

LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY: CURRENT THEORY AND PRACTICE*

By

TADEUSZ SINKO¹

Until the middle of the last [19th] century, most Latin authors were read in the so-called vulgate, that is, in the form of the text (*textus receptus*) which had been transmitted by the great philologists of the past on the basis of a few and often randomly chosen manuscripts. There was no knowledge of the inter-relationship of *codices*, of a history of manuscript tradition, and thus no possibility of an adequate critical apparatus. However, any lexicon meriting the name of ‘scholarly’² must transmit what the manuscripts actually contain and not the corrections, assumptions and additions of scholars. Karl LACHMANN and Friedrich RITSCHL pioneered the systematic and methodical unearthing and use of all available manuscript sources, the determination of their relationships and worth and thus the field of textual criticism, which, aided by *auctores*, *imitatores* and *testimonia*, cleared up the ancient rubble of uncertain readings and even more uncertain corrections, and laid down the immutable principles which now constitute a firm foundation for any future Latin studies. On this foundation of critical editions of authors and complete collections of fragments and inscriptions it became possible to attempt the creation of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* of which F.A. WOLFF could only dream in 1820 and which was demanded by K. HALM 38 years later.

* Originally published in Polish in “Eos” X 1904, fasc. 1, pp. 59–71.

¹ (The editor’s [1904] note:) The author of this article is in his second year of working as an assistant at the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* and can therefore inform the reader of the aims of the *Thesaurus* and of the work it requires not only from a theoretical but also from a practical perspective.

² A short and also inadequate history of Latin lexicography was provided by F. HEERDEGEN (of Erlangen) in the second volume of the well-known *Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft* published by Iwan VON MÜLLER. Those interested must read the prefaces of Robertus STEPHANUS and I.M. GESNER. The best bibliography of 19th century lexicography was provided by GEORGES until 1886 in “Bursians Jahresbericht”. After GEORGES, K. WAGNER from Bremen took charge of this department and, in volume CXIV 1902, pp. 83–187, provided an excellent overview of relevant literature from 1886–1899.

Clearly, such an enormous undertaking, such a huge challenge had to be preceded by the preparation of plans and outlines, not just after the means of realization had become possible, but even before the challenge could be fully met. Before the decision to commit large amounts of both time and money could be made, it was necessary to show what the proposed *Thesaurus* would comprise, what would be its goals and how the collaborating contributors would achieve them; it was necessary to demonstrate the scholarly achievements and advantages of this new ‘Treasury’. In short, it was necessary to create a new theory of Latin lexicography and to illustrate it on the basis of appropriate examples. Up to this point Latin lexica, some very ample, were being created but the principles guiding their creation were purely empirical and dependent on how copious the collections and notes of any particular scholar were. Lexicography was mechanical endeavour rather than an independent field of study.

The individual whose efforts gave rise to this field of study is Eduard WÖLFFLIN, the man who replaced K. HALM at the University of Munich, the spiritual and material father of the new *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. He was a leading pioneer in the investigation of vulgar and provincial Latin and their links with Romance languages, in statistical studies of existing words, of how words were dropped from use and how they were combined by various authors in different periods and in the investigation of the historical development of style and language in various writers and literary genres. Then in 1882, he proclaimed *Utinam sim bonus lexicographus!*³ and two years later began publishing his “Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik” (= ALL), thus blazing the trail to the ‘Treasury’ of Latin.

The first matter that had to be resolved even before the collection of lexicographic data of the Latin language could begin was the following: What is understood by ‘Latin language’? Which written sources constitute this language? Archaic, classical and Silver Latin authors (the ‘pagan’ authors) were universally accepted as sources; the primary challenge was to determine which later authors should be included in the *Thesaurus* and where to draw the boundary separating ancient Latin authors from medieval ones. Earlier lexicographers, who on principle would include only ‘pagan’, classical sources and only occasionally take Christian writers under consideration, would also in theory include the transitional Bronze Age (up to the 4th century AD) and the Iron Age, or, as it was called by FORCELLINI, the Clay Age (*aetas lutea*), probably an allusion to the ‘feet of clay’ of the Biblical idol. Robertus STEPHANUS (Robert ESTIENNE), the father of the more illustrious Henricus, defined its lower limit as the 12th century, including Bernard of Clairvaux and John of Salisbury, just before the great flowering of scholastic Latin. This limit was pushed back by FORCELLINI to the 9th century and the Carolingian Renaissance. SCHELLER and others would include among

³ *Über die Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexicographie*, RhM XXXVII 1882, pp. 83–123.

their excerpts only those authors of the 7th and 8th century who drew copiously from ancient sources, such as Isidore of Seville, Venerable Bede and Paul the Deacon. A seemingly more rational definition is proposed by W. FREUND, who writes that he is compiling a lexicon of ‘national Latin’, an inventory of the ‘Roman nation’. But to FREUND, the ‘Roman nation’ is equivalent to an independent *imperium Romanum*; therefore, for him, ‘national Roman’ literature ends in 476 AD. In reality it does not, since after the fall of the Western Roman Empire many Romans continue to write in Latin, among others Boethius, Ennodius, Priscian, Sidonius, Claudian and Mamertus. DRÄGER’s limitation of the Latin lexicographer and grammarian to the study of a ‘living and vital’ Latin has more charm than accuracy. Grave errors accompanied by the loss of discernment of what is appropriate in Latin begin to appear only at the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century, constituting the upper limit of interest of Latin scholarship. Today, such formulations of the span and development of a language are regarded as mere curiosities and these so-called errors and blemishes are considered in a different light. But it is due to WÖLFFLIN that philologists came to regard this despised *latinitas barbara* as a legitimate descendant of Golden Age Latin. The Romance scholar G. GRÖBER, in the first volume of ALL⁴, specifies this matter with the more practical goal of lexicographical excerpting from texts. He correctly maintains that spoken, vulgar Latin never died but rather kept continually and continuously evolving until its development into the Romance languages. From this standpoint, Latin can be regarded as the most ancient form of Romance languages, while they in turn can be regarded as the most recent phase of Latin. Modern scholarship has to a great degree discredited the spurious hypotheses of how the diverse Romance languages were developed from provincial Latin through the influence of various barbarian languages. If vulgar Latin slowly developed into the Romance languages through internal development, it becomes difficult to establish accurately where Latin ends and the Romance languages begin. GRÖBER dates this dividing line to the beginning on the 7th century only for reasons of practicality, marking as boundary posts the two Gregories, Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great, and including Isidore of Seville as well. This limit is not much different from the historical or political one if one considers the cessation of Byzantium’s efforts to influence the western provinces and the arising of the Germanic kingdoms in Gaul, Spain and Italian Peninsula: Gaul passes to the Franks under Childebert I in the middle of the 6th century, the Visigoths take over the remaining coastal Roman cities in Spain at the beginning of the 7th century, while in the middle of the 7th century Rothari conquers the last purely Roman areas in Langobardia. These dates are also in agreement with the codification of Germanic law: the *Lex Salica* and the *Lex Visigothorum* arise in the time of the two Gregories. The above-mentioned separation between ancient

⁴ *Sprachquellen und Wortquellen des lateinischen Wörterbuchs*, pp. 35–67.

and medieval Latin is not an unnatural one, as the following observations demonstrate. At the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century, the level of liberal arts education falls alarmingly: the complaints of Gregory of Tours about the illiteracy of clergy and court, the minimal requirements demanded of clerics by Isidore are clearly borne out in the so-called Latin-barbarian documents and decrees from the beginning of the 6th century onwards, in which changes in declensions and conjugations, confusion between genders and emergence of articles become apparent and only slightly disguised by the veneer of tradition. Here must end our sources for Latin lexicography, for unattested words obtained through reconstruction from Romance languages, even though they are the building blocks of those languages, cannot be included in the *Thesaurus* unless they are validated by glosses, the final and very important lexicographic source.

In this way, the decision was made to draw upon the Latin language spanning more than eight centuries of literature, i.e., from the middle of the 3rd century BC until the end of the 6th century AD. The documents pertaining to this biography of the language comprise approximately 250 volumes if one includes the 125 volumes each of 25 leaves of Latin authors included in the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, the 60 volumes each of 50 leaves of Migne's *Patrologia Latina* and the 70 even larger volumes of all remaining Latin literature (grammarians, legal texts, scholiasts and inscriptions)⁵. How was this material to be made ready for the lexicographer? By whom? It was immediately evident that this task could not be undertaken by one person but that this would have to be a group effort. How was this group to be organized? How was it to function? HALM and his associates, who in 1858 were counting on the promised financial support of Friedrich Maximilian of Bavaria, kept demanding specialized lexica for each Golden Age Latin author and the most important Silver Age authors as well as excerpts for later authors. These excerpts were to be prepared on a volunteer basis by scholars who were experts in a particular author. They were also to take into consideration whatever was particularly 'important or interesting'. And yet, in the history of a language, it is impossible to ascertain the relative importance of a linguistic phenomenon or of a word. Even the seemingly least important matter assumes new significance when considered from a new perspective. In addition, the consideration of relative importance opened wide the door to a subjectivity which cannot be permitted in scholarly inquiry. Yet again, WÖLFFLIN demonstrated the inadequacy of existing lexica for individual authors and the difficulties caused by their limitations. Most importantly, he proved the absolute

⁵ The *Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum ex quibus exempla afferuntur*, Lipsiae 1904, which gives an alphabetical listing of authors and inscriptions included in the *Thesaurus*, along with various notes concerning chronology and the best editions, is a tremendously valuable and desirable tool of every Latin scholar.

necessity of a complete inventory of all words of all authors⁶. Only such a complete inventory permits the creation of philological statistical data and negative observation, i.e., concluding that certain words are not found in any particular author or period. During the history of a language, statistical data and negative observation are the most important indicators of the development and loss of words. This is illustrated by the following examples. Whoever has attempted the dating of Plato's writings or has glanced at the statistical tables of his stylistic features compiled by W. LUTOSŁAWSKI must have wondered at the placing of certain particles or expressions in the various dialogues. Perhaps from the perusal of Tycho MOMMSEN's work on Greek prepositions one remembers that *σύν* is limited to Xenophon and Greek poetry, while in prose *μετά* is normally found. These examples are sufficient reminders that before and during WÖLFFLIN's time⁷, philological statistical data existed for Greek and that he was the main proponent of philological statistical data for Latin⁸.

The occurrence of the concessive particle *etsi* in a Latin text does not appear noteworthy: it is regarded as something very common. Yet it is not really as common as it appears. Vergil does not use it, nor Horace, Sallust or Quintilian. It occurs only three times in the Old Testament Vulgate text. Sallust uses *tametsi*, *etiamsi* or *si* followed by *tamen*. Caesar regularly avoids *fluvius*, *amnis*, *nequeo*, *nescio*, *reor*, *igitur*, *quamquam*, *absque*, and *mox*. Other similar observations are due to the intelligence and diligence of various scholars: Professor MORAWSKI formulated the interesting relationship of *ob* and *propter* in the Roman historians and drew attention to the curious development of *beneficio alicuius rei* in Silver Latin. But only a member of the *Thesaurus* team, having the complete materials at his disposal, will be able to specify in the first paragraph of his entry that a particular particle occurs so many times in such and such an author, that it is lacking in another and in which author it disappears completely. For example, *mox*, which is rather common in old Latin, is not favoured by Cicero who used it 4 times in his speeches (and 2 are in quotations from Terence), 5 times in his rhetorical writings and once in his correspondence with Atticus. Nepos and Caesar avoid this adverb and Seneca the Elder uses it only once. On the other hand, Velleius uses *mox* about 50 times and Tacitus, more than 300 times. Thus *mox* belongs to Silver Latin. These types of observations play a great role in solving the puzzles of so-called higher criticism, i.e., in judging the authenticity or non-

⁶ The sum of all Latin words known today (not including proper names) can be easily assessed at 50,000 with the help of O. GRADENWITZ's *Laterculi vocum latinarum*, Leipzig 1904. The completed *Thesaurus* will enlarge this number by several hundred words.

⁷ For German scholars had gathered the linguistic-statistical data of LUTOSŁAWSKI long before his English work on Plato's logic was published (*The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, London 1897).

⁸ *Die neuen Aufgaben des Thesaurus linguae latinae*, München 1894; IDEM, *Moderne Lexicographie*, ALL XII 1902, pp. 373–400.

authenticity of various texts. Obviously, statistical data will be available for all words, not just particles. Thus, in the *Thesaurus* one reads that *auditio* is found in prose writers beginning with Cicero while *auditor* is found in the speeches and grammarians beginning with *Rhet. ad Her.*; it occurs once only in Plautus and Varro. From the later poets Horace uses it four times in hexameter, Ovid once, Martial three times and Juvenal once. As soon as the *Thesaurus* is completed (circa 1930), both the outline and overview of the lexicographic resources of each author will exist showing how frequently (or infrequently) a particular word occurs and how its use wanes until it finally drops out of the language. Thus the beautiful image painted by Horace of words falling like leaves in the winter to make room for new ones will be reflected in strict lexical statistical data.

The accuracy of lexical statistical data remains quite variable even when accompanied by the complete compilation of the literature as it is dependent on the materials available. At the earliest period of literature such materials are mounds of rubble, while in its decline they are a disordered clutter of raw materials. Even if, by chance, the earliest currently posited occurrence of a word should in fact happen to be its oldest attestation in literature, the possibility still exists that this word was found in spoken language long before it was recorded in literature. For example, *scribo*, *-onis*, a derivation of *scriba*, is not found before Gregory the Great. This word is of no importance in the Romance languages, which use as their base *scribanus*, as demonstrated by Fr. *écrivain* and It. *scribano*. The word *scribo*, however, must be several hundred years older than it is first attested in literature, because the name *gens Scribonia* could only be derived from *scribo*. Most probably soldiers would call their camp writers, the clerks, by this term with the vulgar suffix *-on*; academic language, on the other hand, kept to the proper *scriba*.

Cases do exist, however, in which the 'birth certificate' of a given word can be attested. Well-known cases include Cicero's excuses when he coins Latin *providentia* for the Greek philosophical expression πρόνοια, or Seneca's invention of *essentia* as the equivalent of Greek οὐσία. A whole series of philosophical and rhetorical terms arise in the same way, by translation from Greek, e.g., case names in Latin. A second category of innovation is composed of words created by the poets specifically to replace words that cannot be used in hexameter verse. When Lucretius and Vergil write *maximitas* instead of *magnitudo* and *nominito* instead of *nomino*, they can be considered as the creators of these forms, unless, of course, they had previously been used by Ennius in his lost works. It will frequently be stated in the *Thesaurus* that a particular word introduced by the hexameter poets becomes popular in literature, e.g., the use of *supervacuius* (instead of the older *supervacaneus* found in prose) is spread thanks to Horace and Ovid although it is not known who was the first to use the adjective. Other innovations do not persist. For example, *pacalis* from *pax* (by analogy of *legalis* from *lex*) was most probably first created by Ovid but its use did not spread to

other authors. It was not a term created by *necessitas metri*: no adjective meaning ‘peaceful’ was in use among the war-loving Romans.

Philosophy and the study of Greek influenced classical and Silver Latin authors to coin new words, to provide new meanings and features to the existing ones. Christianity influenced the authors of the Church in the same way. One such concept, one word among the many (and one whose development is well attested by various authors) is *Salvator mundi* (saviour). From the following passage from the second *Verrine Oration* (154) it is evident that the term was not in use before Cicero, and unknown to this author as well. Verres demanded to be praised not only as the *patronus Siciliae* but also as *Soter* and Cicero asks him: “hoc quantum est? ita magnum, ut latine uno verbo exprimi non possit. Id est nimirum soter, qui salutem dedit”. A comment on these words is found in Mart. Cap. V 510: “Cicero Soterem salvatorem noluit nominare: illud enim nimium insolens erat”. Cicero could not form the noun *salvator* because he did not use the verb *salvare*, replacing it by *servare*, *salvum facere* or *reddere*. For Christians, *servator* did not suffice, meaning as it did ‘preserver’ or ‘maintainer’, but not ‘saviour’, although Arnobius calls Christ *generis humani conservator*. However the translators of the so-called ‘Itala’, basing themselves on the vulgar *salvare*, were able to render the Greek σωτήρ as *salvator*. It is impossible to create an agent noun in *-tor* from *salvus*: there is no *bonator* from *bonus*, no *malator* from *malus*. The grammarians did not approve of this Christian innovation, as is demonstrated by the following words of St. Augustine (*Trin.* XIII 10, 14): “Iesus id est Salvator. Nec quaerunt grammatici, quam sit Latinum, sed Christiani, quam verum. Salvare et salvator non fuerunt haec Latina, antequam veniret Salvator; quando ad Latinos venit, et haec Latina fecit” (cf. *ibid.*: “verbum [*scil.* *salvator*] Latina lingua antea non habebat, sed habere poterat, sicut potuit, quando voluit”).

Even when complete statistical data is available, it is quite difficult to indicate exactly when the last occurrence of any particular word takes place. If it is not found in the Romance languages, it must have died out on the lips of the people; when its demise took place is more difficult to determine because literary tradition insists on its continued use. Yet even in this case, complete statistical data is helpful. Obviously, it must be compiled from the writings of uneducated authors for they, not as much influenced by educational and literary trends, more faithfully reflect the spoken language of their time. Comparison of these uneducated authors with the sources from which they draw is also very informative: Solinus, while keeping the contents of Pliny, changes some of his words, as does Orosius with Justin⁹. Such departures from the language of original sources are clear evidence of a change in linguistic usage. Thus any very common Latin word that

⁹ The not-yet-attempted comparison of the translations of Plato’s *Timaeus* by Cicero and by Chalcidius would provide an excellent contribution to both the history of the language and to the terminology of philosophy.

is not continued in the Romance languages should be carefully examined to see whether already in Latin the frequency of its usage diminished and it was lost; if it was lost, which words were used as replacements and finally which one of these triumphed and was continued in the Romance languages. In this battle for survival, the sensual appeal, the specificity and fullness of meaning as well as the sound of a word were important factors. For example, the adverb *saepe* was not continued in the Romance languages and its decline can be observed quite early. It competes with *subinde* (Fr. *souvent*) and *frequenter*. The relative frequency of each of these 3 competing words is as follows: in Pomponius Mela, *saepe* occurs thrice and *subinde* 12 times, in the first four books of astrology by Firmicus Maternus, *saepe* is very rare (three instances) whereas *frequenter* abounds (almost 60 times), and in Cassius Felix, *saepe* is also used thrice but there are almost 70 occurrences of *frequenter*, which was not used at all by Sallust and Caesar. Similar results are obtained for the word *omnes* which, due to its similarity to *homines* and beginning with Apuleius was systematically replaced with *toti* which was continued into the Romance languages. The loss of *mus* can already be observed in Latin and is confirmed by the fact that the French call a mouse *souris* from the species *sorex*, while the Spanish use a word meaning 'rat' and Italians use *topo* (from *talpa* meaning 'mole'). Similarly, a multitude of words competing with *edere* can be found, among them *comedere*, *cibari*, *manducare*, *esitare*, *gustare*. As early as 385, *Peregrinatio Egeriae* does not use *edere* although eating is often mentioned, nor does Caelius Aurelius, an African doctor in the 5th century, nor the dietician Anthimus at the beginning of the 6th century, while in the Old Testament Vulgate almost 500 uses of *comedere* occur for just 30 *edere*, even joined in the phrase *comedere et bibere*. Valerius Maximus and Suetonius repeat without alteration Cicero's phrase, "ut biberent, quoniam esse nolent", uttered by Appius Claudius Caecus when drowning the augur's chickens unwilling to eat. Already somewhere in the middle of the 3rd century, however, the *Periochae* of Livy (XIX) says "pullos, qui cibari nolebant". The battle for survival of words with similar meanings is not directly of interest to the lexicographer who, for *saepe*, formulates the statistical data and adds "cf. *subinde*, *frequenter*" and does the same for *edere* and its synonyms and for all similar cases. Once all the data has been formulated for all the synonyms of a given word, collectively it will give the history of the concept, and the history of concepts is the history of the culture. A sample of such a history can be obtained from three papers published in ALL: *Was heisst 'Leute'?* (VI 1889, pp. 341 ff.), *Was heisst 'die Kinder'?* (VII 1892, pp. 78 ff.) and *Was heisst 'das Pferd'?* (VII 1892, pp. 313 ff.).

While the documenting of the disappearance of a word and its battle to survive against its competitors are only indirectly of interest to the lexicographer, WÖLFFLIN's further proposal, to take into account local differences and characteristics of Latin, is virtually impossible to achieve. Theoretically, WÖLFFLIN is right

when he concludes that the characteristics of Latin were not uniform in all the countries in which it was spoken. On the contrary, in addition to variations over time, local variations surely existed. This local differentiation accompanied by other influences gave rise to the multiplicity of Romance languages. In practice, however, ‘African’ and ‘Spanish’ Latin (as proposed by WÖLFFLIN in ALL II, VI, VII, VIII–X) as well as ‘Gallic’ Latin (as proposed by P. GEYER in ALL II, VII, VIII) rest on a very frail foundation of a few, at most several, observations. Even the *Thesaurus* will not be able to increase their number. WÖLFFLIN observed that a group of writers of African descent of the 2nd and 3rd century, including Fronto but more importantly Apuleius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius and others, exhibit several common characteristics that do not occur in earlier writers: expressions such as *saecula saeculorum*, *caeli caelorum*, or the so-called genitive of identity including *cupiditates libidinum* and *imperii iussio*, as well as the replacement of the ablative of comparison by a periphrasis with the ablative, e.g., *doctior ab illo*. WÖLFFLIN attributed these changes to the influence of the Semitic Punic language (of which nothing is known). *Africitas* was popular in WÖLFFLIN’S circles for a few years until the author himself thoroughly reduced it after many and often sharp comments from without. He himself admits today that many ‘Africanisms’ can be explained by the influence of the Asiatic rhetorical style and others could well prove to be common to all Latin if more European authors of the 2nd and 3rd centuries were extant. Still, he believes in *Africitas*, theoretically, and therefore harmlessly. WÖLFFLIN based his hypothesis of ‘Spanish’ Latin on three observations from Columella and the two Senecas and the evidence for ‘Gallic’ Latin is just as poor. While comparison with *plus* in French and with *magis* in Spanish can be traced back to the 5th century: Gallic writers, Sidonius Apollinaris and Alcimus Avitus, both use *plus* while the Spaniard Orosius uses *magis*. Such individual observations, however, do not entitle the lexicographer to label words as provincial Gallic, Spanish or African. This only becomes possible with proper names if they occur very frequently in inscriptions from a one province and not at all in others.

In the solutions of the lexicographical problems discussed above statistical data drawn from all materials of all authors up to the 7th century played a great role. Unfortunately, the *Thesaurus* has access to complete materials only for Gold and Silver Age Latin: Apuleius and Fronto are the last authors to be completely analysed and it is for them alone that full statistical data are available. Christian literature is prepared only in very incomplete, random excerpts comprising ‘important and interesting’ items (on the value, cf. above). In addition, these excerpts were prepared for the most part by secular scholars with little expertise in the theological writers. Either, through haste, theologians were not consulted, or else they did not volunteer their services. It suffices to say that the philologist excerpting Tertullian did not annotate the very common *gratia* although it is in Tertullian that it appears for the first time with the meaning of

Christian grace. Why would a philologist marvel at and note the word *sanctus* in the Church Fathers? Yet the vicissitudes of this word in the Christian tradition alone are very interesting. Such is more or less the state of all Christian terminology: everything found in the indices of the Viennese *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* was copied, everything else was excerpted. Only the letters of St. Jerome and the *De civ. Dei* of St. Augustine were completely analysed. Thankfully, Biblical concordances were also available. Thus, with such material the *Thesaurus* cannot fulfill WÖLFFLIN's aims, and for this WÖLFFLIN himself is to blame. For in 1894, when a consortium of five German academic institutions¹⁰ guaranteed half a million marks over a period of 20 years, his voice was the most influential in the question of Christian literature. He included it in the *Thesaurus* and, had he demanded the full analysis of Christian writers from at least the first four centuries, his directive would have prevailed. Desirous of seeing at least the initial stages of the *Thesaurus* begun in his lifetime, he insisted on excerpts instead and took responsibility for their provision. He provided many himself and made efforts to obtain others. Unfortunately, all this resulted in the *Thesaurus* being, at least as far as the history of Christian Latin is concerned, very much incomplete. This weakness, enhanced by the inadequacy of reference works which could be consulted, prevents the non-theologian from properly exploiting the meagre materials that do exist. For factual information relating to pagan antiquity, the *Thesaurus* draws upon the *RE* by PAULY–WISSOWA, DAREMBERG and SAGLIO's *Dictionnaire* and on various works on law and antiquities both public and private. There are very few works, however, to aid in comparable Christian studies, particularly since existing encyclopaedias or histories of Church Latin are based on very meagre philological material.

This Achilles' heel of the *Thesaurus*, however, is not generally known, and as reviewers do not have access to the Church writers materials, no such criticism has as yet been forthcoming¹¹. The only criticism came from one of the members of the *Thesaurus* team, H. DIELS and it concerned the relationship of Latin to Greek culture. DIELS observed that, since Latin philosophical terminology and the entire spiritual aspect of Roman life is dependent on Greek influence, it is warranted to demand that the scholar who prepares the history of a particular Greek concept in Latin literature should also know its history in Greek literature. This, however, will only become possible when the civilised world will mandate the creation of a new *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*. It may be possible

¹⁰ E. WÖLFFLIN, *Zwei Gutachten über das Unternehmen eines lateinischen Wörterbuchs*, ALL VII 1892, p. 506.

¹¹ The reviews and discussion of the first volumes of the *Thesaurus* were collected by WAGENER in the already-mentioned "Bursians Jahresbericht" (n. 2) while the techniques and difficulties of writing the entries were presented by the editor-in-chief, Friedrich VOLLMER, at the last (October 1903) philological conference in Halle. This paper was published under the title of *Vom Thesaurus linguae Latinae* in *Neue Jahrb.* XIII 1904, pp. 46–56.

to achieve this in a hundred years, maybe much later or even never. In any case, the publication of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* before the publication of the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* is a ὕστερον πρότερον, an anachronism. One cannot adequately discuss the history of a word such as *affectus*, *animus* and the like without knowing its history in Greek. Nor can one imagine a good history of *elementum* in Latin without knowing it in Greek. DIELS provided the history of *elementum* in both Greek and Latin, but even if he had only Latin materials at his disposal, his history of *elementum* in Latin would have remained the same. The task of the lexicographer is to understand the usage of a particular word every time it appears in a given author, and then, according to the word's meanings, to arrange the authors in chronological order. Once a word entered the Latin language, it existed independently and without constant reference to its Greek source. The knowledge of such a source may help explain why a certain author used this word in this particular context. The lexicographer, however, determines facts and does not delve into motivation. Thus if even DIELS had used πάθος and ψυχή as their foils, his entries on *affectus* and *animus* would not have changed in any way, and from his discussion of *elementum*, only the annotation “v. DIELS, *Elementum*” will be included in the *Thesaurus*. An author does not need to read the Greek section, just as he does not need to constantly seek enlightenment from the Greek *Thesaurus* by Stephanus. This does not mean, however, that the knowledge of Greek is completely superfluous. In fact the author, after grouping Latin passages according to the meaning of a certain word, expression or construction, observes that it owes its meaning to Greek. If one takes together the appearances of *vir bonus* in Cicero or Apuleius, one sees even without further research that it is the equivalent of Greek καλός κάγαθός, its appearance in Seneca clearly indicates its relation to Greek σοφός, and Quintilian's periphrasis of *vir bonus* by *vir civilis* reflects the sophists' ἀνὴρ πολιτικός. Still, using Greek to construe Latin must be done with great care. Observing Latin *bene* or *male audire* it would be very easy to write “cf. καλῶς or κακῶς ἀκούειν” and to conclude that this peculiar Latin construction follows the Greek. A review of the earliest Latin examples, however, proves its purely Latin development.

Following the discussion of these important issues, it is now possible to briefly present what else is included in each entry in the *Thesaurus*. The lexicographer, by taking under consideration manuscript tradition, inscriptions, and grammatical evidence, is able to establish the orthography of a word and list all secondary forms which are often very important in Romance studies, e.g., *besta*, the secondary form of *bestia* (French *bête*¹²) or *meletrix* and *menetrix*, the secondary forms of *meretrix*. He gives all irregular forms of declensions, grading or conjugation and notes the absence of certain inflectional forms and gives their replacements

¹² The history of this word was given by Professor MIODOŃSKI in *Rozprawy Akademii Krakowskiej* XI 1886.

and he restores the proper order to existing forms: the *Thesaurus* informs us that the perfect of *audio* is *audivi*, *audiisti*, *audiit*, *audivimus*, *audivistis*. Finally, the first paragraph contains a review of ancient etymologies and the continuation of the word in Romance languages and dialects.

The etymology of a word should lead into its “biography”, the development of its meaning: the meaning that most closely matches its etymology should be considered as the most ancient, and its later meanings develop according to the laws of semasiology. Unfortunately, both etymology and semasiology shed even now so little light that they cannot function as guiding lights in the labyrinth of the development of word meaning. Etymological annotations in the *Thesaurus* are there to give at least some information, but from THURNEYSEN’S observations such as “incertae originis”, “cf.”, “esse videtur cum” it is probable that no one will learn much more than that the greatest attribute of etymology today is *ars nesciendi*. It will only be on the basis of the complete *Thesaurus* that the semasiologist will be able to seek the proof for his laws: up to that time, only the observation that the concrete meaning of a word is usually older than its abstract or rather figurative meaning may be acceptable. However, cf. *aftuo*. Abandoned by etymology and semasiology, the lexicographer will find help in chronology, for the earliest occurrences of a word usually convey its earliest meaning. He will often be aided by Festus and the grammarians. It is not only words, however, but also their combinations, formulae and phrases in a historical order that are noted by the *Thesaurus* collaborator. The data that today’s scholars are labouring to collect in research papers devoted to a given author or in separate, labourious monographs, such as Professor MORAWSKI in a series of observations on the rhetoricians and their influence on literature, will be given in a complete chronology, all *ampullae rhetorum*, all *flores* and *colores*. Such associations will permit many places to be corrected and completed and will also often permit the proper identification of sources. Textual criticism with the *Thesaurus* in hand will be based on firm principles. Even a lawyer, a doctor, agronomist or natural scientist will find in the contents of the *Thesaurus* if not instruction, then a very rich lode of material for his studies. For the new *Thesaurus* will be nothing else than an ordered inventory, a treasury of Latin.

GREEK ROMANCE: ITS ORIGIN
AND THE SYSTEMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENRE*

By

TADEUSZ SINKO

In May 1905 the Spaniards were celebrating the 300th anniversary of the first edition of the most illustrious romance in world literature, *Vida y hechos del ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Its author, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, while writing his immortal satire on the stupidity of those who were wasting their time on reading tales about the adventures of chivalric knights, like the Amadis de Gaula, and who – due to the oversight of other duties and pursuits – were losing contact with real life, by the same token put an end to the mediaeval genre of fantastic chivalric tales, called since its very beginning in the 13th century – romances, *romanz*. This term, applied for the first time in the *Romanz des Français*, indicated in the first place, or rather solely, a plebeian language used in those poetic works. For in opposition to literary Latin this *lingua laica* was called *Romancia seu lingua romansalis*. And it is only in the *Roman de Troie* by a French *trouvère* Benoît de Sainte-Maure that the series of events and adventures (*geste*) includes a love story, one of Troilus and Cressida; and thereafter all literary works of this type – be they based on an ancient or mediaeval motif – turn around love, that means, around what in our everyday speech we call ‘romance’.

“The thing reads as a romance” – is what we say with approval about some scholarly work, at any rate a historical work, whose content, or rather subject matter, consists of unusual, uncommon events and whose form is such that it does not require from its reader any effort or particular attention. On the contrary – the reading provides pleasure, is entertaining and relaxing. The above trite saying indicates that we expect the romance to be absorbing and easy to read. But also in the pejorative sense we are used to say about a scholar that – instead of providing us with rigorous arguments and proofs – he “is telling romances”, that is – extravagant fabrications not based on solid foundations. In this case

* Originally published in Polish in “Eos” XI 1905, fasc. 2, pp. 65–111.

the reference to romance echoes those ‘fabricated stories’ which constituted the essence of a certain type of tales, recounted – since the 15th century – in prose. In Polish this term is an equivalent of ‘banialuki’ (rubbish), by which are designated the products or rather figments of imagination, in memory of “a fair princess Banieluka from the eastern land”, the heroine of the *Antyspasty małżeńskie* (Marital Antispasts) by Hieronim Morsztyn. We may add here one more expression: “Everything ended as in a romance”, which means that despite the most difficult obstacles, Numa – by the very odd turn of fortune in her favour – was finally able to marry Pompilius; and so we have all the echoes which quite faithfully render the main characteristics of the Greek romance.

The notion of ‘Greek romance’, in spite of its romano-hellenic form, is not a hybrid. For in fact it was a fictitious and quite often fantastic tale about a loving couple which – after having been engaged or married – was separated by the hostile fortune and tossed around the whole world through various dangers and adventures. The lovers, even when they are lured by the most intense temptations, remain faithful to each other. As a result they triumph in the end over their defeated foes, so that they may enjoy in peace the recompense for their virtue.

Therefore is it true that all modern as well as ancient tales about the kidnapped and saved maidens, like Helena, Oleńka, Basia, Danuška [characters from Henryk Sienkiewicz’s historical novels], have something in common with the Greeks? With respect to the development and the history of literary genres they are a direct offspring of the Greek romances. Starting from Alexandre Dumas *père*, the backward path goes through the heroic romance of the 17th century, represented by such authors as Gomberville and Mademoiselle de Scudéry, down to the tale about the toils of Persiles and Sigismunda (*Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda*), whose author was Cervantes, “the slayer of the chivalric romance”. The guide of *Don Quijote*’s author in the newly created literary genre was a Greek writer Heliodorus, the author of the Ethiopian tale about Theagenes and Chariclea. The history of the influence of Greek romance upon the European literature starting from 1535 (date of the first edition of Heliodorus) is best presented in the inestimable book by the Scottish author John DUNLOP, *The History of Prose Fiction* (Edinburgh 1814, 1816; London 1843), popularised in German version by LIEBRECHT (*Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, Berlin 1851). The path from Bernardin de Saint Pierre (*Paul et Virginie*), from the bucolic prose writer Gessner and from the authors of pastoral romances again goes back to Longus as well as to Heliodorus, Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles Tatius. And one who realizes what role in the mediaeval literature was played by the tale about Apollonius, the king of Tyre, as well as all those stories about Alexander the Great and about the destruction of Troy, will hardly be surprised by the vivid interest with which the historians of world literature did and still do examine the ancient romance. A scholar working on Polish literature who would wish to understand the comments by our Polish Solomon, Stanisław H. Lubomirski,

in his *Rozmowy Artaxerxes z Ewandre* (Discussions between Artaxerxes and Euander) on invented stories which are called “romana”, should consult DUNLOP’S work, which would lead him back as far as antiquity.

The classicists look at this particular field of studies from a different perspective. In their view, the Greek romance has nothing to do with classicism, that is – with its alleged perfection or supreme standard; therefore, according to them it rather brings disrepute than adds glory to the literature of Homer and Sophocles. Accordingly, it is not worth dealing with it nor yet knowing it. Even for a “serious scholar” it is sufficient to be aware of the existence of a fundamental book on this topic, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* by Erwin ROHDE (Leipzig ¹1876, ²1900), but he does not have to bother reading it. For even if he begins to read it, he will learn nothing about Greek romance as such on the few hundreds of pages, and so – tired of pedantic comments on erotic elements in the Alexandrian poetry or on utopian and travel literature – he will put this book aside without reading its last chapter, and instead, he will try to find an easier way to get some pertinent information by consulting a more concise work on this topic, namely *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman* by E. SCHWARTZ (Berlin 1896). Unfortunately, he won’t find it there either, even if he goes through the first four lectures, allegedly devoted to the Greek romance itself. Not giving up yet on his search for knowledge and desperately looking for salvation, he turns to French literature on the topic, since French scholars are considered to be able to treat even the dullest subjects in a light and accessible manner. He may however go through such work as the one decorated by the French Academy, that is *Histoire du roman chez les Grecs et les Romains* (Paris ¹1859, ²1862) by M. CHASSANG and still he will get lost in the overabundance of romance motives starting from Homer, but not touching upon the proper Greek romance authors.

Such disappointment, experienced by a philologist willing to acquire some knowledge on this topic, indicates that the problem of the sources and the origin of Greek romance is very difficult and complicated, if the basic treatises on the subject by CHASSANG and ROHDE contain a very detailed analysis of the works created by the predecessors of Greek romance, while providing only a superficial presentation of actual specimens of this genre which survived until today. Much better coped with this problem the first historian of romance, bishop HUET who suggested – in the letter addressed to the secretary of countess de la Fayette (authoress of the novel entitled *Zayde*) – that Greek novels derive from eastern tales. HUET’S *Lettre [...] de l’origine des romans* (Paris 1670), translated into Latin under the title *Huetii liber de origine fabularum romanensium* (Hague Comitibus 1682), during two centuries was a fundamental work on the poetics of the genre. It was the basis of research work for the aforementioned DUNLOP and also for the well-known minister of education during the reign of Louis Philippe, A.F. VILLEMMAIN in his *Essai sur les romans grecs*; whereas it was CHASSANG’S

book that served as a model for the German scholar NICOLAI, who compiled its epitome under the title *Entstehung und Wesen des griechischen Romans* (Berlin 1867).

Much more significant than the above mentioned attempts by the scholars (and we actually enumerated them all) towards the clarification of the genesis of Greek romance and its history was the publication of the Egyptian papyri and parchments during the last 12 years. In 1893 Ulrich WILCKEN published two fragments of the romance about Ninus and Semiramis, *Ein neuer griechischer Roman* (Hermes XXVIII 1893, pp. 161–193), conventionally known as *Der Ninusroman*), containing over 300 lines, among which some are damaged, in narrow columns (on average 20 characters per line). The quality of the papyrus (now in Berlin, *Pap. Berol.* 6926) and of the calligraphic uncials indicates that we are dealing here with a bookseller's copy. The accounts inscribed on its verso provide us with the date before which the manuscript was written and then destined for recycling; they are dated between the 1st of the month of Payni in the 3rd year of Trajan and the 1st of Payni in the 4th, that is from May 26, 100 AD to May 26, 101 AD. On the basis of this evidence, the latest date for the composition of this romance would be the middle of the 1st century AD, but we may equally place it by the end of the 1st century BC or even in the Ptolemaic period. Following the publication of these fragments, supplemented by E. PICCOLOMINI (see: RAL [s. V] II 1893, pp. 313–332 and Nuova Antologia XLVI 1893, fasc. 15) and by Lionell LEVI (RFIC I [XXIII] 1894), scholars including WILAMOWITZ (Hermes XXXV 1900, p. 8; GGA CLXIII 1901, pp. 30 ff. and earlier in *Aristoteles und Athen*, vol. II, Berlin 1893, p. 32) took over the CHASSANG's theory, rejected by ROHDE, stating that Greek romance derived from the degenerated Ionian historiography of the 4th century BC.

A twenty-six verse column from the Berlin papyrus of the 2nd century AD, published in 1895 by KREBS and annotated by KAIBEL and ROBERT (Hermes XXX 1895, pp. 144 ff.), opened new perspectives to the connection between romance and the sophist school of rhetoric, as well as mythology and legend. A fragment published by MAHAFFY (RAL [s. V] VI 1897), written on the verso of accounts from the times of Domitian, confirmed that the motive of storms and shipwrecks, very common in later romances, appeared already in the 2nd century AD, although O. CRUSIUS opposes this view (Beilage zur Allgemeine Zeitung 1897, 145, 3 July 1897, München). Also three excerpts from the romance about princess Chione (62 verses of 12 characters each), which WILCKEN deciphered under the text in Coptic on parchment folia, purchased by him in Egyptian Thebes (they were consumed by fire together with the ship in the harbour of Hamburg in 1899) and published in 1901 (APF I, fasc. 2, pp. 255 ff.) furnished the material, which could be compared to e.g. *Historia Apollonii*. And even if this romance was treated by E. KREBS (*Die Erzählung des Apollonius aus Tyrus*, Berlin 1899) as an original Roman work, composed during the 1st half of the 3rd century AD and

modified in the 5th century by some Christian author, WILCKEN (*op. cit.*, p. 258, n. 2) and K. BÜRGER (*Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Romans*, vol. II, Blankenburg am Harz 1903) brought forth sufficient arguments as to the existence of a Greek original and included it among the preserved Greek romances. Less significant were the remarks by G. THIELE (*Zum griechischen Roman*, in the collective work entitled *Aus der Anomia: archäologische Beiträge Carl Robert zur Erinnerung an Berlin dargebracht*, Berlin 1890, pp. 124 ff.) who concluded – on the evidence of *Rhet. ad Her.* I 12, Cic. *De inv.* I 27 and Anon. Seguer. *Rh. gr.* I, p. 435 – that there existed a tale, which was very similar to later romances, in Greek and Roman schools of rhetoric already during the times of Sulla; the same applies to comments made by BÜRGER (*Der antike Roman vor Petronius*, *Hermes* XXVII 1892, pp. 345–358) which – in spite of vehement objections of ROHDE (*RhM* XLIII 1893, p. 125) – were taken over by R. HEINZE (*Petron und der griechische Roman*, *Hermes* XXXIV 1899, pp. 494–519), who attempted to prove that Petronius' satire is nothing more than a parody of the pompous Greek romance, which – according to him – existed in its conventional form already at the beginning of the 1st century AD. Of much higher value, however, is a paper by Bürger (*Zu Xenophon von Ephesus*, *Hermes* XXVII 1899, pp. 36–67), where it is argued that the form, in which the romance by Xenophon of Ephesus was preserved until our times, is not the same as it originally was, but comes from some later editor who kept certain parts of the genuine text intact, while drastically rescinding other parts. This important discovery was corroborated by the analogy with Chariton's novel. Six parchment folia, purchased by Wilcken in Thebes (hence it is called Codex Thebanus), contain (or rather had contained before they perished in flames) two chapters from the book VIII of Chariton's novel (VIII 5, 9–6, 1; 6, 8–7, 3) which differ from the text contained in the only other existing codex (Florentinus). The collation of the two codices indicates that they belong to two different versions of the lost original of Chariton's work. Where they both agree, the wording is identical; where they do not, the fuller version must be closer to the original. The Theban version comes from the 7th/8th century. It was already W. SCHMID who in his article on Chariton in the Pauly–Wissowa assumed that the original was created in the 2nd century AD. His assumption, based mainly on linguistic and stylistic criteria, was confirmed by the papyrus: GRENFELL, HUNT and HOGARTH (*Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, London 1900) published a 2nd century AD papyrus containing a fragment of Chariton's romance. In Rohde's view it was the last link in the chain of preserved romances and it was dated by him sometime during the 6th century AD. As a starting point Rohde took the summary of Antonius Diogenes' romance and told the prehistory of travel fiction in the 2nd chapter of his book (“Ethnographische Utopien, Fabeln und Romane”), whereas the harbingers of the erotic romances were presented by him and very rigorously characterized in the 1st chapter (“Die erotische Erzählung der hellenistischen Dichter”). From these two chapters, and particularly from

the second, a historian of Greek romance is now able to draw only a few valuable details; other details are useless. Of more worth for him is the 3rd chapter (“Die griechische Sophistik der Kaiserzeit”), while from the 4th chapter (“Die einzelnen sophistischen Liebesromane”) he may use only a few elements. The construction based on the following chronology: Antonius Diogenes, Iamblichus, Xenophon of Ephesus, Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, Chariton, Longus is in ruins. That ROHDE did not want to accept it and that he omitted even the romance on Ninus, is not so surprising. What is however surprising is that the editor of the 2nd edition of ROHDE’s book, Friedrich SCHOLL, makes the following comment: “Rohde würde kaum Veranlassung gehabt haben an den Grundlagen und wesentlichen Auffassungen der ersten Darstellung zu ändern”. In fact the very foundations and essential concepts of ROHDE regarding the Greek romance were altered, which was pointed out by Wilhelm SCHMID, the author of a treatise on Atticism (and also of several entries in the Pauly–Wissowa on some romance writers – Achilles Tatius, Antonius Diogenes, Chariton), in his lecture given in Stuttgart during the conference of the professors from the Wirtemberg gymnasia (7 May 1904) and published in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum VII 1904*. His article (*Der griechische Roman*), updating our knowledge of the nature and the origin of Greek romance, is for the most part filled with critical remarks on THIELE’S arguments, but it does not deal with the history of this genre, probably leaving this aspect of the problem to some successor of ROHDE, such as e.g. the author of *Der Mimus*, Hermann REICH, who in the 2nd volume of his monumental work is expected to talk about the influence of the mime on the romance. In any case, before a new great work on Greek romance is published, which would be of some value to those scholars for whom ROHDE is obsolete, here is a concise history of Greek romance, which takes into account the results of the research hitherto undertaken and also offers some further considerations.

One of the reasons which delayed the study of the essence of Greek romance is the lack of any ancient treatise on the poetics or theory of this particular literary genre. It appeared only after the classical period which was very productive in the field of literary genres, systemised by Aristotle and his followers, though none of them formulated a theory of this genre. That is why there is no ancient technical term for it. Among the authors of fully preserved works, Chariton describes his as διήγημα πάθους ἐρωτικοῦ (cf. πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι, I 1); Heliodorus (end of X) as σύνταγμα τῶν περὶ Θεαγένην καὶ Χαρίκλειαν Αἰθιοπικῶν. In his epitome the patriarch Photius calls Iamblichus’ romance Ἰαμβλίχου δραματικόν, ἔρωτας ὑποκρινόμενον (p. 221, 1 HERCHER), that of Antonius Diogenes τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγοι εἴκοσι τέσσαρες, and then he calls it δραματικόν (p. 233, 2 HERCHER) and applies the same term to the work of Achilles Tatius (cod. 87) and of Heliodorus (σύνταγμα δραματικόν, cod. 75 f.) and he calls the works of all those three authors ἐρωτικῶν δραμάτων ὑποθέσεις (cod. 94 f.). Therefore the term ἐρωτικὰ

δράματα refers on the one hand to the content of these romances, full of dangerous events and adventures (δράματα appears already in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, ROHDE², p. 376, n. 3), and on the other hand it draws from the Byzantine terminology (e.g. Εὐμαθίου τὸ καθ' Ὑσμίνην καὶ Ὑσμινίαν δρᾶμα). However it is also possible to suspect that the term δραματικόν (*scil.* διήγημα or σύνταγμα) was borrowed from the terminology of rhetoric schools.

Among school exercises (προγυμνάσματα), the orators list tales (διηγήματα or διηγήσεις), which are not connected with trial or court (not ἐπὶ κριτῶν but καθ' ἑαυτάς), and within those they distinguish διηγήσεις βιωτικά, ιστορικά, μυθικά and περιπετικά (e.g. Anon. Seguer. *Rh. gr.*, p. 435, 12 ff.). Historical and mythological tales do not need to be defined; these are declamations on topics from history or mythology. And the nature of “biotic” and “peripetic” tales will become clear if we find out that orators treat them as διηγήματα πλασματικά (e.g. Nicolaus, *Progymn.* 2, p. 22, 44 ff., in: SPENDEL, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. III), and also – that they refer mime to “biotic” tales, whereas they define the term διήγημα πλασματικόν by δραματικόν (Aphthon. *Progymn.* 2, p. 22, 44 ff., in: SPENDEL, *Rhet.*, vol. II). And since in drama περιπέτεια is obligatory, διήγημα δραματικόν is also called περιπετικόν. ROHDE was searching for examples of such dramatic and peripetic tales in the controversies of Seneca the Elder and in declamations of Quintilianus (pp. 361–366). Topics were invented (hence πλασματικόν) by the teacher, and the student had to work on them. Here are a couple of examples of such tales, akin to motifs from the preserved romances. A virgin, kidnapped by pirates, was put on sale. She was bought by a pimp who placed her in his brothel. There she used to beg her clients to leave the fee for the pimp without touching her. A soldier did not heed to her prayers, and so she killed him when he tried to rape her. She had to stand trial, but was released by the judges, who sent her back home to her family. – For Seneca it was supposed to be the example of a quasi legal speech, and so he makes her demand to have her priesthood restored and defend against the citizens who claim that “sacerdos casta e castis, pura e puris sit” (*Contr.* I 2).

Another example: A young man, captured by pirates, asks his father in a letter to be bought out. The father does not respond. The daughter of the leader of pirates falls in love with the captive and promises to set him free if he swears that he will marry her after his release. He takes an oath and they both escape to the parents of the youth and they get married there. At some point an orphan cousin of the youth turns out and the father decides to abide by the law and to marry her to his only son. The latter refuses to divorce his saviour, and so his father disinherits him. – And again, Seneca turns it into a legal case where the son has to defend himself against his father's decision.

The above two examples should suffice as a proof that Roman (and also Greek) youth, already in the Augustan period, was trained in dealing with fictitious topics, abounding in dramatic turns. However these were only brief school

declamations, similar to our school exercises, and not romances. The theory of such exercises was formulated already by the orators from pre-Sullan times, as witnessed by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and by Cicero (*De inv.* I 27). Herennius' teacher calls διήγηνα πλάσματικόν *argumentum* and distinguishes its two types: "unum (genus), quod in negotiis, alterum, quod in personis positum est". A fictitious tale about a subject (*in negotiis, in rebus positum*) is the ἔκφρασις πραγμάτων, description of wars, battles, travels, but also landscapes, works of art (see: ROHDE², pp. 358–361). A tale about a person does not differ from the aforementioned διήγημα δραματικόν (περιπετικόν). Here, the Roman rhetorician would expect the following characteristics:

Illud genus narrationis, quod in personis positum est, debet habere: sermonis festivitatem, animorum dissimilitudinem, gravitatem levitatem, spem metum, suspicionem desiderium, dissimulationem misericordiam, rerum varietates fortunae commutationem, insperatum incommodum subitam laetitiam, iucundum exitum rerum.

Both form and substance are defined here. As far as form is concerned, a tale should be pleasant, that is – graceful and light. As pertains to substance, first the contrast of characters of persons involved is mentioned: some should be serious (*graves*), some fickle (*leves*); they should be exposed to various adventures (*rerum varietates*) and turns of fortune (*fortunae commutatio*). And what emotions should fill their hearts is indicated by the word *desiderium*, which in this context may only mean the amorous desire. And so love should constitute an axis of the action. It fills the lovers' hearts with hope and trepidation, provokes scenes of jealousy (*suspicio*), entices to pretend indifference (*dissimulatio*), and finally it makes one pity the unhappy lover. Lovers, affected by unexpected misfortunes (*insperatum incommodum*), at last find favour on the part of fortune and everything ends happily, which means that those who were separated are reunited and will live together in eternal bliss.

Such interpretation of the passage of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is not possible without the knowledge of the preserved Greek romances which contain all the above mentioned motives, yet, it may be accurate, if we clearly identify its range. THIELE saw in this passage a formulation of poetics of the existing romances, but he must have forgotten how narrow its scope was; for such *argumentum in personis positum* was not even a long speech, but rather a small exercise or assignment. Also the fact that Roman orators do not analyse very closely other types of non-judicial tales, as if they took it for granted that readers know them well, whereas they discuss this particular type in depth, is a proof of its novelty. Had it been already by then a conventional literary genre, they would have used a specific term to name it and would have mentioned a specific work to illustrate it. So it was not in the telling of romances or composing them, that the Roman youth was being trained in schools of rhetoric. One thing, however, is certain: anonymous author, who was first to write a romance, must have gone through

rhetorical education, must have known how to talk about a subject (*narratio, quae in negotiis versatur*), about complicated experiences of persons (*narratio in personis posita*), and must have been familiar with all other types of rhetorical exercises. In this sense we may say that romance derives from the schools of rhetoric.

In order to answer the question – when was it that the first romance was produced – we should recall first which literary genres contained the subject matter typical for later romances. In Alexandrian epoch the erotic plot was a narrative axis of the *Argonautica* by Apollonius of Rhodes (Jason and Medea); it was also an important motif in the *Μεσσηνιακά* by Rhianus of Crete, where an adulterous Messenian woman caused the fall of the citadel of Ira; a girl who freed Aristomenes from slavery is given in marriage to the hero's son, whereas the hero himself marries the daughter of Damagenes. Other epic poems by Rhianus, such as *Ἀχαιικά*, *Ἡλιακά*, *Θεσσαλικά*, i.e. the Achaian, Eleian and Thessalian Tales respectively, were surely not devoid of local erotic legends either. However, the most proper vessel for such legends was on the one hand the objective Alexandrian elegy, and on the other – the epyllion. A little book by Virgil's Greek teacher [Parthenius of Nicaea] about unfortunate love affairs (περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων) provides a sufficient proof of this. The majority of those love stories had an unhappy or even tragic ending. Yet, there were some which ended happily, such as – in the first place – the famous elegy by Callimachus about Acontius and Kidyppe, adorning his *Ἀΐτια*. The fact that earlier this year was published my brief monograph on the Alexandrian poetry (*Poezya Aleksandryjska, próba charakterystyki*, in: *Sprawozdanie Dyrektora c. k. Gimnazjum Nowodworskiego czyli Św. Anny w Krakowie za rok szkolny 1905*) makes me skip the in-depth discussion of the erotic poetry from that period and of its forms. Suffice to remark here that – as long as the romantic epos and particularly the epyllion was produced – there was no room for the romance in prose. The epos was supplanted by the epyllion. The latter, just like the bucolic, already in Moschus and then – to a higher degree – in Bion degenerates into the ἐρωτύλον, μελύδριον, i.e. the Anacreontic in hexameters. The ausonian poet who – in the beginning of the 1st century BC – mourns over Bion's death and laments that καὶ τὸ μέλος τέθνακε καὶ ὤλετο Δωρὶς ἄοιδά, uses these words in reference to the death of not only the bucolic poetry, but also of the great Alexandrian poetry as a whole. From that period only the epigram survived, written by such authors as Antipater of Sidon, Meleager of Gadara, Archias of Antioch, Philodemus of Gadara, that means – by the whole circle of near-east Greeks and hellenised Semites.

It cannot be by pure accident that – from among the romancers – Chariton's birthplace is Aphrodisias in Caria, Jamblichus' – Syria, Heliodorus' – Syrian Emesa. Neither should it be attributed to mere chance that in all Greek romances the action takes place somewhere in Asia Minor, Far East and Egypt. None of them is located in Greece or Italy. Only Sicily is used by Chariton as the theatre

of events. Yet, his Syracusan tale is located mainly in Miletus; the main heroes of Antonius Diogenes' romance are from Tyre and return to Tyre; in the same city, as well as in Tarsus and Ephesus, are active the characters of the history of Apollonius. On the other hand, as a "far-away land" functions Cyrene and also Egypt. Ephesus gave name to the romance of Xenophon, who sends the pair of his heroes from Egypt to Sicily and to southern Italy. The only classical location in his romance is Rhodes, just as in Heliodorus – Delphi. However the latter immediately transfers the action to the outskirts of Ethiopia. Only Longus does not move beyond the isle of Lesbos. Achilles Tatius returns to Tyre. This Anatolian origin of many romancers and their focus on Anatolian shores, as well as their avoidance of classical locations, are indications of the fact that the fountainhead of the Greek romance was Asia Minor. It is there that Aristides of Miletus – at the beginning of the 1st century BC – collected some frivolous Milesian tales under the title *Μιλησιακά*; it is also there that – around the same time – the Asian rhetoricians were composing their romances.

ROHDE searches for the roots of the romance in the period as late as the overwhelming rule of Asianism during the reign of Hadrian and – pointing out to the hostility of sophists towards rhythmic poetry of all kind (pp. 357 ff.) – is of the opinion that romance was one of the rivals aiming at supplanting poetry. However, he does not take into account a gap of two centuries between the last Alexandrian bucolics or epyllia and Antonius Diogenes. The organic development and decline of literary genres, which are being continually substituted one for another, suggests to us that we should rather look back at the beginning of the 1st century BC. Although we do not have all the links connecting the founder of the Asianism, Hegesias of Magnesia (ca. 250 BC), and the sophists of Hadrian's period, yet we notice traces of Asianism in the authors of epigrams, such as Antipater of Sidon, Archias of Antioch and others. That at this period Greeks did not write epyllia anymore, may only indicate that they found new form for the old subject matter, or rather – that they borrowed it from historiographers. If the *Suda* uses the term "historians" with respect to Xenophon of Ephesus and his two namesakes, the authors of the *Βαβυλωνιακά* and *Κυπριακά*, he is simply following a tradition of including this literary genre into historiography. The affiliation between romances and historiography is signalled by the romancers themselves in the titles such as *Βαβυλωνιακά*, *Ἐφesiaκά*, *Αἰθιωπικά*, which only with the addition of the names of the loving couple, as e.g. τὰ κατὰ Ἄνθειαν καὶ Ἄβροκόμην, or τὰ περὶ Θεαγένην καὶ Χαρίκλειαν, become proper romance titles. Besides, the usage of historical figures as romance characters, like e.g. Ninus and Semiramis, or creating a pseudo-historical background, as is the case of the novels of Chariton or Antonius Diogenes, even more eloquently speak in favour of the thesis stating that romance did originate from historiography.

Obviously the ancestor of the romance itself was very romantic indeed. Ctesias of Cnidus, a physician at the court of Parysatis, the mother of Artaxerxes

Π and Cyrus the Younger, in his *Περσικά*, published around 390 BC, was very critical of the negligent treatment of sources by Herodotus and of his untruthfulness. However, what he himself allegedly transcribed from the supposedly vast royal archives, was no more than the old Ionian legend about Ninus, an Assyrian hero, conqueror of all Asia, and about the daughter of Derceto, a hetaira Semiramis, who as a wife of Ninus displayed no lesser wisdom than courage; and finally – about an effeminate debauchee Sardanapalus, who died as a hero. On top of that – later events, including those which he may have known from eyewitness account, were treated by him as a purely literary subject matter and used arbitrarily to add drama to various scenes and episodes. And so very justifiably the ancient critics called him ποιητής in the sense similar to Old Polish “wymysłek” [Eng. “taleteller”]. Xenophon, while writing his fictitious *Κύρου παιδεία*, did not even pretend to have used any Persian sources. He was just enjoying the privilege attributed to a philosopher-historian who – for paedagogical or hortatory reasons – is allowed to transmit his own thoughts and precepts set in historical background. If the dialogue by Antisthenes about the ideal (cynical) ruler – *Κύρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας* – was considered as belonging to philosophical literature, the *Cyrus* by Xenophon was treated by the Greeks as a historical work. Here a determining criterion was the historicity of certain figures and events, and – in the first place – the historical narration. A famous episode involving Pantheia and Abradatas is a mere imitation of erotic motives of this type, so cherished by the Ionian historians. E. SCHWARTZ recalls an eastern love story found in the work of the Alexandrian historian, Chares of Mytilene (fr. 37 MÜLLER; Athen. XIII, 575 B ff.):

Hystaspes had a brother named Zariadres. In the opinion of their compatriots they were sons of Aphrodite and Adonis. Hystaspes ruled over Media and the land bordering Media from down under, whereas Zariadres governed the land stretching from the Caspian gates up to the Tanais river. And Homartes who was king of the Marathi, beyond the Tanais, had a daughter named Odatis. About her it is recorded in histories that she saw Zariadres in a dream and fell in love with him, while he felt the same passion for her. And so they kept on longing for each other because of the imaginings of sleep. Odatis was the most beautiful woman in Asia, and Zariadres also was handsome. However when Zariadres declared to Homartes through messengers a desire to marry his daughter, Homartes would not agree to the match, because he lacked male offspring and so wished to give her to a male of his own household.

And then in this artificially simple style, modelled on Herodotus, Chares recounts how the king invited princes, friends and relatives from all parts of the land and organized a huge nuptial feast without announcing the identity of the bride-groom. When Odatis entered the room, her father informed her that this was her wedding and told her to offer a cup filled with wine to the one whom

she would choose to be her husband. The princess looked around and ran away in tears. She let Zariadres know about the upcoming wedding but he was not around. However, he did not disappoint his beloved. Having travelled day and night, he left his chariot in a secluded spot; and then, in company of his chariot-driver dressed in Scythian clothes, arrived at the entrance of the palace, where the weeping Odatis was slowly mixing wine in a cup. He stood before her and said: "Odatis, here I am according to your desire, I – Zariadres". Odatis recognized him as a man of her dreams, gave him the cup and let him drive her away in the chariot which had been hidden nearby. Slaves and servant maids, though aware of the princess' love affair, did not inform the king about the kidnapping; instead, they assured him that they knew nothing about her whereabouts.

This love affair is held in remembrance among the Asian barbarians who give it as an example to follow; they even picture this story in their temples and palaces and even in private dwellings. Also many princes bestow the name Odatis on their own daughters.

The eastern origin of this story is not the fruit of Chares' imagination, as is attested by analogous motifs from later Persian and Arabic tales. The Greeks got to know these when Alexander the Great opened for them the gates to mysterious eastern lands. And as ivy entwines a huge column, a fantastic legend wreathed itself around the heroic figure of the conqueror of East. His historian, Clitarchus of Colophon wrote his *Persica* in a "poetic" manner of Ctesias, a cynic Onesicritus of Aegina models his Alexander on Cyrus of Xenophon and presents him as an ideal king-philosopher. The marvels of Bactrian and Indian nature provide a very picturesque background to those "histories"; and cynic diatribes are put in the mouth of Indian sages, the *gymnosophistae*. Over those literary compositions the common folk preferred the "more authentic" letters from Alexander to his mother Olympia or to his tutor Aristotle. And finally – the Egyptian priests had their share in popularising the figure of Alexander at least in Egypt, when in order to add lustre and to legitimise his *diadochi*, they were intimating that Alexander was the son of Zeus Ammon, or rather of his priest Nectanebo, the last descendant of the Pharaohs.

When the Asiatic orators from the 1st century BC included in the programme of school exercises fictitious stories like the one about Zariadres and Odatis, they profited from the material collected and shaped by the aforementioned Ionian historians about the marvels of the East. From there comes this eastern scenery and eastern atmosphere of the preserved romances. The story about Odatis contained in the first place – contrasting characters (*gravis* Homartes vs. *levis* Zariadres), then – amorous yearning of lovers separated from each other (*desiderium*), an unexpected misfortune (Odatis is about to marry her relative) and a sudden joy (in the last moment a saviour turns out). One who got used to be dwelling on such topics at school, later also was keen on elaborating on them. In order to fulfil this

need the scope of the school exercises was widened. What if Homartes decided to pursue Zariadres? What if he waged war with the seducer or with his brother? Zariadres in Chares' work was the son of Aphrodite for a reason, which means that after several adventures she must have granted him a blissful reunion with Odatis.

That such origin of romances is probable, is confirmed by the fragments of romances published from the papyri, as we have mentioned at the outset. Some rhetorician chooses Ninus and Semiramis as his main characters. The convention of school declamation demands that the lovers be young and innocent. Therefore Semiramis, instead of being a prostitute, becomes a thirteen years old maiden who has not yet crossed the threshold of her chamber, and Ninus is a seventeen years old boy. He has just returned in triumph from some military expedition and – having fallen in love with his cousin – addresses her mother Derceto with a speech which is organised along all the principles of school rhetoric and in which he asks for permission to accelerate the wedding. His argument was that – according to Assyrian law – girls were not allowed to marry before the age of fifteen. But the laws of nature are much stronger. And thus – thirteen years old girls become mothers; boys at the age of fifteen do not only taste, but even enjoy the gifts of love. And he, mindful of the oath which he has sworn, despite many temptations, preserved his chastity intact. And now he neither clandestinely nor surreptitiously, but frankly and publicly, demands the hand of her who was promised to be his wife. Two years of waiting is a very long time, and very uncertain, especially for a warrior like him. So in case he eventually perishes on land or at sea, let at least a descendant remain of him. His aunt promises to aid him, while the maiden is supposed to conciliate Thambe, her aunt and Ninus' mother. Unfortunately she is not able to give a nice speech, especially when the topic is marriage. She blushes or grows pale in turn, stumbles in her speech and gets confused; and in the end – weeping profusely – puts her head on Thambe's lap. The latter realises what is going on, so she just showers her niece with kisses and assures her of her goodwill. The artificial chiasmus between the characters changes into parallelism. Both aunts get together and deliver their speeches (not preserved), which results in the wedding of the young lovers. The parallelism did not materialise immediately, because the shy maiden, who had been unable to pronounce the word "marriage", is more scared of its actual consumption. Yet the eloquence and persuasiveness of Ninus makes her overcome all such objections, so that – even if all this happens in wintertime – for the young couple it is a paradise on earth. Eros does not let Koros ("excess") in. Their bliss ends in spring when Ninus leads the expedition against the rebellious Armenians. Idyllic images are replaced by warlike accounts, like the march of 70,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry of the Assyrians and of Greek and Carian mercenaries with 150 elephants, the crossing of huge rivers and the passage through high mountain chains, the stationing of the army on the Armenian plane, the setting of the troops in the battle array, the speech of Ninus before the battle.

Here the fragment ends. In order to fill in what is missing, we should recollect how the author changed the traditional character traits of Semiramis. According to Ctesias (in Diodorus II 44 ff.; Justin. I 2) the hetaera married an Assyrian satrap Onues, who was in the camp of Ninus during the siege of Bactra. The siege was dragging on, so the officers brought their wives to camp. Semiramis was among them and it was due to her wise advice that the city was finally sacked. This did not escape the king's notice; he fell in love with her and took her as wife. It means that Ninus seduced somebody else's wife. The author who enjoys in character switches made her be kidnapped by some enamoured prince, probably during Ninus' absence. Having found out what had happened, Ninus sets off in pursuit of the seducer. After many adventures he regains his wife and here the romance ends.

The connection between the author and the Ionian historians, such as Ctesias, is clearly shown by the choice of the topic, whereas the influence of school oratory may be detected in speeches of which all fragments abound. The mention of Greek and Carian mercenaries within the army of Ninus, and especially of elephants, indicates that the author had some vague knowledge about the contingent of Egyptian mercenaries led by Psammetichus and about the tactical role of elephants in the army of the *diadochi*.

The Ninus romance fits perfectly the framework of the Ionian historiography, although traditional characters are modelled according to school conventions. The above mentioned episode from the eastern tale by Chares about the princess Odatis and the prince Zariadres has its counterpart in the fragments of the romance about Chione and Chrestus. The king addresses his council: The kingdom will be inherited by his future son-in-law. Therefore a thorough deliberation is needed before one is chosen as such. Thirty days are given for the reflection on this (fr. 1). Several members of the council would wish to win the hand of the princess. And so they deliberate which of them it should be. Apparently they are ready to kidnap Chione if the king decided to destine her to a stranger, for they are despised by the people because of their menacing and coward-like stance. Why would none of them ask openly for the princess' hand? Chione learns about it all from her mother (fr. 2). In the following passage (fr. 3) Chrestus, her long-time lover, suggests to her to flee with the aid of their common friend Megamedes. However the princess does not trust the latter anymore. Yet, since there is no other chance for her to escape and to live happily with her beloved, she decides to die together with him. And so the scene is set for further complications. The fulfillment of the father's plans is hindered both by his daughter's choice of old standing and also by the plot of the princes whose position at the royal court was threatened. Chrestus may have gained the king's favour by some heroic deed and thus may have won the princess' hand. If so, the princes would have conspired against him. The other possibility is that Chrestus kidnaps Chione with the help of Megamedes, who eventually turns out to be unworthy of his trust,

just as the princess suspected. At any rate, we may extrapolate the development of Chione's story from Ovid (*Met.* XI 301 ff.). A fourteen years old daughter of Daedalion, a girl of extraordinary beauty, is wooed by countless suitors. Among them are two gods. Hermes, having seen her, lulls her to sleep and becomes the father of Autolycus. Apollo kept watch until the nightfall and then approached the girl in the guise of an old woman, and thus became the father of Philammon. The mother, proud of her sons, insulted the goddess Diana and was killed by her. The author of the romance most probably replaced the gods by the humans and invented some other justification of the goddess' wrath. He also changed the ending by making the story take a favourable turn. But just like Semiramis is only a reflection of a traditional Assyrian queen, so Chione, as a heroine of the romance, is modelled upon a character of some Alexandrian epyllion.

The same attitude towards the tradition can be detected in the fragments containing the story of Parthenope and Metiochus. According to the mythographic tradition (Eustathius ad Dionys. *Perieg.* 358 f.) a beautiful girl named Parthenope, impervious to amorous advances of countless suitors, wished to preserve her virginity. This apparently provoked the anger of Aphrodite, who aroused in the girl's heart a fierce passion for a Phrygian Metiochus. In order to escape her heart's command, Parthenope cut her hair, disfigured herself and eloped to Campania, where Dionysus made her his priestess and – after her death – granted her immortality. Parthenope was also one of those figures, whose traits of character were reversed by the romancers. Lucian (*De saltat.* 2) lists Parthenope together with Phaedra and Rhodope as γύναιον ἔρωτικὸν μαχλότατον. He also mentions Metiochus (*Pseudol.* 25), along with Ninus and Achilles, as a heroic figure. It seems that the romancers transferred the motif of sexual indifference from Parthenope to him and made of Parthenope a voluptuous seductress. It is surely not insignificant that a different tradition (Eustath. *loc. cit.*) counted her among the Sirens. The above mentioned jugglery is confirmed by a surviving fragment, in which a certain stranger pronounces a conventional praise of Eros, similar to speeches delivered by Plato's banqueters. Metiochus, who happened to be present there, declares that even if he himself has not yet fallen in love, the falsity of mythological eulogies of Eros may be shown on the basis of pure logic. Philosophy and physiology demonstrate that Eros is merely an intellectual agitation (κίνημα διανοίας), caused by excessively good life and nourishment (ὑπὸ τρυφῆς γιγνόμενον) and maintained or increased by the contacts with the object of this agitation (ὑπὸ συνηθείας αὐξόμενον). Parthenope standing nearby overhears these remarks and is glad that Metiochus has not yet experienced love. Apparently she is in love with him. It is not hard to figure out what happened next, even if the fragment stops here. Eros punishes the insensible youth by bringing Parthenope before his eyes and inciting in him a fierce passion for her. Before the wedding or soon after, certain impediments occur which cause the separation of the lovers, who only after many sufferings are reunited.

We mentioned at the outset that the dating of the papyri enables us to place the Ninus romance in the 1st century AD. The same applies to the romance about Metiochus. However, nothing goes against an earlier dating. Actually a very strong connection between these romances and the Alexandrian historiography and poetry would advocate for placing them at the earliest stage of the development of the genre, i.e. in the 1st century BC. As we learn from GRENFELL'S papyrus from Fayum, the romance of Chariton was known in manuscript form in the 2nd century AD. Its relation to the romance by Iamblichus (dated at 170 AD) indicates that it should be dated no later than the beginning of the 2nd century AD. We will show below that the 2nd century AD was a period of the most intense development of this literary genre.

Just like some time earlier Hecataeus of Miletus and Herodotus, so also Chariton begins his tale about Chaereas and Callirhoe (*Τὰ περὶ Χαϊρέαν καὶ Καλλιρόην*, ed. J.Ph. D'ORVILLE, Amsterdam ¹1750; 144 pp. of text; 788 pp. of commentary; 3 vols.) with a self-introduction: "I Chariton of Aphrodisias, a clerk of the attorney Athenagoras, shall relate the story which occurred in Syracuse". This remark used to be taken as an allegory, in view of which Chariton named himself after Charites in order to underline the charm of his novel. The city of his birth was sacred to Aphrodite, the goddess of love, because he writes about love. The name of Athenagoras was supposed to recall the historical background on which we will elaborate later on. But does the mention of himself as a lawyer's secretary have also a hidden meaning? Yes, Chariton is fond of court-room scenes and legal speeches. All these clever assumptions turned out to be futile with the publication of inscriptions found in Aphrodisias in Caria. Among them we find Χαρίτων (*CIG* 2846) and Ἀθηναγόρας (e.g. *CIG* 2782, 2783). Against such evidence there is no room for any conjectures. Chariton was really born in the city of Aphrodisias, he was writing indictments on behalf of his boss, and in his time of leisure he was composing romances.

Hermocrates, a Syracusan *strategos*, the victor over the Athenians (obviously in 413 BC), had a daughter named Callirhoe, whose exquisite beauty attracted countless suitors from Sicily, Italy and Epirus. Clearly she did not favour any of them, as Eros was planning a very peculiar union for her. To sum up – a political rival of Hermocrates, Aristo (who in Thucydides is called Athenagoras and who is his adversary between 413 and 408 BC; Chariton had already mentioned his own employer, the latter's namesake, so he changed the name of the *strategos*) had a very handsome son Chaereas whom Eros wished to use as a token of reconciliation between the two hostile clans. Accordingly – when Callirhoe was going with her mother to the site of the feast of Aphrodite – Eros made Chaereas appear on her path after he left the palaestra. One mutual glimpse sufficed to kindle a fiery passion in the young couple's hearts. Upon his return home, Chaereas sensed a deep wound in his heart and – simultaneously – the maiden addressed a prayer to Aphrodite: "Give me, Mistress, for a husband that man whom you

have just shown me!” Since then, both were spending sleepless nights and days filled with yearning. The girl remains silent. The boy discloses his secret to his father, who does not like at all the perspective of his son being linked with the daughter of his political foe. Chaereas, devoured by the fever of love, stops visiting the palaestra; his friends are seeking the reason for that and – upon finding out – are trying to find some help for him at the people’s assembly. The head of the assembly is Hermocrates. People implore him to grant his daughter’s hand to Chaereas, and so he as a good democrat yields to the popular will. Immediately, the *prytaneis* and the people follow the *strategos* to his house, chanting wedding songs on their way there. The frightened maiden starts weeping and then, when she learns from her nurse that it is the people who chose a husband for her, she faints. However, a moment later, Chaereas, already aware of the happy outcome, wakes her up with kisses. Soon the wedding ceremony is celebrated with the participation of the whole populace, similar to that of Peleus and Thetis in bygone days. But instead of Eris, it is Φθόνος that turns out here.

At this point of the story an Alexandrian epyllion would have ended. A romancer however introduces a new intrigue. The suitors, frustrated in their expectations, form a coalition in the name of common hatred and debate on how to take vengeance on Chaereas, who so effortlessly took such a treasure away from them. The son of the tyrant from Rhegium suggests that they should interrupt the wedding ceremony by force. More favourably though is received the speech of the tyrant of Acragas who takes it upon himself to split the happy couple by using ruse and stirring jealousy. Chaereas indeed seemed to be very prone to suspicion, for already on the second day after the wedding, having noticed the remnants from the overnight partying (κῶμος), abandoned by the suitors in front of his wife’s house, he made a terrible scene, which only through kisses and caresses was eventually appeased. And on this weak point of Chaereas’ character the sly Acragantian decides to base his scheme. He tells one of his followers, a handsome parasite, to seduce Callirhoe’s maid and to arrange an overnight date in her room. At the same time he sends to the palaestra, where Chaereas used to practice, a perfidious old man who is supposed to inform the young man of the alleged infidelity of his wife. The old man promises to Chaereas that he would give him proofs of that, and then he convinces him to announce to his wife that he must depart in the evening. After that he should hide somewhere near his house, so that he may notice the arrival of his wife’s lover. And as a matter of fact he sees a man, very elegantly dressed, who enters surreptitiously through the door which lay open for him. It was the Acragantian’s parasite whom the maid let in. Having entered he hides behind the door and then slips away into the darkness of the night, after Chaereas, mad with jealousy, darted into his wife’s chamber. Callirhoe was still awake; she was sitting on the edge of her bed, longing for her husband. Upon hearing his footsteps, she rushed joyfully to greet him. His response, however, was a kick below the breasts. Callirhoe fell dead on the floor.

It was impossible to resuscitate her. The following day, however, the whole truth is revealed. The maid under torture confessed everything. Chaereas in despair would have committed suicide, had not his friend Polycharmus intervened. Yet, he accuses himself of murder before the people of Syracuse and asks for death penalty, but due to the intercession of the dead girl's father he is declared innocent. The burial of the victim of his jealousy is celebrated with great pomp; piles of nice dresses and of jewellery are enclosed with her in the tomb.

The whole scene was observed by a group of robbers, marauding in the area under the command of Theron, who decided to pillage the tomb. Callirhoe, while locked in the grave, recovers her senses, for the kick which she had received only plunged her into a coma; now she is fearfully expecting death from hunger. Suddenly, she realizes that somebody is opening the tomb. A robber, upon seeing a resurrected corpse, runs away, and so Theron himself takes possession of all the goods and of the maiden, for whom he could expect a non-negligible ransom. And even if at the council of robbers some voices were raised with the suggestion that the girl should be brought back to Hermocrates in return for some rescue fee, they had no courage to stand in front of the *strategos* with their guilty conscience. And so they boarded the ship, which they themselves had prepared beforehand, and put to sea, leaving the shores of Sicily behind. They sailed past Athens and continued towards Miletus in Ionia. They landed not far away from the city. At some point Theron noticed a noble man, attended by a large suite and plunged in deep sorrow and mourning, who, as he found out from a passer-by, was the most prominent of the Milesians, named Dionysius, distraught after the recent loss of his wife. The passer-by was Leonas, a steward of Dionysius. Theron told him that he has a beautiful and well educated slave-girl from Sybaris for sale, whom he purchased from her jealous mistress. She might provide solace for Dionysius. Leonas, overwhelmed by joy, invites the merchant to his place. After a banquet they appoint a meeting place, where Leonas is supposed to take over the girl in exchange for a recompense for Theron. The latter makes Callirhoe put on a nice dress under the pretext that he wants to leave her under the tutelage of his friends, so that she does not have to be exposed to toils and dangers of the travel to Lycia. Callirhoe asks for a permission to keep just one ring and awaits her fate. For the time being Leonas offered only the down-payment, one silver talent. The balance was to be paid by Dionysius himself. Theron is glad that – without attracting the attention of the authorities – he earned at least the portion of the whole sum, so he hands down the slave-girl and hastily sails away. Leonas entrusts the beautiful girl to Plango, wife of Phocas, the administrator of the same master's estates.

At dawn Leonas rushes to meet Dionysius; he tells him about the purchase and asks for money. Having received it, he goes to the spot where he was meant to encounter Theron, but does not find him there or anywhere else. He suspects that the merchant sold him a kidnapped slave-girl, but in spite of this he decides

to keep her for his master. So he asks Dionysius to come to Phocas' estate and shows him in the nearby temple of Aphrodite the slave-girl whom he had purchased. Dionysus and the whole populace alike take her for the goddess herself. After this first encounter Dionysius is unable to remain calm. He knows that he cannot permit himself to fall in love with a slave-girl who on top of that was stolen from somebody else, but he is out of control of his passion. Therefore, he returns to the temple of Aphrodite and asks the slave-girl about her pedigree. She begs him to show the magnanimity of a Greek lord and requests from him the preservation of her secret. She has never been a slave; never been to Sybaris. Cruel fates brought her to Miletus. Dionysius the more eagerly takes care of Phocas' estate. One day Plango came to Callirhoe and implored her to appeal to angry Dionysius for leniency on behalf of her and her husband. Callirhoe obliges, so that Dionysius – due to her intercession – forgives the alleged wrongdoers. The whole thing was only a comedy, improvised by Plango. In the end, Dionysius gives Callirhoe a kiss.

That kiss was a drop which made the cup run over. The alternative for him was either to possess Callirhoe or perish. He was saved from perishing by a lucky incident. While Callirhoe was bathing, Plango noticed a strange modification of her body. The girl's marriage – although short-lived – did not remain fruitless. Callirhoe, distraught by this discovery, asks Plango for help, for she supposedly would not wish her child to be the offspring of a slave-girl, and thus – to live in slavery. Plango promises to help her, but actually is very slow with providing any aid; instead, she arouses in her a pity for the fruit of her womb. Finally she gives her the following advice: If she marries Dionysius, her son would pass for a progeny of the leader of the Ionians, and would become his heir. Callirhoe hesitates; she wants to consult her husband, whose effigy is displayed on her ring. Chaereas appears to her in a dream and entrusts to her the care of their son, which she interprets as his benediction to accept Plango's advice. She draws the same conclusion from her son's silence, and finally convinces herself of the rightfulness of her decision. Therefore she asks Plango, her protectress and temptress, to inform the master that she is ready to marry him.

Dionysius was already on the brink of starving himself to death, when Plango told him about Callirhoe's willingness to marry him. He ceased to consider this union as a *mésalliance*, since he has learned that she was a daughter of the *strategos* of Syracuse, Hermocrates to whom even the Great King of Persia sends gifts in recognition of him being the victor over the Athenians. Thus a very sumptuous wedding ceremony is held. Seven months later Callirhoe crowns her husband's joy with a son. The author remarks, "What happened next, I will tell later. But first I shall relate what was going on at the same time in the city of Syracuse" (III 2). Chaereas, while making offerings at his wife's grave, noticed that the tomb was open. In panic he rushes to the city. People arrive at the tomb and find out that the jewellery was stolen and the corpse disappeared. Chaereas suspects

in his distress that some god must have snatched his wife to heavens. Much more sober Hermocrates immediately issues the order to seek for the tomb-robbers. Chaereas sets sails across the Ionian sea and hits upon a pirate ship, whose whole crew turns out to be dead. On the board he finds precious goods stolen from Callirhoe's grave and discovers one man alive, hiding in some niche, who explains that he was held captive by the pirates. Because of divine wrath the ship could not put in at any port, so that – due to lack of drinking water – everybody died. Only he survived, apparently on account of his probity and piety. Upon returning to Syracuse, Chaereas gives an account of his expedition before the people's assembly, where Theron also repeats his fictitious story. For he was that alleged passenger, miraculously saved from death, who actually owed his life to the fact that he hid a water container from his companions. Yet, at the assembly a certain fisherman recognizes him as one who was lurking around the harbour on the day of Callirhoe's burial. On the order of Hemocrates, Theron is put to torture and reveals everything up to the sale of Callirhoe to Dionysius. Chaereas immediately sets sail on a trireme to Miletus, where during his initial prayer in the temple of Aphrodite he notices a golden statue of his wife, and then learns of her whereabouts from a priestess. Before Chaereas decided what he should do next, Phocas – having realized at what danger is exposed his master's happiness – informed a Persian contingent which was stationed nearby that a pirate ship put in at the shore near Miletus. During the night the Persians attack the companions of Chaereas and some of them they kill and some take prisoner. Among the captives were Chaereas and Polycharmus, whom the Persians hand over to Mithridates, the satrap of Caria. In Miletus a rumour is spread that all the strangers were killed. Callirhoe deduces from the accounts by the priests that her husband did visit the temple; now she is convinced that he is dead, and so with the permission of Hermocrates she erects on the sea shore a cenotaph for Chaereas, similar to the one she herself had in Syracuse. The aforementioned Mithridates saw her once making some offerings at the grave and, naturally, fell madly in love with her. Yet, it seemed to him to be a very risky enterprise to seduce the wife of the most prominent Milesian, a friend of the Persian king. However, fate willed it that he was given an unexpected opportunity. A group of slaves, among whom was our pair of Syracusan friends, rose in revolt against their guards. The revolt was stamped out and the culprits were sentenced to death by hanging. Polycharmus – while on his way to the place of execution – heaved a sigh: "It is because of you, Callirhoe, that we suffer so. You are responsible for all this". Upon overhearing it, a guard suspected that the rebel mentioned the name of some fellow mutineer or maybe of the revolt's firebrand. Therefore he brought Polycharmus to Mithridates to whom the captive revealed the cause of his moaning. Immediately Mithridates demanded that Chaereas be conveyed to him, and then, having expressed great sympathy for him, the son of heroic Hermocrates, he promised to offer his help in the recovery of Callirhoe. The only thing which

Chaereas was meant to do was to write a letter to her, announcing the upcoming salvation. Mithridates himself writes another letter and assures Callirhoe of his help. Obviously, he did not intend to recover Callirhoe for Chaereas, but for himself. However, both letters are intercepted by Dionysius who considers the information about Chaereas being alive as a pure invention and a stratagem of Mithridates. Therefore, through the satrap of a neighbouring region, he sends to the king a complaint against Mithridates. The king summons the accused and the accuser together with his wife to Babylon. Initially Mithridates plans to openly rebel against the king and sever all ties with him. Yet, wise calculation prevails, and so he goes in company of Chaereas to Babylon. On his part, Dionysius is reluctant to take his wife on such a long trip, but finally decides to abide by the king's order.

And now (books V and VI), Chariton gives a summary of the up-to-date events and talks at length about the enormous impression which Callirhoe's beauty was making on the barbarians during her travel to Babylon. On the day of the trial the whole city in great excitement gathers in front of the court. After a brief debate (whose account betrays the authorship of an attorney's secretary), Mithridates provides a living proof of his veracity: he presents Chaereas before the jury. Callirhoe is greatly distressed; Dionysius even more so. A fierce dispute takes place between the two husbands. For the time being, the king decides only to grant pardon to Mithridates, while the quarrel between the two husbands of Callirhoe is to be resolved at a later trial. The "cause of the quarrel" is transferred to the harem and left to the care of Statira, the king's wife. However, the king – who already during the hearing fell in love with Callirhoe – keeps on postponing the date of the trial and in the meantime tries in vain to seduce Callirhoe, using his faithful eunuch as a go-between. The resulting delay of the trial is no less annoying to Dionysius than it is to Chaereas.

Suddenly the news of a rebellion in Egypt arrive (there is no historical record of any such mutiny during the reign of Artaxerxes II). The king gathers the army and – having taken the whole harem including Callirhoe – goes to war against the rebels. In this expedition he is joined by Dionysius to whom he promised the return of his wife after the campaign. That is at least the information which Chaereas receives. Dejected by these tidings, he contacts the self-proclaimed king of the Egyptian rebels and offers him his services. The Egyptian gives to him – the son of the victor over the Athenians – the command over the fleet. In this capacity Chaereas defeats the Persian fleet and then conquers Tyre and Aradus. There he captures the whole royal harem with Statira and Callirhoe. During the distribution of the captives he learns that one of them – with her face veiled – sought refuge in the temple of Aphrodite, where she declared that she would not let anybody abduct her alive. Chaereas decides to find out who she is.

At this point (VIII 1), the author remarks that in his opinion his last book should be the most pleasurable one for the readers, since everything that until

then was dark and gloomy will lighten and brighten up. In the temple's entrance Chaereas recognizes Callirhoe. Soon after he is informed of the defeat of the Egyptian king. Thus he does no longer have to fight against the Persian ruler. He sends back to him Statira with all her servant-maids and commends himself to his graces. Then he takes the fleet to Syracuse, because his Egyptian companions do not want to part with him. When Statira was about to depart, Callirhoe gave her a secret note for Dionysius in which she was asking him to care for her son, without admitting that it is Chaereas' child. Neither did she reveal to Chaereas the existence of that child. Statira commended to the king the magnanimity of Chaereas. Dionysius found solace in Callirhoe's goodwill as well as in the son left under his care. In Syracuse Chaereas relates at the assembly his adventures and then demands that his Egyptian companions be granted Syracusan citizenship. This demand was accepted. Callirhoe goes to Aphrodite's shrine where she expresses her gratitude to the goddess for her care and prays for happy life and simultaneous death for herself and her husband.

"And that is what I wrote about Callirhoe", adds the author, and it is quite right that he mentions only the heroine's name in the end. For only she contrives any plans and carries them into effect; she displays calm judgement in her dealings with the pirates and shows quick wits in her relations with Dionysius by abandoning him in a very tactful way and leaving him the son whom he truly believed to be his own. The character of Chaereas, which from the very beginning was presented (in a rather cumbersome manner) as marred by suspiciousness and impetuosity, arouses our antipathy in the scene of him brutally kicking his wife, which action we are unable to forgive him, even if through six books he is weeping and moaning and keeps declaring his readiness to commit suicide. His metamorphosis into a heroic warrior, a worthy son of Hermocrates, occurs so rapidly (book VII), that we can hardly identify him as the former cry-baby, tutored by wise Polycharmus. Just as the main characters, so also the other figures in this novel are sketched in a very unsound and irresolute manner. Only the leader of the band of robbers, Theron, and the satrap Mithridates, as well as the procuress Plango, have some distinct traits in their perfidious wickedness. On the contrary, the two noble rivals of Chaereas – Dionysius and Artaxerxes – are strangely soft-mannered and humane. The Greek may even be considered as no less than a refined gentleman. He tortures himself incessantly with qualms of conscience that he fell in love with a slave-girl, is scared of a *mésalliance* and is beaming with joy at the thought of having as wife the daughter of Hermocrates. He is not aware of the fact that he actually induces her into bigamy. The same applies to queen Statira who abstains from persecuting her rival, even as she knows about her husband's passion for her. Actually, it is quite the opposite – she takes great care of her. The author, who plunged all individuals in the atmosphere of good-natured kindness, was not prone – or rather had no talent – to draw wicked characters. Mild nervousness and tearfulness, their profound sighs and

sentimental monologues attest to the author's gift of lyricism. However, this lyric component does not go beyond the convention of school oratory. On any given occasion the author produces well-constructed speeches or rather declamations. As for the epic component, he offers nothing but banalities and commonplaces.

His narrative is straightforward with no digressions or episodes. The structure of the whole, with repeated summaries of previous events, is clear but unoriginal. The formulaic expressions like: "Enough of that. Now I would like to talk about..." indicate a serious inability to compose a coherent work. The psychology is limited to a catalogue of sentiments and emotions, e.g. – the resurrected Callirhoe hears some noise at the entrance to her tomb (I 9): "She was overcome by all kinds of emotions – fear, joy, sadness, astonishment, hope and disbelief". Or – Dionysius reads the letters intercepted from Mithridates (IV 5): "He was filled by various sentiments – confidence, despair, trepidation, incredulity". And in each such instance it is the same.

Where there are no well-drawn characters, where sentiments and feelings are not properly expressed, there the narrative must rely on external events and on chance. And actually, the goddess of chance, Τύχη, is above all events and characters; it is she to whom the miserable heroes address their complaints. In relation to her the other deities play a secondary role. Even if Aphrodite is quite frequently an addressee of prayers, her own and her son Eros' activity is barely noticeable. It seems that it is the fault of the author who – at the very beginning – failed to underline the motif of Callirhoe's imperviousness to the advances of the suitors and of her priding in her beauty and thus offending Aphrodite. Chaereas alike drew upon himself the wrath of Eros. The two offended deities united them, but they did so with intent of separating them instantly and leaving them at the mercy of Tyche. Only upon the completion of the penance, the deities would anew become favourable towards them.

Chariton's romance was a pretty early specimen of this genre. This may explain it being passed under silence in ancient times and in Byzantine period. However, it had a significant influence on the development of the genre as a model and a storehouse of motifs for all the authors of the preserved romances. Even the number of eight books, taken from Thucydides whose style in the first place Chariton imitates (see C.G. COBET, *Mnemosyne* VIII 1859, p. 251), was meaningful, even if it was the multiplication of eight, for the followers of Chariton – while imitating him – try to surpass or outbid him.

This in the first place was the case of a Syrian author, Iamblichus, whose lost romance entitled *Τῶν περὶ Σινωνίν καὶ Ροδάνην Βαβυλωνιακῶν λόγοι 15'* (XVI) was summarized by Photius in the 94th codex of his *Library*. Its conventional subject matter was completely exhausted already in book XVI. Therefore the figures of XXXV or XXXVI books, as provided by the *Suda*, must be faulty. Just like Chariton at the beginning of his work, so also Iamblichus talks about himself midway through the romance where – in the midst of the passage devoted

to Babylonian sorcery – he remarks that he has the first-hand knowledge of this subject, for he himself is a Babylonian sorcerer (ch. 10, Photius). He lived during the reign of the Armenian ruler Soaemus, a former Roman senator and consul (obviously – titular). Cassius Dio (LXX, vol. IV, p. 171, ed. DINDORF) relates that the aforementioned Soaemus was installed on the throne by Lucius Verus after the completion of the famous war with the Parthians which lasted four years. Supposedly this war and its course were predicted to the Romans by Iamblichus. A marginal note in the Bessarion codex (A) of the *Library* of Photius, probably based on the integral text, offers some additional information to the above referred data, shedding light on the Babylonian erudition of Iamblichus. The emperor Trajan after the sack of Babylon (115/116 AD), captured a highly educated sorcerer, who was then purchased by the Syrian tutors of Iamblichus and appointed a caretaker of the boy. And it was he who taught Iamblichus both the language and the sorcery of the Babylonians, and also told him the Babylonian story of Sinonis and Rhodanes. This last detail seems to be merely an invention of the commentator, since the content of Iamblichus' tale fits perfectly the conventional pattern of a romance.

Chariton was talking about the amorous passion of a barbarian ruler for the wife of his subject. The same motif is used by Iamblichus as the axis of his novel, though he replaces the lenient Artaxerxes by the cruel Babylonian king Garmus, who was infatuated with beautiful Sinonis, young wife of Rhodanes. She scorns his enticements; therefore he gives the order to put her in golden chains and to crucify Rhodanes. And while Chaereas was saved by the mention of the name of Callirhoe, Rhodanes is rescued from imminent death by Sinonis who arranges their escape. The king sends two eunuchs, Sacas nad Damas, on pursuit. Damas discovers some vestiges leading to a meadow where Rhodanes unearthed a hidden treasure, but there is no trace of the two fugitives. The only thing that Damas finds there is the wreath of Sinonis which he sends to the king as proof that he is at the couple's heels. Poisonous bees enable the couple to avoid being captured by the pursuing soldiers led by Damas, who were trying to penetrate into the cave where the two were hiding. However, the fact that they swallowed the honey of those poisonous bees makes them lose conscience upon leaving the cave. The soldiers are convinced that the two are dead; therefore – according to a Babylonian custom – they cover the corpses with clothes, loafs of bread and pieces of meat. Damas sends to the king the braid of Sinonis which he found in the cave. The ravens, fighting for meat on the allegedly dead bodies, make them regain consciousness. So they collect all the offerings left by the soldiers of Damas and – having packed them on two asses which were grazing on a nearby pasture – run away, until they arrive at an inn. The inn-keeper was killed that night by his brother, but the suspicion for this murder falls on the two arrivals. Eventually the murderer admits his guilt, so Rhodanes – having picked up some venom which was used by the murderer – flees with his wife,

until they stop at the house of a cannibal robber, whom the soldiers of Damas have just rounded up. The house is set on fire. Rhodanes kills the stolen asses, throws the carcasses on the flames in order to make a path by which they both escape. The soldiers take them for the ghosts of the dead and let them pass by. In their flight they hit upon a burial ceremony of a girl whom some sorcerer restores to life. The sorcerer foretells to Rhodanes that he will become a king. The future ruler, though, is for the time being happy that he and his wife may take a rest in an empty tomb of the girl and may refresh themselves with the burial offerings. They also decide to keep the clothes of the resurrected girl. Yet, these very clothes were the reason why they are taken for tomb robbers, arrested and brought before the judge called Saraechus the Just. Saraechus decides that the couple should be sent over as a gift to king Garmus. Therefore Rhodanes determines to poison himself and his wife with the venom he had picked up at the inn. Very timely, however, a faithful slave-girl submitted to him and to his wife a soporific, so that against their will they are brought when sleeping to Babylon. They wake up on the outskirts of the city. Rhodanes throws himself on the sword and gets badly wounded. Saraechus inquires about the reason for this gesture and – having learned the story of the couple – resolves to keep them away from the wrath of the king; and so he conveys them to the island of Aphrodite, situated where the Tigris and Euphrates join up.

A priestess of Aphrodite had two sons – Euphrates and Tigris, very much resembling Rhodanes, and a daughter Mesopotamia, a double of Sinonis. Tigris passed away not long before, so the priestess considers the newly arriving Rhodanes as her resurrected son who was accompanied by Persephone on his way back from the underworld, for she takes Sinonis for that goddess. Rhodanes had already recovered from his wounds, when Damas learned of his whereabouts and of the protection of Saraechus. Damas arrests Saraechus and sends a doctor with a letter to the priestess, in which he requests from her the immediate return of the runaways. However, the doctor drowns while traversing the river on the back of a camel. Rhodanes finds the letter, hidden inside the ear of the castaway camel, and so he runs away together with his wife. Then he liberates Saraechus, who joins them in their flight. Damas arrived too late to find the fugitives on the island, yet, upon hearing a priest addressing Euphrates by the name of Rhodanes, as he was not able to distinguish between the two look-alikes, Damas seized Euphrates and told the king of his capture. In the meantime Mesopotamia ran away in order to escape the lot destined for Sinonis.

The fugitive threesome put up in the house of a man whose daughter – with her hair cut short after the recent loss of her husband – is asked to give the golden necklace of Sinonis in gage to a goldsmith. The latter recognizes it as his own work and is convinced that the girl with short hair is Sinonis. He decides to keep an eye on her and informs Damas of his discovery. The girl runs away from her pursuers and hides in an apparently empty house, where – as it turns out – a slave

is murdering his lover and then is taking his own life. Stained with blood, the girl flees from there and – when back home – recounts to her father the incident with the goldsmith. The lovers decide to look for some other hideout. When they leave, Sinonis notices traces of blood on Rhodanes' lips. The reason for this was that Rhodanes – upon their departure – planted a kiss on the lips of the blood-stained daughter of their host. Sinonis suspects that this kiss was only one of many instances of Rhodanes' infidelity, and so makes him a terrible scene of jealousy (like Chaereas to Callirhoe) and goes back to the house of the adulterous girl, intending to punish her. On her way there she is invited to stay at a rich debauchee's place, whom she kills overnight while fending off his advances. The slaves of the victim capture her and send her to the king. The king has already learnt from the goldsmith's letter that Sinonis had been found. Therefore he issues the edict announcing the liberation of all prisoners. Accordingly, the murderer of that debauchee was also set free. However Mesopotamia and Euphrates are despatched by Sacas to the king as Sinonis and Rhodanes respectively.

In the meantime, inside the aforementioned house, the hound of Rhodanes found the bodies of the slave and his lover and ate their flesh to the bones. The father of Sinonis, who happened to arrive at that scene, recognized the hound of his son-in-law, so he killed and buried the beast and then – having placed on the grave the inscription saying: "Here rests beautiful Sinonis" – hung himself on the spot. Soon after Rhodanes arrives at this place in search of his wife. Having read the inscription on the grave, he wounded himself and with his own blood wrote on the wall: "And also handsome Rhodanes". When he was about to commit suicide, suddenly appears the blood-stained girl – so ill-fatedly kissed by Rhodanes – and informs him that Sinonis is alive. Then she snatches the sword from Rhodanes and the noose from Saraechus and goes back with them to her father's place. Upon their return, when the girl and wounded Rhodanes happened to be alone in some chamber, jealous Sinonis bursts inside and attacks with the sword her alleged rival. Rhodanes prevents the murder, so Sinonis runs away exclaiming: "Feel invited today to my wedding with Garmus!"

Meanwhile Garmus had already realized that the couple sent to him was not genuine, so he ordered to kill them both. The executioner, though, fell in love with Mesopotamia and handed her over to the Egyptian queen, Berenice, who took great care of the girl. In revenge Garmus declared war against the queen. Euphrates also avoided death somehow, as did Saraechus who – after being captured – was supposed to be crucified on the same meadow on which Rhodanes had the other day discovered a treasure, but instead, he bribes the mercenaries of Garmus, the Alani, who were escorting him, and then – having become their king – goes to war against Garmus and defeats him decisively. However, before all this happened, Rhodanes is to be crucified in the presence of Garmus. During the execution Sacas delivers a letter to the king with the news about the upcoming marriage of Sinonis and the Syrian king. And as was the case with Dionysius and Artaxerxes, similarly

here – Rhodanes is set free and is supposed to fight on the side of Garmus, so that in case of victory he might recover his wife. And although Garmus gave secret orders to kill Rhodanes after a victorious campaign, yet, those orders could not be carried out, because – before Rhodanes defeated the Syrians and recovered his wife – Saraechus overthrew Garmus and then handed the Babylonian kingdom over to the conqueror of Syria upon his return from battle.

Into this bizarre story of persecutions and flights, Iamblichus inserted numerous episodes of various nature – antiquarian, as e.g. his discourse on different sorts of sorcery, ethnological and novelistic. And so the tale of the suitors of Mesopotamia, daughter of a priestess of Aphrodite (ch. 8, Phot.), has its counterparts in eastern sagas. Aphrodite must have played in the adventures of the lovers a function similar to that which she played in – e.g. – Chariton. Yet, in the concise summary by Photius there is no mention of it. Neither are we able to deduce from that epitome what was the main thread of the story; the only thing we can see there is a hotchpotch of various adventures.

Many surviving excerpts (in the *Erotici scriptores Graeci* ed. by HERCHER) suggest a great popularity of Iamblichus in Byzantium. Having read this romance Photius commented that it is a pity that so beautiful style and such compositional skill were wasted for this childish tomfoolery (παίγνια καὶ πλάσματα), and he lamented that Iamblichus did not choose some more weighty subject matter (σπουδαῖα πράγματα). Most probably Iamblichus did not treat too seriously his Babylonian traditions. At any rate, his work enjoyed great popularity, so that as late as in the 17th century AD he found an imitator of his work, namely Philip von Zesen, the author of the *African Sophonisbe*, modelled on the Sophonisbe by Mademoiselle de Scudéri.

No less famous than the Babylonian, or rather more so, in Christian era was the Egyptian sorcery, which was introduced into the romance by Antonius Diogenes, the author of 24 books (triple Chariton) of the *Incredible Wonders Beyond Thule* (Τῶν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπίστων λόγοι κδ'). The very title indicates that the antiquarian and ethnological content of Iamblichus is replaced here by paradoxography, which was so abundantly represented in the Alexandrian epoch. Photius, to whom we owe (cod. 166) the outline of this work, states clearly (ch. 11, Phot.) that Antonius Diogenes referred to ancient authors whose works he had laboriously excerpted. Some idea about this type of literature is provided by *True History* of Lucian, although we should not (as Photius and ROHDE do) consider this text to be a parody of Antonius. Lucian only pokes fun at fantastic travel tales. Had he meant Diogenes, he would have been obliged to introduce the motif of a pair of lovers. And the occurrence of certain common elements here and there may easily be explained by the fact that Lucian parodies the authors whom Antonius was also using as models.

The function of a persecutor Garmus is here taken over by the Egyptian sorcerer Paapis, while the role of a protector Saraechus – by Astraeus, a Pythagorean.

The persecuted pair is not a married couple, but a pair of siblings. They are called Mantinias and Dercillis. An Arcadian named Deinias met them in Thule where he stopped with a group of friends, in whose company he was travelling in search of adventures. At the time of this encounter the two siblings were in a bizarre state – during the day they were dead, while at night they were brought back to life. Deinias fell in love with Dercillis, who had just the night-time at her disposal for making various acquaintances and for flirting. She explained to him the cause of her half-death. The two siblings lived with their parents in Tyre, where one day they were visited by an Egyptian priest Paapis, who convinced the brother and sister to give some soporific powder to their parents. Having swallowed it, the parents died, so the unaware poisoners had to flee in order to avoid being held responsible for this act. After visiting Rhodes, Crete and Etruria, they reached the land of the Cimmerians, where Dercillis descended to Hades and learned from her deceased servant named Myrto the secrets of the underworld. The two siblings are constantly persecuted by Paapis. In the land of the Cimmerians they split, so that Dercillis continues her journey with her lover Ceryllus and a mysterious companion named Astraeus, a disciple of Pythagoras. Astraeus protects her from all dangers, yet, he is unable to make Ceryllus avoid death on account of a pristine guilt which he was bearing. Through the land of the Iberians, the Celts, the Aquitanians and the Artabrians, about whom the author was telling various incredible stories, Dercyllis reaches the land of the Asturians, where she is abandoned by Astraeus. Then she travels to Sicily. Here she is submitted to the authority of Aenesidemus, the tyrant of Leontini (ca. 490 BC), at whose court she is confronted by Paapis. But to her delight, she also meets there Mantinias, with whose help she steals the magic books of Paapis together with some magical plants. The two siblings flee over to Rhegium and then to Metapontus. In this centre of Pythagorean studies they meet Astraeus, who helps them escape from the pursuing Paapis and brings them over to his former companion Zalmoxis, of the Getae tribe. Zalmoxis purifies them from the old guilt and predicts that the final atonement for their crime will necessarily occur in Thule. So the siblings are off to Thule. On their way they are hunted down by Paapis, who – upon catching up with them – spits in their faces, thus submitting them to deathlike existence during the daytime. And even though Paapis is killed by one of Dercyllis' lovers, the spell remains. And it is only after Azulis, a companion of Deinias, finds in a book of Paapis a salutary formula, that the siblings are back to normal life. Both return immediately to Tyre in order to resuscitate their parents with the help of the books of magic. Deinias visits the Moon with his companions, where the Sybil grants him the fulfillment of one request. Deinias demands to be brought back to Tyre and be reunited with Dercillis. Upon his immediate return he finds both the siblings alive and well and their parents resuscitated. He marries his lover from Thule and decides not to go back to Arcadia. When an Arcadian named Cymbas arrived in the name of the

state to bring him back to his motherland, he responded that at his age he had no intention to travel anywhere, but instead, told him the story of his life and asked that his account be written down in two copies. One of these was for Cymbas, the other was to be deposited in Deinias' tomb.

When Alexander the Great conquered Tyre, recounts his officer Balagrus in a letter to his wife Phila, in a tomb near the city walls six stone sarcophagi were discovered, adorned with such inscriptions: "Mantinius, son of Mnason, lived 42 years, then 760 nights; Dercillis, daughter of Mnason, lived 39 years, then 760 nights, etc.". The secret behind these inscriptions was elucidated by the discovery inside the grave of a box containing tablets of cypress wood, on which was written down the story of Deinias. Balagrus asked that the copy of it be made for his wife. From that copy Antonius Diogenes makes another duplicate, which he sends to his sister Isidora, wife of Faustinus. She is the addressee of the dedication in the preface to his work, where he talks about the origin of this romance. The Ἀπιστά constitute only the bait or the enticement to the public, eager for such adventurous stories. The real purpose of this novel was the promotion of neo-Pythagorean teaching whose advocates were Astraeus and Zalmoxis. The idea of sin (the poisoning of the parents), atonement and absolution of evil, through the precepts and tutelage of Astraeus and Zalmoxis, is so overexposed that in view of its predominance even the erotic content becomes secondary. All this places the romance of Antonius in the circle of those neo-Pythagoreans whose saintly leader was Apollonius of Tyana. In that circle was revived the ancient fantastic biography of Pythagoras, written back in the 4th century BC by Aristoxenus of Tarent. Apollonius blew this biography up into a monumental history of a holy thaumaturge, while other Pythagoreans were propagating their teaching through the stories about men under the spell, whom only the teaching of Pythagoras was able to redeem. A parody of such tales was written after 100 AD by Lucius of Patrae, who related his transformation into an ass, his sufferings while in the asinine body, and his rescue in the end. This story is quite faithfully recounted in the text preserved among the works of Lucian – Λούκιος ἢ ὄνος, whereas the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius adds anew the religious spirit to a parody of Pythagoreanism, though only by the end of the work, where the allegoric light is projected on the very realistic narrative. Lust and intemperance transformed man into a beast. The mysteries of Isis allow him to regain human dignity. The same principal idea is instilled into the tale of Amor and Psyche by Apuleius. Initially it was a popular saga about a princess who was wed to an unknown husband, about whose origin she was not allowed to inquire. Nonetheless, the princess did inquire and this resulted in the transformation of the prince into a dragon and subsequently – his disappearance. And only through the penance of the princess and her many sufferings and misfortunes, the prince regained human form and the princess – her husband. This saga was allegorized by some Greek author who gave to the heroine the name of Psyche and to the hero – Eros. And

then a subsequent motif was inserted into the story, that of Aphrodite's wrath against Psyche, which, however, had no impact on the very narrative. At any rate – the names themselves gave the clue to this tale: the human *psyche* loses the divine Eros through some trespassing and recovers it through penance.

The introduction of popular motifs into the romance and the permeation of the whole with moralizing tendency are the common traits shared by the Greek author of the *History of Apollonius* with Antonius Diogenes and with the author of *Eros and Psyche*. If we are to trust KLEBS that the first Latin version of this work comes from the first part of the 3rd century AD, it is beyond doubt – in view of the arguments brought forth by WILCKEN and BÜRGER – that the Greek original should be dated by the end of the 2nd century AD. The Christian editor of the preserved text removed the motif of the protection of the heroes by the pagan deities, but even in this doctored text of his the edifying tendency of this romance is obvious: gods kill incestuous Antiochus and his daughter with a thunder, while miraculously rescuing Arcestratis. Just like in the romance of Iamblichus, here also a dead girl who is about to be buried is brought to life by a doctor. The gods provide their protection to little Tharsia, they arouse pity in the heart of the slave who is on the brink of murdering her, and also – do not permit her to lose chastity, even during her forced stay in the brothel. Evil step-mother or rather caretaker of Tharsia and her husband are justly punished, while Apollonius – upon his return from Egypt – recovers his daughter and his wife and on top of that – wins the crown of Tyre and Cyrene.

To this group of moralizing romances belong also five books of the *Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes* (Τῶν κατὰ Ἀνθείαν καὶ Ἀβροκόμην Ἐφησιακῶν βιβλία ε΄) by Xenophon of Ephesus (1726; earlier in Italian 1723). Linguistic peculiarities (no sophistic ἀφέλεια, no dual, fut. perf., rare usage of the optative) and compositional characteristics would suggest to place him close to Chariton. First-hand knowledge of the temple of Artemis in Ephesus which was destroyed by the Goths in 264 AD, blossoming status of the Clarian Apollo's oracle, which ceased to function after the 3rd century AD, provide the *terminus ante quem*. The overview of the motifs employed by the author suggests that he should be placed after both Iamblichus and the author of the Apollonius tale. The preliminaries are similar to Chariton's work. In Ephesus lived an attractive young man named Habrocomes, worshipped as a god, who had Eros in contempt. At the festival of Artemis he spotted Anthia, a girl even more beautiful than he was, wearing the costume of Artemis or of one of her companions. Upon seeing them side by side, people exclaim: "Oh, how well-matched pair they would form!" Anthia senses that she is being observed by Habrocomes while she makes offerings, and so reveals as many of her charms as she can (μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν ἂν τὰ δύναντα) for Habrocomes to see, and keeps conversing with her friends, so that he might listen to her voice. Upon his return home, the young fellow has to admit to himself that he has become a slave of Eros. He suffers but says nothing. Anthia too

is love-sick. The parents in despair (like the parents of Cydippe in Callimachus) consult the oracle of Apollo in Colophon for advice. The oracle responds that there is one cure for them, but adds that they will have to face many wanderings and persecutions, before they happily return home from the shores of the river Nile. The wedding is arranged and the married life begins for them – as the author recounts in a very detailed way (I, 9 – like in the story of Ninus). They are not too preoccupied by the verdict of the oracle. More perturbed are the parents, who see in the prediction of wanderings the order to go on travel (just like Zalmoxis' command for the guilty siblings to go to Thule), so they prepare the ship for the young couple to set sail, unaware of the reason and destination of their voyage. En route through the sea they pledge to remain faithful to each other. From this point on the whole novel is a eulogy of marital fidelity, which obviously was the leading theme in the *Odyssey*. They stop at Rhodes, make votive offerings in the shrine of Helios and resume their travel. The hero is warned in sleep of an upcoming misfortune, which soon comes true, when the Phoenician pirates attack the Ephesian ship and set it aflame. They kill the whole crew and take Anthia and Habrocomes captive. The pirates were in the pay of a rich Tyrian merchant, Apsyrtus, to whom they convey their prey. En route to Tyre, Corymbus, the captain of the pirate ship, falls in love with Habrocomes, while his subordinate Euxinus – with Anthia. Both try to obtain the reciprocation from their respective love objects, and so Corymbus pleads with Anthia for Euxinus, and the latter with Habrocomes for Corymbus. The distraught couple interpret these advances as a punishment for their former neglect of Eros, and begin to think about the suicide. Before anything of this could occur, Apsyrtus appears and decides to keep the captives for himself. A few days later he goes on some business to Syria. His daughter Manto intends to profit from his absence, and so – using her maids as intermediaries – sends a note to Habrocomes with a declaration of love (like in Chariton – the king and Callirhoe); she promises to marry him and asks for a secret encounter. Habrocomes responds that he would rather die than accept her advances. Manto is seeking vengeance. Thus when her father returns bringing with him Moeris, a young man destined to become Manto's husband, she – acting like Phaedra – accuses the slave of an attempt at her virtue and brings it about that Habrocomes is whipped in the presence of Anthia. Habrocomes is imprisoned. Manto takes Anthia as her slave-girl and goes with Moeris, now her husband, to Syria. Here she has Anthia married to a goatherd Lampo who, however, is ready to accept his wife's request not to use his marital rights (like the peasant to whom Clytaemnestra gave Electra as a wife in Euripides). Yet, when Moeris began to court the beautiful wife of the goatherd, Manto gives orders to murder her stealthily (as does Tharsia's caretaker towards her). However Lampo (like Tharsia's slave) takes pity on his marvellous wife and, instead, sells her to Cilician merchants.

Manto sends a letter to her father in which she informs him that she sold Anthia in order to prevent Moeris from committing adultery. In the meantime

Apsyrtus finds out that Habrocomes was innocent (from Manto's love note left behind in jail) and makes him a manager of his house. He also revealed to Habrocomes the contents of Manto's letter. Habrocomes leaves immediately for Syria, where he learns from Lampo that Anthia was sold to Cilicia, so he goes there in search for her. Over there, in the forest, he meets Hippothous, the leader of the group of robbers, which was ambushed and dismantled by Perilaus of Tarsus, the chief law enforcement official in Cilicia (ὁ τῆς εἰρήνης τῆς ἐν Κιλικίᾳ προεστῶς). In the company of the robber, Habrocomes travels around Cappadocia; one day, during the supper, his companion tells him the story of his life. From a decent citizen of Perinthus he turned into a brigand because of his boyish love. He recounts also that his comrades were supposed to sacrifice to Ares a beautiful captive girl. They tied her to a tree and when they were about to slaughter her, Perilaus attacked them with his troops and set the girl free. The description of the girl is a clear indication for Habrocomes that the girl in question was his wife. So he goes to Tarsus, where he is told that Anthia is dead. As he learns, Perilaus fell in love with her and wished to marry her. She in turn made him promise to wait thirty days before the wedding, and on the day of the wedding swallowed some substance, given to her by an Ephesian physician, and passed away. Perilaus interred her with great ceremony. In the tomb she awoke from the coma (like Sinon's after taking Saraechus' drug), but had no time to ponder on her situation, because soon she was carried off by the tomb robbers (like Callirhoe). Obviously, Habrocomes is ignorant of Chariton's tale about Callirhoe, so in mourning for his dead wife he goes – without Hippothous' knowledge – to Alexandria in hope of finding there at least the body of his kidnapped wife. The tomb-raiders also went to Alexandria, where they sold Anthia to Psammis, an Indian prince. The captive convinced the superstitious barbarian that he must wait one year to have her hand, unless he wishes to incur the wrath of Isis to whom she is consecrated.

Meanwhile Habrocomes is captured by a band of Egyptian thieves, called the Shepherds (βουκόλοι), who sell him into slavery to an old man named Araxus. In his house Habrocomes will have to assume the role of Hippolytus towards the old man's lustful wife Cyno. She imagines that it is only due to her husband's presence that the slave hesitates to submit to her advances, so she kills the old man, but this causes an even greater reluctance on the part of her beloved. She is burning with the desire for vengeance and so accuses him of murdering his master, and hands him over for punishment to the governor (ἄρχων) of Egypt. Habrocomes is sentenced to death by crucifixion. The executioners put him on the cross upon a cliff overlooking the Nile. Habrocomes prays to Helios begging for his mercy, whereupon a violent wind blows the cross into the river, and Habrocomes is carried downstream to the mouth of the Nile. He is recaptured there by the soldiers and returned to the governor, who now orders that he be burned on the stake. However, after his another prayer for mercy, the rising wa-

ters of the Nile extinguish the flames, which the governor interprets as a result of divine intervention, and so he demands that the case of Araxus be re-examined. Having learned the truth, he releases Habrocomes and orders that Cyno be put to death.

Meanwhile Psammis, en route in Anthia's company to India, is attacked by the robbers led by Hippothous, who in the meantime resumed his former trade. Anthia is taken prisoner. Hippothous does not recognize her (now calling herself Memphitis) and gives her as booty to his fellow robber Anchialus. He in turn lusts so eagerly after her that in defence of her virtue she kills him (Sinonis does the same with the old debauchee). The robbers cast her in punishment into a deep pit with two fierce dogs, expecting her either to die of hunger or be devoured by the hounds. But a guard named Amphinomus – out of love for her – brings her secretly bread and water, which also the dogs consume and thus become more and more benign.

In the meantime Habrocomes goes to Syracuse where he is entertained by an old fisherman who keeps at home the mummified body of his wife, about whom he tells his guest a very romantic story.

The prefect of Egypt – while clearing the country of robbers with the help of his relative Polyidus – destroyed the band of Hippothous. Among the prisoners whom Polyidus caught were also Amphinomus and Anthia. The warrior fell in love with his captive girl who escaped his advances by taking refuge in the temple of Isis. Polyidus' wife learned about it, so during her husband's absence she decided to sell Anthia to a pimp (as is the case of Tharsia in Apollonius). Anthia is purchased by a procurer from Tarent, but he is unable to make any profit from her charms, since Anthia keeps feigning a cataleptic fit. Therefore he puts her on sale on the slave-market, where she is bought by Hippothous, who had by then abandoned his former way of life as a robber, married a rich widow in Tauromenium and – after her death – was leading a very luxurious life in Italy. He recognized in his recent acquisition his former captive from Egypt whom he had thrown into a pit to be devoured by the dogs, but he did not know yet that she was the wife of his friend Habrocomes. Therefore he did not have any qualms of conscience to fall in love with her, but some time later he found who she was. And now he decides to go on search of his friend, intending to return his wife to him. En route to Ephesus he stops at Rhodes. Anthia goes to the shrine of Helios to pay tribute to the god and leaves there – next to her votive gift – the lock of hair. She is recognized by her former slaves, now rich freedmen, who invite her for a stay at their house. On the next day Habrocomes, being already fed up with his work as a stone-cutter on Sicily, arrives at Rhodes, and here in the temple of Helios recognizes Anthia's lock of hair (the motif of recognition of Orestes by Electra), and – with the help of his faithful servants – finally finds her. All, including Hippothous, erupt in joy. The husband and his wife, having assured each other of mutual fidelity, return to Ephesus, and here pay tribute to

Artemis. To their offerings for the goddess they add a description of their tribulation and adventures (τὴν γραφήν τῆ θεῶ ἀνέθεσαν, πάνθ' ὅσα τ' ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσ' ἔδρασαν)¹. Hippothous, the noble brigand, was also partaking in their bliss.

Xenophon composed his narrative from the motifs used by Chariton, Iamblichus and the author of the Apollonius romance, and enriched it with elements drawn from tragedy and with the introduction of robbers into the framework of the action. The robbers appeared already in Chariton's work, but merely as tomb raiders, whereas here Hippothous is an integral participant of the action and, in the view of the author, his less noble occupation does not undermine the nobility of his character. That is why he is placed at the table of jubilation together with virtuous people. While the motif of the wrath of Eros, directed against the young man, is not consistently developed, but at the very beginning is replaced by the motif of the oracle, which sets in motion the adventures of the heroes, the pair's mutual pledges of fidelity constitute the main effective cause of the subsequent events. However, the episodes in which their fidelity is put to test are overabundant, so that the author keeps on repeating the same situations again and again. Xenophon does not explain clearly the purpose of the travels undertaken by his characters. The real reason seems to be that – since Chariton placed his romance on Sicily and since the heroes of Antonius Diogenes dwelled there and also in southern Italy – therefore Xenophon's characters too go to those places without any logical justifications. On the other hand, unlike his predecessors, Xenophon does not include a historical background, does not mention any historical kings, but, instead, does not hesitate to refer to Roman officials: the archon of Egypt (*praefectus Aegypti*) and the law enforcement officer or the irenarch. This novel is thus meant to be a contemporary work. The other innovation of Xenophon is the omission of the self-portrayal in his novel, whereas Chariton, Iamblichus and Antonius Diogenes were talking about themselves also. Xenophon avoids as well the usage of such formulaic statements as: “about this I have already narrated”, “now I will tell what happened” etc. However, apart from similar motifs, there is one common element which Xenophon shares with his predecessors, and that is the religious dimension. On any given occasion the characters send their prayers to Artemis, Isis, Apis and – particularly – to Helios, and they are always granted a manifest protection by these deities.

Xenophon removed from his work the burden of erudite digressions, typical for Iamblichus and Diogenes, while enriching a simple narrative of Chariton with a number of new motifs. But in the plethora of these motifs, he had neither time nor space to deepen human psychology and to sketch more distinctly the background of the action. His work is deprived of any local colour. The avoidance of all these deficiencies was the aim of Heliodorus, the author of the

¹ Similarly in Apollonius: “casus [...] suos ipse descripsit et duo volumina fecit, unum in templo Dianae Ephesiorum, alterum bibliothecae suae”.

largest ancient novel in ten books (double Xenophon) – the *Aethiopian Story* (*Αἰθιοπικῶν βιβλία δέκα*, ¹1534, ²1596 with Latin translation by Stanislaus [Stanisław] Warszewicki) about Theagenes and Chariclea. Heliodorus put together the Babylonian erudition of Iamblichus, Pythagorean wisdom of Diogenes and Xenophon’s roguish background, and thus produced a “ruffiano-sacerdotal” novel. He knew about the trip of the Egyptian pharaoh Nectanebo to Macedonia, and so sent the Egyptian priests to Delphi and the Delphic priests to Egypt, with the intention of magnifying the glory of Helios. At any rate, he did not have to concern himself with inventing the motifs. He simply made a selection of pertinent ones from his predecessors, while applying his entire care toward the composition. Already in Xenophon many past events were presented through a story told by one of the characters. Heliodorus uses this device to a very large extent. The meaning of the episodes described in the beginning of book I, as well as the real identity of characters involved, became clear only by the end of book VI. Thus the celebrated ἀναστροφὴ τῆς τάξεως, modelled on Odysseus *apologoi* to Alcinous, reigns here supreme. Even the names of characters are not immediately provided. First we see them in action, and then only gradually their secrets are being brought to the open.

A band of robbers goes to a hilly area near the mouth of the Nile, where they notice a pile of dead bodies among the remnants of a feast, and a woman dressed as Aphrodite holding on her knees the body of a beautiful youth and tearfully speaking to him. The young man gives some signs of life. From what is said, we conclude that their names are Chariclea and Theagenes respectively. The robbers are about to seize the pair, but another band of brigands supervenes to capture the spoils of the dead and to abduct the girl with the wounded youth. They bring them to a lacustrine village on the marshes of the Nile and leave them under the guard of some non-Egyptian man. The latter, having overheard the captives talking to each other in Greek, reveals himself as a Greek, named Cnemon, and spends the whole night on telling them the story of his life. Due to the unwanted advances of his stepmother and the treachery of a slave-girl, called Thisbe, he was forced to flee, until he was taken prisoner by a band of Egyptian robbers, the so-called Shepherds, under the command of Thyamis. Formerly he was a priest in Memphis, but – having been deprived of this function by his brother – he became a robber. Thyamis falls in love with Chariclea who pretended that Theagenes was her brother, and proposes to marry her immediately. However, Chariclea asks for a delay, necessary to complete certain obligations toward the gods. The former priest accepts these fake religious qualms and decides to wait. Meanwhile Theagenes, disappointed with his alleged role of a brother, intends to announce that he is Chariclea’s husband, but she begs him to wait until an occasion occurs to make their wedlock legal and formally sworn (ἐνώμοστον ἐπὶ πᾶσι γάμον, ἔνθεσμον, εἴ πῃ γένοιτο, περισκοποῦσα, I 25). So Theagenes also bides his time, but at some point the band of robbers, mentioned at the be-

ginning of the novel as those who had to withdraw empty-handed, attacks the village and sets it aflame. Before the confrontation with the invaders Thyamis concealed Chariclea in the underground hideout (in Xenophon too, Anthia was placed in a pit), and then, realizing that he is defeated and wounded, rushes to the hideout, willing to be united with his beloved – let alone in death. At the entrance he hears a woman's voice asking in Greek: "Who is it?" Convinced that it was Chariclea, he kills her and runs away. When the battle is over, Cnemon and Theagenes enter into the hideout. Theagenes believes that the woman's body is that of Chariclea, but soon after he sees his beloved alive. From a tablet found in the hand of the dead woman, Cnemon learns that this is the body of his nemesis, Thisbe, who came to Egypt in company of a rich merchant and was captured here by a robber Thermutis, who seized her and concealed in this very cave. He too arrives thither after the battle and is convinced that the men whom he met there must be responsible for the murder. The Greeks plead not guilty and, trying to get rid of him, send him on the reconnoitring mission. Thermutis refuses to part alone, so Cnemon joins him, but during their march he keeps complaining about stomachache. Repeatedly he stops in the thicket and rejoins his companion, until the latter's vigilance is put to sleep, so that he is able to flee and go to a village, where he was supposed to meet Chariclea and Theagenes, but does not find them there. Instead, he hits upon an old Greek-speaking Egyptian, who conveys him to the house of a rich merchant, Nausicles. The merchant is not at home, for he went on search of his slave-girl Thisbe, taken from him by the robbers. And so in his absence it is the host's daughter who entertains Cnemon. During the banquet the Greek-speaking Egyptian tells the story of his past adventures. His name is Calasiris; he used to be a priest in Memphis. Yet, his intention to avoid temptations of women and the perspective of deadly combat between his sons, foretold by the oracle, contributed to his decision of leaving Egypt. He went to Delphi in order to acquaint himself with priestly knowledge there, and soon befriended Charicles, the priest of Apollo. The latter, having lost his wife and daughter, went to Egypt to seek consolation (like Apollonius), where a certain Ethiopian priest entrusted to him a seven years old girl with some tokens. Charicles brought her back to Delphi, gave her the name of Chariclea, and was raising her as if she were his daughter. When she grew up, she became a priestess of Artemis, and as such did not wish to ever marry. Only when she saw handsome Theagenes who came there to make some ceremonial offerings in the name of the Thessalians, and whom she herself crowned as a winner in the games, she finally realized what love is. Calasiris who was Theagenes' friend wanted to help the young pair, especially after having read the inscription in Ethiopian characters on Chariclea's headband, written by Persine, wife of king Hydaspes, who explained that the reason for exposing her daughter was her white complexion. According to this inscription, it resulted from Persine's gazing intently at the painting of Andromeda in the chamber of her husband. Fearing that the black father might search for

another explanation of the white colour of his daughter's skin, she gave her to Sisimithres, a priest, who sent her somewhere. Calasiris knew Persine well and promised to go on search of her daughter. So now he reveals to Chariclea the secret of her birth and persuades her to flee to Egypt. Theagenes abducts her, and so all three embark on a ship. They are captured by the pirates, whose captain Trachinus becomes enamoured of the captive girl. Calasiris persuades another pirate, named Pelorus, that Chariclea is in love with him. The two rivals have a bitter quarrel during the distribution of the booty; the fierce fight erupts, which leads to the scene depicted at the beginning of the romance.

Before he finished his tale, Nausicles returned bringing with him a beautiful slave-girl, whom he had presented to the satrap Mithridates as the lost Thisbe. Calasiris recognizes Chariclea and purchases her from Nausicles for a marvellous amethyst ring and goes with her (Cnemon got engaged with the daughter of Nausicles, and so stayed by her) in search of Theagenes. In order to make it easier to procure food, they disguise themselves as beggars, but also take their priestly clothes packed inside the bags. They heard from Nausicles that Mithridates sent the beautiful youth to the king. On their way they hit upon a battlefield, where a band of robbers destroyed Mithridates' force. A dead boy, resuscitated by his mother, a witch, predicts a happy outcome for them, so they continue their travel, until they arrive at Memphis. The city was by then besieged by the band of Thyamis, who demanded to be restored to the priesthood, of which he had been deprived by his brother Petosiris. Arsace, wife of the satrap Oroondates, who ruled the city in her husband's absence, suggests that the dispute between the two brothers should be settled in a duel. But the cowardly Petosiris withdraws from combat at the very sight of Thyamis, and runs away from him around the city walls. Thyamis wants to spare him, but still decides to humiliate him by slightly wounding him. At that moment Calasiris steps in between the two adversaries, removes his beggar's cloak and, having reconciled the quarrelling brothers with his paternal authority, returns with them in triumph to the city. In his combat Thyamis was assisted by Theagenes, whom Chariclea, forgetting about her mendicant's rags, tries to embrace, only to be rebuffed and struck by him. Her beloved took her for a courtesan, but when she threw off her rags, he recognized in her his missing lover. The youth's joy is somewhat dimmed by the sudden death of Calasiris and – no less so – by Arsace's invitation to stay in her palace. Theagenes has already noticed how lustfully was leering at him the satrap's notoriously lascivious wife. The role of a temptress of Theagenes and of the go-between is given to the old chamber-woman, Cybele. However, her entreaties and pleas are to no avail. Cybele's son Achaemenes recognizes Theagenes as a former captive of Mithridates, and informs the mistress about it. She in turn makes Theagenes her servant and promises Chariclea's hand to Achaemenes, who for some time already has been lusting after her. At this point Theagenes pretends to comply with the demands of the satrap's wife in return for one favour: let Chariclea who is his

wife and not his sister – as he has claimed until then – be prevented from marrying Achaemenes. Arsace accepts it, for she did not care at all about Achaemenes. Yet, when Theagenes even then refuses to respond to her passionate advances, she puts him in jail where Chariclea was also locked, having been accused of poisoning Cybele. Eventually she was condemned to the stake but – thanks to her magical ring – was saved from the flames. Therefore she had to share again the prison cell with her beloved, until both of them were summoned by the eunuch Bagos to Oroondates, who was told by Achaemenes about the misconduct of his wife. As a result of this denunciation, the two were conveyed to the Persian camp. By then Oroondates was a leader of the expedition against the Ethiopians. Arsace, upon learning about Bagos' mission, killed herself. The hero and the heroine are captured by the Ethiopians, the conquerors of Oroondates. According to the Ethiopian custom, every few years several boys and girls had to be sacrificed to Helios, the supreme Ethiopian god. The sacrifice was supposed to take place on the meadow near the capital city, Meroe. In the presence of the ruling couple and the royal court, the trial of chastity of the victims is being held; those who are pure, remain unscathed by the fire. Theagenes and Chariclea pass the test. But when the sacrifice is about to begin – despite the protests of the *gymnosophistae* who are in attendance – Chariclea falls at the feet of Sisimithres and – as tokens of recognition – shows to Persine certain objects and a mark on her arm. Persine acknowledges her as her daughter. Hydaspes announces to the people that he has recovered his unique daughter, but – if it be the people's will – he is ready to sacrifice her. However, the crowd demands that the princess be set free. Therefore only Theagenes is to be sacrificed. But just before the ceremony, the youth gives the display of bravery by taming a raging bull and then defeating a fierce Ethiopian wrestler (an imitation of the fight between Polydeuces and Amycus in Theocritus). And now he asks for one favour: let Chariclea be the one who would kill him as sacrificial victim. Chariclea asks for the same, intending to kill herself after killing her lover. But only a married woman is allowed to make a sacrifice, while she is still a virgin. At this critical moment the tension is additionally augmented by the arrival of Greek envoys, who demand that the daughter of a Delphic priest Charicles be released. Charicles recognizes the abductor of his daughter and – screaming angrily – charges him. And here Sisimithres intervenes; he explains everything and announces the abolition of human sacrifice. The young couple returns in triumph to Meroe to celebrate the nuptial rites.

“And thus ends the Ethiopian story of Theagenes and Chariclea. It was written by a Phoenician from Emesa, from the family of the priests of Helios, son of Theodosius, Heliodoros”. There is no single detail in this romance which would prevent us from treating this work's personal epilogue as believable. For everything here is aimed at glorifying Helios, who saves the heroine through the intervention of his priest Sisimithres, who – in the form of the god Apollo – takes care of her in Delphi, who prophesizes the happy return to Ethiopia, and who in

the last moment grants salvation to those who are supposed to be his sacrificial victims. His glory is being quite emphatically proclaimed by the two main characters and also by other personages of the romance. And a peculiar predilection for priests (Sisimithres, Charicles, Calasiris, Thyamis, *gymnosophistae*) can only be explained by the priesthood of the author himself. That is why – on any given occasion – the Egyptian priest would praise the wisdom of his Greek counterpart, the Greek one – that of the Egyptian, and both would laud the Ethiopian *gymnosophistae*. It seems that the author produced his work in the period of a very advanced convergence of various religions with a common denominator of the universal cult of Helios, named Mithra in the Christian era. And even if Heliodorus never uses that name, does not Theagenes taming a raging bull constitute an allusion to a figure – known from the Mithraic reliefs – of a young man slaying a rushing bull? In comparison to Helios, other deities are presented as very pale figures. Only the Moirae and Tyche play a fairly significant role, as do also some unnamed daemons. If to this theological apparatus, abounding in presages and prophetic dreams, one adds – for the sake of comparison – the abstinence from meat and wine, observed by Calasiris, or if one recalls the condemnation of all bloody sacrifices, pronounced by the *gymnosophistae*, one must – in concord with ROHDE – label Heliodorus as neo-Pythagorean, who probably had already come through the fanciful biography of Apollonius of Tyana, written by one of the Philostrati. And the sacrifice which Calasiris – upon seeing Odysseus in a dream – orders to be made by the hero in Ithaca (V 25), refers us to the *Heroicus* by Philostratus. However, there are no traces of neo-Platonism here, which indicates that Heliodorus wrote his romance before the expansion of this philosophico-religious movement. The fighting in the region of the Upper Nile and the hegemony of the Ethiopians seem to be the echo of the power of the Abyssinian Auxumitae, to whom Diocletian had to pay tribute. It is not without significance that the Auxumitae arrive at the court of Hydaspes as envoys from an independent nation, connected with the Ethiopian ruler by the treaty of friendship. Therefore the historical reminiscences point out roughly to the 3rd century AD. And the mention of the Persian satraps in Egypt should be considered as an anachronistic remnant from the earlier romances.

These combinations, based on the internal evidence of the work itself, cannot be undermined by the information transmitted by Socrates, the church historian (V 22), who remarks that a certain ecclesiastical regulation was established by the bishop of Tricca, Heliodorus, who is said (λέγεται) to have written in his youth an Ethiopian romance. This seems to be a mere speculation, based on the contamination of some Heliodorus, a bishop of Tricca, and Heliodorus, a romancer. Nicephorus Callistus (*Hist. eccles.* XII 34) adds to this tradition an anecdote, according to which Heliodorus – having been ordered by the synod to burn his book which was judged harmful for the youth – preferred to renounce his episcopal function than his book.

Heliodorus was a priest and a Pythagorean philosopher. But he was also a theatre lover, for almost on every page he indulges in comparisons and metaphors drawn from the theatre (they were collected by J.H.W. WALDEN in HSCPh V 1895, pp. 1–43). And in the first place – he was a rhetor. Hence his grandiloquent style with elaborate periodic sentences, hence frequent descriptions (ἐκφράσεις) and aetiological comments, hence the whole range of rhetorical devices. In his grandiloquence (σεμνότης), Heliodorus is able to produce things which verge on beautiful. However, any attempts at interspersing the narrative with humorous inserts lead either to such concepts as the repeated gastric indisposition of Cnemon, or to laboured puns and plays on ideas. Yet, the unbearably ideal figures of priests are very nicely counterweighed by the personage of cunning Cnemon with his Attic background, consisting of a mixture of tragic and comic motifs. An excessively loose connection of the latter's figure with the main plot indicates that Heliodorus was the first to introduce – of his own initiative – a secondary plot with a secondary hero, instead of episodic insertions. And thus, in place of a simple romance, interrupted by excurses alien to the plot, he creates a complex novel, which is supposed to be both solemn and ethical (obviously, in the ancient meaning of this word – Arist. *Poet.* 18, 2). The psychological aspect is taken into consideration and is marked in many – at times very profound – comments on lovers and love itself.

In grandiloquence it was very hard to surpass Heliodorus. After his romance the only path to take for a romancer was that of realism, which was noticeable in embryonic form already in the *Aethiopica*. Yet, in order to have enough space for the portrayal of the environment and for the description of everyday life and customs, it was necessary to simplify the narrative and to reduce the number of the events to the minimum. And indeed, such attempt was undertaken. We have two specimens of this trend: four books of a pastoral novel about Daphnis and Chloe (*Ποιμενικῶν τῶν κατὰ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλόην λόγοι δ'*, 1598; earlier – in Latin hexameters in 1569 and in French by AMYOT in 1559) and eight books of the romance about Leucippe and Clitophon (*Τῶν κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα λόγοι η'*, 1601). Both these realistic romances aspire at psychology also, but this could not be successful in antiquity, for it was made impossible by the rhetoric and the sophistry.

It cannot be denied that the idyllic element of Longus is somewhat connected with certain letters of peasants and fishermen by Alciphron, a contemporary of Lucian, and with the letters of peasants (ἀγροικαὶ ἐπιστολαί) by Claudius Aelianus from the beginning of the 3rd century AD. Yet, there is an even closer affinity with the 7th oration of Dio of Prusa – *Εὐβοϊκὸς ἢ κυνηγός*. Despite this all, one should not – on the grounds of similarity of expressions and of idyllic descriptions – consider Longus as an imitator of Dio; even less justifiable would be to regard him as an epigone of Alciphron. The occurrence of a few identical locutions referring to life in the country is a too weak basis to suggest a mutual

dependence of these authors, among whom Aelianus would allegedly copy Longus. Such a thesis is formulated by H. REICH (*De Alciphronis Longique aetate*, diss. Regimonti 1894), who places Longus between Alciphron and Aelianus at the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 3rd century. The arguments brought forth by REICH are very feeble and, consequently, the only clue to determine the dates of Longus may be the consideration of the systematic development of the Greek romance. And this consideration leads one to the conclusion that the simplicity and the idyllic character of Longus' work was a reaction to the complexity and the grandiloquence of Heliodorus. The motif of the heroine's exposure and her eventual recognition, introduced into the romance for the first time by Heliodorus, was used by Longus as the principal element of his narrative. And the proof that he was not the first one to use this motif, is – among other – its duality, for the hero as well was exposed as a child and in the end – was similarly recognized. Despite a radical simplification of the action, it is not difficult to notice that Longus repeats – or rather hints at – the whole repertory of motifs from the elaborate romances, but in miniature. And so the hero in his amorous advances towards the heroine has rivals – Dorcon and Lampis. The former tries to seduce her by stealth, the latter – actually abducts her. Besides – the hero is exposed to temptations by a libidinous married woman and a lecherous sponger (cf. Corymbus and Habrocomes in Xenophon of Ephesus). The novelty and originality of Longus consists in the fact that, for the first time in Greek romances, the hero, although unknowingly, breaks the oath of fidelity to his beloved by allowing Lycaenium to introduce him into the secrets of lovemaking. No less did the heroine step away from the rigorous rule of Heliodorus by kissing the dying Dorcon. Apart from these temptations on both sides, Longus took over from his predecessors also the motif of pirates, who kidnap Daphnis, as well as the machinery of war, resulting in the abduction of Chloe into captivity. Yet, these novelistic clichés are so tightly wrapped in abundant idyllic elements that the scholars failed to notice them and to refer them to the predecessors of Longus, and, instead, always considered him to be a completely distinct phenomenon, which does not fit the evolutionary pattern of this genre. However, already the above observations provide certain guidelines into the affiliations of Longus with the rest of the romancers. He also follows their religious propensity, and even – as an epigone – is pushing it to the limits: the fortunes of the heroes are continuously under control of pastoral deities – the Nymphs and the god Pan. The whole story is merely an illustration of the commonplace that the innocent simpletons are under constant protection of the gods, who save them from all afflictions. Young people honour the gods best by remaining pure in love. To show how such pure love is born and how it evolves in the hearts of two innocent youths, to present the germination, the growth and the blossoming of the passion against the background of nature, and to harmonize it all with the four seasons of the year, is a task worthy of a psychologist. Let us see to what extent did Longus accomplish this task.

One day a slave of a rich Mytilenean citizen, a goatherd named Lamon, found under a she-goat an infant boy sucking the merciful animal, so he took home the child together with certain precious objects, which were lying by the side of the foundling, and gave him to his wife to be brought up. He bestowed on him the name of Daphnis. Two years after this occurrence, Dryas, a neighbouring shepherd, found in similar circumstances a female infant, whom since then – under the name of Chloe – he was raising as if she had been his own daughter. And because the aforementioned precious tokens pointed out to the more noble origin of these children, the herdsman were feeding them well and taught them to read and write. Fifteen years after Daphnis was found, the respective alleged parents, urged during their sleep by the Nymphs, sent the children into the fields to tend the flocks.

Common occupations and amusements bring the youth close to each other. One day Daphnis fell into a pit; after his rescue, Chloe was washing his wounds in the cave of the Nymphs, and suddenly sensed something strange in her heart.

I am ill, but what my malady is I know not; I am in pain, and yet I see no wound. I feel grief, and yet I have lost none of my flock; I am burning, and yet I am sitting in the shade. How often have brambles torn my skin, without me shedding a single tear! How often have the bees stung me, and yet I could still enjoy my meals! Whatever it is which now torments my heart, is much more bitter than all other pains.

Daphnis suffers from the same torture ever since he kissed Chloe as a winner in pastoral competition with Dorcon, the ox-herd (like Theagenes who – upon winning the wrestling match – was awarded by Chariclea). Dorcon also fell in love with Chloe, and being unable to convince her either by gifts – which she would promptly hand over to Daphnis – or by tempting Dryas, decided to turn to trickery. Dressed up in a wolf skin, he tried to attack and rape Chloe near the spring, but was tracked down by the hunting dogs and he owed his survival only to the help of the two tenders of flocks.

This was going on in springtime. In the summer their amorous passion becomes even more enflamed. Daphnis, while searching for a grasshopper on the lap of sleeping Chloe, notices for the first time the charms which he was ignoring before and the girl becomes even dearer to him, since she has rescued him from the pirates. For when Daphnis was snatched by them and abducted on a ship, Chloe blew into the flute, which she received from dying Dorcon as a gift for a kiss; on this sign, the stolen herds jumped into the water, the ship capsized and the heavily armed robbers drowned, whereas Daphnis unconstrained swam back to the shore. For some reason, unknown to herself, Chloe concealed from him the kissing incident with Dorcon.

In the autumn, after the grape harvest, an old shepherd Philetas, a former lover of Amaryllis, tells the two lovers a story about his encounter in the garden with a winged boy who – as he announced to him – took Daphnis and Chloe

under his protection. And the one who is under tutelage of Eros – for he was that winged boy – can neither eat, nor sleep, nor find joy anywhere. The only medicine against this disease is a kiss and an embrace – *καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασιν*. The young couple apply diligently the first and the second medicine, but do not feel any relief. Daphnis intends to try the third medicine, but a group of men from Methymne, who were given a rough handling by the herdsmen in revenge for hunting on their (i.e. also on Daphnis') fields, organize an armed expedition of their fellow citizens, loot the area near Mytilene and kidnap Chloe. Yet, the god Pan forced them to return the booty and the captive girls, so that the war ended without bloodshed, and the young couple exchanged the oaths of everlasting love and fidelity in the cave of the Nymphs (like Habrocomes and Anthia in Xenophon, *Ephes.* I 11).

Severe winter came on and put an end to the encounters of the young in the open air. However, even then, smart Daphnis finds a way to meet his beloved in her parents' house. With the arrival of spring the two return to their flocks and to the cures prescribed by Philetas. The third type of cure is explained to Daphnis by a certain Lecaenium, who at the same time warned him of a possibility of Chloe suffering some pain, while undergoing this cure. The very thought of this makes Daphnis delay the application of Lycaenium's precepts, especially since he was faced with a new preoccupation. Several rich shepherds were trying to win Chloe's hand, so Daphnis – due to his poverty – had little chance to gain the favour of Dryas. However, he was aided by the Nymphs, who – in his dream – indicated to him a place on the shore where lay three thousand drachmas. This dowry dispelled all doubts of Dryas. Lamón too agreed to the marriage of the young. For the wedding to be celebrated, the consent of their common master Dionysophanes was required, and he announced his arrival to the village.

For his visit Lamón prepared a beautiful garden. However, one night, Lampis, one of the long date suitors of Chloe, destroys all flowers, so that only the benevolence of the son of Dionysophanes, Astylus, who took the blame upon himself, prevents the distraught shepherd from taking his own life. Yet, the very benefactor becomes the cause of a great sorrow for the whole pastoral community, for his parasite, named Gnathon, fell in love with Daphnis and demanded that the latter be made his slave. At this point Lamón reveals to the king – who has just arrived thither with his wife – that Daphnis is neither his son nor a slave, inasmuch as may be judged by the precious objects that were found at the infant's side. It turns out that it was the abandoned child of Dionysophanes, who – having already three sons – got rid of the fourth heir in the manner so common in the ancient times. And now, after the death of two of his children, he gladly accepts the newly recovered son. For the time being, Chloe is out of the picture. She was kidnaped by Lampis, but Gnathon recovered her from the hands of the abductor, and brought back to his master. As a slave-girl, she could not become Daphnis' wife. But the objects which were found with her indicate that she was not born as a slave

either. Therefore the two may marry. During the feast, organized in Mytilene by Dionysophanes, the noble guests look at the precious objects which were found long ago with Chloe, and one of them, Megacles, recognizes them and realizes that she is his formerly exposed daughter. The wedding ceremony – on the request of the young couple – takes place in the village, near the cave of the Nymphs.

This is the story which Longus told

as an offering to Eros, the Nymphs and Pan, and also as a work that will provide pleasure to many, in the hope that it may heal the sick, console the sorrowful, refresh the memory of one who once has loved, and instruct one who has not yet fallen in love.

The author did not mention his name in this romance, but is it without significance that Dionysophanes was composing a long love-story (μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο συνέταττε λόγον καὶ ἐρωτικὸν καὶ μακρόν)? Isn't it our romance that is meant? In Dionysophanes' garden there was an altar of Dionysus; besides – the name of the king is related to that deity.

While in the narrative we notice a great dependence on the pattern of the heroic romance (the assault by the robbers, the abduction of the hero and the heroine), in the form, or style, Longus is completely different from the rest. On the basis of artificial simplicity and unpretentiousness or sophistic nonchalance (*ἀφέλεια*), he produced his refinedly naive form of expression, seemingly quite congruent with the conversations between herdsmen and peasants, but actually tiresome in the narrative. And just like through this *apheleia* of style one can see a competent sophist, similarly – from under the sheepskin of a raconteur describing the innocent children's caresses – sticks out the hoof of a lascivious faun. But who knows if this Greek sensuality is not the only reason why the whole story does not plunge into an abstract sentimentalism?

The essence of Longus' narrative was its simplicity, discretely variegated by the echoes of the romance of adventure. Yet, this very simplicity was actually hindering the development of the bucolic romance. One who did not wish to repeat the motif of idyllic frolicking of an enamoured herdsman and his beloved, had to give up on writing a bucolic romance. At any rate, we do not know of any romancer who would carry this genre on. The pastoral literature lives on, since the times of Alciphron and Claudius Aelianus, in the form of a letter, e.g. of Aristaenetus (5th century AD) or Theophylactus Simocattes (7th century AD).

All this does not mean that Longus was not imitated at all in antiquity. The last ancient romancer, Achilles Tatius, not only copies his style, but also borrows certain ideas from him. He too begins his work with the description of a picture, here one representing the rape of Europa by Zeus in form of a bull, that is the triumph of Eros over the supreme god. At this point, a young man appears and argues for the power of Eros by making references to his own experience; and then – at the request of the narrator – he tells him about his past adventures,

while sitting on the bank of a stream, in the shadow under the patulous plane-tree. In the same scenery the Platonic Socrates was once talking with Phaedrus about the essence of soul and love.

It is not without reason that Achilles Tatius reverts to Plato in this way, for he too intends to present the psychology of love and aims at solving the problem which has been posited by Heliodorus and then treated by Longus. Yet, replacing the mystical idealism of Plato with some rationalistic realism bears only paltry fruits. Drawing from Plato (*Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Leges* VIII 5–8 etc.), from Xenophon (*Symposium*) and from other authors who were dealing with love and marriage², Achilles collects an anthology of remarks and opinions about this topic, and on any given occasion makes it a subject of declarations and discussions. As the result, instead of the psychology of love, we are offered nothing but trivial declamations or disputes on this subject.

Similarly, Achilles is not very successful in his search for realism. The hero's first love is a virgin, but he has already mingled with harlots (ὁμιλήσας ταῖς εἰς Ἀφροδίτην πολουμέναις, II 27), and he is not very rigorously observing the principles of fidelity (V 27). Miraculous escapes are explained by the author in a rationalistic manner, while the religious component recedes into the background. Apart from that, all personages and events are taken from the common stock of previous romances.

Clitophon from Tyre is supposed to marry his own half-sister Calligone; however, one day his aunt arrives to his parents' house with her daughter Leucippe. The young man at once became enamoured of the maiden, and gained her love with the help of his friend Clinias, and his smart servant Satyrus. Having been liberated – just before the nuptials – from Calligone, who was mistakenly kidnapped as Leucippe by the latter's suitor of old, Callisthenes of Byzantium, Clitophon is on the verge of enjoying the fruit of his advances in Leucippe's chamber, when suddenly the virgin's mother enters thither. In order to avoid his own and the maiden's humiliation, Clitophon elopes with Leucippe, Clinias and Satyrus. The ship capsizes and the shipwrecked heroes fall into the hands of the Egyptian robbers. Leucippe is to be killed as a sacrificial victim. Clitophon sees from afar the robbers piercing the lap of the virgin with a knife and then – apparently – ripping off her entrails, but he is unable to come to her rescue; only when her body is cast into a trench, he rushes toward the supposed corpse and there he hits upon Satyrus and his new acquaintance, named Menelaus. It turns out that the latter had taken upon himself the role of the sacrificer in order to save her. Therefore, while performing the sacrificial ritual, he resorted to theatrical trickery by using a knife with the sliding blade and attaching to Leucippe's lap a bag full of blood. Later on, in company of some soldiers, who defeated the band of their abductors,

² Cf. A. W. WINCKELMANN, *Plutarchi Eroticus*, Turici 1836, pp. 96 ff.; F. WILHELM, *Zu Achilles Tatius*, RhM LVII 1902, pp. 55–75.

the heroic pair continues their voyage, during which the head of the detachment, named Charmides, harasses Leucippe with his amorous advances; one of the soldiers serves her some love potion, which sends the heroine into fits of extravagant frenzy. No sooner was she cured than another soldier, called Chaereas, abducts her on a ship from the harbour in Pharos, and – upon being pursued – decapitates her before her lover's eyes and throws the decapitated body into the sea. Clitophon, heartbroken and devoid of any hope, decides to agree to marry Melite, a rich Ephesian woman, whose husband perished at sea during some expedition. The wedding is to take place in Ephesus. At some point, however, Clitophon – while visiting the country residence of his wife-to-be – finds out that one of her slave-girls was Leucippe. Therefore he keeps on postponing the wedding, until it turns out that the wedding cannot take place anyway – due to a sudden return of Thersander, Melite's husband, who actually had not perished by shipwreck. The husband throws the rival – or rather the adulterer – into fetters in his own house; while under custody, Clitophon duly responds to Melite's courtship, so she in turn gives him her clothes and thus enables him to escape. However, not long after his flight, he falls into Thersander's hands and is lodged in prison. Here one of his cell-mates tells him that a friend of his was commanded by Melite to kill a certain Leucippe, but it was he himself who was accused of the deed. Clitophon is supposed to stand trial on the charge of having committed adultery with Melite. Clitophon not only pleads guilty of this trespass, but also accuses himself of Leucippe's murder which he allegedly perpetrated on the urging of Melite. In spite of Clinias' speech in his defence, he was condemned to death and only the arrival of a group of envoys at the temple of Artemis caused the suspension of the execution. At the head of this group was Leucippe's father, who now requests from Clitophon the return of his daughter. They all go to the temple of Artemis where they find Leucippe who has escaped from a hut in which she had been detained by Thersander, enamoured of her. Now a new trial is held in the temple; the high priest of Artemis pleads Clitophon's case. Melite's innocence and Leucippe's chastity are to be determined by divine verdict (as in Heliodorus). And so Melite swears that she had not have any intercourse with Clitophon in Thersander's absence, and she comes out intact of the Stygian water, whereas Leucippe's chastity is confirmed by the music from Pan's cave (as in Longus). Thersander loses the case; Leucippe explains how was it that it was not she who was killed on the ship and the whole company returns happily to Tyre. Callisthenes was exculpated of the abduction of Calligone and received the permission to marry her. And thus this realistic romance turns somehow into a humorous novel, and by the same token becomes very similar to the unique original Roman novel, the *Satyricon* by Petronius. And even if Petronius did not write a romance but a Menippean satire in the form taken from Alexandrian mimes and farcical plays, i.e. in prose with poetic insertions, nonetheless he must have had the Greek romances before his eyes. The portrayal of the trio of vagabonds, pursued by the wrath of Priapus,

is a parody of the romantic stereotype. Giton replaces a beloved heroine; and in the role of a hero appears Encolpius, a rogue *par excellence*, who must constantly struggle for the favours of his beloved. Yet, the Roman realism of Petronius, which was connected with the Italian substratum of the times of Nero, has nothing to do with the abstract conventional Greek idealism. Therefore, we refer the readers to an excellent study by Professor K. MORAWSKI, *Petroniusz Arbiter i jego romans* (Przegląd Polski XIII 1879, fasc. 4) and we return to the problem of determining the dates of Achilles Tatius.

ROHDE was convinced that he lived after Musaeus, the author of an epyllion about Hero and Leander. And indeed, certain expressions and situations are similar in both these writers. However, these similarities may be related to a common Alexandrian source. Besides, in view of the systematic development of literary genres, the romance of Achilles must have preceded the epyllion of Musaeus. For, just as the first romance was created after the epyllion had died out, and its topics had been absorbed in new form by school oratory, so also – after the renaissance of the epyllion in the circle of Nonnus (towards the end of the 4th century AD) – the romance ceased to have any reason for further existence, since its narrative found anew a proper form in the epyllion. Therefore, we do not hesitate to place Achilles roughly by the end of the 4th century AD, i.e. before Musaeus.

Byzantine men of letters were eagerly perusing those literary products of the decaying Hellenism, but – faced with the rebirth of both the epic and the epyllion – they were writing only poetic works. The public at large, the Christian populace, never got to know those fruits of the feverish imagination of the rhetors. The common folk were fond of spiritual edifying novels about Barlaam and Ioasaph, about Syntipas the philosopher and the seven sages, about two sly jackals named Stephanites and Ichneutes; all these stories were of Eastern origin – from Arabia and India (cf. K. KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches*, München ²1897, pp. 886 ff.). The renaissance of the 11th century provoked a renewed interest in the novels of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, as attested by the romances of Eumathius, Theodorus Prodromus, Nicetas Eugenianus and Constantinus Manasses (cf. KRUMBACHER, p. 643), but these degenerated fruits of Byzantine fantasy were not met with great appreciation of the public. Just as since the 7th century AD it was the East wherefrom the plots of the novels were drawn, so since the 13th century AD the West took over as the source of these plots. The crusaders brought with them to Byzantium the western tales and chivalrous romances, which until the 16th century constituted the favourite readings of the Byzantine society (cf. KRUMBACHER, pp. 854 ff.). And when in the West these chivalrous romances eventually became extinct, the way was paved for the imitators of Heliodorus and of other Greek romancers. And thus the Greek romance, in spite of its feeble aesthetic value, plays an extremely important role in the history of the European literature, and so – for the sake of this role – it merits to be known.