love. Consequently, a reader of Achilles' novel may well have identified more easily with the effeminacy of Cleitophon and Menelaus than with any erotic ideal. The debate is never concluded in favour of one side or the other in part because Cleitophon and Menelaus see themselves as having fixed sexual identities and cannot understand each other's perspectives, but perhaps also because they are actually more similar than they might care to admit: for them, when the mask of performance is removed, everything comes down to sex.

We have seen, then, that both Xenophon and Achilles seem to acknowledge the existence of fixed sexual dispositions, and seem, to varying degrees, to contest the legitimacy of cultural ideals of male sexual behaviour. The representation of homosexuality – and heterosexuality – in these novels illustrates Cohen's remarks concerning differing attitudes and conflicting norms:<sup>153</sup> not to put too fine a point on it, sex is a messy business, full of conflict and contradiction, and inconsistencies may be found within a single text or a single character. Cleitophon's and Menelaus' failed performances of masculinity help to reveal the fragility and instability of gender, and it is to these qualities in the masculinity of Habrocomes and Daphnis that we now turn.

### *Masculinity in peril.*

Both Habrocomes and Daphnis are propositioned by characters who desire a homosexual relationship with them, and both heroes react violently against the advances of these admirers. We have observed that the imperial period saw a contestation and problematisation of paederasty, and that the potential effect of paederasty on masculinity was falling under increasing scrutiny. We shall see that Habrocomes' and Daphnis' violent reactions may be read as further examples of this scrutiny; they are prompted not by any antipathy towards homosexual behaviour *per se*, but by a concern for how certain forms of such behaviour might impinge upon

---

<sup>153</sup> See above, p.165-166.

the hero's emerging masculinity, to whose performance he is a newcomer. We begin with Habrocomes.

Habrocomes catches the eye of the pirate Corymbus. Corymbus confides his feelings in his fellow pirate Euxeinus, who has similar designs on Anthia, and each agrees to plead the cause of the other. Euxeinus approaches Habrocomes with the following words:

τί δέ σοι γυναικός δεῖ νῦν καὶ πραγμάτων, τί δὲ ἐρωμένης τηλικῶδε ὄντι;

Why should you need a wife and worries now? Why should you need a ladylove at your age? (X. Eph. 1.16.5).

Euxeinus does not have to spell out what Corymbus wants from Habrocomes. He is able to make his point obliquely by the deliberate use of the noun ἐρωμένη, and by a heavy emphasis on Habrocomes' age. The use of ἐρωμένη evokes the masculine counterpart, ἐρώμενος, in the reader's mind, and the double reference to Habrocomes' age in the words νῦν and τηλικῶδε reminds the reader that the hero is only sixteen, and yet is already married. Behind Euxeinus' words lurks the question, 'Why should one so young want to play the conjugal role of *erastēs* to an *erōmenē*, when his age better suits him to the role of *erōmenos* in a paederastic relationship?' His words echo the common paederastic views that we have seen expressed by Cleinias, that women spell trouble (πραγμάτων),<sup>154</sup> and that youth should not be marred by marriage. Though not himself sexually interested in Habrocomes, Euxeinus is well able to make the stock arguments that a prospective *erastēs* might make, assuming a role and giving a performance on Corymbus' behalf. As he did in the case of Hippothous, Xenophon shows an awareness of the significance of age boundaries within paederasty: Corymbus is introduced as a νεανίας,<sup>155</sup> and is thus a few years older than the μεῖράκιον Habrocomes. But although this age-gap may be ideal in paederastic terms, Euxeinus' mention of Habrocomes' marriage raises a vital issue which informs the hero's vilification of the proposition.

<sup>154</sup> Not, of course, an opinion limited to paederasts, but one found throughout Greek literature from as early as Hesiod and Semonides.

<sup>155</sup> 1.13.3.



When Habrocomes and Anthia are reunited, Habrocomes bitterly denounces the role of *erōmenos*:

εἰς τοῦτο ἄρα μέχρι νῦν σώφρων ἐτηρήθην, ἵνα ἑμαυτὸν ὑποθῶ ληστῇ ἔρωντι τὴν αἰσχρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν; καὶ τίς ἐμοὶ βίος περιλείπεται πόρνη μὲν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς γενομένῳ, ἀποστερηθέντι δὲ Ἀνθίας τῆς ἐμῆς; ἀλλ' οὐ μὰ τὴν μέχρις ἄρτι σωφροσύνην ἐκ παιδός μοι σύντροφον, οὐκ ἂν ἑμαυτὸν ὑποθείην Κορύμβῳ, τεθνήξομαι δὲ πρότερον καὶ φανούμαι νεκρὸς σώφρων.<sup>156</sup>

Was it for this that I kept myself chaste up to now, to submit myself to the shameful lust of an amorous pirate? And what life is left to me, becoming a whore instead of a man, and deprived of my Anthia? But I swear by the chastity that has been with me from childhood till now, I could not submit myself to Corymbus. I will die first and prove my chastity with my own dead body! (X. Eph. 2.1.3-4; trans. Anderson, modified).

His extreme reaction is dictated by a complex matrix of his own social standing and level of sexual maturity, which bestows upon him the status of adult male. Let us consider his social standing first of all. As we have observed, the paederastic ideal consisted of a hierarchical relationship between an older male who played the active, insertive role, and a younger male who played the passive, receptive role; for a man's masculinity to remain unimpeached, he must not allow himself to be penetrated by a social inferior.<sup>157</sup> Habrocomes is an elite male who characterises Corymbus' lust as shameful not because it is homosexual, but because it would entail the hero's submission to a man who, as both pirate and barbarian, is doubly his social inferior. In its implication of both social and physical submission to Corymbus, Habrocomes' repeated use of the verb ὑποτίθημι emphasises what is wrong with the proposed relationship: should he play the passive role in homosexual intercourse and literally 'put himself beneath' Corymbus, he would also accept the pirate's new social superiority. The distinction between active and passive was closely connected in both Greek and Roman culture to that between free and slave, with sexual passivity associated with young slaves, who were obliged to submit to their masters (Edwards 1993: 72-73). This connection is ominously hinted at by

<sup>156</sup> Much as we saw that Theagenes' *sōphrosynē* was something he felt the need to display (see above, p.144-145), so here Habrocomes will make his *sōphrosynē* manifest by means of his death (φανούμαι νεκρὸς σώφρων).

<sup>157</sup> See above, p.168.

Euxeinus' references to Habrocomes' loss of liberty, and his parting advice that the young man should attend only to his master.<sup>158</sup>

The other catalyst for Habrocomes' reaction is his sexual maturity. When he married Anthia, he assumed the role of active male in a sexual sense, a role denoted in his reaction by the word *anēr*. Indeed, on his wedding night he refers to himself as Anthia's *anēr* and as her *erastēs*;<sup>159</sup> were he now to become a paederastic *erōmenos*, both his sexual maturity and his masculine status would be vitiated.<sup>160</sup> For the generic hero, marriage is a boundary-marker terminating the period in which the young man may reasonably perform the role of *erōmenos*.<sup>161</sup> So, while Habrocomes may be the perfect age for that role, his marital status precludes it: marriage results in progression to a new level of masculinity from which a man cannot regress without forfeiting his gender status. Habrocomes appears aware of the forfeit involved as, with stunning vitriol, he uses the feminine, *πόρνη*, to express a fear for the integrity of his gender.<sup>162</sup> This is the sole application of *πόρνη* to a male in the extant Greek novels. Callirhoe's suitors brand Chaereas with the masculine, *πόρνος*, and Cleitophon is labelled *πόρνος* when accused of having committed adultery with Melite,<sup>163</sup> but in each of these cases the hero is left with his masculine gender. Habrocomes, by contrast, envisages the role of *erōmenos* to Corymbus' *erastēs* as emasculating him completely and reducing him not merely to the level of a woman, but to that of the basest kind of female prostitute. His identification of the passive sexual role as that of a prostitute stems in part from the promise Euxeinus makes to him: if he accedes to Corymbus' desires, the latter will reward him by restoring him to his previous good fortune, so, like a prostitute, he will effectively be remunerated for the sexual services he provides.<sup>164</sup>

<sup>158</sup> 1.16.3-5.

<sup>159</sup> 1.9.3.

<sup>160</sup> It is evidently acceptable for him to be seen as an *erōmenos* within his marriage (see above, p.165, n.15), but the connotations of this status in a homosexual relationship are entirely different.

<sup>161</sup> See above, p.183, with n.88.

<sup>162</sup> With this we might compare his outburst at the realisation that he has fallen for Anthia (1.4.1-2): he no longer considers himself *ἀνδρικός*, and thinks love has made him *ἀνανδρος*; love for a woman may have unmanned him in his own eyes, but it has not had quite the effect that he envisages the role of *erōmenos* to have.

<sup>163</sup> Chariton 1.2.3 (see above, p.147, n.252, for my preference of the manuscript's *πόρνος* over Praechter's emendation, *ἄπορος*); Ach. Tat. 8.10.9 (we shall consider this instance later in the chapter).

<sup>164</sup> There may have been an accepted connection in Greek thought between the specific figures of the *pornē* and the *kinaidos*, the man who seeks out and enjoys the passive role: Ps.-Archilochus describes

The symbolic change of gender that Habrocomes anticipates reflects the Graeco-Roman cultural conception of the passive participant in homosexual sex as playing a woman's role.<sup>165</sup> Timarchus, for instance, is accused of having allowed his body to be used like a woman's.<sup>166</sup> In Petronius' *Satyricon*, Encolpius maligns Giton and Ascyrtos with feminising language, claiming that even those who considered Ascyrtos a *vir* hired him like a *puella*, while Giton has been raised like a girl, has done *opus muliebre* in a workhouse, and has behaved like a street hooker.<sup>167</sup> Of course, the force of Encolpius' words is ironically undercut by the dubious social status and moral character of the *Satyricon*'s protagonists, although the accusation he makes would be extremely serious if Ascyrtos and Giton were true *viri*: the maintenance of virility entailed the maintenance of bodily impenetrability, and in both Greek and Roman contexts, for a freeborn adult male to sell himself for the passive role signified a forfeit of masculinity.<sup>168</sup> Catullus presents a gender-transformation taking place at the precise moment when Attis mutilates his own genitals, demonstrating the extent to which masculinity is perceived to lie in the male genitals and the ability to play the active sexual role.<sup>169</sup> Although Habrocomes will not be emasculated in a literal sense, by taking on the role of *erōmenos* he will forfeit that of *erastēs*, and will thus become feminised. In terms of age Habrocomes may still be a *meirakion*, but in terms of sexual maturity he is very much an *anēr*. His disgust thus reflects the ramifications of a scenario that would invert the protocols on which Greek (and Roman) masculinity operates.

Similar sex and gender politics can be seen to operate in Longus' treatment of Gnathon's attempt on Daphnis. Gnathon's overtures may be less threatening and more humorous than those of Corymbus, but their amusing exterior belies very serious repercussions that relate to Daphnis' social and sexual status. Longus goes to

---

the minds of the two as identical, since they both enjoy being paid for being penetrated (328 West: ἴσος κιναίδου καὶ κακῆς πόρνης ὁ νοῦς ...).

<sup>165</sup> We shall return shortly to the characterisation of the passive role as a womanish one.

<sup>166</sup> Aeschin. 1.185: 'τὸν ἄνδρα μὲν καὶ ἄρρενα τὸ σῶμα, γυναικεία δὲ ἁμαρτήματα ἡμαρτηκότα'.

<sup>167</sup> Petr. 81.

<sup>168</sup> On the Roman concept of *stuprum*, a disgrace usually pertaining to sexual activity, see Williams (1999: 96-124); on the relation of bodily impenetrability to the status of the *vir*, see Edwards (1993: 75) and Walters (1997); and on the legal and constitutional consequences of a citizen male prostituting himself in classical Athens, see Aeschin. 1, with Dover (1978: 19ff.), Winkler (1990: 56ff.), and Halperin (2002).

<sup>169</sup> Catul. 63.6ff.

some lengths to characterise Gnathon as effeminate, which Xenophon does not in the case of Corymbus. The threat to Daphnis' masculinity therefore comes not merely from the fact that he would be feminised by the role of *erōmenos*, but that in assuming that role he would be feminised *by* an effeminate: his masculinity is doubly jeopardised. Let us begin by exploring how Longus immediately characterises Gnathon as effeminate and as a possible paederast. When first introducing Gnathon, Longus is economical with details, but what little he says gives the reader a surprising amount of information:

Ἦκε μὲν ὁ Ἄστυλος ἐφ' ἵππου καὶ παράσιτος αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὗτος ἐφ' ἵππου, ὁ μὲν ἀρτιγένειος, ὁ δὲ Γνάθων (τουτὶ γὰρ ἔκαλεῖτο) τὸν πώγωνα ξυρώμενος πάλαι ...

Astylos arrived on horseback, with a hanger-on of his, also on horseback. He was just growing his first beard, but Gnathon (that was his name) had been shaving his for some time (Longus 4.10.1; trans. Morgan).

Gnathon is a παράσιτος, a character-type rooted in Greek and Roman comedy and one which suggests that he is not a true threat.<sup>170</sup> But this label is also indicative of a lack of moderation in all areas of life.<sup>171</sup> For example, the man hired by Chariton's tyrant of Acragas to seduce Callirhoe's maid is described as a παράσιτος,<sup>172</sup> and dresses in a highly effeminate manner in order to attract Chaereas' attention and identify himself as an adulterer and a man generally lacking in sexual continence.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>170</sup> See Winkler (1990: 112), Konstan (1994b: 18), and Morgan (2004: 229).

<sup>171</sup> The parasite-like behaviour of Cleitophon (see above, p.119, n.131) may therefore have repercussions for his masculinity.

<sup>172</sup> Chariton 1.4.1.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.* 1.4.9: κόμην εἶχε λιπαρὰν καὶ βοστρύχους μύρων ἀποπνέοντας, ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑπογεγραμμένους, ἱμάτιον μαλακόν, ὑπόδημα λεπτόν· δακτύλιοι βαρεῖς ὑπέστιλβον ('His hair was glistening with perfumed locks, his eyes were shadowed; he wore a soft cloak and fine slippers; heavy rings sparkled on his fingers'; trans. Goold). Chariton couches the entire plan in the language of literal performance by framing it as a drama overseen by the tyrant of Acragas, with actors playing roles. We saw in Chapter 2 that Cnemon's outward appearance masked his inward nature (see above, p.118); here, by contrast, the parasite gives everything to his performance, exhibiting inner moral turpitude through outer mien, so that Chaereas should believe him to be a *moichos* – which the hero duly does (1.4.10). According to Phylarchus (*FGrHist* 84 F45), a law of Syracuse stated that any man who expended excessive effort on his personal grooming was open to identification as an adulterer or a *kinaidos*; see Davidson (1998: 165). The over-the-top grooming of the parasite in Chariton's Sicilian tale makes yet more sense in the light of this Syracusan law: his dressed hair, make-up, heavy jewellery, and soft clothes convey the moral softness of his character; see Gleason (1990: 400, 409), Edwards (1993: 78), and Richlin (1993: 541ff.) on the dress of the effeminate, to which we shall return later in relation to Cleitophon.

As with Chariton, Longus' intention in labelling Gnathon παράσιτος is to enable the reader to identify instantly a man who is prepared to play an effeminate role.

As yet the reader knows nothing of Gnathon's sexual predilections, but when Longus draws attention to Astylus' and Gnathon's facial hair – a matter of perpetual concern in paederastic contexts –, the reader's suspicions are aroused. Astylus is just beginning to grow a beard, and therefore just emerging from youth into adulthood. Gnathon, by contrast, has been shaving for some time. This might well suggest that he is old enough to pose a sexual threat to the hero, but it might also imply something more. Although facial hair was subject to changing trends, and it may sometimes have been fashionable to shave the beard, it appears to have been common to associate hair removal with effeminacy. This applies especially to the depilation of the body, often presented as the practice of the habitual passive,<sup>174</sup> but it may also be true of the beard, whose presence generally marks out men from women, and mature (*i.e.* active) males from immature (*i.e.* passive) males.<sup>175</sup> Shaving could easily suggest a desire to defer adult masculinity, and to remain an *erōmenos*, and thus passive, beyond an age considered acceptable: Aristophanes' Agathon is clean-shaven, and his Cleisthenes beardless.<sup>176</sup> It is worth noting that beards appear to have been especially popular in the second century, owing to Hadrian's sporting of one (Elsner 2007: 218). The second century is generally agreed to be the time Longus was writing. Might the fact that Gnathon shaves his beard be an implicit, and very contemporary, comment on his masculinity, or lack of it?<sup>177</sup> The language Longus uses of Gnathon's beard may be deliberately chosen to

<sup>174</sup> See Gleason (1995: 68ff.).

<sup>175</sup> See Frontisi-Ducroux & Lissarrague (1990: 217, 228). In paederastic scenes on vases, the hierarchy is usually represented by the presence of the beard in the case of the older male, and its absence in the case of the younger.

<sup>176</sup> *Ar. Thesm.* 191ff., 574-575. Dover (1978: 144), however, suggests that Agathon would have 'cut his beard close in order to retain the appearance of a young man whose beard is beginning to grow', and argues that the reference to Agathon's shaving refers not to his face but to his body. Cleisthenes was apparently unable to grow a beard, which may have contributed to his characterisation as a sexual passive.

<sup>177</sup> I do not want to overstate the case here, and it is not without contradictions even within Longus' text itself: Dorcon is described (like Astylus) as ἄρτιγένειος (1.15.1), and he makes much of his facial hair, and Daphnis' lack of it, in the beauty contest, suggesting that beards are indeed markers of masculinity; however, Daphnis is then able to use his own beardlessness (ἀγένειος) to positive effect, likening himself to Dionysus, and Dorcon's beard (προγένειος) to that of a goat (although that simile is not unproblematic: Daphnis' status as a goatherd undercuts the power of the goat as a negative paradigm of masculinity). Elsner (2007: 218) notes that Polemon's hugely influential physiognomical text is strangely silent on the matter of beards, and Swain (2007b: 13) suggests that

hint at a preference for homosexual sex, while retaining some ambiguity as to whether Gnathon takes the active or the passive role: while Astylus is ἄρτιγένειος, having only the first soft, downy hair, Gnathon has to shave a real beard, a πώγων, which might be thought intentionally close to πυγέων and cognate words referring to the buttocks and anal sex.

Apparently a stock moniker for a comic parasite, the name Gnathon ('Jaws') is instantly suggestive of gluttony (Morgan 2004: 229). In a study of Roman political invective, Corbeill (1997) has demonstrated that gluttony could give rise to accusations of effeminacy. This holds true for Greek culture, where food, drink, and sex were all thought to require moderation.<sup>178</sup> Over-indulgence in any or all of these areas had the power to label the agent an effeminate,<sup>179</sup> and if a man is gluttonous towards food and drink, it is safe to assume that he may also be sexually voracious, and indiscriminately so.<sup>180</sup> The suggestion of gluttony in Gnathon's name may imply that he puts other things into his mouth besides food and drink: his sexual incontinence may extend to fellatio, an activity that would certainly characterise him as a gender deviant in Graeco-Roman thought.<sup>181</sup> One final possibility in Gnathon's name also implies his sexual and gender identity. We have noted that the tragic playwright Agathon was often taken to symbolise effeminacy because of his long-term homosexual relationship with Pausanias. Could it be that Longus intends the reader to hear in the name Γνάθων a similarity to the name Ἄγαθων? Just as Agathon is associated with symposia by means of Plato's famous dialogue on love, so too is Gnathon a symposiast, who has learned about love from attendance at such events;<sup>182</sup> but Agathon's symposium is a sober affair, with drunkenness deliberately rejected,<sup>183</sup> while Gnathon's erotic knowledge has been gleaned at the symposia of

---

this silence 'may call into question some moderns' insistence on the importance of the beard as a sign of maleness'. However, Elsner (*ibid.*) does raise the possibility that 'any physiognomic dig at facial hair [might have] risked the emperor taking it personally'.

<sup>178</sup> E.g. Muson. 12 (*On Sex*) and 18B (*On Food*): excess in these aspects of life is shameful.

<sup>179</sup> See Goldhill (1995: 48) and Davidson (1998 *passim*).

<sup>180</sup> Cf. Aeschin. 1.42: Timarchus is presented as a slave to food, drink, gambling, and women, as well as to passive homosexual sex.

<sup>181</sup> See Williams (1999: 197-203), and below, p.218-219, on Thersander. Seemingly cognate with γνάμπτω ('bend': *LSJ s.v. γνάθος, γναμπτήρ, γνάμπτω, γναμφαί*), presumably owing to the curving shape of the jaw, Gnathon's name may well suggest the bending involved in any passive homosexual role; γνάμπτω is used in this kind of *double entendre* at *AP* 12.222, of a wrestling teacher taking advantage of his student.

<sup>182</sup> 4.17.3.

<sup>183</sup> Pl. *Smp.* 176.

the profligate (ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀσώτων συμποσίοις). If Longus did indeed intend the name Gnathon to recall Agathon, the connection would function both straightforwardly and ironically, on the one hand simply evoking the effeminacy inscribed in the figure of Agathon, and on the other implying just how far removed Gnathon is from the heavenly love of which Agathon's lover Pausanias speaks.<sup>184</sup>

To the dirty-minded reader (whose presence Longus evidently anticipates in the prologue's ironic prayer to maintain *sōphrosynē*),<sup>185</sup> or simply to the *pepaideumenos* versed in literature and the codes of masculinity, all of these tit-bits of characterisation are suggested by a seemingly throw-away reference to a beard and a name. The assumptions the reader makes from that reference are then substantiated by Longus' simple yet vivid remarks on Gnathon's moral fibre and most pertinent physical characteristics:

ὁ δὲ Γνάθων, οἷα μαθὼν ἐσθίειν ἄνθρωπος καὶ πίνειν εἰς μέθην καὶ λαγνεύειν μετὰ τὴν μέθην καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ὢν ἢ γνάθος καὶ γαστήρ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γαστέρα ...

... Gnathon, ... whose accomplishments comprised eating, getting drunk, and drunken fornication, and who consisted of nothing more than jaws, a stomach, and the parts below the stomach ... (Longus 4.11.2; trans. Morgan).

Longus chooses his vocabulary carefully here: λαγνεύω denotes not merely sex, but gratuitous and immoderate sex.<sup>186</sup> Gnathon's excessive behaviour with regard to food, drink, and sex characterises him so completely that he can be summed up as no more than mouth, belly, and genitals: he is his actions, and those actions brand him effeminate. This characterisation as effeminate does not necessarily mean that Gnathon has a fixed sexual preference: effeminacy, as we have observed, can denote a lack of moderation in sexual relations with men, women, or both. But with his next words, Longus plays a trump card designed to resolve the ambiguity of Gnathon's effeminacy: Gnathon is said to take note of Daphnis as he brings gifts to Astylus,

<sup>184</sup> The name Ἀγάθων means 'Good Man', but Gnathon's intentions are anything but positive for Daphnis, as we shall see (although Gnathon does of course turn out to be a 'goody' in the end: 4.29).

<sup>185</sup> See above, p.141, n.228.

<sup>186</sup> *LSJ* s.v., with the cognate adjective λάγνος ('lecherous', 'lustful'). The choice of verb also stands in punning contrast to the harmless intentions of Astylus: Daphnis' brother has come to the country to hunt hares (4.11.1: περὶ θήραν εἶχε λαγωῶν), while Gnathon has come for drunken, animalistic sex (4.11.2: καὶ λαγνεύειν μετὰ τὴν μέθην), as his inebriated attempt on Daphnis will show.

and to be φύσει παιδεραστικός ('a paederast by nature').<sup>187</sup> Lest the reader should have missed the earlier hints at homosexual inclination, Longus finally spells it out: Gnathon is interested in boys, and his effeminacy is of the paederastic kind.<sup>188</sup> After the earlier ambiguity, this reads very much like a statement of an exclusive sexual identity. At this point we might return to the possible identification of Gnathon with Agathon. Duncan (2006: 42-44) observes that Aristophanes presents Agathon as changing his clothing to suit his current poetic intentions, and yet also as writing according to his nature.<sup>189</sup> She argues (*ibid.* 29) that the Agathon of both Plato and Aristophanes is 'a site for the investigation of identity, and in particular for investigating the degree to which the self has an essential and stable nature'. Both writers, she suggests (*ibid.* 48), question whether Agathon's nature determines his actions, or whether his actions respond to his environment. If this is right, and if Gnathon is indeed intended to recall Agathon, then we might view him as a focal point for engagement with the question of nature's involvement in the formation of sexual and gender identity. As we discuss Daphnis' rejection of Gnathon's advances, we shall note some instances of that engagement.

The threat towards which Longus has been building finally manifests itself, and, as so often with this text, the reader is more aware of the significance of the scenes he is reading than are the characters involved. As in the case of Habrocomes' response to Euxeinus, we shall see that Daphnis' reaction to Gnathon is predicated on his social and sexual statuses, which together constitute his gender status. Much as we saw Cybele attempting to 'soften' Theagenes on Arsace's behalf,<sup>190</sup> Gnathon endeavours to 'soften' (μαλθάρσων) Daphnis by praising his goats and promising him manumission.<sup>191</sup> Already aware of Gnathon's effeminacy, the reader recognises the ominous connotations in the reference to softening: Gnathon wishes to 'soften' Daphnis into accommodating his effeminate attitude to sex, but the reader

---

<sup>187</sup> Diphilus allegedly wrote a comedy entitled *The Paederasts*, so the application of παιδεραστικός to Gnathon may further identify him with the comic stage.

<sup>188</sup> The term παιδεραστικός suggests the active sexual role, but we have already observed an insinuation of passivity in the initial description of Gnathon, and we shall meet further evidence of this shortly.

<sup>189</sup> We shall return to Aristophanes' Agathon when we consider Cleitophon's cross-dressing.

<sup>190</sup> See above, p.144-145.

<sup>191</sup> 4.11.3.



understands that Daphnis, as an elite Greek male,<sup>192</sup> cannot become ‘softer’ without jeopardising his masculinity. Later that evening, using language drawn from nature, Gnathon asks Daphnis to provide ‘what nanny-goats give billy-goats’.<sup>193</sup> Here we see the desire for active homosexual sex suggested by the label *paiderastēs*, but also the dominant cultural assumption that the passive homosexual role has a feminising effect on its actor: Gnathon anticipates playing the male role of *erastēs*, with Daphnis the figurative female. But his lust does not stop there, as he goes on to wish that he could be one of Daphnis’ female goats and be put to graze by him (ὕπ’ ἐκείνου νεμόμενος), an innuendo that seems to imply the passive role,<sup>194</sup> thus invoking the meanings implicit in Gnathon’s shaven face. So not only do Gnathon’s words demonstrate the feminising effect of passive homosexual sex, but they also reveal the indiscriminate nature of his desires: his lasciviousness extends to wilful neglect of the protocols of paederasty, which require him to be *either* active *or* passive, but never both within the same relationship.<sup>195</sup>

Daphnis’ response to Gnathon’s proposition is to use an argument from nature against him:

... καὶ λέγοντος ὡς αἴγας μὲν βαίνειν τράγους καλόν, τράγον δὲ οὐπώποτε τις εἶδε βαίνοντα τράγον οὐδὲ κριὸν ἀντὶ τῶν οἴων κριὸν οὐδὲ ἀλεκτρούνας ἀντὶ τῶν ἀλεκτρορίδων τοὺς ἀλεκτρούνας ...

... then he replied that it was all right for billies to mount nannies, but no one had ever yet seen a billy mounting a billy, or a ram mounting a ram instead of the ewes, or cocks cocks instead of hens (Longus 4.12.2; trans. Morgan).

<sup>192</sup> The reader has surmised Daphnis’ elite status from the recognition tokens found with him, if not from generic conventions.

<sup>193</sup> 4.12.1; trans. Morgan: ... παρασχεῖν τοιοῦτον οἶον αἱ αἴγες τοῖς τράγοις. Gnathon’s approach to Daphnis is somewhat reminiscent of Hippothous’ approach to Habrocomes: he runs up to him and kisses him (see above, p.181).

<sup>194</sup> 4.16.3. Cf. Habrocomes’ use of ὑποτίθημι (above, p.199) and Chloe’s naive, but gender-appropriate, wish to be a goat grazed by Daphnis (1.14.3: ὑπ’ ἐκείνου νέμωμαι): ὑπό seems to be used to imply the passive sexual role; cf., however, the men in the wine-presses, who wish to be sheep grazed by Chloe (2.2.2: ὑπ’ ἐκείνης νέμεσθαι), and yet have just been likened to that overtly masculine and sexually-aggressive figure, the satyr: it seems that, like the terms ἐρώμενος and παῖς (see above, p.165, n.15, and p.184, n.93), ὑπό may take on a very specific meaning when used in a homosexual context.

<sup>195</sup> The roles are later reversed yet again, as Gnathon refers to himself as an *erastēs* (4.17.3, 4.17.4, 4.17.5). After rejecting Gnathon, Daphnis keeps a special watch over Chloe (4.12.3): Daphnis does not know the apparently exclusive quality of Gnathon’s lust, but he instinctively knows effeminacy when he sees it, and assumes that Chloe too is at risk.

What Gnathon proposes is *para physin* because the animals don't do it like that. While an argument from nature is an appropriate one for a country boy to make, the reader is aware that it is a cultured, and thus urban, argument.<sup>196</sup> In the group of episodes relating to Gnathon, we find a highly complex web of interlocking ideas in which Morgan (2004: 230) is correct in isolating the city/country dichotomy as of primary importance. Paederasty is clearly identified as a city pastime: Astylus asks his father if he may take Daphnis home so that he can learn 'the ways of the city' (τὰ ἀστικά) under Gnathon's tutelage (ὑπὸ Γνάθωνος), an obvious euphemism for homosexual sex.<sup>197</sup> Longus seems to question whether masculinity is brought into being by means of its own social performance, or dictated by some essential core, but ultimately the matter is unresolved. In describing Gnathon as a paederast 'by nature' and having Daphnis argue that paederasty is against nature, he explores the way in which culture naturalises the practices of sex and gender.<sup>198</sup> Within Gnathon's social ambit, convention promotes paederasty as natural, but within Daphnis', the familiar actions of the animals are natural.<sup>199</sup> Daphnis' rusticity might seem to distance him from the urban, elite practice of paederasty, and yet Daphnis is really an urban, elite boy. The reader may wonder whether, if paederasty is 'naturally' a city pursuit, it might therefore be more 'natural' to Daphnis than he thinks. But by the point of Gnathon's attempt on him, Daphnis has learned other, heterosexual, city ways, which govern his aversion to the proposition. It is to these that we now turn.

---

<sup>196</sup> On the irony in Daphnis' argument, see Goldhill (1995: 66) and Morgan (2004: 231). For the argument from nature against paederasty in contemporary texts, see Plu. *Amatorius* 751c and Ps.-Lucian *Am.* 20, 22; for the philosophical grounding of the argument, see Goldhill (1995: 52ff.), with particular reference to Plato's *Laws*. Proponents of paederasty might argue that boys' beauty was more natural than that of women, and that paederastic love was thus the more natural kind; Menelaus effectively makes this argument at Ach. Tat. 2.38.5.

<sup>197</sup> 4.19.1; note the telling ὑπὸ again. Writing on classical Athens, Hubbard (1998: 49) notes that paederasty was a 'strongly class-marked institution, of which subsistence-level laborers and farmers ... had little experience'; see also D. Chr. *Or.* 7.148ff., on paederasty as a city pursuit.

<sup>198</sup> Daphnis and Chloe's whole story is, as Winkler (1990: 104) puts it, a 'controlled experiment': it is 'not about the natural growth of erotic instinct but about the inadequacy of instinct to realize itself and about the many kinds of knowledge, education, and training required both to formulate the very meaning of spontaneous feelings and then to express them in appropriate action. Longus' tentative and exploratory fiction is, we might say, more about culture than about nature, and at times it seems to lead us in the direction of the thesis that sex itself is in no recoverable sense a natural fact but is through and through a social reality' (*ibid.* 103).

<sup>199</sup> Winkler observes that in classical discourse 'nature' often 'refers precisely to convention: it is norm-enforcing language' (*ibid.* 69); see also Veyne (1985: 26-27).

According to the classical paederastic ideal, the role of *erōmenos* to a social inferior would be inappropriate for Daphnis, as we have seen it to be for Habrocomes.<sup>200</sup> As in Habrocomes' case, Daphnis' sexual status is also a primary motivating factor in his reaction to Gnathon's request, and it is from his sexual experience that he seems to acquire his 'natural' grasp on the distinctly cultured argument from nature. Prior to the urban Gnathon's appearance on the scene, Daphnis has had sex with Lycaenion, who herself comes from the city.<sup>201</sup> During his experience, *physis* is said to take over:<sup>202</sup> while Gnathon's form of τὰ ἀστικά may be natural to *him*, another form of τὰ ἀστικά comes naturally to Daphnis.<sup>203</sup> In the Introduction we noted Culler's discussion of the ways in which narratives confront the interplay of nature and culture in the formation of identity.<sup>204</sup> Narratives, he states, often exhibit the 'complications' and 'entanglements' involved in efforts to establish how identity is formed. Daphnis' 'natural' awareness of his masculinity seems a good example of such entanglements, and it is worth paraphrasing Culler here: Daphnis discovers who he is by acting in such a way as to become what was always his nature. After his first introduction to city ways by Lycaenion, he is able to adopt a cultured urban argument against a form of urban sex of which he knows nothing. He has had an acculturative experience which has imbued him with a subliminal comprehension of his own masculinity and of the cultural meanings of sexual acts, a comprehension that is attuned to elite city protocols; while such protocols may endorse paederasty, they also preclude the sexually mature (and socially superior) male from playing the role of *erōmenos*. Not for nothing does Lycaenion enigmatically tell Daphnis to:

... μέμνησο ὅτι σε ἄνδρα ἐγὼ πρὸ Χλόης πεποίηκα.

---

<sup>200</sup> The issue of social status is noted by Winkler (1990: 112-114); see also Konstan (1994b: 29-30) and Watanabe (2003a: 48).

<sup>201</sup> 3.15.1.

<sup>202</sup> 3.18.4.

<sup>203</sup> Theocritus' influence on Longus is well known (see Morgan 2004: 2-7 and commentary *passim*). In Theocritus (or Ps.-Theocritus), τὰ ἀστικά indicates city love of a heterosexual kind: see Theoc. 20, the rejection of a *boukolos* by a city girl, who describes her own kisses as ἀστικά (20.4); the *boukolos* complains to his shepherd companions that women from the town (τὰ ἀστικά) will not kiss him (20.30); like Gnathon before Astylus, he proceeds to cite examples of divine beings who have loved animal-herders.

<sup>204</sup> See above, p.13-14.

... remember that I have made you a man before Chloe (Longus 3.19.3; trans. Morgan, modified).<sup>205</sup>

His sex with Lycaenion is the moment at which he assumes the identity of active male, just as we saw that Habrocomes' marital status classified him as an *anēr*.<sup>206</sup> As a newly-made active male with a latent understanding of urban concerns, Daphnis recognises that what Gnathon proposes is wholly unsuitable: Lycaenion has taught him to exercise his masculinity in the role of *erastēs* in a heterosexual context, and has thus prepared him for marriage; after making this transition, he cannot now regress to the passive role proposed by Gnathon. A strikingly similar concern with sexual boundaries is found in an epigram by Martial, which addresses the constraint to learn and perform masculinity in a socially appropriate manner. There, the poet warns a young husband that if he has prior experience of homosexual sex, but not of sex with women, he will not get away with bugging his wife for long. His best course of action is to be initiated into heterosexual sex by a prostitute before marriage,<sup>207</sup> since:

illa virum faciet; non bene virgo docet.

She'll make a man; a virgin does not teach well (Mart. 11.78).

When we take into account the connotations of prostitution in Lycaenion's name,<sup>208</sup> we see that Daphnis has had an experience remarkably akin to what Martial recommends for the young man in the epigram. Commenting on another of Martial's epigrams, Kay (1985: 120) observes that the use of *vir* signifies a transition from homosexuality to heterosexuality: it is never used of the passive homosexual partner (*puer*), and it indicates that the male is now past the age of excusable homosexual

<sup>205</sup> Cf. Nape's fear that if Chloe is not married off soon, she may 'make a man' (ἄνδρα ποιήσεται) of one of the shepherds (3.25.2). It is unclear what is signified by the use of the middle voice (ποιήσεται) in Chloe's case, and the active (πεποίηκα) in Lycaenion's. Does it perhaps indicate Lycaenion's much more 'go-getting' approach to sex? Or does it suggest that Lycaenion is making a man whom she then turns out into the world, while Chloe may make a man 'for herself', in some reflexive sense, *i.e.* a man whom she would then have to marry?

<sup>206</sup> Daphnis' assumption of the active role is signified by the fact that Lycaenion subordinates herself to him: αὐτήν δὲ ὑποστορέσσασα (3.18.4).

<sup>207</sup> Kay (1985: 167) notes that visits to prostitutes were 'a part of every adolescent Roman male's education', and we have seen a suggestion of something similar in Achilles Tatius (see above, p.193-194); we have also observed, however, that it was possible to have too much 'education' of this kind.

<sup>208</sup> On Lycaenion's name, see Morgan (2004: 208-209).

liaisons. Furthermore, he notes (*ibid.*) that the Greek words παῖς and ἀνήρ are semantically equivalent to *puer* and *vir* in this context. Daphnis has not had homosexual sex like Martial's character, but he *has* made the transition from a period when such behaviour would be socially acceptable (at least in the city), so he is socially obliged to reject Gnathon's advances: Lycaenion has made him an *anēr*, and no *anēr* plays the role of *pais* without becoming feminised.<sup>209</sup>

Daphnis rejects Gnathon not only verbally but also physically, and the language Longus uses here emphasises the fragile nature of Daphnis' newly-formed masculinity:

... οἷός τε ἦν ὁ Γνάθων βιάζεσθαι τὰς χεῖρας προσφέρων, ὁ δὲ μεθύοντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐστῶτα μόλις παρωσάμενος ἔσφηλεν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ ὥσπερ σκύλαξ ἀποδραμῶν κείμενον κατέλιπεν, ἀνδρὸς οὐ παιδὸς ἐς χειραγωγίαν δεόμενον ...

Gnathon then laid hands on him and was set to take him by force, but Daphnis pushed him away and sent him sprawling to the ground (he was drunk and could barely stand), then ran off like a puppy, leaving him lying there. It was not a boy he needed now to lend a helping hand, but a man (Longus 4.12.3; trans. Morgan).

If Daphnis is now an *anēr*, what are we to make of him being likened to a baby animal? The image of the puppy is perhaps emblematic of developing masculinity. Plutarch, for example, relates a story about the Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus' use of differently-trained puppies as examples of how best to train young men;<sup>210</sup> the puppy motif might therefore be thought to represent a boy on his way to

---

<sup>209</sup> Epstein (1995: 70) rightly notes that '[Daphnis'] experience with Gnathon corroborates the lesson that masculinity depends upon the assumption of the active role'; see also Epstein (2002: 36). The perceived feminisation of the passive role is evident when Lamon, knowing Daphnis' true social status, declares to Dionysophanes that Gnathon wants to take the young man to Mitylene for 'women's work' (4.19.5: γυναικῶν ἔργα). Here we might think of Encolpius' claim that Giton had performed *opus muliebre*. Just as Daphnis has a 'natural' awareness of the cultured argument from nature, so too is the country-bumpkin Lamon 'naturally' aware that passive homosexual sex is feminising. Ἔργα is of course a key word in this text, signifying heterosexual, conjugal love, the goal to which the novel is leading. Both Daphnis' and Lamon's 'natural' understandings appeal to and reinforce the educated reader's awareness of elite cultural protocols.

<sup>210</sup> Plu. *Moralia* 225d ff. As the wolfish Lycurgus trains his Spartan puppies, so the lupine Lycaenion trains the puppy Daphnis.

manhood.<sup>211</sup> But it also seems to have a more specifically homosexual sense. Fragments are extant from two mimes, entitled *Scylax* and *Catularius (Puppy)* and attributed to Decimus Laberius, the latter of which appears to refer to anal sex.<sup>212</sup> Indeed, in a consideration of the influence of mime on Petronius, Sandy (1974: 343, n.32) suggests that the title *Catularius* indicates ‘dog-style love-making, i.e., sodomy’.<sup>213</sup> The word σκύλαξ might thus denote either the active or the passive role in youthful homosexual sex, both of which roles Gnathon seems to want to play with Daphnis.<sup>214</sup> There is perhaps one further sense in the use of σκύλαξ. Might it also be intended to suggest the fragility of gender, and the particularly sensitive nature of Daphnis’ age in relation to the emergence of his masculinity? In this respect, the juxtaposition of the words ἀνὴρ and παῖς in the above passage is important. There is of course a *double entendre* in the notion of Gnathon needing a hand from a man where he had previously wanted a hand of an entirely different sort from a *pais*, a young beloved. But there is a more profound meaning in ἀνὴρ and παῖς, and here we might look to the first myth narrated in the novel, where two young cowherds, a boy and a girl, compete at singing. The boy – very significantly, because the boy stands for Daphnis – is said to have a voice that is louder because he is an ἀνὴρ, but sweet because he is a παῖς.<sup>215</sup> The boy in the myth is on the cusp of becoming a man: he is in some sense *both* man and boy. The myths in the novel correspond to the various stages of Daphnis and Chloe’s sexual development. By Book 4, Daphnis has passed the point at which he might be thought both man and boy: he has passed the point of no return, and Gnathon is mistaken to view him as a potential *pais*. But the use of ἀνὴρ and παῖς in both the myth and the passage here highlights the sensitivity of Daphnis’ masculinity, and the ease with which he might be robbed of it. Writing on Roman texts, Richlin (1993: 532) observes that there is a point in a

<sup>211</sup> It may be of relevance to note that Strabo refers to the suckling of Romulus and Remus by a she-wolf with the phrase ὑπὸ λυκαίνης σκυλακεύεσθαι (5.3.2): like Daphnis, these human puppies are nurtured by a she-wolf (though Daphnis, as new *erastēs*, is not ὑπὸ Lycaenion). Given that child exposure and suckling by animals play a role in Longus’ myth, it is worth considering that he may be intertexting with Roman foundation myth.

<sup>212</sup> *Scylax*: Laber. 101, Bonaria; *Catularius*: Laber. 30, 32, Bonaria. Thanks to Costas Panayotakis for drawing my attention to these fragments.

<sup>213</sup> See also Sandy (1974: 335, n.13).

<sup>214</sup> We have also noted Strato’s epigram (*AP* 12.238) referring to young dogs both mounting and being mounted (see above, p.173, n.48), where the puppies are referred to as οἱ κύναιοι παῖλοι μεिरακτευσόμενοι: the notion of puppyhood seems closely connected to youthful homosexual activity, and especially, perhaps, to the alternation of sexual roles.

<sup>215</sup> 1.27.3.

young man's life when he is 'just on the edge of too-old-to-be-a-*puer*, just the age for teasing', and that, '[t]esting this edge was a great source of Roman humor'.<sup>216</sup> Daphnis' 'edge' is tested in just such a humorous (though inherently serious) manner: Gnathon's approach to him takes place at the point in his life when he is making the transition from boy to man, and consequently when his masculinity is most fragile.

Only in Longus' text do we find an overt negotiation of the roles played by nature and culture in the genesis of masculinity. However, *both* Daphnis and Habrocomes are clearly aware (even if only latently in Daphnis' case) of the protocols that govern the performance of that masculinity. Both authors deliberately situate a homosexual attempt on their heroes after they have been heterosexually-initiated and 'learned' to perform the 'natural' role of the adult male – that of *erastēs*. Their new active male sexual status is thus a key factor in their reactions against the prospect of becoming another man's *erōmenos*.<sup>217</sup> Hence, as well as social considerations (in that the heroes are the social superiors of their admirers) and generic considerations (in that the novel as genre tends to privilege heterosexual, conjugal love), we must also take account of sexual considerations. Habrocomes' and Daphnis' social, sexual, and thus gender identities are fundamental: to submit to these *erastai* would result in the heroes' feminisation and loss of masculinity. Habrocomes articulates explicitly the potential repercussions of youthful passivity, and his fear of feminisation raises a concern never far from the mind of the elite second-century male reader: in an environment where masculinity is scrutinised and evaluated, a man's actions (or perhaps more importantly, his passions) could come back to haunt him. In the next section, this is exactly what we find occurring in the case of Achilles' Thersander.

### ***The faces of effeminacy: the moichos and the kinaidos.***

We have observed that effeminacy may be characterised by a desire for the passive homosexual role, or by an excessive heterosexual lust, or, in the most extreme cases,

---

<sup>216</sup> See also Walters (1997: 33) on the ambivalent and worrisome status of the freeborn male youth in Roman thought, and see Ach. Tat. 8.10.5, where Thersander's counsel suggests that the priest of Artemis may have slept with Cleitophon because the latter is still young and easy on the eye.

<sup>217</sup> I think that Winkler (1990: 112-114) is essentially correct in his argument that it is not homosexuality *per se* that is reacted against in Longus' text, but rather Gnathon's effeminate *mode* of homosexuality and the socially inappropriate nature of his designs on Daphnis. Winkler does not, however, consider the influence of Daphnis' sexual status.

by both. Accusations of *kinaideia* and *moicheia* are effectively accusations of effeminacy. In the case of Thersander we find effeminacy signalled by both of these behaviours. Cleitophon first narrates Thersander's lascivious attempts on Leucippe, and then the courtroom allegations that he had prostituted himself during his youth. Given the perceived indiscriminate quality of the effeminate's desires, it would come as no surprise to the reader to find Thersander depicted both as attempted adulterer with Leucippe in adulthood, and as passive homosexual in youth.<sup>218</sup> His behaviour with Leucippe reveals his inability to control his lust and exercise moderation; the reader is thus prepared for his later exposure as a willing sexual passive. We must remember that we learn of Thersander's phenomenal misperformance of masculinity from Cleitophon, and we shall see later that Cleitophon's narration of Thersander's misdeeds has implications for the way we read Cleitophon's own performance of masculinity.

The first indication the reader is given of Thersander's sexual incontinence is his acceptance of Sosthenes' suggestion that Leucippe be kept locked up in order that Thersander may take advantage of her.<sup>219</sup> At this point, Thersander has not even seen Leucippe, but he has so little control over his sexual desires that he accedes eagerly to Sosthenes' offer.<sup>220</sup> However, as yet Thersander believes Leucippe to be a slave, bought from the brigands who kidnapped her. There is nothing inherently effeminate in his presumption of sexual rights over her, since slaves were considered possessions with no bodily autonomy, and were therefore available to be penetrated or otherwise physically abused (Walters 1997: 39). And yet in the novels we find the masculine ideal of self-restraint extended to a man's dealings (sexual or otherwise) with his slaves. For instance, lamenting the fact that she has been 'murdered' by her

<sup>218</sup> Suetonius offers an example of alleged homosexual passivity in youth, and heterosexual adultery in adulthood, claiming that Caesar was the *puer* of King Nicomedes of Bithynia, and was later an adulterer: his reputation was one of both *impudicitia* and adultery (*Jul.* 52.3); we shall return to this example later on in relation to Cleitophon.

<sup>219</sup> Ach. Tat. 6.3.4ff.

<sup>220</sup> His characterisation here as effeminate is paralleled by that of Callisthenes, who also experiences an uncontrollable lust for Leucippe, having never seen her, but only heard about her beauty: there, sowing the seeds for his later defamation of Thersander, Cleitophon states: '... for such is the lack of self-control in the lewd, that they are led into the passion of love by means of their ears, and report has the same effect upon them as the ministry of the love-smitten eyes, acting upon the mind, has upon others' (2.13.1; trans. Gaselee); similarly, Sosthenes advises Thersander to 'believe ... [in Leucippe's beauty] from hearsay, as though you actually saw her' (6.3.5; trans. Gaselee). Cleitophon seems to intend a certain distancing of himself from these lustful men – he, after all, fell for Leucippe on sight, not hearsay –, but we shall see that he might be thought to have much in common with them.



*erastēs*, Callirhoe makes a point of the fact that Chaereas had never even struck a slave, suggesting that he was within his rights to do so, but had always restrained himself;<sup>221</sup> and Dionysius is acutely aware of the importance of not being thought to have used force on his new ‘slave’ Callirhoe, despite it being within his rights to do so.<sup>222</sup> So although Thersander *may* fairly expect to take whatever he wants from Leucippe as long as he believes her his slave, he *ought* not to do so. Implicitly, therefore, he is characterised as lacking sexual self-control.

But it is not only in respect of a man’s treatment of his slaves that such codes of conduct operate: he must also – and very much more importantly – moderate his behaviour in relation to free women. So, as we saw in Chapter 2, Theagenes demonstrates his masculinity by restraining his desire for Charicleia when alone with her in the Egyptian cave, and later by rejecting the advances of Arsace.<sup>223</sup> While Thersander has sexual rights over a slave but should nonetheless control himself, he has no such rights over a freeborn elite woman. Knowing that Leucippe is not a slave, but a free woman, the reader is aware that Thersander is at double the risk of feminising himself, should he try to take advantage of her. When Sosthenes lauds him to Leucippe in an effort to make her well-disposed towards him, her response underscores Thersander’s failings as a man: he ought to be lavishing his attentions on his city and his wife, rather than on her, and she will only consider him ὡς ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν when he ceases subjecting other men’s wives to *hybris*.<sup>224</sup> Thersander soon fulfils his promise as an effeminate. Having heard from Melite that Leucippe is Cleitophon’s *gynē*,<sup>225</sup> he asks Sosthenes to confirm the story,<sup>226</sup> and then eavesdrops on Leucippe’s soliloquy, which leaves absolutely no room for doubt as

<sup>221</sup> Chariton 1.14.7. *Cf.* Dionysius’ gradual loss of self-control, hinted at by the fact that he strikes Leonas (2.3.6), a detail that stands in deliberate antithesis to Chaereas’ never having done such a thing; and *cf.* the unmanly Cleitophon, who is capable of beating nobody but a slave, and an Egyptian one at that (Ach. Tat. 4.15.6) – and *that* only shortly after his disquisition on Egyptian *deilia* (4.14.9).

<sup>222</sup> Chariton 2.4.9-10. *Cf.* the licentious Arsace’s elated reaction to the news that Theagenes is her slave, and she can thus do with him what she will (Hld. 7.24).

<sup>223</sup> In his characterisation of Arsace, Heliodorus exemplifies the peculiarities of the Graeco-Roman construction of gender. In her unusual political position as a ruler whose husband is absent, and in her attempts to indulge her desire for her ‘slave’ Theagenes, Arsace is a paradoxical combination of the masculine female and the effeminate male, both of whom threaten gender boundaries. Indeed, when Arsace balks at the prospect of torturing Theagenes in order to elicit his sexual submission, Cybele responds with a remark that uses the loaded concept of softness in a way that knowingly points up such boundaries: Αὐθίς αὐτὸν μαλακίῳ (Hld. 8.5.11).

<sup>224</sup> Ach. Tat. 6.12.3-5.

<sup>225</sup> 6.9.6-7.

<sup>226</sup> 6.15.3.

to her status as a free woman and (effectively) a wife.<sup>227</sup> Hearing how much Leucippe loves Cleitophon, Thersander curses his rival and wishes that he might become him in order to have Leucippe. This wish to become Cleitophon provokes a response from Sosthenes that indirectly characterises the hero: he advises Thersander that he must not ‘soften’ (οὐ μαλακιστέον) in his mission.<sup>228</sup> This of course pertains to Thersander’s resolve in something which has mutated from the seduction of a slave to full-blown *moicheia*, but collaterally it implies that Cleitophon himself is effeminate. Cleitophon has several times been labelled a *moichos*,<sup>229</sup> a slur that Sosthenes now applies to him again, immediately after the reference to softening. Cleitophon and Thersander are thus more alike than the former imagines:<sup>230</sup> both are soft adulterers, and Cleitophon’s performance of Thersander’s misperformance of masculinity indirectly reveals his own.

Entering the hut and finding Leucippe resistant to his charms, Thersander tries to force her to kiss him.<sup>231</sup> Her response emphasises his sexual incontinence and his inability to perform according to the accepted norms of masculinity: he is not acting (ποιεῖς) as a free or noble man, but is in fact mimicking (μιμῆ) Sosthenes;<sup>232</sup> his lust has enslaved him, detracting from his masculinity and, by logical extension, feminising him. As we saw earlier, the distinctions between freedom and slavery, and activity and passivity, were closely linked.<sup>233</sup> As Gnathon, a slave to aphrodisiac and alimentary desires, also appears to be a willing sexual passive, so the identification of Thersander as a slave to his lust encourages the reader to associate

---

<sup>227</sup> 6.16. In her solitude, Leucippe four times refers to Cleitophon as her *anēr*, states categorically that she is not a slave, and even announces her elite lineage, all of which emphasises the hybridic nature of Thersander’s imminent behaviour towards her. One might say that in his efforts to paint Leucippe as chaste and Thersander as sexually incontinent, Cleitophon over-eggs the pudding somewhat. Leucippe’s references to the ‘drama’ in which she is acting the ‘part’ of Lacaena are symptomatic of Cleitophon’s own obsession with performance; *cf.* the theatrical words he recounts Cleinias exhorting him with at 1.10.7 (see above, p.189), and Thersander’s premeditated adoption of a different mien when he enters the hut after overhearing Leucippe’s words (6.18.1: εἰσέρχεται σχηματίσας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ εὐάγωγότερον πρὸς θεῖον).

<sup>228</sup> 6.17.2; noted also by Morgan (2007: 109).

<sup>229</sup> See Schwartz (2002).

<sup>230</sup> Much as we noted that Cleitophon reveals himself and Menelaus to be alike, despite his protestations that he does not understand paederasty (see above, p.197).

<sup>231</sup> 6.18.4ff.

<sup>232</sup> 6.18.6.

<sup>233</sup> See above, p.199-200.

him with sexual passivity, long before such charges are ever made.<sup>234</sup> Ironically, by trying to exercise his masculinity in the most active, aggressive manner possible, Thersander leaves himself open to the accusation of passivity: he is the abominable figure so common in Roman writings, a man who is both *moichos* and *kinaidos* rolled into one,<sup>235</sup> and his *kinaideia* will indeed resurface later. Leucippe boldly asserts that he will have no success with her unless he becomes Cleitophon. Here again we see in Cleitophon's performance an attempt to emphasise the behavioural distance between himself and Thersander; but once more the words he attributes to another in fact stress the proximity between the two men. Thersander's subsequent physical violence towards Leucippe only strengthens her defiance: he and Sosthenes, she says, are as lacking in moderation as brigands; even the real brigands she has encountered exhibited more self-control and did not attempt the *hybris* they are proposing.<sup>236</sup> Bandits and pirates were often characterised as lacking the ability to moderate their desires;<sup>237</sup> they therefore belonged to the same conceptual category as slaves and women. Leucippe's branding of Thersander a slave and a brigand thus implies his effeminacy, and given the connection that has been made between Thersander and Cleitophon, this implication might also be thought to extend to the hero.

Having primed his audience with suggestions of Thersander's effeminacy, Cleitophon later fulfils expectations by narrating the priest of Artemis' allegations that Thersander had prostituted himself during his youth. Bartsch (1989: 128) remarks that the court proceedings are 'a tribute to rhetoric', with the priest of Artemis 'putting on an act', indicated by the phrase 'τὴν Ἀριστοφάνους ἐξηλωκῶς κωμωδίαν'. This is undoubtedly correct, although the 'act' is of course as much Cleitophon's as the priest's, and the reference to Aristophanes provides another example of the hero's desire to lay claim to *paideia*: in his construction of

<sup>234</sup> When Thersander later bursts into the shrine of Artemis, demanding the return of his 'slave' Leucippe, Cleitophon labels him τριδουλος (8.1.2). While this term literally denotes slavery by descent through three generations (*LSJ s.v.*), Cleitophon may intend it to signify the triple desires of the *akolastos*: food, drink, and sex; if so, he portrays Thersander very much as a Gnathon-figure.

<sup>235</sup> See Edwards (1993: 82-83, 91) on the *moechocinaedus* in Roman texts, and Winkler (1990: 45ff.) on the *kinaidos* as the opposite of the hoplite in Athenian masculine ideology.

<sup>236</sup> 6.22.

<sup>237</sup> Brigands practise all forms of sexual excess and overturn sexual codes: see, e.g., Aeschin. 1.191, where those who cannot control themselves sexually are said to be those who make up bandit gangs. On bandits as morally incontinent, with particular reference to the novels, see Hopwood (1998).

his characters, Cleitophon is as eager to flaunt his own knowledge of the literary canon as he is to recount that of others. We observed in Chapter 1 Cleitophon's self-presentation as something of an orator.<sup>238</sup> In his narration of the courtroom scene he moves from epideictic to forensic oratory:<sup>239</sup> while his words may be as peppered with innuendo as an Aristophanic play, they owe rather more to Aeschines. The debt is one of which any educated reader would be aware, and the especially attentive might also recall that Aeschines names one Thersander as a man with whom Timarchus has had sexual relations.<sup>240</sup> Before even detailing the accusations made, Cleitophon refers to the priest's subject-matter: Thersander's *porneia*.<sup>241</sup> The speech is thus contextualised in the world of real-life Graeco-Roman rhetorical practice, whereby a speaker would accuse his opponent of having been a sexual passive during his youth.<sup>242</sup> Such accusations were not, of course, always grounded in verifiable fact, but they were nonetheless an effective means of defaming one's enemies.<sup>243</sup>

The priest first alleges that Thersander's 'mouth is impure' (στόματός ἐστιν οὐ καθαρῶν) and that 'he has a tongue full of *hybris* in every way' (πανταχοῦ τὴν γλῶτταν μεστήν ὕβρεως ἔχει).<sup>244</sup> These words refer to the verbal abuse Thersander has recently aimed at Leucippe, Cleitophon, and the priest himself, but the audience is certainly expected to infer an accusation of oral sex.<sup>245</sup> Such an accusation would be equally at home in a Roman context: as Williams (1999: 198) notes, Roman texts have a tendency to use the language of purity and impurity when referring to oral sex.<sup>246</sup> He goes on to state that fellatio marked a man as passive; it was doubly degrading because the *fellator* was both penetrated and made unclean (*ibid.*). With his very first words, then, the priest makes an effective attack on Thersander's masculinity. What makes the accusation even stronger is that it

<sup>238</sup> See above, p.70ff.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. above, p.60-61, where he also seems to adopt the pose of the courtroom orator.

<sup>240</sup> Aeschin. 1.52.

<sup>241</sup> 8.9.1.

<sup>242</sup> On this practice in a Roman context, see Richlin (1993: 538) and Walters (1997: 42, n.13); Edwards (1993: 70-71) highlights Cicero's fondness for this form of attack. Winkler (1990: 46) observes that accusations of this kind usually comprised three elements: promiscuity, payment, and passivity to another man's penetration; Achilles is no exception.

<sup>243</sup> We have already noted the gravity of the suitors' slander of Chaereas, and Encolpius' slander of Ascylos and Giton.

<sup>244</sup> 8.9.1-2.

<sup>245</sup> Cf. above, p.204, on Gnathon.

<sup>246</sup> See, e.g. Mart. 3.17, 9.63.

pertains to Thersander's adulthood: it was not a youthful folly that might perhaps be left behind on maturation, but something in which he has continued to engage at a time of life when he ought to know better.<sup>247</sup> The priest then conducts a chronological defamation of Thersander's life, beginning with his youth, and imitating the details given by Aeschines of Timarchus' experiences as a μείρῶκιον: Thersander allegedly acted the part (ὑπεκρίνατο) of *sōphrosynē* and used the guise (προσποιούμενος) of *paideia* purposefully to seek out passive sex.<sup>248</sup> This accusation trades on, but reverses, the stereotype of teachers of *paideia* abusing their positions to acquire sex: the use and abuse of education was clearly not a one-way street. But Thersander's pretense to *sōphrosynē* and his manipulation of *paideia* make him sound really rather like Cleitophon, who, as we have seen, used *paideia* to impress and get close to Leucippe, and later told Leucippe's father his back-story in such a way as to give a shine to his *sōphrosynē*.<sup>249</sup> Again we are tempted to think that he has much in common with the man from whom he is trying to distance himself.

Next, in an image that recalls Menelaus' remarks in the debate in Book 2, Thersander is said to have frequented the gymnasia, using wrestling as a pretext for indulging his lust for other men.<sup>250</sup> In the case of Menelaus, we observed that his obsession with sex and all things physical was symptomatic of effeminacy; here, Thersander's disposition is shown to be similar, and both the reader and the text's internal audience are immediately encouraged to classify him as effeminate. But when we learn that his preferred wrestling partners were τοὺς ἀνδρειοτέρους

<sup>247</sup> Cf. Aeschin. 1.39: Aeschines will pass over the offences committed by Timarchus during boyhood, and will focus on his behaviour after he reached the age of majority – *i.e.* behaviour for which he is wholly culpable and which he cannot attribute to the foolishness of youth. Writing on Roman sources, Richlin (1993: 539) notes that accusations of continued passivity in an adult male are rare and often vague; in a Roman context, then, the insinuations made against Thersander would be particularly appalling.

<sup>248</sup> 8.9.2; cf. Aeschin. 1.40, where Timarchus is alleged to have used education as a smokescreen. Achilles' priest signals the passive role with the loaded ὑπο- prefix (ὑποκύπτων καὶ ὑποκατακλιόμενος αἰεί) and the participle δεχόμενος (8.9.3), and implies that Thersander was paid by the use of προσηταιρίζετο (8.9.3), which might be thought to suggest prostitution.

<sup>249</sup> For his spin-doctoring of *sōphrosynē*, see 8.5.2.

<sup>250</sup> Thersander's association with the gymnasia also recalls Cleitophon's use of the words παιδοτριβῆς and ἔρωτος ἀθλητῆς (see above, p.155-156): once more Cleitophon and Thersander are rather alike. The priest later calls Thersander ὁ νυκτερινός δικαστής ('nocturnal juror'; 8.9.11), a phrase rather reminiscent of Cleitophon's ἔρωτος ἀθλητῆς: the reader may again retrospectively assimilate the two men; as Vilborg (1962: 134) notes, courts never sat during the night, and the label applied to Thersander must therefore relate to his nocturnal sexual excesses.

(‘more manly’),<sup>251</sup> we realise that he is not just effeminate, but hyper-effeminate: τοὺς ἀνδρειοτέρους seems to insinuate not only that Thersander enjoyed being penetrated, but that he enjoyed being penetrated by a big penis, a pleasure generally attributed to women and effeminate men.<sup>252</sup> Furthermore, the classical Greek homoerotic ideal was a boy with small genitalia, so Thersander’s interest in well-endowed males suggests contravention of paederastic etiquette. The notion of being ‘more manly’ might also be thought to imply that the men Thersander chose were somewhat older than was acceptable. A man attracted to men who were beyond a certain age risked being thought effeminate, as such relationships provoked doubt over who was playing the role of active inserter, and who that of passive receiver.<sup>253</sup> When Thersander’s age diminishes his allure and he becomes ἕξωρος and no longer ὠραῖος, he uses his tongue for ἀσελγεία and his mouth for ἀναίσχυντία,<sup>254</sup> committing all kinds of *hybris*.<sup>255</sup> The priest’s rhetoric has come full circle, back to the accusation that Thersander willingly performs oral sex, and he has concluded the allegations of sexual misconduct with the most morally reprehensible and memorable one of all.

In the Introduction, we observed that Achilles’ text comprises several layers of performance.<sup>256</sup> While we might wish to examine how masculinity is performed by the characters in the text, it is impossible to do so without also being caught up in the performative quality of the narrative itself: Achilles presents the anonymous

<sup>251</sup> 8.9.4.

<sup>252</sup> See Williams (1999: 86) on the significance of Priapus and the Priapic male in Roman thought. Taylor (1997: 365) notes that Roman invective presents the habitual sexual passive as preoccupied with the size of other men’s genitals; see *HA Elagabalus* 5.3 for the claim that Elagabalus sought to play the passive role with well-endowed men, on which see Kuefler (2001: 88); see also Petr. 92, where, on account of the incredible size of his penis, Ascyrtos is picked up and taken home by a man described as *infamis*; and Petr. 105, where Lichas recognises Encolpius by feeling his genitals.

<sup>253</sup> Williams (1999: 84) notes that in a Roman context, male post-adolescent prostitutes might be asked either to penetrate their male clients or to play the receptive role.

<sup>254</sup> 8.9.5. The twofold accusation here of things done with the tongue and things done with the mouth is interesting: while both clearly impute to Thersander the performance of oral sex, might it be that the separate references to tongue and mouth are intended to imply cunnilingus and fellatio respectively? See Williams (1999: 199ff.) on the equally bad reputations of the man who performed the former and he who performed the latter: he sees in imperial sources the assumption ‘that a man whose tastes are debased enough to induce him to perform one of these disgusting acts will readily perform the other’ (*ibid.* 200). We have already observed in the characterisation of Thersander the notion that the effeminate may be marked by an excessive lust for both passive sex with men and sex with women.

<sup>255</sup> Cf. Aeschin. 1.95, where, when Timarchus became ἕξωρος, men would no longer gratify his desires: this suggests, perhaps, that his former clients did not wish to expose themselves to accusations of effeminacy.

<sup>256</sup> See above, p.12-13.

narrator performing Cleitophon performing all of the people in his life, who themselves sometimes perform – like the priest of Artemis, for example.<sup>257</sup> This text, more than any other novel, gives the impression of being one huge performance, with Cleitophon an ambitious actor assuming multiple roles. But his ambition outweighs his ability. In the scenes we have discussed above, we have noted in passing that everything Cleitophon narrates seems to suggest something about his own performance of gender: he may take on the roles of others, but we are often given glimpses of the actor beneath the mask. In the final section of this chapter, we turn to Cleitophon's cross-dressing, which provides a focal point for an investigation of his misperformance of gender, and his self-characterisation as effeminate.

### *Becoming the woman.*

In Book 2, Cleitophon likens his erotic enslavement to Leucippe to Heracles' enslavement to Omphale, during which the hero was forced to dress as a woman.<sup>258</sup> At the beginning of Book 6, this image of transvestism is crystallised in action. After Cleitophon has slept with Melite, she encourages him to disguise himself as her by wearing her clothes, and in this way to escape without being detected. Once he is outfitted, Melite says she is reminded of a painting of Achilles; the reader understands that she means the young Achilles disguised as a woman. In the two myths to which Cleitophon refers – Heracles in Lydia and Achilles on Scyros – the masculinity of both heroes is ultimately reinforced by their transvestism, for they both exercise their gender sexually and father sons during that period (Cyrino 1998: 214).<sup>259</sup> But the notion of transvestism in Graeco-Roman thought is not unproblematic. Any man wearing a woman's clothing, or merely clothing deemed overly long or loose and thus insufficiently masculine, might easily be thought effeminate: Aristophanes' effeminate Agathon is portrayed as fond of feminine dress and accoutrements;<sup>260</sup> Aeschines abuses his arch-enemy Demosthenes by claiming that his clothing is indistinguishable from a woman's, and relating his style of dress to *anandria* and *kinaidia*;<sup>261</sup> Clodius' infiltration of the Bona Dea festival by disguising himself as a woman gave Cicero political ammunition for a long time

<sup>257</sup> Or the opposing counsel, Sopater, who begins like an epideictic orator about to declaim: τερατευσάμενος καὶ τρίψας τὸ πρόσωπον (8.10.2).

<sup>258</sup> 2.6.2.

<sup>259</sup> On the significance of these myths, see also Lindheim (1998) and Raval (2002).

<sup>260</sup> Ar. *Thesm.* 130ff.

<sup>261</sup> Aeschin. 1.131.

after the event (Corbeill 1997: 120); the Romans even used the adjective *discinctus* ('loose-belted') as a synonym for 'effeminate', regularly drawing attention to ambiguous clothing in their rhetorical invective (Edwards 1993: 90; Richlin 1993: 542). In the ancient world as in the modern, clothing was taken to be an external signifier of gender identity.<sup>262</sup> While Cleitophon might wish his audience to identify him with the masculinity of Heracles or Achilles, emerging triumphant from its feminine bonds, the educated imperial reader, aware, as he must be, of such sartorial anxieties, is surely more likely to identify him with the figure of the effeminate. This identification is sealed by Melite's remark that Cleitophon is even better-looking wearing a dress,<sup>263</sup> a statement that aligns Cleitophon with men who cannot control their sexual urges, and who adopt feminine clothing and indulge in excessive grooming as a means of making themselves more attractive to women.<sup>264</sup> As we have seen, effeminacy was something of a catch-all concept, often conflating lust for women with the passive homosexual role; in addition to announcing Cleitophon's heterosexual lust, his cross-dressing thus plants in the reader's mind the suspicion that his effeminacy might extend to more than just adultery.

Melite asks Cleitophon not only to put on her clothes, but also to leave her his own so that she may wear them and through them feel close to him.<sup>265</sup> This is not just cross-dressing, but virtual gender-swapping, as Cleitophon willingly forfeits the external emblems of his masculinity to a woman, and dons her tokens of gender in exchange. But, like Habrocomes' fear,<sup>266</sup> Cleitophon becomes not simply a woman, but a prostitute, as Melite gives him a hundred gold pieces, and sends him on his way.<sup>267</sup> The aim of Cleitophon's assumption of Melite's clothing is that he should be

---

<sup>262</sup> The most influential study of the cultural significance of cross-dressing in the modern world is that of Garber (1992).

<sup>263</sup> 6.1.3.

<sup>264</sup> An effeminate appearance is assumed to be found appealing by lascivious women (Edwards 1993: 82-83); this of course says much about Melite. Cf. Ps.-Lucian's Charicles: he is an ardent fan of women, and adept in the use of cosmetics in order to attract them; he fills up his house with women until it resembles the Thesmophoria (*Am.* 9-10) – the reader is encouraged to think of Aristophanes' play. Ovid illustrates the difficulty of maintaining a masculine reputation while a man is on the hunt for women: he advises limited grooming in order to attract women, since excessive beautification is the province only of lascivious females and men who seek passive homosexual liaisons (*Ars Am.* 1.523-524).

<sup>265</sup> 6.1.3.

<sup>266</sup> See above, p.200-201.

<sup>267</sup> The payment of Cleitophon is remarkably similar to that of the *Phoenicica's* ego-narrator by Persis (A.2.5ff., Stephens & Winkler). There too the narrator is offered the tokens of the woman's



mistaken for her and thus be able to leave the scene without being challenged. It might therefore be argued that he is merely ‘playing a role’, like a male actor playing a female part in the theatre, and that his masculinity is not damaged by his act. But his acceptance of money from Melite emphasises the permeable boundary between acting and prostitution: acting carried connotations of effeminacy, and actors and prostitutes inhabited the same conceptual category;<sup>268</sup> indeed, particularly open to the accusation of effeminacy is the actor who plays a woman’s role (Williams 1999: 139-140).<sup>269</sup> In addition, Cleitophon has committed adultery – in itself sufficient to feminise him; his immediate adoption of a woman’s attire is thus particularly appropriate, and serves to complete his characterisation as *moichos*.<sup>270</sup>

Cleitophon’s transvestism is intricately connected with many other points in the text where his masculinity is called into question. His easy acceptance of the female role reifies for the reader all of the earlier intimations of effeminacy. When Cleitophon had initially resisted Melite’s advances, she had railed against him, saying that he rose from her bed like another woman, and was a eunuch and an *androgynos*.<sup>271</sup> Here we have another sharing of conceptual categories: women, *androgynoi* (or *kinaidoi*), and eunuchs were all effeminate, by virtue of not being men, or not being proper men; as such they were all believed to have little or no capacity to moderate their sexual behaviour. Paradoxically, eunuchs were considered on the one hand to be unable to have sex and undesirous of it, and on the other as given to all kinds of sexual vice (Kuefler 2001: 35 *et passim*).<sup>272</sup> Melite’s accusations of course draw on the first of these beliefs, but the reader’s thoughts incline to the second. Given Cleitophon’s earlier attempts on Leucippe, we know that he certainly desires sex and

---

femininity – in this case not her clothes, but her golden jewellery – and then money; in notable contrast to Cleitophon, though he (seemingly) accepts the money, he refuses the feminine trappings.

<sup>268</sup> See Edwards (1993: 128ff.) and Duncan (2006: 124ff.).

<sup>269</sup> Melite’s desire to wear Cleitophon’s clothes may say something about her attitude towards sex: in discussing the Roman correspondence between male actors and female prostitutes, Duncan (2006: 157ff.) observes that the latter customarily cross-dressed in *togae*, which signified their profession and marked them out from respectable women; *cf.* above, p.222, n.264, on Melite.

<sup>270</sup> See below, p.226: Sosthenes immediately recognises him and labels him a *moichos* when he encounters him in Melite’s clothing.

<sup>271</sup> 5.25.7-8; see also 5.22.5 and 8.5.2.

<sup>272</sup> See Philostr. *VA* 1.34ff., where Damis believes that, because they have been castrated, eunuchs no longer feel sexual urges (*cf.* Thersander’s words at 6.21.3); Apollonius contradicts him and foretells an imminent example of the lust of eunuchs: ironically, a eunuch is caught ‘playing the man’ (ἀνδριζόμενον) in the Persian king’s harem (1.37). *Cf.* also Lucian *Eun.* 10, where the eunuch Bagoas is alleged to have once been caught engaged in *moicheia*. The figure of the eunuch thus poses the perpetual threat of adultery, which is indeed what Cleitophon himself is involved in.

is capable of it; we have also seen that his inability to restrain himself with Leucippe detracts from his masculinity.<sup>273</sup> If Cleitophon were to continue to practise the sexual continence about which Melite complains, and for which she brands him a eunuch, he might reclaim at least some of the masculine kudos he has earlier forfeited in his escapades with Leucippe. But in his eventual submission to Melite he reveals that he does indeed have the moral fibre of a woman, a eunuch, or an *androgynos*, and in his cross-dressing he also assumes the external appearance of such figures. We find eunuchs associated with dressing-up and disguise in other sources too, and there again the context is sexual. In Terence's *Eunuch*,<sup>274</sup> a character poses as a eunuch in order to rape a slave girl, and the plot of the *Iolaus* fragment appears to be similar, seemingly also engaging with notions of *kinaideia*.<sup>275</sup> In the imperial era, eunuchs were especially associated with the worship of Cybele, the Roman face of the Syrian Atargatis and the Phoenician Astarte. Eunuch priests are stereotyped in the literary sources as near-transvestites and sexual passives.<sup>276</sup> When Cleitophon is twice referred to as a eunuch, it is tempting to relate these references to his Phoenician nationality and his meeting of the narrator before a votive offering to Astarte: Cleitophon is like a self-castrated priest who possesses no sexual self-control; he certainly does a comprehensive job of castrating himself figuratively.<sup>277</sup>

In her criticism of Cleitophon, Melite also refers to him as 'more savage than a bandit', an accusation later levelled at Thersander by Leucippe, as we have seen. Melite's meaning is that, in his refusal to sleep with her, Cleitophon lacks pity, but the reader associates bandits, like eunuchs, with a lack of sexual self-control. Pantheia's dream that causes her to interrupt Cleitophon's attempted tryst with Leucippe features a bandit ripping her daughter open from the groin up; Cleitophon

---

<sup>273</sup> See above, p.143-144.

<sup>274</sup> And apparently also in Menander's *Androgynos*.

<sup>275</sup> See Stephens & Winkler (1995: 358ff.).

<sup>276</sup> E.g. Ap. *Met.* 8.24ff.; Ps.-Lucian *Asin.* 35ff.; Lucian *Syr. D.* (the latter less cutting). For the elision in Graeco-Roman thought of the eunuch priests of Atargatis/Astarte with the *galli* of Cybele, see Taylor (1997: 331ff.).

<sup>277</sup> Morales (2004: 191-192) observes an apparent connection between Phoenicians and cunnilingus: the verb φοινικίζω seems to have denoted this practice; if such a connection influenced Achilles in his casting of Cleitophon as a Phoenician, this would only add to his effeminate characterisation (see above, p.220, n.254, on the status of the *cunnilingus* in Graeco-Roman thought). We shall return in the Conclusion to the possible significance of Cleitophon's status as a Phoenician.

is thus assimilated early on with such sexually immoderate figures.<sup>278</sup> Bandits are the sort of men who dress up in women's clothing for dubious purposes: the lustful Callisthenes had earlier engaged a band of brigands to kidnap Calligone, which they effected by disguising themselves as women;<sup>279</sup> the disguise is apparently rather convincing, as they are taken to be women without question, as is Cleitophon by Melite's porter: so convincing is Cleitophon's drag act that the porter is dumbfounded to learn that it was not in fact Melite that he let out.<sup>280</sup> Bandits are also conceptually close to slaves, as we observed in discussion of Leucippe's branding of Thersander a slave and a bandit.<sup>281</sup> Indeed, one of Callisthenes' slaves is said to be φύσει πειρατικός,<sup>282</sup> and heads the group of brigands who kidnap Calligone.<sup>283</sup> After causing Cleitophon's flight from the house, Leucippe's mother worries that the man in her daughter's bedroom may have been a slave:<sup>284</sup> so Cleitophon, like Thersander later, is equated not only with bandits but also with slaves. We have already remarked on the ancient assumption that slaves could be penetrated;<sup>285</sup> the equation of Cleitophon with a slave is therefore a loaded one, as it is in the case of Thersander.

Walters (1997: 37ff.) observes that the ability to protect one's body from sexual penetration and from beating was a mark of elite social status, and that Roman thought symbolically identified these two forms of bodily invasion. He states: 'To allow oneself to be beaten, or sexually penetrated, was to put oneself in the position of the slave, that archetypal passive body' (*ibid.* 40). We remember that Cleitophon three times allows himself to be beaten, twice by Thersander and once by Sostratus.<sup>286</sup> Thersander's physical attacks are the legitimate reactions of a cuckolded husband, as we saw in Chapter 1 in relation to Chaereas,<sup>287</sup> but in the first case Cleitophon is being accused of *moicheia* when he has not as yet engaged in it;

<sup>278</sup> 2.23.5.

<sup>279</sup> 2.17.3. Apuleius has a robber escaping capture by dressing as a woman; even he feels it necessary to defend his masculinity (*Ap. Met.* 7.8).

<sup>280</sup> 2.18.3; 6.2.1. Cleitophon's cross-dressing is also linked to that of the bandits by the fact that both take place during holy festivals (2.16.2; 6.3.2).

<sup>281</sup> See above, p.217.

<sup>282</sup> We are reminded of Gnathon, who was φύσει παιδεραστής; Achilles' Gorgias is later described as φύσει φαρμακεύς (4.15.4).

<sup>283</sup> 2.17.3.

<sup>284</sup> 2.24.4.

<sup>285</sup> See above, p.214.

<sup>286</sup> 5.23.5ff.; 7.14.3; 8.1.3ff.

<sup>287</sup> See above, p.81-82.

he really ought to defend himself – something of which he seems aware, as he makes the point that he could have done so, but deemed it better not to.<sup>288</sup> In the second case he describes himself as presenting his face to Sostratus' *hybris*; again, if he truly believes he is being treated with *hybris*, he should not, by the masculine ideal, tolerate such treatment. When Thersander attacks him for a second time – by which time we know that the beating is really deserved, for Cleitophon is indeed a *moichos*, having slept with Melite when he knew that both Thersander and Leucippe were alive – he once more fails to retaliate, but continues to present his treatment as *hybris*, in which his own teeth come to his rescue by wounding Thersander's hand.<sup>289</sup> In his submission to physical assault, Cleitophon thus assimilates himself both to the figure of the *moichos*, whose behaviour reduces him from full masculine status and exposes him to physical attack, and to the figure of the slave, who lacks corporeal autonomy. The association of the *moichos* with effeminacy through lack of sexual self-control, and the slave with passivity, causes the reader to wonder: if Cleitophon allows himself to be beaten, what other forms of bodily invasion might he allow?

When Cleitophon leaves the scene of his adultery dressed in women's clothes, he runs headlong into Sosthenes and Thersander; Sosthenes, he says, is the first to recognise him:<sup>290</sup> unlike Melite's porter, the slave has no trouble identifying him, and the reader, knowing Sosthenes' unscrupulousness and now on the look-out for further signs of Cleitophon's moral turpitude, might well think this is a case of 'takes one to know one'. Richlin (1993: 541ff.) suggests that the characteristics of the effeminate – such as feminine clothing – that were enumerated and inveighed against by Roman rhetoric may have been based on the actual existence of a pathic subculture, for whom such clothing 'formed part of a self-presentation used for sexual signals and group cohesion' (*ibid.* 543).<sup>291</sup> If Richlin is correct, then Sosthenes' easy recognition of the disguised Cleitophon takes on yet another meaning. Sosthenes calls him a *moichos*, who is 'playing the bacchant' (βακχεύων): having already been encouraged to recall two cross-dressing males, Heracles and

<sup>288</sup> His inadequacy is underlined by the fact that the same expression (ῥαπίζει κατὰ κόρη) is used of both Thersander's attack on Cleitophon here and his attack on Leucippe at 6.20.1; she, by contrast, stoutly defends herself.

<sup>289</sup> In the ultimate irony he goes on to refer to his wounds as like those received in battle (8.2.3).

<sup>290</sup> 6.5.1.

<sup>291</sup> On the possible existence of such subcultures, see also Taylor (1997).

Achilles, we are now presented with the image of a third, Pentheus, whose masculinity was definitely not reinforced by his transvestism.<sup>292</sup> This leaves the reader wondering if the ‘women’ who are going to rip our Pentheus apart are Sosthenes and Thersander. Their catching of the *moichos* calls to the reader’s mind the possible punishments for the crime of *moicheia*: Thersander is within his rights to beat Cleitophon (which he has done once and will do again), or even to rape him.<sup>293</sup> Indeed, Cleitophon’s transvestism might be thought almost to invite such treatment, and certainly to damage his masculinity: one of Seneca’s declamations relates the story of a young man who was gang-raped while going about dressed in women’s clothing as part of a bet; he took the rapists to court and won his case, but was himself barred from speaking in public.<sup>294</sup> As Gleason (1995: 100) remarks, ‘public admission that he played the role of a woman threatened to vitiate his eloquence and destroy his standing as a man’. Cleitophon’s own public admission that he has played the role of a woman might well be thought to detract from his masculine authority as orator in his own epideictic performance.<sup>295</sup>

We have noted that Cleitophon’s acceptance of money from Melite smacks of an exchange between a prostitute and client. Thersander’s counsel Sopater is thus closer to the truth than he realises when he later alleges that Melite had sought to commit *moicheia*, and had found herself a πόρνος for that purpose.<sup>296</sup> What is more, Cleitophon is the sort of prostitute:

... ὅς πρὸς μὲν γυναῖκας ἄνδρας ἀπομιμῆται, γυνὴ δὲ γίνεται πρὸς ἄνδρας ...

... who imitates men with women, but becomes a woman with men ... (Ach. Tat. 8.10.9).

<sup>292</sup> See Cyrino (1998: 236ff.). To liken a man to a bacchant seems to be a stock means of attacking his masculinity: see Russell (1998: 131-132) on Plutarch’s use of the analogy in his *Life of Antony*.

<sup>293</sup> See, e.g., the miller’s revenge at Ap. *Met.* 9.28; see also Walters (1997: 39).

<sup>294</sup> Sen. *Con.* 5.6.

<sup>295</sup> Cleitophon’s name means ‘glorious voice’, and is thus suggestive of his likeness to an orator. On Cleitophon’s name, see Brethes (2001: 185); on names in Achilles’ novel from a Platonic perspective, see Repath (Forthcoming a: Chapter 4).

<sup>296</sup> 8.10.9; see also 8.10.11.

Sopater's accusation, that Cleitophon plays the male sexual role with women and the female with men, is one that would be familiar to the reader from rhetorical invective. Suetonius records Curio as having accused Julius Caesar (a man who had allegedly been first a *puer* and later an adulterer) of being 'every woman's man and every man's woman';<sup>297</sup> and Cicero claims that Clodius (that notorious transvestite) is 'often a woman among men and a man among women'.<sup>298</sup> Accusations of this kind portray the target as so utterly lacking in self-control that he chooses to be both *moichos* and *kinaidos* – like Thersander. But in Sopater's accusation against Cleitophon the choice of verbs is instructive: Cleitophon *imitates* (ἀπομιμῆται) men with women, but *becomes* (γίνεται) a woman with men. In other words, he is such an effeminate that the best he can manage is an *imitation* of active male sexuality; conversely, his alleged adoption of the passive role with men is so complete that he *becomes* female. We have noted that accusations of this kind were exaggerated and not necessarily true,<sup>299</sup> but the reader nonetheless easily relates Sopater's words to Cleitophon's sex with Melite and his subsequent transvestism: while he may have played the active part with her, he very soon turned himself into a woman, and promptly ran straight into the company of men.

Cleitophon's narration of Thersander's *moicheia* and *kinaideia* demonstrates that he himself is fully aware of the cultural meanings invested in certain male sexual behaviours – he is conscious of the script according to which real men ought to perform masculinity. He may wish his audience to denounce the *moichos* and the *kinaidos* in Thersander, but, as we have seen, this entails the audience's recognition of those same identities in *him*. So why should the hero represent himself as an effeminate, if he has the power to shape his own narrative,<sup>300</sup> which we have observed him to do in relating events to Leucippe's father? Marinčič (2007: 194–195) identifies Cleitophon's self-presentation as effeminate with the more feminine style of oratory adumbrated by Gleason (1990: 405ff.; 1995: 127ff. *et passim*) as an alternative form of self-projection and persuasion that an orator might choose. This is an attractive connection, and it may well be that Achilles is inspired by such

<sup>297</sup> Suet. *Jul.* 52.3: omnium mulierum virum et omnium virorum mulier; see also above, p.214, n.218.

<sup>298</sup> Cic. *Dom.* 139: inter viros saepe mulier et inter mulieres vir.

<sup>299</sup> See above, p.218.

<sup>300</sup> Within reason, of course, given that it is another narrator who narrates Cleitophon narrating his story.

practices in his characterisation of Cleitophon – though, as Marinčič (*ibid.* 195) notes, Cleitophon does not use an effeminate rhetorical style. As Marinčič (*ibid.*) sees it, Cleitophon ‘styles himself ... as a morally and sexually ambiguous character ... [who] can be seen as a spectacular representative of the species *cultus adulter*, the virile adulterer who uses woman’s clothes or effeminate appearance only as a camouflage’. This is not quite right. Although, as we have seen, Cleitophon’s transvestism certainly draws on the stereotype of the *cultus adulter*, he fails to perform properly even at such a morally low level of masculinity: an adulterer of this kind traditionally adopts an effeminate appearance in order to initiate his adultery,<sup>301</sup> and not, as in Cleitophon’s case, at the behest of a woman, in order to effect an escape. Raval (2002: 152) argues that narratives of transvestism often serve as a means of ‘exploring and venting insecurities about the provisional nature of masculinity’; indeed, as we have seen, Cleitophon’s masculinity is so provisional that the adoption of Melite’s clothing seems to grant him a new gender, and virtually even a new sex. I suggest that Achilles has Cleitophon present himself in such an effeminate way for precisely this purpose: as a means of demonstrating the instability of gender, and of challenging the validity of the accepted scripts of masculinity. But has Achilles constructed Cleitophon as an *accidental* misperformer of masculinity – a man who simply never gets it right, but is ignorant of his failings?<sup>302</sup> Or is it possible that Cleitophon knows what he is doing, and knows he is doing it wrong? Has Achilles created a hero who knows the performance he is supposed to give, but deliberately does the opposite, and in so doing challenges the male script of both the romance genre and the elite of the real world?

#### *Chapter summary.*

Achilles Tatius has long been acknowledged as part of the imperial debate on the merits of love of women and love of boys, alongside Plutarch and Ps.-Lucian. But we should also view Xenophon and Longus as contributing to that debate. It is possible to see in Xenophon both the contestation of classical-style, hierarchical paederasty, and the advocacy of ‘true’ love between males. Although Hippothous’ relationships with both Hyperanthes and Cleisthenes conform in some outward

---

<sup>301</sup> So the pretended adulterer in Chariton’s novel, Iolaus, and Terence’s Chaerea when planning his rape of the slave girl.

<sup>302</sup> His narration of the Thersander episode may suggest the possibility that Cleitophon is able to see the faults of others, but not of himself.

respects to the pederastic model, both seem expected – if not necessarily destined – to endure beyond the attainment of adulthood, and are comparable to the relationship between the hero and heroine. For the hero to be involved in a homosexual relationship is a very different matter. Habrocomes and Corymbus are in no way equals, either in terms of emotion or in terms of social status. What is more, Habrocomes has already become a man and learned to exercise adult, heterosexual masculinity. His reaction to the prospect of becoming an *erōmenos* illustrates the potential threat to masculinity that Graeco-Roman thought perceives as inherent in pederasty: pederasty is simultaneously constructed as a rite of passage for a young male and as a potentially feminising practice. The situation is similar in Longus, though he is less interested in contesting classical pederasty than in questioning the roles of nature and culture in the formation of masculinity. Both Gnathon and Daphnis seem to act as sites for the investigation of sexual identity, but the results of Longus' experiment are ambiguous. Masculinity and sexual identity appear to be the products of both nature and culture; ultimately, Daphnis must perform his gender according to the established elite script. Achilles shows as much interest in the feminising effects of misperformed heterosexual masculinity as he does in those of pederasty. For him, sexualities seem to be fixed, though neither preference is privileged over the other, and both may be performed in feminising ways. Like Xenophon, though in a far more comprehensive, subversive, and audacious manner, Achilles seems to contest the ideals of masculinity, both homosexual and heterosexual.

Chariton and Heliodorus have been notably absent from this chapter. Neither author engages to any great extent with the issue of homosexuality, and it is worth asking why this might be. Do they deliberately avoid the issue, or is it simply surplus to their requirements? Is the absence of the theme related to the fact that both authors seem to set their fictions in the classical past, while the dramatic dates of Achilles', Longus', and Xenophon's stories are rather vaguer? But this would surely make engagement with homosexuality more likely, rather than less, since pederasty truly found its footing at that time. Is there some significance in the likelihood that Chariton is the earliest and Heliodorus the latest of our authors? Given the apparent cluster of interest in the issue in the second century (Plutarch, Ps.-Lucian, Achilles, Longus, Xenophon (perhaps), Strato), might Chariton be too early and Heliodorus



too late for homosexuality to be a significant presence on their intellectual radar? This might hold for Heliodorus, though I noted in Chapter 1 that I incline towards a second-century date for Chariton,<sup>303</sup> which would locate him in the period of intense interest in the subject. And in fact, while he makes no full-scale investigation of the topic, Chariton does see fit to mention it, in Callirhoe's reference to Chaereas' *erastai*, and possibly also obliquely, in the importance of the gymnasium in Chaereas' life, and in the use of Homeric intertexts pertaining to Achilles and Patroclus (though, as we have noted, he usually transposes these to a heterosexual context).<sup>304</sup> It may be that such references are Chariton's way of killing two birds with one stone: of adding classical colour to his classical tale, and of acknowledging contemporary, imperial interest in the subject. A full exploration of the matter may not be relevant to his particular purposes, however. Those purposes are somewhat different from those of the authors who do explore the issue of homosexuality: Chariton's novel is far more focused than any of the others on the separation and eventual reunion of the hero and heroine, and it is especially focused on the experiences of Callirhoe; with the exception of the characterisation of Dionysius and other rivals for Callirhoe's love, this novel is little concerned with male sexual behaviour. Heliodorus, on the other hand, is certainly concerned with male sexual behaviour, and tackles the discourse of effeminacy through Theagenes' resistance both to his feelings for Charicleia and to the advances of Arsace; homosexuality, however, seems not to exist in his romantic world. Should we read its absence as a sign of the influence of Christianity? I suggested in the Introduction that although the authors of the novels may well have been aware of Christian doctrine, the discourses with which they engage may be explained by other means.<sup>305</sup> I would argue that this also holds true for those discourses with which they do *not* engage. Like Chariton's, Heliodorus' novel is rather different from others, although similar in the basic elements of its plot. As well as being (unlike Chariton's tale) more advanced in terms of narrative structure and language, the *Aethiopica* is different in that it is a novel about a return to a homeland, as much as it is about love and sex. In the case of both Chariton and Heliodorus, it may be that such differences in focus

---

<sup>303</sup> See above, p.27 and p.65, n.155.

<sup>304</sup> See above, p.166, n.19.

<sup>305</sup> See above, p.20-22.

are sufficient to induce the author to prioritise some discourses for close examination, and to reject others.

## Conclusion

In his discussion of performance theory, Carlson (2004: 205) describes the concept of performance as ‘complex, conflicted and protean’, and finds himself ‘troubled ... with material from one discrete “chapter” constantly slipping away to bond with material in others’. In exploring the performance of gender in the Greek novels, this has been my experience too. We observed in the Introduction that some overlap between discourses must be both expected and accepted:<sup>1</sup> a man’s gender identity is made up of interlocking and sometimes contradictory masculinities. Indeed, we have seen the performative masculine discourses of *paideia*, *andreia*, and sexual identity feeding into and informing one another, and sometimes also showing signs of self-contradiction. Carlson states (*ibid.* 206) that because it is an ongoing process of doing and redoing, performance has a tendency to ‘resist conclusions’. Nonetheless, I shall try to draw some tentative conclusions here, and also highlight some areas that this study has not been able to cover, but which might provide the ground for productive research in the future.

To consider the second of these issues first, I suggested at the beginning of the study that there was nothing in the gender of the novels that could not be explained without recourse to the influence of Christianity – that it is not necessary to view the novels as participating in some sort of dialogue with Christianity.<sup>2</sup> That is not to say that I am invincible. Research has recently begun to investigate possible connections between the novels and New Testament literature, but much more work is still to be done in this area. My own knowledge of early Christian literature is as yet somewhat limited, and I have been able to approach the novels from the perspective of a classicist only. I would hope, however, that the analysis offered here might be of some use to those exploring the representation of gender in Christian material. A figure whose surface I have only been able to scrape in this study is the brigand. Although others have conducted minor studies on the bandits and pirates of the novels, here again there is more to be done, both in terms of the characterisation of individual bandits and pirates and how this might relate to ideologies of

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p.7.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p.20-22.

masculinity in a wider sense, and in terms of the broader semantics of brigandage. What exactly does it mean to call a man a bandit or a pirate? How are brigands different from other men? What are the differences between noble brigands like Thyamis and Hippothous, and run-of-the-mill bandits and pirates like Anchialus and Corymbus? A third field that is overdue for investigation is that of gender in the novel fragments. Stephens & Winkler (1995) frequently observe similarities in plot and characterisation between the fragments and the complete texts, so while it is perhaps rather risky to attempt a reconstruction of gender on the basis of such fragmentary evidence, tentative arguments might still be made by reading the fragments and summaries in the light of the gender represented in the core texts. The *Babyloniaca* and the *Phoenicica* seem to be the stand-out pieces, the former featuring an extremely assertive and aggressive heroine, and the latter a young man apparently deflowered by a woman, though others such as *Ninus*, *Sesonchosis*, *Calligone*, *Metiochus and Parthenope*, and *Iolaus* are worthy of closer investigation. These are all areas to which I hope my work here will make some contribution, and to which I hope it may qualify me to turn my own attention in the future.

Moving now to the matter of conclusion, although all five novels are to some extent bound together by their subject-matter and the bones of their plots, thus forming some sort of genre, the gender performed by their male characters is not exclusive to that genre. Gender in the novels is ‘generic’ only in the sense that the same or similar characteristics may be found in more than one text, and are sometimes performed in the same or similar ways. The novels’ masculinities do not exist in isolation, but draw on, and reflect on, both earlier and contemporary ideologies of masculinity. In the Introduction, we noted that social change in the real world may result in the reinforcement through literature of what might be considered more traditional ideals.<sup>3</sup> This is in fact what Egger argues in her study of women in the novels. She suggests that reading about constrained gender roles may become more popular at times when gender roles in the real world are undergoing change:

... when strictly circumscribed models of femininity (as well as of masculinity) are relaxed, fantasies about the security of traditional, more

---

<sup>3</sup> See above, p.20.

limited gender identities tend to increase, even if or just because they are socially more or less obsolete (Egger 1994b: 279-280, n.54).

The novels' fetish for classical settings might be thought a mark of this romanticising of tradition and limitation. But where the discourses of masculinity are concerned, we have seen that the texts do not straightforwardly reconstruct the classical past. Without doubt they are influenced by Homeric and classical notions of masculinity, but such notions are tempered by, or subordinated to, what seem to be defining aspects of imperial masculinity. By adopting classical or vaguely classical backdrops, our authors distance their male characters somewhat from contemporary realities such as the rise of the Roman empire and the spread of new religious movements; in so doing they free themselves of the obligation to confront such contemporary, and perhaps sensitive, matters head-on. On the smaller-scale, however, contemporary issues affecting the everyday life of the elite male are very much in evidence – issues such as the practice of physiognomy, the interrogation of male sexuality, and the prevalence of public figures like orators and sophists. We might therefore say that the novels present the imperial realities of gender within their classical fictions.

The contemporary issues mentioned above are united by the notion of performance, by 'a sense of being "on" or doing something "for the camera"' (Bauman 1989: 266). In the case of *andreia* and to a lesser extent in the case of *paideia* too, we have seen the concept of physiognomy in operation: these are inner qualities that a man shows to the world by means of his outer appearance, and they are qualities by which he may be judged; his external image may also be fraudulent, concealing an inner nature that cannot live up to what the appearance promises. Closely connected to physiognomy are the accusations of effeminacy that we have seen in Achilles' novel. Although such accusations have a long history and may be found in classical oratory and comedy, as we have seen from Aeschines and Aristophanes, they are most at home in imperial rhetorical invective, to the extent that they may be seen as a hallmark of the first few centuries after Christ. Achilles' characterisation of Cleitophon seems to owe much to the epideictic oratory of the second century, and to the showy glitz and glamour about which we have seen Lucian complain. So

while Achilles may set his fiction somewhere in the past, his concerns are symptomatic of the imperial present.

Chariton and Heliodorus have much in common, perhaps surprisingly, given the likelihood that they are furthest apart in chronological terms. Both are especially interested in *andreia* as a component of masculine identity, and both de-emphasise homosexuality. Xenophon, Achilles, and Longus, on the other hand, are particularly keen to explore sexual identity and the relationship between homosexuality and heterosexuality; all three appear to imply the existence of exclusive sexualities, and we might perhaps see such an implication in Heliodorus' text too, which seems almost to deny the existence of homosexuality. It is notable that the texts appear to subordinate certain specifically Athenian ideals of masculinity. In keeping with his generally negative presentation of Athens, Heliodorus has fun at the expense of that paradigm of Athenian masculinity, the hoplite: the only representative of this figure is Cnemon, who might look like a warrior, but cannot perform as one, and is subjected to Theagenes' mockery. But that is not to say that Heliodorus does not value hand-to-hand combat as a marker of masculinity. Similarly, Chariton cannot resist mentioning Athens' defeat by Syracuse. Military ability is as important to him as it is to Heliodorus, but the skills of both Theagenes and Chaereas in this area are implicitly superior to those of the Athenians.<sup>4</sup> Achilles even flirts with, and never truly condemns, the image of the *kinaidos*, the Athenian ideological opposite of the hoplite, and the very essence of unmanliness. Athenian-style hierarchical paederasty is, as we have seen, absent from the *Aethiopica*, but it is also demoted by Xenophon, in favour of mutual, reciprocal love, and exposed by Achilles (and to some extent by Longus through the figure of the paederast Gnathon) as being about nothing more than sex.

Masculinity in the novels is certainly constructed through alterity:<sup>5</sup> Theagenes' masculinity is established initially by means of his contrast with Cnemon; Dionysius and Chaereas are threatened by emotions figured as feminine or immature; Daphnis and Habrocomes' gender is reinforced by their rejection of a sexual role that stands in contrast to the one they have already learned to play; Cleitophon *attempts* to draw

---

<sup>4</sup> On Chariton's depiction of Athens, see Smith (2007).

<sup>5</sup> See above, p.4-5.

an implicit contrast between himself and Thersander. The principal ‘other’ against which the novels’ male characters are constructed, or against which they try to construct themselves, seems to be the effeminate male. So, although they may reject certain Athenian values, the novels’ performances of masculinity draw on an opposition that goes back to classical Athenian ideology: real man vs. effeminate. But, as we have seen, this distinction is also very much a part of the literature and life of the imperial period, both for Greeks and for Romans: it has been absorbed into, and become one with, Graeco-Roman ideologies of masculinity. As we noted in the Introduction, ideals of gender exist in tension with the realities of men’s lives,<sup>6</sup> and we have seen such tension particularly in the case of Dionysius. But we have also remarked that it is in the inevitable gaps between discourse and reality that those ideals might be challenged. I have suggested that Achilles operates in those gaps, using Cleitophon as a means of contesting the accepted scripts for the performance of masculinity. Let us consider Achilles further now.

Whereas in other novels male protagonists frequently strive to attain and maintain the ideals of masculinity, in Achilles’ novel they behave almost as if those ideals do not exist. Achilles foregrounds masculine codes only to have Cleitophon (and others) flout them.<sup>7</sup> Morgan (2007) argues – not just for Cleitophon’s self-presentation as effeminate, but also for his factual errors and his apparent knowledge of things he cannot possibly know – that we are to see in Achilles’ text a ‘hidden author’ technique, as Conte (1996) has argued for Petronius’ *Satyricon*, whereby the author ‘contrives to communicate with the reader behind the back of the narrator’ (Morgan 2007: 108). I have indeed suggested here that this is one level at which we might read the text: Cleitophon provides a constant source of amusement for the reader who knows how a real man should perform his masculinity. Morgan asks (but never quite answers) the question of whether Achilles’ novel is ‘to some degree a satirical commentary’ on his world. I would answer that question affirmatively. In her discussion of the significance of the effeminate Agathon in Aristophanes’ comedy, Duncan states:

---

<sup>6</sup> See above, p.10.

<sup>7</sup> The positive transformation of Callisthenes counterpoints Cleitophon’s own behaviour.

In Agathon, we have playwright, actor, and character in one figure on stage. Aristophanes uses him to suggest the dangerous potential of watching tragedy: seeing him and listening to him make the audience resemble him (Duncan 2006: 46).

This is a useful way of thinking about Cleitophon, whose identity is similarly ambiguous: he is a character in a novel, the narrator of his own story, and a performer within that story, and he treads a fine line between genders, frequently falling off the tightrope on the wrong side; he is (like Agathon), the writer of tragic experiences, and yet in the trial in Book 8 he finds himself surprisingly at home in an Aristophanic world (like Agathon); he is (like Agathon) a transvestite, and even if his cross-dressing is only a one-time thing, it is nonetheless a symbolic, performative moment at which the novel's other hints at his effeminacy are concentrated in physical action. What effect might these things have on the reader? Cleitophon's failings as a man may make him seem realistic, as we have noted, but how real is too real? When does his misperformance of masculinity get too close to the reader for comfort? If Duncan (*ibid.* 47) is correct in arguing that theatrical transvestism is a sign of a 'crisis of identity not only for the actor ("is there anything under the costume?")', but for the audience ("what does watching a play make us?")', then how might the reader feel on reading of Cleitophon's transvestism?<sup>8</sup> I find myself amused at Cleitophon's expense, yet I am also irresistibly on his side; I do not fear that I might be similar to Cleitophon in ways that my culture dictates I should not be. But a male reader, steeped in the performative, competitive, and intensely virile atmosphere of the Second Sophistic, might well experience such anxiety: the example Cleitophon sets of transvestism and *moichokinaideia* might be unsettlingly close to home.

If Achilles' novel is indeed a commentary on his world, how radical a commentary is it? And if the example Cleitophon sets might be thought to express the reader's own concerns about masculinity in a way that could be unsettling to him, how does Achilles make his novel readable? In the first place, the narrative technique Achilles chooses (a primary narrator who narrates Cleitophon's narration) doubly distances

---

<sup>8</sup> After all, Cleitophon himself says that one is incited to imitate example (1.5.6).



the author from what he writes;<sup>9</sup> to some degree, then, Achilles separates himself from the commentary he makes on his world's masculine values: he makes that commentary only implicitly and obliquely. In the second place, Achilles casts Cleitophon not as a Greek, but as a Phoenician, thereby distancing his hero's effeminacy both from himself and from the reader. As a totally hellenised race, the Phoenicians are Greek enough for the reader to identify with them, and yet they remain alien enough to be stereotyped as debauched.<sup>10</sup> By creating a central character who is sufficiently Greek to be meaningful to the reader, but 'other' enough in his ethnicity to be non-threatening, Achilles is able to question the value and attainability of Graeco-Roman ideals of masculinity. The Phoenician Cleitophon is a safe site for the investigation of gendered identity: by virtue of not being Greek or Roman, he has licence to misperform masculinity. However, by not resuming the novel's frame and thus never passing judgement on Cleitophon's misperformance, Achilles might perhaps be read, if not as endorsing Cleitophon's actions, then at least as taking a *laissez faire* attitude towards them.

We have noted Marinčič's suggestion that Cleitophon in some ways resembles the real-world proponents of a more feminine style of oratory.<sup>11</sup> In an analysis of performance and theatricality in Second Sophistic oratory, Connolly argues that non-Roman orators of this type may sometimes have deliberately cultivated effeminate oratorical styles and physical appearances in order to subvert the ideals propounded in Roman rhetorical handbooks. These orators, she remarks:

... play up Roman vices: they imitate, pose, wear perfume, play the woman. Above all, they do not conceal the mimetic habits that Roman orators treat with fear and disgust (Connolly 2001: 92).

With the exception, perhaps, of wearing perfume, this sounds very like Cleitophon. Connolly goes on to state that:

---

<sup>9</sup> A similar argument could be made for Longus, who presents his narrative through a painting and a narrator; unlike Achilles, however, Longus ultimately reinforces accepted codes of masculinity.

<sup>10</sup> On Phoenicians in the novels, see Briquel-Chatonnet (1992). For other implications of Cleitophon's ethnicity, see Morales (2004: 48-50, 55-56) and De Temmerman (2006: 361).

<sup>11</sup> See above, p.228-229.

... the prescriptions of the performance of proper manliness which fill imperial rhetorical handbooks and ethical treatises contain the seeds of their own subversion (*ibid.* 95).

In his construction of Cleitophon, a man who seemingly knows the script but does not follow it and yet gets away with his misperformance, might Achilles too be subverting such prescriptions of masculinity?

In differing ways and to differing extents, all of the novels confront what it means to be a man, and not just in a classical, romantic world, but in the real and very contemporary world: masculinity is epideictic – it is a thing performed, perhaps not well or convincingly, but performed nonetheless. In his analysis of Renaissance literature, Greenblatt (1980: 4-6) views the cultural system of elite self-fashioning evident in his texts as existing in interplay with similar systems in the lives of the texts' authors and the world in which they lived. Although the authors of the Greek novels are shadowy figures about whom we know next-to-nothing, we do know something of the ideals of elite life in the imperial period. Perhaps we can believe that Chariton, Xenophon, Achilles, Longus, and Heliodorus in some way wrote their own (mis)performances, their own experiences and fears, into their male characters, and that through his text each author expressed his own concerns not just about *being* a man, but about being *seen* to be a man.

## Bibliography

### *Texts and translations of the Greek novels.*

#### **Achilles Tattius:**

- Garnaud, J.-P. ed. and trans. 1991. *Achille Tattius d'Alexandrie: le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. Paris: Budé.
- Gaselee, S. trans. 1984. *Achilles Tattius: the adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. trans. 2001. *Achilles Tattius: Leucippe and Clitophon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winkler, J.J. trans. 1989. 'Achilles Tattius: *Leucippe and Clitophon*' in Reardon, B.P. ed. *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 170-284.

#### **Chariton:**

- Goold, G.P. ed. and trans. 1995. *Chariton: Callirhoe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reardon, B.P. trans. 1989. 'Chariton: *Chaereas and Callirhoe*' in Reardon, B.P. ed. *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 17-124.
- Reardon, B.P. ed. 2004. *Chariton: De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*. Munich: Saur.

#### **Heliodorus:**

- Morgan, J.R. trans. 1989. 'Heliodorus: *An Ethiopian Story*' in Reardon, B.P. ed. *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 349-588.
- Rattenbury, R.M. and Lumb, T.W. eds. 2003. *Héliodore: les Éthiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée)*<sup>4</sup>. Maillon, J. trans. 3 vols. Paris: Budé.

#### **Longus:**

- Dalmeida, G. ed. and trans. 1960. *Longus: Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*<sup>2</sup>. Paris: Budé.

Gill, C. trans. 1989. 'Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe*' in Reardon, B.P. ed. *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 285-348.

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

Thornley, G. trans. 1989. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*. Edmonds, J.M. rev. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

### **Xenophon of Ephesus:**

Anderson, G. trans. 1989. 'Xenophon of Ephesus: *An Ephesian Tale*' in Reardon, B. P. ed. *Collected ancient Greek novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 125-169.

Dalmeyda, G. ed. and trans. 1926. *Xénophon d'Éphèse: les Éphésiaques*. Paris: Budé.

O'Sullivan, J.N. ed. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius: De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*. Munich: Saur.

Papanikolaou, A.D. ed. 1973. *Xenophon Ephesius: De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner.

### **Fragments:**

Stephens, S.A. and Winkler, J.J. eds. 1995. *Ancient Greek novels, the fragments: introduction, text, translation, and commentary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***Secondary sources.***

Adkins, A.W.H. 1960. *Merit and responsibility: a study in Greek values*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Allen, D.S. 2000. *The world of Prometheus: the politics of punishing in democratic Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Alston, R. 1998. 'Arms and the man: soldiers, masculinity and power in Republican and Imperial Rome' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge. 205-223.

Alvares, J. 1995. 'The drama of Hippothous in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*. *CJ* 90.4. 393-404.

- Anderson, G. 1986. *Philostratus: biography and belles lettres in the third century A.D.* London: Croom Helm.
- Anderson, G. 1989. 'The *pepaideumenos* in action: sophists and their outlook in the early empire.' *ANRW* 2. 33.1. 79-208.
- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic: a cultural phenomenon in the Roman empire.* London: Routledge.
- Baker, R.J. 1968. 'Miles annosus: the military motif in Propertius.' *Latomus* 27. 322-349.
- Baldwin, B. 1973. *Studies in Lucian.* Toronto: Hakkert.
- Balot, R.K. 1998. 'Foucault, Chariton, and the masculine self.' *Helios* 25.2. 139-162.
- Barsby, J. 1999. 'Love in Terence' in Braund, S.M. and Mayer, R. eds. *Love and Latin literature.* Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 22. 5-29.
- Barton, T.S. 1995. *Power and knowledge: astrology, physiognomics, and medicine under the Roman empire.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the ancient novel: the reader and the role of description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bassi, K. 1998. *Acting like men: gender, drama, and nostalgia in ancient Greece.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bassi, K. 2003. 'The semantics of manliness in ancient Greece' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity.* Leiden: Brill. 25-58.
- Bauman, R. 1989. 'Performance' in Barnouw, E. ed. *International encyclopedia of communications* 3. New York: Oxford University Press. 262-266.
- Blok, J. 1987. 'Sexual asymmetry: a historiographical essay' in Blok, J. and Mason, P. eds. *Sexual asymmetry: studies in ancient society.* Amsterdam: Gieben. 1-57.
- Bompaire, J. 1958. *Lucien écrivain: imitation et création.* Paris: de Boccard.
- Borg, B.E. ed. 2004. *Paideia: the world of the Second Sophistic.* Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Borgogno, A. 1971. 'Menandro in Caritone.' *RFIC* 99. 257-263.
- Boswell, J. 1980. *Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Nice, R. trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1969. *Greek sophists in the Roman empire*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bowie, E.L. 1974 (1970). 'Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic' in Finley, M.I. ed. *Studies in ancient society*. London: Routledge. 166-209.
- Bowie, E.L. 1976. Abstract from 'The novels and the real world' in Reardon, B.P. ed. *Erotica antiqua: acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*. 91-96.
- Bowie, E.L. 1982. 'The importance of sophists.' *YClS* 27. 29-59.
- Bowie, E.L. 1989. 'The Greek novel' in Easterling, P.E. and Knox, B.M.W. eds. *The Cambridge history of classical literature: the Hellenistic period and the empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 123-139.
- Bowie, E.L. 1994. 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world' in Tatum, J. ed. *The search for the ancient novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 435-459.
- Bowie, E.L. 2002. 'The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions.' *AN* 2. 47-63.
- Bowie, E.L. 2003. 'The ancient readers of the Greek novels' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 89-106.
- Branaman, A. 2003. 'Interaction and hierarchy in everyday life: Goffman and beyond' in Treviño, A.J. ed. *Goffman's legacy*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield. 86-126.
- Brethes, R. 2001. 'Clitophon ou une anthologie de l'anti-héros' in Pouderon, B. ed. *Les personnages du roman grec*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen. 181-191.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. 1999. 'La pederastia en la novela griega antigua.' *Excerpta Philologica* 9. 7-50.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. 2000. 'El debate sobre los dos amores en la literatura imperial' in Alganza Roldán, M., Camacho Rojo, J.M., Fuentes González, P.P., and Villena Ponsoda, M. eds. *Ἐπιείκεια: studia Graeca in memoriam Jesús Lens Tuero*. Granada: Athos-Pérgamos. 55-73.
- Briquel-Chatonnet, F. 1992. 'L'image des Phéniciens dans les romans grecs' in Baslez, M.-F., Hoffmann, P., and Trédé, M. eds. *Le monde du roman grec*. Paris: L'École normale supérieure. 189-197.
- Brittan, A. 2001. 'Masculinities and masculinism' in Whitehead, S.M. and Barrett, F.J. eds. *The masculinities reader*. Cambridge: Polity. 51-55.

- Brown, P. 1988. *The body and society: men, women and sexual renunciation in early Christianity*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Brown, P. 1992. *Power and persuasion in late antiquity: towards a Christian empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Buffière, F. 1980. *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Burg, B.R. 1984. *Sodomy and the pirate tradition: English sea rovers in the seventeenth century Caribbean*. New York: New York University Press.
- Burr, V. 1995. *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Buss, D.M. 2000. *The dangerous passion: why jealousy is as necessary as love or sex*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Cahoon, L. 1988. 'The bed as battlefield: erotic conquest and military metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*.' *TAPhA* 118. 293-307.
- Cairns, D.L. 2003. 'Ethics, ethology, terminology: Iliadic anger and the cross-cultural study of emotion.' *YCIS* 32. 11-49.
- Campbell, B. 1987. 'Teach yourself how to be a general.' *JRS* 77. 13-29.
- Campbell, J.K. 1964. *Honour, family and patronage: a study of institutions and moral values in a Greek mountain community*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Cantarella, E. 1992. *Bisexuality in the ancient world*. Ó Cuilleain, C. trans. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Carlson, M. 2004. *Performance: a critical introduction*.<sup>2</sup> New York: Routledge.
- Carrigan, C., Connell, B., and Lee, J. 2002. 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity' in Adams, R. and Savran, D. eds. *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 99-118.
- Caston, R.R. 2000. *Elegiac passion: a study of jealousy in Roman love elegy*. Diss., Brown University.
- Chew, K. 2000. 'Achilles Tatius and parody.' *CJ* 96.1. 57-70.
- Christenson, D. 2000. 'Callinus and *militia amoris* in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*.' *CQ* 50.2. 631-632.
- Clarke, W.M. 1978. 'Achilles and Patroclus in love.' *Hermes* 106. 381-396.

- Cohen, D. 1991. *Law, sexuality, and society: the enforcement of morals in classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Connell, R.W. 2001. 'The social organization of masculinity' in Whitehead, S.M. and Barrett, F.J. eds. *The masculinities reader*. Cambridge: Polity. 30-50.
- Connell, R.W. 2002. 'The history of masculinity' in Adams, R. and Savran, D. eds. *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 245-261.
- Connolly, J. 2001. 'Reclaiming the theatrical in the Second Sophistic.' *Helios* 28.1. 75-96.
- Connolly, J. 2003. 'Like the labors of Heracles: *andreia* and *paideia* in Greek culture under Rome' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 287-317.
- Conte, G.B. 1996. *The hidden author: an interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cooper, K. 1996. *The virgin and the bride: idealized womanhood in late antiquity*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Corbeill, A. 1997. 'Dining deviants in Roman political invective' in Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B. eds. *Roman sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 99-128.
- Couraud-Lalanne, S. 1998. 'Récit d'un τέλος ἐρωτικόν: réflexions sur le statut des jeunes dans le roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias.' *REG* 111. 518-550.
- Courtney, E. 2001. *A companion to Petronius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cribiore, R. 2001. *Gymnastics of the mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Culler, J. 1997. *Literary theory: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cullyer, H. 2003. 'Paradoxical *andreia*: Socratic echoes in Stoic 'manly courage'' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 213-233.
- Cyrino, M.S. 1998. 'Heroes in d(u)ress: transvestism and power in the myths of Herakles and Achilles.' *Arethusa* 31. 207-241.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., and Weghorst, S.J. 1982. 'Male sexual jealousy.' *Ethology and Sociobiology* 3. 11-27.



- Davidson, J. 1998. *Courtesans and fishcakes: the consuming passions of classical Athens*. London: Fontana.
- Davidson, J. 2001. 'Dover, Foucault and Greek homosexuality: penetration and the truth of sex.' *P&P* 170. 3-51.
- De Temmerman, K. 2006. *Personages op papyrus: een narratologische analyse van de retorische karakteriseringstechnieken in de Oudgriekse roman*. Diss., Ghent.
- Doherty, L.E. 1992. 'Gender and internal audiences in the *Odyssey*.' *AJP* 113.2. 161-177.
- Doulamis, K. Forthcoming, 2007. 'Stoic echoes and style in Xenophon of Ephesus' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel*. *AN Suppl.* 10.
- Dover, K.J. 1974. *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dover, K.J. 1978. *Greek homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dowden, K. 1996. 'Heliodoros: serious intentions.' *CQ* 46.1. 267-285.
- DuBois, P. 1988. *Sowing the body: psychoanalysis and ancient representations of women*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Duncan, A. 2006. *Performance and identity in the classical world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durham, D.B. 1938. 'Parody in Achilles Tatius.' *CPh* 33. 1-19.
- Edwards, C. 1993. *The politics of immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egger, B. 1990. *Women in the Greek novel: constructing the feminine*. Diss., California.
- Egger, B. 1994a. 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe' in Morgan, J.R. and Stoneman, R. eds. *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*. London: Routledge. 31-48.
- Egger, B. 1994b. 'Women and marriage in the Greek novels: the boundaries of romance' in Tatum, J. ed. *The search for the ancient novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 260-280.
- Egger, B. 1999. 'The role of women in the Greek novel: woman as heroine and reader' in Swain, S. ed. *Oxford readings in the Greek novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Elsner, J. 2007. 'Physiognomics: art and text' in Swain, S. ed. *Seeing the face, seeing the soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from classical antiquity to medieval Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 203-224.
- Elsom, H.E. 1992. 'Callirhoe: displaying the phallic woman' in Richlin, A. ed. *Pornography and representation in Greece and Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press. 212-230.
- Epstein, S.J. 1995. 'Longus' werewolves.' *CPh* 90. 58-73.
- Epstein, S.J. 2002. 'The education of Daphnis: goats, gods, the birds and the bees.' *Phoenix* 56. 25-39.
- Evans, E.C. 1935. 'Roman descriptions of personal appearance in history and biography.' *HSPH* 46. 43-84.
- Evans, E.C. 1969. 'Physiognomics in the ancient world.' *TAPhS* 59.5. 5-101.
- Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fantham, E. 1986. 'Ζηλοτυπία: a brief excursion into sex, violence, and literary history.' *Phoenix* 40. 45-57.
- Farber, J.J. 1979. 'The *Cyropaedia* and Hellenistic kingship.' *AJPh* 100. 497-514.
- Farrell, D.M. 1980. 'Jealousy.' *PhR* 89. 527-559.
- Ferguson, J. 1958. *Moral values in the ancient world*. London: Methuen.
- Fisher, N. 1998. 'Violence, masculinity and the law in classical Athens' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge. 68-97.
- Fitzgerald, J.T. and White, L.M. trans. 1983. *The Tabula of Cebes*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Fitzgerald, J.T. ed. 1997. *Greco-Roman perspectives on friendship*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. 1975. *Aristotle on emotion*. London: Duckworth.
- Foucault, M. 1979. *The history of sexuality volume one: introduction*. Hurley, R. trans. London: Allan Lane.
- Foucault, M. 1987. *The history of sexuality volume two: the use of pleasure*. Hurley, R. trans. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1990. *The history of sexuality volume three: the care of the self*. Hurley, R. trans. London: Penguin.

- Fox, M. 1998. 'The constrained man' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *Thinking men: masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*. London: Routledge. 6-22.
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. 1998a. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. 1998b. *Thinking men: masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition*. London: Routledge.
- Frangoulidis, F. 2001. *Roles and performances in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. and Lissarrague, F. 1990. 'From ambiguity to ambivalence: a Dionysiac excursion through the "Anakreontic" vases' in Halperin, D.M., Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I. eds. 1990. *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 211-256.
- Galinsky, G.K. 1988. 'The anger of Aeneas.' *AJPh* 109. 321-348.
- Gamel, M.-K. ed. 2000. *Approaches to theatrical performance in the ancient Mediterranean*. *Helios* 27.2 (special issue).
- Garber, M. 1992. *Vested interests: cross-dressing and cultural anxiety*. New York: Routledge.
- García Romero, F. 1995. 'Ἔρωσ' Ἀθλητῆς: les métaphores érotico-sportives dans les comédies d'Aristophane.' *Nikephoros* 8. 57-76.
- Garrison, E.P. 1991. 'Attitudes toward suicide in ancient Greece.' *TAPA* 121. 1-34.
- Gera, D.L. 1995. 'Lucian's choice: *Somnium* 6-16' in Innes, D., Hine, H., and Pelling, C. eds. *Ethics and rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*. Oxford: Clarendon. 237-250.
- Gera, D.L. 1997. *Warrior women: the anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gill, C. ed. 1995. *The Discourses of Epictetus*. London: Everyman.
- Gilmore, D.D. 1990. *Manhood in the making: cultural concepts of masculinity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gleason, M.W. 1990. 'The semiotics of gender: physiognomy and self-fashioning in the second century C.E.' in Halperin, D.M., Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I. eds. *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 389-415.

- Gleason, M.W. 1995. *Making men: sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goffman, E. 1969. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.
- Goffman, E. 1977. 'The arrangement between the sexes.' *Theory and Society* 4.3. 301-332.
- Golden, M. 1984. 'Slavery and homosexuality at Athens.' *Phoenix* 38. 308-324.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's virginity: ancient erotic fiction and the history of sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1999. 'Programme notes' in Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-29.
- Goldhill, S. 2001a. 'Introduction. Setting an agenda: 'Everything is Greece to the wise'' in Goldhill, S. ed. *Being Greek under Rome: cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-25.
- Goldhill, S. 2001b. 'The erotic eye: visual stimulation and cultural conflict' in Goldhill, S. ed. *Being Greek under Rome: cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 154-194.
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. 1999. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenblatt, S. 1980. *Renaissance self-fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greimas, A.-J. 1987. *On meaning: selected writings in semiotic theory*. London: Continuum.
- Gross, N.P. 1985. *Amatory persuasion in antiquity: studies in theory and practice*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging masculinity: the rhetoric of performance in the Roman world*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gutterman, D.S. 2001. 'Postmodernism and the interrogation of masculinity' in Whitehead, S.M. and Barrett, F.J. eds. *The masculinities reader*. Cambridge: Polity. 56-71.
- Hägg, T. 2004 (1969). 'The *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon Ephesius – original or epitome?' in Boje Mortensen, L. and Eide, T. eds. *Tomas Hägg: Parthenope: Selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. 159-198.

- Hägg, T. 2004 (1971). 'The naming of the characters in the romance of Xenophon Ephesius' in Boje Mortensen, L. and Eide, T. eds. *Tomas Hägg: Parthenope: Selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. 199-229.
- Hägg, T. 2004 (1987). 'Callirhoe and Parthenope: the beginnings of the historical novel' in Boje Mortensen, L. and Eide, T. eds. *Tomas Hägg: Parthenope: Selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. 73-98.
- Hägg, T. 2004 (1994). 'Orality, literacy, and the 'readership' of the early Greek novel' in Boje Mortensen, L. and Eide, T. eds. *Tomas Hägg: Parthenope: Selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. 109-140.
- Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B. eds. 1997. *Roman sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Halperin, D.M. 1990. *One hundred years of homosexuality and other essays on Greek love*. New York: Routledge.
- Halperin, D.M. 1994. 'Historicizing the subject of desire: sexual preferences and erotic identities in the pseudo-Lucianic *Erôtes*' in Goldstein, J. ed. *Foucault and the writing of history*. Oxford: Blackwell. 19-34.
- Halperin, D.M. 2002. 'The democratic body: prostitution and citizenship in classical Athens' in Adams, R. and Savran, D. eds. *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 69-75.
- Halperin, D.M., Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I. eds. 1990. *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hammond, D. and Jablow, A. 1987. 'Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid' in Brod, H. ed. *The making of masculinities: the new men's studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin. 241-258.
- Harrell, S.E. 2003. 'Marvelous *andreia*: politics, geography, and ethnicity in Herodotus' *Histories*' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 77-94.
- Harris, W.V. 2001. *Restraining rage: the ideology of anger control in classical antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. 1985. 'Women in Thucydides.' *Arethusa* 18. 67-90.
- Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel*. London: Routledge.
- Haywood, C. and Mac an Ghaill, M. 2003. *Men and masculinities: theory, research and social practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Heath, S. 1987. 'Male feminism' in Jardine, A. and Smith, P. eds. *Men in feminism*. New York: Methuen. 1-32.
- Heiserman, A. 1977. *The novel before the novel: essays and discussions about the beginnings of prose fiction in the west*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Helms, J. 1966. *Character portrayal in the romance of Chariton*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Henderson, J. 1975. *The maculate muse: obscene language in Attic comedy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Herrmann, F.-G. Forthcoming, 2007. 'Longus' imitation: *mimēsis* in the education of *Daphnis and Chloe*' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel*. *AN Suppl.* 10.
- Herzfeld, M. 1985. *The poetics of manhood: contest and identity in a Cretan mountain village*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hobbs, A. 2000. *Plato and the hero: courage, manliness and the impersonal good*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hock, R.F. 1997. 'An extraordinary friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: the importance of friendship in the Greek romances' in Fitzgerald, J.T. ed. *Greco-Roman perspectives on friendship*. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 145-162.
- Hock, R.F. 2005. 'The educational curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*' in Brant, J.-A.A., Hedrick, C.W., and Shea, C. eds. *Ancient fiction: the matrix of early Christian and Jewish narrative*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Hock, R.F., Chance, J.B., and Perkins, J. eds. 1998. *Ancient fiction and early Christian narrative*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Hopwood, K. 1998. "'All that may become a man': the bandit in the ancient novel' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge. 195-204.
- Horrocks, R. 1994. *Masculinity in crisis: myths, fantasies and realities*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Horrocks, R. 1995. *Male myths and icons: masculinity in popular culture*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hubbard, T.K. 1998. 'Popular perceptions of elite homosexuality.' *Arion* 6.1. 48-78.
- Hubbard, T.K. 2003. 'Sex in the gym: athletic trainers and pedagogical pederasty.' *Intertexts* 7.1. 1-26.

- Hunter, R. 2003. 'Longus' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 361-386.
- Jaeger, W. 1945. *Paideia: the ideals of Greek culture volume 3: the conflict of cultural ideals in the age of Plato*. Hightet, G. trans. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johne, R. 2003. 'Women in the ancient novel' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 151-207.
- Jones, C.P. 1986. *Culture and society in Lucian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jones, C.P. 1992. 'La personnalité de Chariton' in Baslez, M.-F., Hoffmann, P., and Trédé, M. eds. *Le monde du roman grec*. Paris: L'École normale supérieure. 161-167.
- Jones, M. 2003. Noms sans frontières: *the meanings of personal names and their significance in Heliodoros' Aithiopika*. M.A. diss., Swansea.
- Jones, M. 2006. 'Heavenly and pandemic names in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*.' *CQ* 56.2. 548-562.
- Jones, M. Forthcoming, 2007. 'Andreia and gender in the Greek novels' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel*. *AN Suppl.* 10.
- Jones, M. Forthcoming, 2009. 'The lover in the painting: fiction from art in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*' (provisional title) in Morgan, J.R. and Repath, I.D. eds. *Where the truth lies: lies and metafiction in ancient narrative* (provisional title). *AN Suppl.* (vol. no. to be confirmed).
- Just, R. 1994. *Women in Athenian law and life*. London: Routledge.
- Kaimio, M. 1995. 'How to manage in the male world: the strategies of the heroine in Chariton's novel.' *AAntHung* 36. 119-132.
- Kay, N.M. 1985. *Martial Book XI: a commentary*. London: Duckworth.
- Klabunde, M.R. 2001. *Boys or women? The rhetoric of sexual preference in Achilles Tatius, Plutarch, and Pseudo-Lucian*. Diss., Cincinnati.
- Kleijwegt, M. 1991. *Ancient youth: the ambiguity of youth and the absence of adolescence in Greco-Roman society*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Kokolakis, M. 1960. *The dramatic simile of life*. Athens: Boukouri.
- König, J. 2005. *Athletics and literature in the Roman empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Konstan, D. 1994a. 'Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and narrative in the novel' in Morgan, J.R. and Stoneman, R. eds. *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*. London: Routledge. 49-63.
- Konstan, D. 1994b. *Sexual symmetry: love in the ancient novel and related genres*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Konstan, D. 2003. 'Before jealousy' in Konstan, D. and Rutter, N.K. eds. *Envy, spite and jealousy: the rivalrous emotions in ancient Greece*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 7-27.
- Konstan, D. Forthcoming. 'Le courage dans le roman grec: de Chariton à Xénophon d'Ephèse, avec une référence à Philon d'Alexandrie' in Pouderon, B. ed. *Roman IV: vertus, passions et vices dans le roman grec*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen.
- Kuefler, M. 2001. *The manly eunuch: masculinity, gender ambiguity, and Christian ideology in late antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kytzler, B. 2003. 'Xenophon of Ephesus' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 336-360.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Lalanne, S. 2006. *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*. Paris: Éditions la découverte.
- Lancaster, R. 2002. 'Subject honor, object shame' in Adams, R. and Savran, D. eds. *The masculinity studies reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 41-68.
- Lateiner, D. 1997. 'Abduction marriage in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*.' *GRBS* 38. 409-439.
- Lawall, G. 1966. 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as anti-hero.' *YCIS* 19. 121-169.
- Leonard, M. 2003. 'Antigone, the political and the ethics of psychoanalysis.' *PCPS* 49. 130-154.
- Lindheim, S. 1998. 'Hercules cross-dressed, Hercules undressed: unmasking the construction of the Propertian *amator* in elegy 4.9.' *AJPh* 119. 43-66.
- Lloyd, R. 1995. *Closer and closer apart: jealousy in literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Loroux, N. 1990. 'Herakles: the super-male and the feminine' in Halperin, D.M., Winkler, J.J., and Zeitlin, F.I. eds. *Before sexuality: the construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 21-52.



- Lutz, C.E. 1947. 'Musonius Rufus "The Roman Socrates".' *YCIS* 10. 3-147.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1980. *The Latin love poets from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McInerney, J. 2003. 'Plutarch's manly women' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 319-344.
- MacAlister, S. 1996. *Dreams and suicides: the Greek novel from antiquity to the Byzantine empire*. London: Routledge.
- MacMullen, R. 1982. 'Roman attitudes to Greek love.' *Historia* 31. 484-502.
- Maguire, S.L. 2005. *Charikleia in context*. Diss., Swansea.
- Marinčič, M. 2007. 'Advertising one's own story: text and speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*' in Rimell, V. ed. *Seeing tongues, hearing scripts: orality and representation in the ancient novel. AN Suppl. 7*. 168-200.
- Marrou, H.I. 1956. *A history of education in antiquity*. Lamb, G. trans. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Moore, S.D. and Capel Anderson, J. eds. 2003. *New Testament masculinities*. Leiden: Brill.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, D.H.J. 1992. *Discovering men*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, D.H.J. 1994. 'Theater of war: combat, the military, and masculinities' in Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. eds. *Theorizing masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 165-182.
- Morgan, J.R. 1978. *A commentary on books 9 and 10 of Heliodoros' Aithiopika*. Diss., Oxford.
- Morgan, J.R. 1989. 'The story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*.' *JHS* 109. 99-113.
- Morgan, J.R. 1995. 'The Greek novel: towards a sociology of production and reception' in Powell, A. ed. *The Greek world*. London: Routledge. 130-152.
- Morgan, J.R. 1996. '*Erotika mathemata*: Greek romance as sentimental education' in Sommerstein, A.H. and Atherton, C. eds. *Education in Greek fiction*. Nottingham Classical Literature Series 4. Bari: Levante Editori. 163-189.

- Morgan, J.R. 1998. 'Narrative doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*' in Hunter, R. ed. *Studies in Heliodorus*. Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. 21. 60-78.
- Morgan, J.R. 2003. 'Heliodoros' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 417-456.
- Morgan, J.R. 2006. 'Un discours figuré chez Héliodore: comment, en disant l'inverse de ce qu'on veut, on peut accomplir ce qu'on veut sans sembler dire l'inverse de ce qu'on veut' in Pouderon, B. and Peigney, J. eds. *Discours et débats dans l'ancien roman*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen.
- Morgan, J.R. 2007. 'Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilles Tatius as hidden author' in Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S., Harrison, S., and Zimmerman, M. eds. *The Greek and the Roman novel: parallel readings*. AN Suppl. 8. 105-120.
- Morgan, J.R. Forthcoming, 2007. 'The representation of philosophers in Greek fiction' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel*. AN Suppl. 10.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murgatroyd, P. 1975. 'Militia amoris and the Roman elegists.' *Latomus* 34. 59-79.
- Murray, O. 1990. 'The Solonian law of *hubris*' in Cartledge, P., Millett, P., and Todd, S. eds. *Nomos: essays in Athenian law, politics and society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 139-145.
- Nijf, O. van 2003. 'Athletics, *andreia* and the *askêsis*-culture in the Roman east' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 263-286.
- Nijf, O. van 2004. 'Athletics and *paideia*: festivals and physical education in the world of the Second Sophistic' in Borg, B.E. ed. *Paideia: the world of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 203-228.
- Nortwick, T. van 2001. 'Like a woman: Hector and the boundaries of masculinity.' *Arethusa* 34. 221-235.
- O'Sullivan, J.N. 1978. 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Achilles Tatius I.' *CQ* 28.2. 312-329.
- O'Sullivan, J.N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: his compositional technique and the birth of the novel*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ogden, D. 1996. 'Homosexuality and warfare in ancient Greece' in Lloyd, A.B. ed. *Battle in antiquity*. London: Duckworth. 107-168.
- Olson, S.D. 1998. *Aristophanes: Peace*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Ormond, K. 1999. 'Review of Foxhall and Salmon eds. 1998. *Thinking men: masculinity and its self-representation in the classical tradition.*' *BMCRev* 1999.04.21.
- Paglialunga, E. 2000a. 'Amor y celos en los personajes masculinos de Caritón de Afrodísia.' *Florilib* 11. 181-194.
- Paglialunga, E. 2000b. 'Mujeres celosas en la novela griega' in Alganza Roldán, M., Camacho Rojo, J.M., Fuentes González, P.P., and Villena Ponsoda, M. eds. *Ἐπιείκεια: studia Graeca in memoriam Jesús Lens Tuero*. Granada: Athos-Pérgamos. 371-386.
- Parker, H.N. 2001. 'The myth of the heterosexual: anthropology and sexuality for classicists.' *Arethusa* 34. 313-362.
- Parrott, W.G. 1991. 'The emotional experiences of envy and jealousy' in Salovey, P. ed. *The psychology of jealousy and envy*. New York: The Guilford Press. 3-30.
- Pattoni, M.P. 2004. 'Dafni davanti alla porta chiusa (Longus 3.5-9): variazioni in tema di paraklausithyron.' *Lexis* 22. 341-368.
- Paul, L., Foss, M.A., and Galloway, J. 1993. 'Sexual jealousy in young women and men: aggressive responsiveness to partner and rival.' *Aggressive Behavior* 19. 401-420.
- Perkins, J. 1995. *The suffering self: pain and narrative representation in the early Christian era*. London: Routledge.
- Phillips, L. and Jørgensen, M.W. 2002. *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Pike, K.L. 1967. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Plepelits, K. 2003. 'Achilles Tatius' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 385-416.
- Porter, J.R. 2003. 'Chariton and Lysias 1: further considerations.' *Hermes* 131. 433-440.
- Preston, K. 1916. *Studies in the diction of the sermo amatorius in Roman comedy*. New York: Garland.
- Ramelli, I. 2007. 'The ancient novels and the New Testament: possible contacts.' *AN* 5. 41-68.
- Raval, S. 2002. 'Cross-dressing and "gender trouble" in the Ovidian corpus.' *Helios* 29.2. 149-172.

- Reardon, B.P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles après J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Reardon, B.P. 1974. 'The Second Sophistic and the novel' in Bowersock, G.W. ed. *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: papers presented at the 105<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of the American Philological Association.* 23-29.
- Reardon, B.P. 1982. 'Theme, structure and narrative in Chariton.' *YCIS* 27. 1-27.
- Reardon, B.P. 1994. 'Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative' in Morgan, J.R. and Stoneman, R. eds. *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context.* London: Routledge. 80-96.
- Reardon, B.P. 2003. 'Chariton' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world.* Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 309-335.
- Reardon, B.P. ed. 1989. *Collected ancient Greek novels.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Reden, S. von and Goldhill, S. 1999. 'Plato and the performance of dialogue' in Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds. *Performance culture and Athenian democracy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 257-289.
- Repath, I.D. 2007. 'The *Physiognomy* of Adamantius the sophist' in Swain, S. ed. *Seeing the face, seeing the soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from classical antiquity to medieval Islam.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 487-547.
- Repath, I.D. Forthcoming, 2007. 'Emotional conflict and Platonic psychology in the Greek novel' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel. AN Suppl.* 10.
- Repath, I.D. Forthcoming a. *Playing with Plato: Platonic allusion in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Cleitophon.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Repath, I.D. Forthcoming b. 'Chariton's Adrastus.' *CQ.*
- Rhee, H. 2005. *Early Christian literature: Christ and culture in the second and third centuries.* London: Routledge.
- Richardson, T.W. 1984. 'Homosexuality in the *Satyricon.*' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 35. 104-127.
- Richlin, A. 1992. *The garden of Priapus: sexuality and aggression in Roman humor.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richlin, A. 1993. 'Not before homosexuality: the materiality of the *cinaedus* and the Roman law against love between men.' *JHSex* 3.4. 523-573.

- Richlin, A. 1997. 'Gender and rhetoric: producing manhood in the schools' in Dominik, W.J. ed. *Roman eloquence: rhetoric in society and literature*. London: Routledge. 90-110.
- Riviere, J. 2000 (1929). 'Womanliness as a masquerade' in Saguaro, S. ed. *Psychoanalysis and woman: a reader*. Houndmills: Macmillan. 70-78.
- Rohde, E. 1960. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Hildesheim: George Olms.
- Roisman, J. 2005. *The rhetoric of manhood: masculinity in the Attic orators*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Roncali, R. 1991. 'Zelotypia/daimon in Caritone.' *QS* 17 (34). 183-186.
- Rosen, D. 1993. *The changing fictions of masculinity*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. 2003. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill.
- Roy, J. 1998. 'The masculinity of the Hellenistic king' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge. 111-135.
- Ruiz Montero, C. 1989. 'Caritón de Afrodiasias y el mundo real' in Liviabella Furiani, P. and Scarcella, A.M. eds. *Piccolo mondo antico: appunti sulle donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo antico*. Collana: Università Degli Studi Di Perugia. 107-150.
- Ruiz Montero, C. 2003. 'Xenophon of Ephesus and orality in the Roman Empire.' *AN* 3. 43-62.
- Russell, B.F. 1998. 'The emasculation of Antony: the construction of gender in Plutarch's *Life of Antony*.' *Helios* 25.2. 121-137.
- Russell, D.A. 1983. *Greek declamation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, D.A. 1990. 'Introduction: Greek and Latin in Antonine literature' in Russell, D.A. ed. *Antonine literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1-17.
- Sandbach, F.H. 1975. *The Stoics*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Sandy, G.N. 1974. 'Scaenica Petroniana.' *TAPA* 104. 329-346.
- Sanz Morales, M. and Laguna Mariscal, G. 2003. 'The relationship between Achilles and Patroclus according to Chariton of Aphrodisias.' *CQ* 53.1. 292-295.

- Santoro L'Hoir, F. 1992. *The rhetoric of gender terms: 'man', 'woman', and the portrayal of character in Latin prose*. Leiden: Brill.
- Scanlon, T.F. 2002. *Eros and Greek athletics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scarcella, A. 2003. 'The social and economic structures of the ancient novels' in Schmeling, G. ed. *The novel in the ancient world*. Revised edition. Boston: Brill. 221-276.
- Schaps, D. 1982. 'The women of Greece in wartime.' *CPh* 77. 193-213.
- Schechner, R. 1988. *Performance theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Schmeling, G. 1974. *Chariton*. New York: Twayne.
- Schmeling, G. 1980. *Xenophon of Ephesus*. Boston: Twayne.
- Schmid, W.T. 1992. *On manly courage: a study of Plato's Laches*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schwartz, S. 2002. 'Clitophon the *moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the trial scene in the Greek novel.' *AN* 1. 93-113.
- Scourfield, J.H.D. 2003. 'Anger and gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.' *YCIS* 32. 163-184.
- Sherrod, D. 1987. 'The bonds of men: problems and possibilities in close male relationships' in Brod, H. ed. *The making of masculinities: the new men's studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin. 213-239.
- Skinner, M.B. 1997. 'Ego mulier: the construction of male sexuality in Catullus' in Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B. eds. *Roman sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 129-150.
- Sluiter, I. and Rosen, R.M. 2003. 'General introduction' in Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. *Andreia: studies in manliness and courage in classical antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 1-24.
- Smith, S.D. 2007. *Greek identity and the Athenian past in Chariton: the romance of empire*. *AN Suppl.* 9.
- Smoes, E. 1995. *Le courage chez les Grecs, d'Homère à Aristote*. Brussels: Ousia.
- Smythe, D.C. ed. Forthcoming. *Byzantine masculinities*. Publication details unknown.
- Stadter, P. 1995. "'Subject to the erotic': male sexual behaviour in Plutarch' in Innes, D., Hine, H., and Pelling, C. eds. *Ethics and rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*. Oxford: Clarendon. 221-236.

- Stanford, W.B. 1954. *The Ulysses theme: a study in the adaptability of a traditional hero*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and gender: nondramatic poetry in its setting*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stehle, E. 2001a. 'Introduction' in Stehle, E. ed. *Unmasked performances: staging identities in Greece and Rome*. *Helios* 28.1 (special issue). 3-10.
- Stehle, E. ed. 2001b. *Unmasked performances: staging identities in Greece and Rome*. *Helios* 28.1 (special issue).
- Stephens, S.A. 1994. 'Who read ancient novels?' in Tatum, J. ed. *The search for the ancient novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 405-418.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and empire: language, classicism, and power in the Greek world AD 50-250*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Swain, S. 2007a. 'Polemon's *Physiognomy*' in Swain, S. ed. *Seeing the face, seeing the soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from classical antiquity to medieval Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 125-201.
- Swain, S. 2007b. 'Introduction' in Swain, S. ed. *Seeing the face, seeing the soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from classical antiquity to medieval Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-16.
- Swain, S. ed. 2007c. *Seeing the face, seeing the soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from classical antiquity to medieval Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, R. 1997. 'Two pathic subcultures in ancient Rome.' *JHSex* 7.3. 319-371.
- Thomas, C.M. 2003. *The Acts of Peter, Gospel literature, and the ancient novel: rewriting the past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornton, B.S. 1997. *Eros: the myth of ancient Greek sexuality*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Thorp, J. 1992. 'The social construction of homosexuality.' *Phoenix* 46. 54-61.
- Tosh, J. 1994. 'What should historians do with masculinity? Reflections on nineteenth-century Britain.' *History Workshop* 38. 179-202.
- Trapp, M.B. 1997. 'On the *Tablet of Cebes*' in Sorabji, R. ed. *Aristotle and after*. London: Institute of Classical Studies. 159-180.
- Trapp, M.B. Forthcoming, 2007. 'What is this *philosophia* anyway?' in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. eds. *Philosophical presences in the ancient novel*. *AN Suppl.* 10.

- Veyne, P. 1985. 'Homosexuality in ancient Rome' in Ariès, P. and Béjin, A. eds. *Western sexuality: practice and precept in past and present times*. Forster, A. trans. Oxford: Blackwell. 26-35.
- Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon: a commentary*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Walters, J. 1993. 'No more than a boy': the shifting construction of masculinity from ancient Greece to the Middle Ages.' *Gender and History* 5.1. 20-33.
- Walters, J. 1997. 'Invading the Roman body: manliness and impenetrability in Roman thought' in Hallett, J.P. and Skinner, M.B. eds. *Roman sexualities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 29-43.
- Walton, D.N. 1986. *Courage: a philosophical investigation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Watanabe, A. 2003a. *Hippochoos the lover, bandit, and friend: a study on elite masculinity in the novel*. Diss., Yale.
- Watanabe, A. 2003b. 'The masculinity of Hippochoos.' *AN* 3. 1-41.
- Weeks, J. 1980. 'In days of yore when knights were gay?' Review of Boswell 1980. *Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality*. *History Today* 30. 49.
- Weeks, J. 1991. *Against nature: essays on history, sexuality and identity*. London: Rivers Oram.
- Weeks, J. 2001. *Making sexual history*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Wees, H. van 1998. 'A brief history of tears: gender differentiation in archaic Greece' in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. eds. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge. 10-53.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. 1987. 'Doing gender.' *Gender and Society* 1.2. 125-151.
- Whitehead, S.M. and Barrett, F.J. 2001. 'The sociology of masculinity' in Whitehead, S.M. and Barrett, F.J. eds. *The masculinities reader*. Cambridge: Polity. 1-26.
- Whitmarsh, T. 1998. 'Reading power in Roman Greece: the *paideia* of Dio Chrysostom' in Too, Y.L. and Livingstone, N. eds. *Pedagogy and power: rhetorics of classical learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 192-213.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2000. 'The politics and poetics of parasitism: Athenaeus on parasites and flatterers' in Braund, D. and Wilkins, J. eds. *Athenaeus and his world: reading Greek culture in the Roman empire*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press. 304-315.



- Whitmarsh, T. 2001a. *Greek literature and the Roman empire: the politics of imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001b. ‘Greece is the world’: exile and identity in the Second Sophistic’ in Goldhill, S. ed. *Being Greek under Rome: cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 269-305.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford University Press.
- Wiedemann, T.E.J. 1983. ἐλάχιστον ... ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος: Thucydides, women, and the limits of rational analysis.’ *G&R* 30. 163-170.
- Wiersma, S. 1990. ‘The ancient Greek novel and its heroines: a female paradox.’ *Mnemosyne* 43. 109-123.
- Williams, C.A. 1999. *Roman homosexuality: ideologies of masculinity in classical antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Winkler, J.J. 1990. *The constraints of desire: the anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge.
- Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the poetics of Roman manhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wyke, M. ed. 1998. *Parchments of gender: deciphering the body in antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Yildirim, B. 2004. ‘Identities and empire: local mythology and the self-representation of Aphrodisias’ in Borg, B.E. ed. *Paideia: the world of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 23-52.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Websites.*

*Thesaurus linguae graecae*: [www.tlg.uci.edu/](http://www.tlg.uci.edu/)