Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non–exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Carissa Martin April 6, 2021

Sophrosyne and *Pseudos*: Performing the End of the Ancient Greek Novel

by

Carissa Martin

Dr. Niall Slater

Adviser

Classics Department

Dr. Niall Slater

Adviser

Dr. Christine Perkell

Committee Member

Dr. Kevin Corrigan

Committee Member

2021

Sophrosyne and *Pseudos*: Performing the End of the Ancient Greek Novel

By

Carissa Martin

Dr. Niall Slater

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Classics Department

2021

Abstract

Sophrosyne and *Pseudos*: Performing the End of the Ancient Greek Novel
By Carissa Martin

In this project, I explore how tests of *sophrosyne* create the false sense of closure necessary for ending two ancient Greek novels, *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika*. Through close reading at the narrative and metanarrative levels, I show that the tests of *sophrosyne* in the final book of each novel are spaces for performance which allow for the resolution of two problems: the difficulty of ending a polyphonic novel, and the anxiety about the hero/ine's chastity created by the novels' many threats. I question assumptions about the 'happy' and 'simple' endings of the ancient Greek novel by highlighting the drama, subtlety, deception – and thus the humanity – of these novels. In chapters one and two, I explore the main themes of theater, deception, and manipulation in the chastity test scenes of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika*, respectively. Chapters three and four address the responses of the audience within the narrative to the hero/ine's performances of *sophrosyne,* again in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika,* respectively. The fifth and final chapter examines the role of the audience outside the narrative in creating closure for the novel. At every level, from the protagonists, to the internal audience, to the external audience, performances of *sophrosyne* are necessary for constructing and then reaching the 'happy ending' of each novel.

Sophrosyne and *Pseudos*: Performing the End of the Ancient Greek Novel

By

Carissa Martin

Dr. Niall Slater

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Classics Department

2021

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to those who patiently endured my rambling about an obscure genre from very long ago. I am especially grateful for the longsuffering nature of my longtime roommate, Deanna Dailey, who was always willing put aside her own thesis work and lend a listening ear. I am further indebted to my peers and fellow tutors at the Emory Writing Center, particularly Shawna Dempsey, Rowan Thomas, Karissa Kang, and Kalyani Allums. Their expert help has transformed many an incoherent idea into sensible writing. The Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry provided both funding and encouragement for this project though an Undergraduate Honors Fellowship.

This thesis would never have come to fruition without the encouragement, support, and keen–eyed editing of my adviser, Dr. Niall Slater, whose comments, tangential and otherwise, have been integral to the most interesting areas of this project. I also thank Dr. Christine Perkell, with her sharp wit and thought–provoking questions, for introducing me to the ancient novel and keeping me on my toes as I have continued to work with it. Dr. Kevin Corrigan's lovely writing advice and willingness to explore a new genre gave me the strength to persist through the least pleasant parts of this project and the humility to surrender the most pleasant parts for editing.

And last, but certainly not least, I am most thankful for the constant love and support of my younger sister, Abigail Martin, who frequently reminded me to "speak in actual words, Carissa," and who asked "why on earth does this matter?" Her grounded and playful advice is responsible for any readability and humor which survives in this project.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Love, Lies, and Literature 1
On *Sophrosyne* 4
On Endings 6
On Chastity Tests 9
The Road Ahead 10
Chapter One: Pan, Performance, and *Pseudoparthenoi* 12
If There's A Test for Virginity: *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and *Sophrosyne* 13
The Part that's Really a Story: Cleitophon's Test 15
To Enter the Cave of the Syrinx: Leucippe's Test 19
Chapter Two: Braziers, Bluffing, and Brazenness 28
A Beautiful Shroud: The *Aithiopika* and *Sophrosyne* 29
A Fine Reward: Charikleia's Test 32
The Bull and the Ethiopian Champion: Theagenes' Test 37
Chapter Three: Shouts, Silence, and Sensing the End 45
Crowd Control: Cleitophon's *Sophrosyne* 46
A New Narrator: Leucippe's *Sophrosyne* 50
Chapter Four: Identity, Indulgence, and Interrogating the End 55
Mis(Interpretation): Charikleia's *Sophrosyne* 55
Like Father, Like Daughter: Charikleia's Identity 60
Necessity is the Mother of Deception: Charikleia and Theagenes' Relationship 67
Chapter Five: Close, Closure, and Craft 78
Leucippe and Cleitophon: Encouraging *Euphemia* 79
The *Aithiopika*: Celebrating Confusion 83
Conclusion: Making Provisional Sense 90
Bibliography 94

Introduction: Love, Lies, and Literature

"The novel has to lie."
– Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending*[1]

The ancient Greek novels are among our earliest examples of prose fiction. Written in Greek under the Roman Empire between the first and fifth centuries, the ancient novels feature new, original characters whose dramatic, erotic adventures provide entertainment analogous to the modern romance novel. In every one of the "Big Five" – that is, the five complete, extant novels which survive via manuscripts – the protagonists are the ideal couple, a hero and a heroine who are young, beautiful, and fall in love at first sight. The novels' plots follow a standard formula: after the initial meeting and falling in love, the protagonists are separated and experience dangerous and likely traumatic tests of their faithfulness to one another. At the end of a narrative rife with wars, pirate raids, rape attempts, rival suitors, and human sacrifice, the young man and woman reunite. They prove their faithfulness, marry if they are not already wed, and presumably live out the rest of their happy, faithful lives.

It is this last trope of the novel on which I focus my project. While the arc of the novel and the instincts of audiences inside and outside the novel point toward a happy, fulfilling, untroubled ending, deception and manipulation persist even to the novel's final sentences. In the two latest and most sophisticated novels – Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* – these lies are particularly apparent. We hear from the mouths of the protagonists themselves that they deceive, trick, perform, and manipulate whenever necessary. Their goal is not simply to survive the novel's threats but to preserve their *sophrosyne,* often translated chastity, the central virtue of the novel.[2] So concerned is the novel with the

[1] Kermode (2000) 140.
[2] Bird (2020) 1.

faithfulness and virginity of its protagonists that every novel ends with some variation of a chastity test, a scene where both the hero and heroine must prove that they have remained chaste.

In the earlier three extant novels, *Callirhoe,* the *Ephesiaca,* and *Daphnis and Chloe,* this chastity test scene occurs privately and informally. In the *Ephesiaca*, for example, Anthia questions Habrocomes' faithfulness and defends her own as they spend their first night together: ἀλλ᾽ ἁγνὴ μένω σοι πᾶσαν σωφροσύνης μηχανὴν πεποιημένη, "but I remain pure, having employed every device for chastity" (5.14.2). Xenophon then invokes the most famous demonstration of spousal loyalty by recalling Odysseus and Penelope, who also conversed the night away when they reunited: ταῦτα δι᾽ ὅλης νυκτὸς ἀλλήλοις ἀπελογοῦντο, "Thus they defended themselves to each other throughout the whole night" (5.15.1).[3] In *Daphnis and Chloe,* the eponymous protagonists each question whether the other has forgotten their vows of faithfulness.[4] These small proofs of chastity in the earlier novels – references to the *Odyssey,* questions of faithfulness and loyalty, and truthfully narrating stories – become public, performative experiences in the later novels. [5]

Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, on whose works I focus this project, take a more knowing, complex attitude toward resolving the novel's anxiety about chastity. They express concern with *sophrosyne* even as they show that it can be performed, mocked, and falsified. The threats in the center of these novels explicitly threaten the hero/ine's virginity, thereby destabilizing the believability of an ending which relies on vows of faithfulness for resolution. The protagonists' sexual desire for one another and other characters' desire for the protagonists

[3] Cf. *Odyssey* 23.300.
[4] Chloe at 4.27, Daphnis at 4.28.
[5] The rise of Christianity and the focus on finding a Roman equivalent for *sophrosyne* in the Second Sophistic may account for these changes. As North writes, "for *sophrosyne* the gravest danger lay in the tendency of many Christian moralists to overemphasize its relation to chastity." North (1966) 313.

also become more apparent in these novels; Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus flirt with the bounds of even modern propriety.[6] This increased eroticism and its accompanying threat to the hero/ine's virginity create a deep anxiety about *sophrosyne* which demands resolution. We cannot send our heroes off into the proverbial sunset if we do not know they will enter or return to a mutual, faithful, and lawful relationship.[7] At the same time, the novel's knowing play with eroticism means the author cannot simply stamp 'ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ' on the protagonists and end the novel. Instead, to achieve a satisfying, narratively faithful ending, the author asks the question which the characters and the audience have been asking one another: at the end of all this, have the protagonists *really* maintained their *sophrosyne*?

In order to better understand this question, and thus the nuanced endings of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, I deconstruct the novel's treatment of *sophrosyne* and endings. In this project, I explore how the chastity test scenes in the final books of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* blend *sophrosyne* and deception in order to secure a satisfactory end for the novel. I conduct a close reading of the chastity test scene in each novel first inside the narrative, analyzing its main themes and its effects on the final scenes of both novels (chapters one and two). Then, I analyze the reactions of the audiences within the novel as they watch the protagonists' chastity tests (chapters three and four). Finally, I move beyond the narrative, asking what response the chastity tests provoke or require from the audience outside the novel (chapter five). Through this analysis, I show the narrative and metanarrative necessity of the chastity test

[6] Many translations of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* have printed the raciest sections of the text into Latin or omitted them entirely in order to obscure their sexual nature. Helen Morales comments "for these readers, it seems, the novel can be read as a story which promotes good, honest values if, and only if, various episodes are excised. The emphasis in these adaptations is upon chastity and the union of marriage." Morales (2004) 7.

[7] With such narrative pressure, it is no wonder that the protagonists turn to performance, manipulation, deception, and outright falsehood in order to secure a legitimate marriage.

as a device for creating (false) closure for the novel. In so doing, I call into question assumptions classicists have made and continue to make about the 'happy' and 'simple' endings of the ancient Greek novels. Such a project requires three main points of clarification – What is *sophrosyne* in the novel? What is a novelistic ending? And what, exactly, is a chastity test?

On *Sophrosyne*

During the Second Sophistic, when *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* were written, a renewed interest in Classical art, literature, and rhetoric intersected with an emerging Christian morality.[8] In the process, concern with *sophrosyne* reached new heights. As Simon Goldhill says,

> The relationship between the body and the self, between the self and the world, between the self and others, particularly the divine other, is being reforged...in later antiquity, virginity was a hot topic.[9]

As a result, translators of the novel typically render *sophrosyne* as chastity, a state of bodily virginity and faithfulness to one's spouse. Such a definition, however, obscures the rich and varied history of *sophrosyne*, which in turn does a disservice to the novel's complex engagement with *sophrosyne.*

Helen North summarizes *sophrosyne* in her landmark book on the subject as "the control of appetite, usually erotic."[10] This, of course, includes virginity, chastity, and faithfulness, but *sophrosyne* can also extend to self–control, moderation, making the right choice, good timing, and even skillful storytelling. The many meanings of *sophrosyne* made it a compelling theme for many genres under the Roman Empire, including comedy, rhetoric, philosophy, and Christian martyrologies. However, when Rome adapted the concept from Greek thought to its own social

[8] Bossu (2015) 115.
[9] Goldhill (1995) 1–2.
[10] North (1996) 243.

mores, "*sophrosyne* proved the most difficult to assimilate to the *virtus Romana*. In its origins — social and political, as well as temperamental — it was entirely foreign to Rome."[11] Perhaps it was this foreignness, or an underlying awareness that *sophrosyne* cannot be noticed or proved through physical examination, [12] which caused such deep distrust of women[13] and their chastity both in and out of the novel: Anthia tests Habrocomes' loyalty; Leucippe the *pseudoparthenos,* the "lying virgin," must prove her integrity; Chloe and Daphnis worry the other has forgotten their oaths; and Theagenes and Charikleia defend their chastity before an entire city. Even in the earliest complete, extant novel we have, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Goldhill notes that "suspicion of a wife's fidelity is...the very mainspring of Chariton's plot."[14]

Indeed, the novel does not even seem to view *sophrosyne* as an achievable goal. Scholars writing on Achilles Tatius, Chariton, and Longus propose that the novel's protagonists – especially the heroines – are "too real" and "too human" for the ideal of *sophrosyne* the novel holds.[15] The tension both in and out of the novel between reality and chastity begs the question "what is your wife (or daughter) really like?"[16] No proof, save perhaps divine assurance (and truly not even that), can allay the sneaking suspicion that women lie about virginity. It may be more fitting, then, to say that the novel does not focus on *sophrosyne*, but rather on the struggle for *sophrosyne,* the path the characters tread as they move toward an unattainable goal. We know the novel cannot end without a faithful union rooted in *sophrosyne*, or the audience will walk

---

[11] North (1996) 258.
[12] Despite the suggestions ancient writers such as Galen, Soranus, and Aristotle offered to prove a woman's physical virginity, a deep (and usually masculine) anxiety remained. Our understanding of virginity as a construct, then, may not be uniquely modern — the unknowability of a woman's sexual purity remained a pervasive worry, despite medical writers' claims. See Sissa (1990) 105ff. for further discussion.
[13] This trope, of course, extends all the way back to the *Odyssey,* a central intertext for all of the novels, where the threats to both Penelope and Odysseus' chastity drive the plot to its reunion– and loyalty–centered conclusion.
[14] Goldhill (1995) 127.
[15] Chew (2000) 67; Goldhill (1995) 44; Wiersma (1990) 117.
[16] Goldhill (1995) 121.

away more uncomfortable than amused. As we have established, however, such a union may well be impossible for the novel to construct believably. So what are readers and characters to do? How can we trust a narrative whose entire journey is one long worry about the promised but unprovable concept of *sophrosyne*?

On Endings

Like the anxious intangibility of *sophrosyne,* the task of ending the novel at all may be out of reach. For example, is it true, as the narrator of *Callirhoe* suggests, that the end of the novel cleanses away (καθαρίζειν) the unsavory elements of the narrative?[17] Or, instead, do we feel a lingering sense, however faint, that the lying and deceiving and manipulating which has characterized the rest of the novel still persists in its ending?

Many scholars have read the ancient novel's 'happy ending' as such a sure thing, such an essential part of the genre, that they say it acts as the organizing principle for the whole novel. John Morgan writes of the *Aithiopika* that "marriage...is the end to which all the experiences of hero and heroine have been directed, and which alone can make their experience bearable and senseful."[18] Margaret Doody, echoing this idea, also reads satisfying resolution as a key part of the novelistic genre. "A novel may be considered as a sort of long convalescence from the threat and pain of its beginning. If the opening of a novel is characterized by breaking, it is equally characterized by its counterpart and opposite . . . mending."[19] David Konstan's concept of sexual symmetry also encourages the reading of a happy ending – a mutual and faithful relationship between the protagonists – in the novel.[20]

---

[17] *Callirhoe* 8.1.1.
[18] Morgan (1989) 320.
[19] Doody (1996) 316.
[20] Konstan (1994).

While these readings of the end of the novel appeal to our desire for closure and certainty, they do not address the myriad of unanswered questions, concealed actions, and conflicting desires which remain at the end of the novel. More recent discussions of the novel's end have begun to identify these issues and thus to problematize the end of the ancient Greek novel. Helen Morales, for example, claims "it is only by reading teleologically — stressing the ending and downplaying the journey toward it — that we can read the novels simply as celebrating marriage."[21] Koen de Temmerman, analyzing characterization in the novels, likewise writes "even if the novel ultimately celebrates the love between the two protagonists, the entire story revolves around the fact that, in their love, there are things to hide, there are rivals, and there is jealousy."[22] Both Steve Nimis and Aldo Tagliabue identify numerous incongruous elements at the end of the *Ephesiaca* (traditionally the least complex novel); they argue these inconsistencies indicate "a new 'novelistic' problem: how to end a story properly."[23] The two novels I consider have especially complicated relationships to happy endings, as Simon Goldhill and Rachel Bird both note. Goldhill observes that instability and violence actually increase as *Leucippe and Cleitophon* draws to a close. "As the narrative progresses towards the public, legal testing of [Leucippe's] virginity, not only do the defenses of her virginity become more involved, but also the images of violent penetration increase."[24] Bird says of the *Aithiopika* that

> While the *Aethiopica* seems on a surface–level reading to offer a representation of extreme adherence to sexual virtue and therefore to *sōphrosynē*, particularly in the characterisation of Charicleia, this is an over–simplistic view of the text.[25]

It appears, then, that reading a happy, chaste ending to the ancient novel may be too simplistic.

---

[21] Morales (2008) 41.
[22] De Temmerman (2014) 58.
[23] Nimis (1999) 223.
[24] Goldhill (1995) 117.
[25] Bird (2017) 207.

Instead, close examination of the final books of all five extant novels reveals that the ancient Greek novel is, as Michael Anderson concludes,

> a polyphonic erotic text, discourse rather than simple monologue, and while elevating the chaste, heterosexual love of its hero and heroine, it does not ignore other, sometimes conflicting manifestations.[26]

We can certainly conclude from this shift in perspective over the last twenty–five years that the novel does concern itself with chastity and endings, but we must remain alert to the novel's deliberate, self–conscious manipulation of both ideas.

A similar difficulty arises at the metanarrative level when we consider the very idea of ending the novel. As Frank Kermode writes, "the novel [as a genre] raises the problem of closure in a particularly insistent manner."[27] Beginning with Bakhtin, the problem of bringing closure to a polyphonic narrative has plagued critics of both the ancient and modern novel. If the novelist has done their job well (as, debatably, the ancient novelists have), then the distinct voices and perspectives of the characters will resist a closed ending; at the same time, as Kermode points out, "we need, and provide, fictions of concord."[28] Authors can employ the familiar markers of genres like comedy, epic, and history — a lesson learned, a marriage made, a homecoming achieved — to give a carefully constructed *impression* of an ending, but they cannot really tell us the ending of the characters' stories. Francis Dunn even terms the idea of studying closure in any genre "atheoretical" because of its constructed and fluid nature.[29] Thus, the ending of the ancient Greek novel becomes not only concerned with deception but *is* itself a deception; because we cannot find an end, we must make one. Therefore, the question returns: what are readers and

[26] Anderson (1997) 311.
[27] Kermode (2000) 9.
[28] Kermode (2000) 59.
[29] Dunn (1996) 9.

characters to do? How can we satisfactorily end a narrative which, by its polyphonic nature, defies conclusion?

On Chastity Tests

These two anxieties – the problem of *sophrosyne* and the problem of ending – crystallize in the chastity test scenes which end *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika.* In Books VIII and X respectively, both the hero and heroine must prove their chastity not only to secure a legitimate marriage for themselves, but also to secure a legitimate end for the novel. The usual definition of *sophrosyne* as chastity or virginity does not honor the complexity of this double responsibility, so for this project, I try to encompass the breadth of *sophrosyne* by using two separate terms: 'bodily chastity' and 'rhetorical chastity.' The former is the social construct of virginity, the physical dimension of *sophrosyne,* a lack of sexual intercourse, and bodily integrity. The latter is the performance of said bodily integrity, a display of *sophrosyne* before an audience to convince them that the performer is in fact a virgin.

To continue to emphasize the novel's double anxieties about *sophrosyne* and ending, I term the explicit, public questioning of the protagonists' *sophrosyne* a 'chastity test' rather than a 'virginity test' for two reasons.[30] First, the hero/ine's virginity – their physical, sexual purity – is not the only (or even the primary) concern of these displays. At the end of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika*, the scenes of public trial and ritual sacrifice amplify the novels' concern with *sophrosyne* from the local (are children from their marriage going to be legitimate?) to the communal (is our justice system/religious ritual legitimate?). In light of this shift, 'virginity test' seems reductive; as I noted above, much more is at stake than the simple

[30] There is a less significant third reason: "test of *sophrosyne*" simply does not flow.

physical state of the protagonists.[31] Second, as Cleitophon observes, the virginity of men has been historically, literarily, and scientifically difficult to certify, if such a concept exists at all.[32] While far from a perfect encapsulation of *sophrosyne*, chastity nonetheless extends beyond virginity to less gendered concerns[33] such as emotional faithfulness, honesty, and mutuality. The chastity test scenes which I analyze, then, are multidimensional trials in which two main questions must be answered: are the protagonists chaste, and can they convince the crowd that this is true? The answer to both questions, for the sake of a smooth and satisfying narrative, must of course be yes, but the process of constructing an affirmative answer is not easy. Confronted with this double dilemma, the novel must engage in performance, rhetoric, and deceit. In Kermode's words, "[the novel] has to lie" – and so do the characters, the readers, and the authors.[34]

The Road Ahead

By analyzing these two questions in the chastity test scenes of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, I argue in the first two chapters that performance, deception, and manipulation are the means by which the characters, audiences, and authors resolve the novel's problem of *sophrosyne* and ending. In the first chapter, Pan, Performance, and *Pseudoparthenoi*, I conduct a close reading of the chastity test scenes in Book VIII of *Leucippe and Cleitophon.* I highlight

[31] This does not mean that virginity and sexual purity do not play crucial roles in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. For an excellent discussion of *parthenia* in these two novels, see Ormand 2010.
[32] Twice Cleitophon raises this concern: μαθήσῃ τὴν σήν με παρθενίαν μεμιμημένον, εἴ τις ἐστὶ καὶ ἐν ἀνδράσι παρθενια. "You will learn that I have mimicked your virginity" (5.20.5); εἴ τις ἄρα ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς παρθενία, ταύτην κἀγὼ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος πρὸς Λευκίππην ἔχω· "If there exists a virginity for man, this I have had concerning Leucippe until the present time" (8.5.7).
[33] "*Sophrosyne* is the primary virtue of women in Greek inscriptions, often the only one mentioned, or the only moral virtue amid a list of physical qualities, social attributes, and domestic accomplishments...But *sophrosyne* is by no means limited to women, even in the period of the Empire, when its archaic position as a masculine civic virtue had long since been forgotten." North (1966) 253.
[34] Kermode (2000) 140.

Cleitophon and Leucippe's bodily chastity tests and their rhetorical chastity tests in order to reveal the themes of performance, deception, and narrative control which run through these scenes. In chapter two, Braziers, Bluffing, and Brazenness, I perform a similar close reading of Charikleia and Theagenes' chastity tests in Book X in the *Aithiopika.*

Then, in chapter three, Shouts, Silence, and Sensing the End, I consider the reactions of the internal audience to the chastity test scenes in *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* and I ask what these reactions reveal about *sophrosyne* and about the ending of the novel. Likewise, in chapter four, Identity, Indulgence, and Interrogating the End, I analyze the reactions of the internal audience to the chastity test scenes of the *Aithiopika.* I organize the internal audience's reactions into a chain of performances which showcase the effects of performed *sophrosyne*. Finally, in chapter five, Close, Closure, and Craft, I read the final scene of each novel – its close – to determine the effect of *sophrosyne* on the external audience. I explore how the external audience participates in creating closure for the novel by performing *sophrosyne*. Working from my opening questions about the knowability of *sophrosyne* and the possibility of ending a polyphonic novel, I connect performances of *sophrosyne* to the strategies of ending which Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus employ.

Chapter One: Pan, Performance, and *Pseudoparthenoi*

Ὅτι μὲν παρθένος ἡ Λευκίππη πεπίστευκα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πᾶνα, ὦ φιλτάτη, φοβοῦμαι.
"I am sure Leucippe is a virgin, but, my dearest, I am afraid of Pan!"[35]
– *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* 8.13.2

In Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* we see the chastity test in its most explicit, defined form. As early as Book II, Leucippe mentions *tis dokimasia parthenias,* or "some test for virginity," showing that the idea of verifiable, demonstrable chastity is at work from the beginning of the novel (2.28.2). Leucippe (and Cleitophon, and Melite) prove both their bodily and rhetorical chastity through tests of *sophrosyne* which are suited to each character. Cleitophon, for example, has less pressure to prove his bodily chastity. While he does mention masculine virginity (if such a thing exists), his test of *sophrosyne* mainly focuses on his rhetorical abilities, his skill in convincing the audience that he has remained chaste. Leucippe, on the other hand, faces much more anxiety about her bodily chastity because of her gender and the numerous explicit rape threats she experiences in the novel. As a result, her test is more lengthy, requiring divine confirmation of her bodily chastity and a performance of rhetorical chastity. Both protagonists must be both chaste and convincing.

Because Leucippe and Cleitophon's tests are so distinct and so clearly laid out in the narrative, I address them in chronological order. In this chapter, I establish *sophrosyne* as a concern central to the narrative from the very beginning of the novel by analyzing discussions of chastity which occur in the first two books. Next, I move to Book VIII, where the chastity tests occur. I begin with Cleitophon's test, in which he proves both his bodily chastity and his rhetorical chastity through multiple levels of narration. I then consider Leucippe's test in the

[35] All Greek text in this chapter comes from Vilborg 1955.

cave of Artemis and Pan, where I address both Leucippe's bodily chastity and her narrative control over her chastity test. In all three areas, I highlight themes of deception and performance, especially when Cleitophon's first person narration explicitly calls these ideas to mind.

If There's a Test for Virginity: *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and *Sophrosyne*

The early books of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* capitalize on the tension around *sophrosyne*. Leucippe, angry with her mother for disparaging her relationship with Cleitophon, actually invokes a chastity test as such, declaring εἰ παρθενίας ἔστι τις δοκιμασία, δοκίμασον. "If there's some test for virginity, test me!" (2.28.2). Achilles Tatius does not apply the word *sophrosyne* to Leucippe until Book VIII, but Cleitophon's own battle with *sophrosyne* provides a sense of how great the stakes surrounding it are, even in parody. As he wrestles in his bed over the feelings he has for Leucippe, he invokes Apollo.

> ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός. κἂν εἰς σωφροσύνην τις ἑαυτὸν νουθετῇ, τῷ παραδείγματι πρὸς τὴν μίμησιν ἐρεθίζεται, μάλιστα ὅταν ἐκ τοῦ κρείττονος ᾖ τὸ παράδειγμα· καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἔλεγον· "Ἰδοὺ καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἐρᾷ, κἀκεῖνος παρθένου, καὶ ἐρῶν οὐκ αἰσχύνεται, ἀλλὰ διώκει τὴν παρθένον· σὺ δὲ ὀκνεῖς καὶ αἰδῇ καὶ ἀκαίρως σωφρονεῖς· μὴ κρείττων εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ;"
>
> So the romantic story was fuel for my desires. Even when someone mentally urges himself toward chastity, he is roused to imitation by a model, especially when that model is from someone better than him. And I said these things to myself: "Look, even Apollo fell in love, and with a virgin, and while he loved her he was not ashamed. Rather, he pursued the virgin; but you hesitate and feel shame and remain chaste at the wrong times! Are you better than the god?" (1.5.6–7)

For Cleitophon, the crux of his concern is his own cowardice, his worry that he will not perform adequately in love. His initial battle with *sophrosyne* is not a matter of life and death, but his language (παράδειγμα, μίμησιν, τοῦ κρείττονος) nonetheless introduces a philosophical concern which elevates his worries. Goldhill notes that Cleitophon here is, like many tragic, philosophic,

and Christian figures before him, taking "a god as his paradigm – but of slippage" rather than *sophrosyne,* which is "set up and then undercut as a philosophical term *par excellence*."[36] Already in Book I of *Leucippe and Cleitophon, sophrosyne* is an unstable but unyielding concern.

Cleitophon's battle for and against *sophrosyne* continues into Book II, where he receives instruction in love from a slave, Satyros. Cleitophon worries that he will not be up to the task of pursuing Leucippe, and Satyros tells him that if Cleitophon is frightened and fails to act, he risks making a liar (καταψεύδῃ)[37] of Eros. Cleitophon responds by trying to mold himself into *sophrosyne* as he understands it.

> "Τί γάρ, ὦ κακόδαιμον, οὐ σωφρονεῖς; τί δὲ οὐκ ἐρᾷς ὧν σε δεῖ; παρθένον ἔνδον ἔχεις ἄλλην καλήν· ταύτης ἔρα, ταύτην βλέπε, ταύτην ἔξεστί σοι γαμεῖν."
>
> "So, wretched man, why don't you get a hold of yourself? Why don't you love those things which you must love? You have in your family another beautiful girl; love that woman! Look at her – it's possible for you to marry her." (2.5.2)

These two contests illustrate the stakes for Cleitophon (and by extension, Leucippe) with respect to *sophrosyne.* Again, we see deception, moral philosophizing, and internal struggle intertwine with chastity. Cleitophon's self–questioning intensifies the narrative's worry about *sophrosyne* by casting doubt on the potential for both action and inaction. By the second book of the novel, *sophrosyne* at once is and is not the divinely–sanctioned route which Cleitophon should pursue. This literary game simultaneously heightens the importance of Cleitophon's struggle by invoking the language of serious, self–reflective disciplines, even as the narrative minimizes his suffering

[36] Goldhill (1995) 73. Morales (2004) notes a similar slippage is present when Cleitophon describes his and Melite's interactions as "playing philosophers," writing that "'Philosophising' in this instance indicates not Stoic self–mastery, but seducing a lover and committing adultery." Morales (2004) 59–60.
[37] ὅρα μὴ καταψεύδῃ τοῦ θεοῦ, "see to it that you don't make a liar of the god" (2.4.5).

through obvious parody.

The Part That's Really a Story: Cleitophon's Test

At the beginning of Book VIII, the narrative's concern with *sophrosyne* crystallizes into a dramatic showdown which will require an entire book to resolve. The protagonists have just reunited, Cleitophon has been accused and acquitted of murder, and the hero and heroine prepare to discuss the many dangerous, dramatic experiences they have survived. Thersander, hostile and arrogant as usual, interrupts their reunion and calls Leucippe δούλην ἐμήν, γυναῖκα μάχλον καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρας ἐπιμανῆ, "my slave, a woman who is lustful and crazy for men" (8.1.2). His accusation of Cleitophon – δεσμῶτα καὶ κατάδικε, "prisoner and convict" – picks up on the concerns raised by Cleitophon's trial in Book VII (8.1.2). Is Cleitophon honest? Is he a murderer? This embarrassing spectacle refreshes the novel's anxiety about their *sophrosyne* and forces Cleitophon into his test of *sophrosyne:* storytelling. To dispel the tension created by these accusations, members of the symposium ask for the story of Cleitophon's adventures: τὸ δὲ λοιπόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ μῦθος, λέγε, τέκνον Κλειτοφῶν, μηδὲν αἰδούμενος. "But the rest, the part that's really a story – tell that, young Cleitophon, without being ashamed" (8.4.3).[38] Cleitophon clearly does have some level of shame about his story, though. Rather than simply narrate events, he gives a running editorial commentary as he tells (parts of) his story. Through the process of Cleitophon's narration, the audience learns that he has both bodily chastity – he has not slept with Melite – and rhetorical chastity – self–restraint in storytelling.

When Cleitophon narrates the sections where his bodily chastity may be in doubt, he pointedly boasts about how pure he (and Melite, and Leucippe) have been. Cleitophon tells the

[38] Winkler translates μῦθος as "the real tale," which highlights the irony of the edited account to follow. Reardon (1989) 271.

reader first that ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μελίτην ἐγενόμην, ἐξῆρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐψευδόμην, "when I came to the part about Melite, I made my story more dignified, directing it toward chastity, and I told no lie" (8.5.2). [39] He even swears by Artemis (μὰ ταύτην τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, 8.5.2) that he and Melite did not have sex. He neglects to mention several key facts: that he plans to marry Melite; that, because he thinks Leucippe dead, he promised to have sex with Melite once he left Egypt; and that he did, in fact, sleep with Melite back in Book V.[40] In the same way, Cleitophon shapes his storytelling to emphasize Leucippe's *sophrosyne*.

> κἀν τῷδε κατὰ τὸν Σωσθένην καὶ Θέρσανδρον γενόμενος ἐξῆρον καὶ τὰ αὐτῆς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ τἀμά, ἐρωτικῶς αὐτῇ χαριούμενος ἀκούοντος τοῦ πατρός·
>
> And when I came to the part about Sosthenes and Thersander, I also made her story even more dignified than my own, doing a favor for her as her lover, since her father was listening. (8.5.5)

Cleitophon here repeats the formula he used to describe his edited tale. Aware of the high stakes for Leucippe (her father's presence and the situation with Thersander), he amplifies her chastity.

These editorial choices offer a clear sense of Cleitophon's bodily chastity, but they also serve to emphasize his rhetorical chastity. As we can see above, despite all his boasting, Cleitophon is not in fact chaste. As he narrated in Book V, he had sex with Melite, who decidedly did not rise from his bed ὡς ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀνέστη γυνή "as a woman rises from [the

---

[39] Winkler again here offers a cunning translation: "(though I told no positive lies)." Though the Greek is much more compact, the idea of not *actually* lying certainly captures the self–justifying tone Cleitophon is using here. Winkler (1989) 271.

[40] Περιβαλλούσης οὖν ἠνειχόμην καὶ περιπλεκομένης πρὸς τὰς περιπλοκὰς οὐκ ἀντέλεγον· καὶ ἐγένετο ὅσα ὁ Ἔρως ἤθελεν. "So, when she embraced me, I did not restrain myself, and when she twined herself around me, I did not object to her embraces; and it happened, as much as Eros wished" (5.27.3). As Ormand notes, "this is the only act of sex within the confines of the plot; significantly, it takes place in a context that is specifically designated as outside of marriage." Ormand (2010) 174.

bed of] another woman" (8.5.2).[41] Cleitophon may not be telling a *direct* lie in his narrative, but he certainly manipulates his story by holding back parts of the narrative: ἓν μόνον παρῆκα τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ δραμάτων, τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Μελίτην αἰδῶ· "One thing alone I passed over in my account, which was that after these events, I had reason for shame before Melite" (8.5.3). The shame Cleitophon discusses here implies embarrassment about his sexual relationship with Melite; it also raises the idea of shame (or modesty) as a moral principle. Both shame and omission, according to North, are components of *sophrosyne* as described by many Stoic philosophers.

> Chrysippus was also responsible for the proliferation of virtues in the Old Stoa, a result perhaps of his effort to systematize what was traditional in popular morality. To each of the four *prôtae aretae* he subordinated a group of secondary virtues (SVF 3. 264). In the case of sophrosyne these are *eutaxia* ("proper arrangement"), *kosmiotês* ("orderliness"), *aidêmosynê* ("sense of shame"), and *enkrateia* ("self–restraint"). As the common element in all four secondary virtues suggests, sophrosyne is thought of as controlling or ordering the impulses.[42]

Cleitophon's narration contains all these elements of *sophrosyne: eutaxia* in his impressively chronological retelling of a very complicated series of events, *kosmiotês* in his ability to decorously navigate his story while drunk, *aidêmosynê* in his self–aware shame before Melite, and *enkrateia* in restraining those parts of his narrative which would reflect poorly on himself or Leucippe.

Cleitophon's internal revisions therefore accomplish a double task in the demonstration of his *sophrosyne.* On the one hand, he shows his audience that he has remained chaste, offering divine proof through his oath to Artemis and physical proof in his scars. On the other hand, he

[41] I will mention that the potential for innuendo here about women sleeping with women is significant, and adds another level of playful destabilization to the narrative.
[42] North (1966) 219.

demonstrates his self–control and rhetorical skill, other aspects of *sophrosyne*, by controlling the course of his narrative. As North points out, acts of omission, manipulation, and selection also fall under a Stoic sense of *sophrosyne*–as–*arete*.

> Zeno defined *arete* generically as wisdom (*phronêsis*) and explained the other three principal virtues (*prôtae aretae* is the Stoic term) as manifestations of *phronêsis* in different situations: justice in rendering others their due, *andreia* in enduring, and *sophrosyne* in choosing . . . One [of Chrysippus' definitions of *sophrosyne*] says that sophrosyne is knowledge (*epistêmê*) of things to be chosen and avoided or neither; its antithesis, *akolasia*, is the ignorance of these matters.[43]

Cleitophon has given exactly such a demonstration of *sophrosyne* in his storytelling. Mindful of his audience and of the importance of displaying his and Leucippe's chastity, Cleitophon selects which parts of his story should stay, and which should be put aside. Were this not proof enough of his self–restraint, the reader may also remember that Cleitophon is telling his tale at a symposium: προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ πότου καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου κατὰ μικρὸν ἐξιλασκομένου τὴν αἰδῶ, "as the drinking went on and Dionysius little by little washed away our shame" (8.4.2). Even in these circumstances, Cleitophon demonstrates his *sophrosyne* – self–restraint, chastity, and skill at choosing – in several ways, capturing many of the layers of *sophrosyne* present in the Second Sophistic imagination. Such a 'chastity test' may not be the Victorian search for virginity which modern readers expect, but it moves toward the same goal: demonstrating that the hero, after everything, has remained in control of himself.

As Cleitophon ends his story, he makes a somewhat surprising shift – he prays to Aphrodite.

> δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη, μὴ νεμεσήσῃς ἡμῖν ὡς ὑβρισμένη. οὐκ ἠθέλομεν ἀπάτορα γενέσθαι τὸν γάμον. πάρεστιν οὖν ὁ πατήρ· ἦκε καὶ σύ· εὐμενὴς ἡμῖν ἤδη γενοῦ."

[43] North (1966) 215.

> Lady Aphrodite, please do not exact vengeance from us as if we have committed outrage against you. We did not want our marriage to be unofficiated; but now a father is present. Be here as well, and give your favor to us. (8.5.8)

This invocation of the goddess of love and sex contrasts sharply with Cleitophon's focus on chastity and his earlier oath to Artemis. Such incongruity reminds the reader of the ever–present concern that declarations of chastity in the novel cannot be taken at face value, because the characters have too much to lose. Cleitophon's prayer thus creates an ending tension, a subtle reminder that the story is not over: we are still waiting for Leucippe's chastity test.

To Enter the Cave of the Syrinx: Leucippe's Test

Especially on such a gendered topic as virginity, we might expect stark differences between the hero and heroine's tests – Leucippe's chastity test should be more concerned with bodily chastity than Cleitophon's. From the very beginning of Book VIII, however, Achilles Tatius demonstrates that Leucippe's chastity test is in fact equally concerned with narration, deception, and performance as it is with bodily chastity. This becomes clear in Thersander's initial threat: τὸ δὲ τῆς ψευδοπαρθένου ταύτης ἑταίρας ἡ σύριγξ τιμωρήσεται, "but as for her, that pseudovirgin courtesan, the syrinx will exact vengeance" (8.3.3). It would be easy to read his comment as an indication that Leucippe will have a straightforward test: if she is not a virgin, the syrinx will prove it. Upon closer inspection, however, his insult – *pseudoparthenos,*[44] a "lying virgin" – introduces virginity as a site of deception, not surety. Helen Morales points out

[44] *Pseudoparthenos* here has the violent and deadly connotations of the chastity test in Herodotus Book IV, where virgins beat each other with sticks; whoever dies from her injuries is proven a *pseudoparthenos*. ὁρτῇ δὲ ἐνιαυσίῃ Ἀθηναίης αἱ παρθένοι αὐτῶν δίχα διαστᾶσαι μάχονται πρὸς ἀλλήλας λίθοισί τε καὶ ξύλοισι, τῷ αὐθιγενέι θεῷ λέγουσαι τὰ πάτρια ἀποτελέειν, τὴν Ἀθηναίην καλέομεν. τὰς δὲ ἀποθνησκούσας τῶν παρθένων ἐκ τῶν τρωμάτων ψευδοπαρθένους καλέουσι. "They celebrate a yearly festival of Athena, where their maidens are separated into two bands and fight each other with stones and sticks, thus (they say) honoring in the way of their ancestors that native goddess whom we call Athena. Maidens who die of their wounds are called false virgins" (trans. AD Godley, Perseus, Herodotus, *Histories* 4.180.2).

that "the orator Publius Asprenas declares: 'No woman is chaste enough if an enquiry has to be held about her.'"[45] This raises questions which Leucippe's test of *sophrosyne* must answer. If virginity can be falsified, how can we be certain she is chaste? Will we be able to tell if she is lying? These questions require Leucippe, like Cleitophon, to craft a narrative which convincingly demonstrates her bodily and rhetorical chastity.

While Cleitophon's medium of choice was storytelling, Leucippe's is performance, since she must cater to the needs of a larger audience and their greater skepticism. The setting of Leucippe's performance – a cave which somehow belongs to both Pan and Artemis – establishes an atmosphere of doubt and deception: χαρίζεται τὸ χωρίον τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, συνθήκας ποιησάμενος πρὸς αὐτήν, μηδεμίαν ἐκεῖ καταβαίνειν γυναῖκα. "The land was gifted to Artemis, since Pan made a treaty with her that no woman[46] [i.e. one who has had sex] could go inside there" (8.6.12). Apparently, Leucippe's bodily chastity – her *parthenia* – will be proven by the very god who violently threatens virgins. This strange agreement between a virgin goddess and the notoriously lustful god results in the same incongruous marriage of sexuality and chastity we saw in Cleitophon's test. Ormand, following Goldhill, rightly points out that the set–up of the chastity test implies the threat of rape.

> This idea that to prove herself a virgin she should lock herself up alone in a cave of Pan—a notoriously randy god—is a particularly bad one . . . On the off chance that we have missed this implied set–scene for rape, the story of the syrinx, presented at 8.6 as an *aition* for the test, brings it to the fore. Syrinx, it turns out, was a beautiful virgin (*parthenos*), pursued by Pan . . . In brief, then, Leucippe's virginity will be proven by subjecting it to a secretive test that looks like a set–up for rape.[47]

---

[45] Morales (2004) 214.
[46] γυναῖκα here is used specifically in opposition to παρθένος in the earlier lines of the priest's description. As a result, γυναῖκα means not only "woman" in the sense of gender, but also reveals the sexual maturity and the lack of virginity of the woman in question.
[47] Ormand (2010) 177.

The oddity of this agreement sets a skeptical – even fearful – tone before the details of Leucippe's test are explained, and those only intensify the existing doubt and anxiety. A priest of Artemis reveals that Leucippe's test is not just performative, but a specific type of performance: a musical display.

> κἂν μὲν ᾖ παρθένος, λιγυρόν τι μέλος ἀκούεται καὶ ἔνθεον, ἤτοι τοῦ τόπου πνεῦμα ἔχοντος μουσικὸν εἰς τὴν σύριγγα τεταμιευμένον, ἢ τάχα καὶ ὁ Πὰν αὐτὸς αὐλεῖ.[48] μετὰ δὲ μικρὸν αὐτόμαται μὲν αἱ θύραι ἀνεῴχθησαν τοῦ σπηλαίου, ἐκφαίνεται δὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐστεφανωμένη τὴν κεφαλὴν πίτυος κόμαις. ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ τὴν παρθενίαν ἐψευσμένη, σιωπᾷ μὲν ἡ σύριγξ, οἰμωγὴ δέ τις ἀντὶ μουσικῆς ἐκ τοῦ σπηλαίου πέμπεται.
>
> And if she is a virgin, some delicate and divine melody is heard, either because the place has a musical breath directed into the syrinx, or perhaps Pan himself plays the music. After a little while the doors of the cave, moving on their own, open, and the virgin appears, head garlanded and pine in her hair. However, if she is lying about her virginity, the syrinx is silent, and an awful shout instead of music issues forth from the cave. (8.6.13–14)

Not only does the test seem questionable under Pan's authority, but it is clear that the woman who lies about her virginity – the *pseudoparthenos* – will either die in the cave, or worse: τρίτῃ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ παρθένος ἱέρεια τοῦ τόπου παρελθοῦσα τὴν μὲν σύριγγα εὑρίσκει χαμαί, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα οὐδαμοῦ. "On the third day, a virgin priestess, entering that place, finds a syrinx on the ground, but the woman is nowhere to be found" (8.6.14). The stakes of this test – death or worse – perpetuate our initial doubt about its validity.

At the same time, they create a curious identification between Syrinx, the syrinx, and Leucippe. On some level, Leucippe (and any other test–taker) *is* the syrinx. Perhaps Pan touches

[48] Winkler, writing about Heliodorus, identifies this construction (ἤτοι . . . ἢ) as an amphiboly, an indication of two unequal narrative options. Winkler says this narratological pattern in Heliodorus represents the fear of misinterpretation, which is "the deepest anxiety which informs this novel." I claim that when this construction appears in the center of the description of Leucippe's test of chastity, it indicates a similar anxiety, this time about whether or not we can trust Pan to safely administer this test. Winkler (1982) 120.

her; perhaps she becomes the syrinx if she fails. If she succeeds, perhaps it is she, not the cave or Pan, who plays the syrinx; perhaps she completes a daring escape just as the original Syrinx did. These levels of obscurity surrounding the chastity test and the woman taking it cast doubt on the legitimacy of the results. Leucippe's *sophrosyne* will be as uncertain as the test itself unless she can give a performance which is more convincing than the test is dubious. Like Cleitophon, she will need to use her *sophrosyne* – control in choosing, in leaving out, in arranging – to prove her *sophrosyne* – her chastity.

As the priest continues describing the chastity test, we can observe subtle cues toward the nature of Leucippe's Pan–defying performance. He emphasizes the costuming and staging of the test: ἡ μὲν γὰρ παῖς εἰσέρχεται κεκοσμημένη στολῇ τῇ νενομισμένῃ, ἄλλος δὲ ἐπικλείει τὰς τοῦ σπηλαίου θύρας. "Then the girl enters, dressed in the customary robe, and someone else shuts the doors of the cave" (8.6.12). Later, if the virgin in this description is in fact pure, she emerges from self–moving doors with her "head garlanded and pine in her hair." Whether this costuming is autonomous or divine, it will lend credence to Leucippe's performance.

The priest also reveals the inherent deceit of the chastity test, which has been constructed not around truth but around not lying. Toward the end of his description, the priest tells Leucippe and Cleitophon that they have some control over how things go: πρὸς ταῦτα παρασκευάσασθε πῶς ἂν αὐτοὶ σχῆτε τύχης καὶ σύνετε, "So for these things, prepare how you yourselves will have a chance, and come to an agreement" (8.6.15). He may simply be urging honesty about Leucippe's virginity, but from Achilles Tatius, who loves wordplay, we can expect another layer of meaning. In a test concerned with verification, no version of *alethes* appears anywhere in the description, yet various forms of *pseudomai* appear several times between VIII.6.14 and

VIII.7.5.[49] The priest does not say "tell the truth" or even "don't lie," despite the dire description of what happens to virgins who lie. Nor does he say that the syrinx will reveal truth; he simply says οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε ψεύσαιτο τὴν κρίσιν, "it would never falsify its verdict" (8.6.15). The syrinx would never lie, but the existence of this statement tells us it could. These suggestions that Leucippe, Cleitophon, and the syrinx all have enough agency in the test to pose the threat of lying highlight, as Goldhill says, "a sly and self–aware manipulation of the patriarchal concern for the *knowability*, the *testability* of female chastity."[50] The test, which already rests on shaky ground, has multiple avenues for exploitation. Thus, the message Leucippe receives from the priest's description is the same Cleitophon shared with the reader: to demonstrate your *sophrosyne,* you may perform, deceive, and manipulate – but tell no lies.

When Leucippe reacts to the test, we learn that she has fully understood the priest's description of how to successfully take the chastity test. She demonstrates her *sophrosyne* by entering into the performance of the chastity test, extending it beyond simply entering and exiting the cave. She takes control of the narrative by interrupting the priest, who is offering excuses for any lapse in her chastity.

> Καὶ εὐθὺς ἡ Λευκίππη, πρὶν τὸν ἱερέα εἰπεῖν τὸν ἑξῆς λόγον·"Ὡς γέ μοι δοκεῖ, μηδὲ εἴπῃς· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἑτοίμη εἰς τὸ τῆς σύριγγος σπήλαιον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ χωρὶς κλήσεως κατακεκλεῖσθαι."
>
> And immediately Leucippe, before the priest spoke his next word, said, "So it seems to me that you should speak no more! For I am ready to enter the cave of the syrinx and to be closed within it without being told to do so." (8.6.15)

The audience has seen Leucippe speak boldly before in defense of her bodily chastity,[51] so her

[49] See O'Sullivan (1980) 434 for a full list of *pseudomai* occurrences in Achilles Tatius.
[50] Goldhill (1995) 121.
[51] E.g. Leucippe rebukes Thersander's advances with a strong, lengthy speech at 6.12–13.

urgent interruption here confirms what we may have already suspected – that verbal assaults against chastity are as dangerous as physical ones. The accusation of *pseudoparthenos* from Thersander, the description of what happens to an unchaste woman, and the priest's suggestion that Leucippe may have been forced to lose her virginity[52] all pose real threats to her chastity by directing the narrative toward violation rather than *sophrosyne*. By interrupting the priest and declaring that she will act before being told, Leucippe halts the flow of ways she might not be chaste and asserts what little control she can over the test.

The priest, who has already shown himself aware of the flaws in the test, rightly takes her interjection as a sign of her chastity (ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης), not her virginity (παρθενία), the usual and dominant word for female purity in this section.[53] Leucippe's rush toward the test also displays an element of *sophrosyne* missing from Cleitophon's test: *megalopsychia,* or carelessness toward death. As North points out, *megalopsychia* is a particularly womanly characteristic of *sophrosyne* as demonstrated in the martyrologies of the period: "the Christian ideal of the virgin martyr unites in a new synthesis *sophrosyne* and *megalopsychia*, purity and contempt for death."[54] Even before she enters the cave, Leucippe is exercising her rhetorical chastity by crafting a narrative of bodily chastity.

We also see Leucippe control her narrative on a private level when she reassures her father about her and Cleitophon's honesty: μὰ τὴν γὰρ Ἄρτεμιν, οὐδέτερος ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἐψεύσατο. "I swear by Artemis, neither of us has told any lie" (8.7.3–5). While Cleitophon's

[52] Εἰ δὲ μή, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἴστε οἶα εἰκὸς ἐν τοσαύταις αὐτὴν ἐπιβουλαῖς γενομένην ἄκουσαν— "and if she is not [a virgin], well then, you yourselves know how likely it is that amid so many treacheries a woman may unwillingly be —" (8.6.15).
[53]"Ἀγαθὰ λέγεις," ὁ ἱερεὺς εἶπε, "καί σοι συνήδομαι ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης καὶ τύχης." "You respond well," said the priest, "and I rejoice with you on account of your chastity and your fortune." (8.7.1)
[54] North (1966) 313.

narration suggests that this was his idea,[55] it seems to me that more credit should go to Leucippe. She acts before Cleitophon signals her, she decides what to say and how to say it, and Cleitophon knows her approach will be the most effective.[56] Though Leucippe's agency in storytelling is more limited than Cleitophon–the–narrator's, her confidence and timeliness in manipulating the narrative around her chastity function as further proof of her *sophrosyne*. She continues the theme of not–lying which Cleitophon and the priest introduced, and she swears by Artemis just as Cleitophon does to invite certainty from her audience. Her actions here also display her (and Cleitophon's) keen awareness of audience. If Leucippe does pass the test and can marry Cleitophon, it will be her father's level of certainty which secures the marriage. As a result, Leucippe's display of *sophrosyne* here mirrors Cleitophon's in *kosmiotês,* orderliness, and *eutaxia,* proper arrangement. She knows what to say, when to say it, and to whom to say it in order to perform chastity to the utmost extent, shaping her narrative publicly and privately even before the test.

During the test itself, we see that not only has Leucippe guided the narrative effectively, but she has paid enough attention to the priest's description to give the most convincing performance the crowd has ever seen. Leucippe, properly costumed,[57] walks into the cave confidently – κοσμίως. This adverb encompasses orderliness, stateliness, ornamentation, and

---

[55] διανεύω δὴ τῇ Λευκίππῃ νεύματι ἀφανεῖ τὸν φόβον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξελεῖν ἐπισταμένῃ οἵῳ δὴ τρόπῳ μάλιστα οἴεται πείσειν, "I signal to Leucippe with an indistinct nod to allay her father's fear, because she knows by what method she thinks she can best convince her father" (8.7.4).

[56] Κἀκείνη δὲ ἐδόκει μοι ταὐτὸν ὑποπτεύειν, ὥστε ταχὺ μὲν συνῆκε· διενοεῖτο δὲ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ νεύματος, πῶς ἂν κοσμιώτατα προσενεχθείη τῷ πιστώματι. "And she seemed to me to notice the same thing, with the result that she quickly understood. And she had this in mind even before my nod, how he could most appropriately be led to reassurance" (8.7.4).

[57] ἐστόλιστο δὲ ἡ Λευκίππη ἱερᾷ στολῇ· ποδήρης χιτών, ὀθόνης ὁ χιτών, ζώνη κατὰ μέσον τὸν χιτῶνα, ταινία περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν φοινικοβαφής, ἀσάνδαλος ὁ ποῦς. καὶ ἡ μὲν εἰσῆλθε πάνυ κοσμίως· "Leucippe was adorned with a holy robe; a chiton which fell to her feet, a chiton of fine linen, a girdle around the middle of the chiton, a band around her head colored purple, unsandaled feet. And she walked in [to the cave] in a very dignified manner" (8.13.1).

confidence, revealing the multiple ways Leucippe is demonstrating her *sophrosyne.* Cleitophon may be nervous,[58] but Leucippe is not. The music which emanates from the cave justifies (or perhaps results from) her confidence.

> Ταῦτά μου πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν λαλοῦντος μέλος ἐξηκούετο μουσικόν, καὶ ἐλέγετο μηδεπώποτε λιγυρώτερον οὕτως ἀκουσθῆναι· καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνεῳγμένας εἴδομεν τὰς θύρας. ὡς δὲ ἐξέθορεν ἡ Λευκίππη.
>
> While I babbled these things to myself, a melody was heard a musical one, and it was said that never had a clearer melody been heard than this one; and immediately we saw the doors had been opened. And then out leapt Leucippe! (8.14.1)

We discover that despite whatever divine threats or aid she may have endured, the syrinx – which has been made synonymous with Leucippe – has given a superb performance to prove Leucippe's chastity, because the tune which emerges from the cave is clearer (λιγυρώτερον) than any before.

Finally, Leucippe leaps forth (ἐξέθορεν), whether from sheer dramatic flair, a fear of Pan or both. In combination with the doors suddenly (εὐθὺς) and mysteriously being opened (ἀνεῳγμένας), we can understand this, too, as part of her performance. Leucippe's leap, caught up in performance as it is, holds these same resonances. Along with her control of the "narrative direction" and her "vibrant self–propulsion" (her *megalopsychia*) into the test, this leap adds a final flourish to her performance, solidifying both her rhetorical and bodily chastity. The timing is perfect, the music is perfect, and Leucippe, too, is perfectly chaste. Like Cleitophon, Leucippe has successfully constructed her narrative of *sophrosyne.* In her performance, she exploits the weaknesses in the chastity test, treads carefully in her not–lies, and guides the story before,

[58] Ὅτι μὲν παρθένος ἡ Λευκίππη πεπίστευκα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πᾶνα, ὦ φιλτάτη, φοβοῦμαι. "I am sure Leucippe is a virgin, but, my dearest, I am afraid of Pan!" (8.13.2).

during, and after the chastity test. Her demonstration of *sophrosyne* plays with the reader's expectations of a virginity test and highlights, yet again, Achilles Tatius' knowing manipulation of the novel's anxiety about *sophrosyne.*

Chapter Two: Braziers, Bluffing, and Brazenness

θυσίαι καὶ σφαγαὶ τὰ ἔπαθλα τῶν σωφρονούντων.
"Sacrifices and slaughters are the prizes for those who are chaste!"[59]
– *Aithiopika* 10.9.1

While the tests of *sophrosyne* we saw in Achilles Tatius were stylistically and chronologically distinct from one another, Heliodorus, as is typical of his style, creates a more complex situation in three ways. First, the stakes of the chastity tests in the *Aithiopika* are inverted. If Charikleia and Theagenes pass the test, they will die. This inversion causes the internal and external audiences to be doubly anxious, because they want the hero/ine to pass (to be chaste) and also to fail (to stay alive). Kirk Ormand says this must occur, because

> Heliodorus has pushed this tension [between conflicting desires for the outcome of the narrative] as far as it can go, pushed it so far, in fact, that it can only be resolved by a sleight of hand. I intend the image of sleight of hand quite literally: for, as in a conjuror's trick, Heliodorus distracts us from the central question of Chariclea's virginity, and in so doing resolves the conundrum of the plot. The sequence of events is complex.[60]

Ormand here counts the performativity and narrative control which Charikleia and Theagenes exercise during and after their tests as "distractions" from their virginity. I claim these distractions instead amplify the protagonists' *sophrosyne*, not just their virginity; this amplification creates a picture of chastity which is perhaps the fullest of any of the novels. Second, Charikleia and Theagenes undergo a doubled chastity test in the *Aithiopika.* Each protagonist must showcase both their bodily chastity (their virginity) and their rhetorical chastity (their ability to convince the crowd of said virginity). For the former, Charikleia and Theagenes must stand unburned on a hot gridiron. To prove the latter, they must give their audience a performance which convincingly and overwhelmingly displays their *sophrosyne*: Charikleia with

[59] All Greek text comes from the Budé Heliodorus.
[60] Ormand (2010) 183.

her display of tragic, defiant virginity and Theagenes with his display of creative, skilled self–control. Finally, the chastity tests in the *Aithiopika* are intertwined. The narrator weaves Charikleia's test with Theagenes', creating a complex tapestry of drama and suspense which keeps the reader guessing even after the tests are complete. As we saw with *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, the manipulation, deceit, and stagecraft inherent to these chastity tests allow the protagonists to display both bodily and rhetorical chastity.

In this chapter, I begin as I did with *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, by arguing that the first book of the novel establishes *sophrosyne* as a concern central to the narrative. I then identify the main themes in the protagonists' bodily and rhetorical chastity tests in Book X, focusing first on Charikleia and then on Theagenes.[61] By highlighting the performativity and narrative control present in Charikleia and Theagenes' tests of *sophrosyne*, I demonstrate that the *Aithiopika*, just like *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, ends not with simple, believable resolution but a constructed, performative display of chastity.

A Beautiful Shroud: The *Aithiopika* and *Sophrosyne*

In Book I of the *Aithiopika, sophrosyne* clearly drives the actions of the characters, despite how little the audience knows about them. For example, when the second group of bandits comes upon Charikleia and Theagenes, Charikleia demonstrates that *sophrosyne* is her highest virtue, even above restraining herself from murder. Standing over the convincing argument of several dead bodies, she proves that she can and will distribute ἐκδικίας τῆς εἰς σωφροσύνην ὕβρεως, "vengeances for outrage against chastity" (1.3.1). Later, when she lies miserable in her bed at the second bandits' camp, she prays to Apollo, and shows that her

[61] When Heliodorus' multilayered narrative makes their tests impossible to separate, I discuss the events in chronological order.

sophrosyne allows not only for the deaths of others but even for her own death.

> «Καὶ ποῖ ταῦτα στήσεις; Εἰ μὲν εἰς θάνατον ἀνύβριστον, ἡδὺ τὸ τέλος, εἰ δέ με γνώσεταί τις αἰσχρῶς, ἣν μηδέπω μηδὲ Θεαγένης, ἐγὼ μὲν ἀγχόνῃ προλήψομαι τὴν ὕβριν, καθαρὰν ἐμαυτὴν ὥσπερ φυλάττω καὶ μέχρι θανάτου φυλάξασα καὶ καλὸν ἐντάφιον τὴν σωφροσύνην ἀπενεγκαμένη· σοῦ δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔσται δικαστὴς πικρότερος.»
>
> "And to what end will you bring these things? If it is to an unabused death, that end would be sweet, but if someone will know me shamefully, which not even Theagenes has yet done, I will take hanging before the abuse, keeping myself just as pure as I keep myself now, even until my death, rendering my chastity a beautiful shroud; there will be no more bitter judge than you!" (1.8.3)

This prayer, our first extended glimpse into Charikleia's thoughts, shows that *sophrosyne* is her first priority, and she is willing to confront anyone – bandits, Theagenes, Apollo himself – to preserve it.

Honesty, too, is second to *sophrosyne* for Charikleia. She lies about the identities of herself and Theagenes, saying that they are siblings rather than lovers. As a result, Theagenes doubts whether Charikleia will actually remain loyal to him. She responds

> «Εὐφήμησον» ἔφη ἡ κόρη «μηδέ μοι γίνου τῶν συμφορῶν βαρύτερος μηδέ, τοσαύτην ἔχων ἐκ τῶν παρελθόντων τὴν κατ' ἐμοῦ διὰ τῶν ἔργων δοκιμασίαν, ἐκ λόγων ἐπικαίρων καὶ πρός τι χρειῶδες εἰρημένων ἄγε δι' ὑποψίας΄. . . Ἐγὼ γὰρ δυστυχεῖν μὲν οὐκ ἀρνοῦμαι, μὴ σωφρονεῖν δὲ οὐδὲν οὕτω βίαιον ὥστε με μεταπεισθῆναι·ἓν μόνον οἶδα μὴ σωφρονοῦσα, τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ σοὶ πόθον.»
>
> "Hush!" said the girl, "and don't be a heavier weight for me than our misfortunes, since you, after what we've gone through, have so much proof about me from my deeds. Come, don't become suspicious[62] because of my words, which were timely and spoken

[62] While ἄγε is more often simply a parenthetical "come," there is no other finite verb in this sentence to accompany the second μηδέ, so I have translated ἄγε δι' ὑποψίας as "become suspicious," or more literally, "act because of suspicion." Heliodorus elsewhere repeats the phrase ἄγε δι' ὑποψίας, also in connection with a verbal defense of *sophrosyne* at 7.4.1. Thyamis, the son of Kalasiris, is described in 7.2.3 as one who φύσει τε καὶ ἐκ παίδων εὖ πεφυκὼς τὰ εἰς σωφροσύνην, "by nature and from childhood had tended well to the things suitable for chastity." A few paragraphs later, Thyamis must defend his chastity before the people of Memphis. When Thyamis was a priest, he had been accused before the satrap Oroondates of an affair with the satrap's wife, Arsake, for which his brother was really responsible. Thyamis was then banished, but he has returned in Book VII to reclaim his priesthood with the help of Theagenes. When Arsake asks Thyamis to tell his side of the story, the people of Memphis react as follows. Πρὸς ταῦτα διεταράχθη μὲν καὶ σύμπαν τὸ Μεμφιτῶν πλῆθος, τόν τε Θύαμιν ἀναγνωρίζοντες καὶ τῆς ἀπροσδοκήτου φυγῆς αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν καὶ ἡνίκα ἐγίνετο ἀγνοήσαντες ἐκ δὲ τῶν λεχθέντων δι' ὑποψίας τε ἄγοντες καὶ ἀλήθειαν εἶναι πιστεύοντες. "In response to these things, the crowd of Memphitians was thoroughly

> for something necessary… for I am not denying our bad luck, but there is nothing so violent that I would change my mind about being chaste. With respect to one thing alone I know I was not chaste – the desire I had for you from the beginning." (1.25.3–4)

For Theagenes and Charikleia, anxiety about their *sophrosyne* eclipses all other morality, defines (and strains) their relationship, and explicitly connects to falsehood. Counterintuitively, Charikleia's commitment to the act of being chaste – σωφρονεῖν – occurs in the context of her lie about her relationship and the possibility that she might renege on her vows to Theagenes. The first use of this verb occurs a few scenes earlier, in Knemon's tale, and also directly correlates to lying. Knemon's stepmother, Demainete, tries to seduce him; when she does not succeed, she enacts the revenge of Potiphar's wife: by lying to her husband about the violence of her "suitor."

> τὴν σὴν ἀπουσίαν ἐπιτηρήσας ταῦτα δὴ τὰ εἰωθότα παραινοῦσαν καὶ σωφρονεῖν παρακελευομένην μηδὲ πρὸς ἑταίραις ἔχειν τὸν νοῦν καὶ μέθαις … λὰξ δὲ κατὰ τῆς γαστρὸς ἐναλάμενος οὕτως ἔχειν ὡς ὁρᾷς διέθηκε.
>
> So he, watching out for your departure, while I was offering those usual admonishments and ordering him to be chaste and not to keep his mind on women and drinking … he, having leapt forward, put his foot to my stomach, so that I am in the state you see now. (1.10.4)

Demainete invents Knemon's failure to control himself (σωφρονεῖν) to conceal her own lustful and violent behavior.[63] This use of σωφρονεῖν complements the other instances in Book I which use *sophrosyne* as a justification for dishonesty and violence. It is no surprise, then, that when *sophrosyne* returns in Book VIII, the theme of deception also returns, and Charikleia and Theagenes' *sophrosyne* again exists alongside manipulation and performance.

---

disturbed, having recognized Thyamis and, in the beginning, having been unaware of what reason there was for his unexpected flight. But now, having become suspicious [about his flight] from the things he said, they believed completely that his story was true" (7.4.1).

[63] While this scene is only verbally violent, Demainete's next scheme is to trick Knemon into murdering his own father. Demainete has set Knemon up with a female slave, Thisbe, who tricks him into thinking Demainete is being disloyal to his father. Knemon goes on to murder Demainete's lover, nearly stabs his own father, and is put on trial and banished from his home.

A Fine Reward: Charikleia's Test

As Book X opens, Hydaspes, the king of Ethiopia, is returning victoriously to his palace. With him are captives of war, including Theagenes and Charikleia, who will be ritually sacrificed to honor Hydaspes' victory. This sacrifice, we learn, is set up as a theatrical performance. There are restrictions on who can attend as a θεωρὸς, an audience member,[64] and the pavilion set up for the ritual human sacrifice is described as τὴν σκηνὴν, the dramatic stage.[65] As John Winkler writes, "we are audience to a scene which includes an audience."[66] We also learn that Theagenes and Charikleia are already performing.

> κατηφεῖς μέν, οἷα εἰκός, οἱ ἄλλοι—Θεαγένης δὲ ἐπ' ἔλαττον—, ἡ Χαρίκλεια δὲ καὶ φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ μειδιῶντι συνεχές τε καὶ ἀτενὲς εἰς τὴν Περσίνναν ἀφορῶσα, ὥστε κἀκείνην παθεῖν τι πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν.
>
> The rest of [the captives] were downcast, as you might expect – but Theagenes was the least downcast among them – and Charikleia with her gleaming, smiling face continually and unflinchingly gazed at Persinna, so that woman suffered something at the sight of her. (10.7.3)

Charikleia here has already begun her rhetorical test of chastity by constructing a performance of the confidently chaste virgin. Although not allowed to attend as a θεωρὸς, she nevertheless acts as a spectator here, turning her gaze back upon Persinna, the wife and queen of Hydaspes – Charikleia is aware of her audience. Theagenes, whose rhetorical test occurs later, is not explicitly performing, but he, too, is set apart by his "least downcast" expression. These echoes

---

[64] Κήρυκες οὖν αὐτίκα διήγγελλον τὴν γραφήν, μόνῳ τῷ ἄρρενι γένει τὴν ὑπάντησιν ἐπιτρέποντες γυναιξὶ δὲ ἀπαγορεύοντες . . . μόνῃ δὲ παρεῖναι γυναικῶν τῇ ἱερείᾳ τῆς Σεληναίας ἐπιτέτραπτο, καὶ ἦν ἡ Περσίννα . . . Ἔμελλε δὲ ἄρα καὶ ἡ Χαρίκλεια παρέσεσθαι τοῖς δρωμένοις, οὐχ ὡς θεωρὸς ἀλλ' ἱερεῖον ἐσομένη τῆς Σεληναίας. "So heralds immediately announced [Hydaspes' return], permitting attendance only to the male sex, and excluding women . . . only one of the women, the priestess of Selene, was permitted, and that was Persinna . . . Charikleia also was going to be present for the proceedings, not as a spectator, but in order to be the sacrifice for Selene" (10.4.5).
[65] Κατὰ τὴν προηυτρεπισμένην ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ σκηνὴν προκαθίσαντες, "[the crowd] having sat down before the *skene* which was prepared in advance on the plain" (10.6.2). J. W. H. Walden notes that *skene* is almost always "used of the 'stage' (or that part of the theatre devoted to the actors) and of a spectacle," so it is reasonable to read this *skene* as a signal of drama. Walden (1894) 29.
[66] Winkler (1990) 156.

of theater – audience, staging, expression, and performance – encourage us to look for performativity in the bodily test of chastity which follows.

Both Charikleia and Theagenes undergo the same test of bodily chastity. As sacrifices–to–be, they must remain unburnt on a hot gridiron in front of a large, almost exclusively male audience. This test, which has physical, observable results – burned feet – leaves little room for the ambiguity and deception we saw in Achilles Tatius. As Hydaspes describes this test to Persinna, however, his language allows subtle ambiguities to cloud an otherwise straightforward test.Ἓν μόνον ἂν βοηθήσειεν, εἰ τῆς ἐσχάρας ἣν οἶσθα ἐπιβᾶσα μὴ ἀγνεύουσά πως ὁμιλίας τῆς πρὸς ἄνδρας ἐλεγχθείη. "One thing alone would aid her: if, when she steps on that gridiron which you know about, she would somehow not be proven clean of intercourse with a man" (10.7.7). The language of this description is multilayered and knowing on multiple fronts, which allows for performance, though not for deception. First, ἐσχάρα, which is customarily translated gridiron, ranges in meaning from grate to brazier to pan of coals to altar; at the very least, it is something which burns. This language of heat – and, more specifically, the use of ἐσχάρα – adds a layer of innuendo to the passage. As Jeffrey Henderson, citing Aristophanes, acknowledges, ἐσχάρα is a common euphemism for female genitalia.

> κυκῶν τὰς ἐσχάρας, stirring up the coals, at Eq 1286 refers to cunnilingus; the schol. glosses τὰ χείλη τῶν γυναικείων αἰδοίων. . . . ἐσχάρα as labia seems to have been a common term . . . Aristophanes seems to have made a pun out of a climactic line from Euripides' Helen (566): ὦ χρόνιος ἐλθὼν σῆς δάμαρτος ἐς χέρας, O timely arrived to the arms of your wife!, for the last two words of which Aristophanes has substituted ἐσχάρας.[67]

Such an overtone is hardly out of the question, especially since the novels lean heavily on comedy. If Charikleia and Theagenes are not burned when they encounter the ἐσχάρα, they are

[67] Henderson (1991) 143.

chaste; in other words, they have not touched τὰς ἐσχάρας. As Helen North observes, a fire–based test naturally reflects *sophrosyne*. "The metaphor, ubiquitous in the erotic poetry of all times, that likens the passion of love to a flame, has as its natural counterpart the comparison of *sophrosyne* to a force capable of extinguishing the fire."[68] The gridiron does not merely display the fact of their purity, but their force of will in maintaining that purity.

The sense of knowingness around the bodily chastity test is confirmed when Hydaspes describes the ἐσχάρα as ἣν οἶσθα, "the gridiron *which you know about*," speaking to his wife. The relative pronoun here adds a stronger sense of mystery than the deictic τήνδε or ταύτην. Instead, ἣν οἶσθα explicitly invokes knowledge, creating a circle of private information to which only Hydaspes and Persinna are party. This may simply refer to Persinna's role as the priestess of Selene, since she has likely seen this rite performed before, but a more skeptical reading – and one more consistent with the mystery and nuance Heliodorus favors – encourages the reader toward doubt. What does Persinna know about this ἐσχάρα? More precisely, what *doesn't* everyone else know? This small interjection clouds the purity of the test with doubt and adds even more knowingness to Heliodorus' description of the bodily test of chastity. The subtle pun in ἐσχάρα, the familiar resonance of *sophrosyne* as a force which quenches heat, and the explicit focus on knowledge shifts the bodily display of chastity from a public, unfalsifiable test to a more self–conscious, performative demonstration of both virginity and *sophrosyne.* Someone who recognizes the levels of meaning and opportunities for narrative here could successfully take and perform this test, just as Charikleia and Theagenes eventually do.

With this knowing, theatrical backdrop, the moment of Charikleia and Theagenes' bodily

[68] North (1966) 386.

chastity test arrives. The ἐσχάρα is brought out; Theagenes steps first. Naturally, he passes – we have watched him resist the urge to have sex with Charikleia for nine books now. Curiously, though, the language of his passing the test is καθαρεύων ἐφαίνετο, "he appeared to be acting purely" (10.9.1). The language of seeming and appearance here encourages an awareness of the performativity of the test. Theagenes also undermines the very premise of the test: death is a disappointing reward for chastity.

> «Καλὰ» λέγων ἠρέμα πρὸς τὴν Χαρίκλειαν «τἀπίχειρα παρ' Αἰθίοψι τῶν καθαρῶς βιούντων· θυσίαι καὶ σφαγαὶ τὰ ἔπαθλα τῶν σωφρονούντων.»
> Speaking alone to Charikleia, he said, "What a lovely reward from the Ethiopians for those who live their lives purely: sacrifices and slaughters are the prizes for those who are chaste!" (10.9.1)

His objection to the test enhances the tension in our mind about the results of the test: Charikleia has promised to die chaste, and it seems like she will. Theagenes also objects to Charikleia's sense of timing, which implies that he knows she is giving or could give a performance. He identifies the test of bodily chastity as an opportunity for her to display rhetorical *sophrosyne* and, in Ormand's words, "distract" from the fatal fact of her chastity.

> Ἀλλ' ὦ φιλτάτη, τί οὐχὶ φράζεις σαυτήν; ποῖον ἀναμένεις ἔτι καιρόν; ἢ τὸν ἕως ἂν ἀποδειροτομήσῃ τις; Λέγε, ἱκετεύω, καὶ μήνυε τὴν σαύτης τύχην.
>
> But, dearest, why don't you explain yourself? What right moment are you still waiting for? For the time when someone beheads us?! Speak, I beg you, and declare your fortune. (10.9.1–2)

Theagenes questions Charikleia's sense of timing, her καιρός. Like Cleitophon, he supports the heroine's subsequent display of chastity by drawing attention to her *sophrosyne.*

Charikleia's response offers proof of both her bodily and rhetorical *sophrosyne* as she takes advantage of this dramatic opening. She steps onto the grid before she is told to do so, interrupting the flow of the ritual.

> Ἡ δὲ «Πλησίον ὁ ἀγὼν» εἰποῦσα «καὶ νῦν ταλαντεύει τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ μοῖρα» μηδὲ κελεῦσαι τοὺς ἐπιτεταγμένους ἀναμείνασα ἐνέδυ τε τὸν ἐκ Δελφῶν ἱερὸν χιτῶνα, ἐκ πηριδίου τινὸς ὃ ἐπεφέρετο προκομίσασα, χρυσοϋφῆ τε ὄντα καὶ ἀκτῖσι κατάπαστον, τήν τε κόμην ἀνεῖσα καὶ οἷον κάτοχος φανεῖσα προσέδραμέ τε καὶ ἐφήλατο τῇ ἐσχάρᾳ καὶ εἱστήκει πολὺν χρόνον ἀπαθής.
>
> “My test is near,” she said, “and now fate weighs our circumstances.” Not even waiting for the test administrators to order her, she donned her chiton from the priesthood of Delphi, producing it from a little bag she carried. It was sewn with golden thread and embroidered with sunbeams, and letting down her hair, seeming like a possessed woman, she ran forward and leapt onto the gridiron and stood for a long time unharmed. (10.9.3)

Charikleia, like Leucippe, exercises impeccable timing, is costumed, and takes ownership of the test. The language of this passage – seeming (φανεῖσα) like a woman possessed – highlights the performativity and creativity of her test. There is even a certain metanarrative awareness present in Charikleia’s declaration; τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς directly mirrors the common phrase used to name an ancient Greek novel.[69] Charikleia, in parallel with Leucippe, also performs physically as she leaps to her chastity test. As Alex Purves writes of Homeric heroes,

> The hero’s leap “showcases him at his most performative” and this performance is thereby inevitably entangled with the whole complex structure of narrative direction and design; the vibrant self–propulsion of a body through space cannot help carrying the momentum of the plot along with it.[70]

Charikleia’s leap here contains the same performative resonances and shows her agency over the narrative. Her disregard for the timing of the test and its threat to her life showcases her *megalopsychia,* her “contempt for death,” which North, drawing on Christian martyrologies, identifies as yet another signal of *sophrosyne*.[71] Her leap emphasizes her confidence and continues the challenge she issued to the audience by staring at Persinna. We can see

---

[69] Whitmarsh (2005) 590ff., but especially 596: “We can thus identify three broad categories of title elements for the novels: (A) τὰ περί or τὰ κατά + name(s) of protagonist(s).”
[70] Purves (2019) 97.
[71] North (1966) 313. “The Christian ideal of the virgin martyr unites in a new synthesis *sophrosyne* and *megalopsychia*, purity and contempt for death.”

Charikleia's rhetorical chastity in her awareness of her audience and the stakes of her performance. Likewise, her unharmed stance on the ἐσχάρα demonstrates her bodily chastity.

Finally, just as the priest recognized *sophrosyne* in Leucippe because of her interruption, so too the crowd recognizes *sophrosyne* in Charikleia's timely display.

> Θάμβος γοῦν ἅμα πάντας κατέσχε· καὶ βοὴν μίαν ἄσημον μὲν καὶ ἄναρθρον δηλωτικὴν δὲ τοῦ θαύματος ἐπήχησαν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀγασθέντες καὶ πλέον ὅτι κάλλος οὕτως ὑπεράνθρωπον καὶ τὸ ὥριον τῆς ἀκμῆς ἄθικτον ἐτήρει καὶ ἔχειν ἐνεδείκνυτο σωφροσύνῃ πλέον ἢ τῇ ὥρᾳ κοσμούμενον.
>
> And so amazement at once seized everyone; and they uttered a shout, unified and indistinct and unintelligible, which indicated their wonder. They were astonished (even more than they were at the rest of the circumstances) that beauty so superhuman and flowering to its peak was kept untouched, and it was proven to have an even greater adornment in her chastity[72] than in her youth. (10.9.4)

The language of ornamentation, as North notes, is common to *sophrosyne,* which is "the best or only proper adornment for a woman."[73] Charikleia employs every ornament at her disposal – beauty, youth, timeliness, *megalopsychia* – to capture her audience with wonder at her greatest ornament, *sophrosyne.* Like Leucippe, Charikleia manipulates her audience while she passes the test, simultaneously performing rhetorical chastity and bodily chastity.

The Bull and the Ethiopian Champion: Theagenes' Test

After Charikleia reveals her identity and her marriage to Theagenes,[74] it is Theagenes' turn to demonstrate his rhetorical chastity. His test, which displays themes of self–control, performance, and Greek superiority, relies on the metaphor of *sophrosyne* as mastering a beast,

---

[72] There are unfortunately several textual difficulties surrounding *sophrosyne* here. According to the Budé editor, manuscripts V, Z, M, and P have σωφροσύνῃ, while Bas, A, and T have σωφροσύνην. Further, V, Z, and P have ἢ, while M, A, and T do not. The exact grammar is unclear, but in all cases the sense remains – Charikleia's chastity is the more impressive feature of her display.

[73] North (1966) 383.

[74] Technically, Charikleia's display of rhetorical chastity continues well into the revelation of her identity as she argues against her own sacrifice. I have chosen not to classify this as part of her test of *sophrosyne* in favor of framing it as an effect of the test, because Charikleia's *sophrosyne* is what allows her to enter into dialogue with the gymnosophists and argue for her life and status as the Ethiopian princess.

just as Charikleia's test relied on *sophrosyne* as quenching a fire or as an ornament. As North says, "nothing is more familiar in Greek art than the symbolic battle between the human (or the Divine) and the bestial, resulting in a victory of order, civilization, *sophrosyne* over chaos, barbarism, *hybris*."[75] We see this in Theagenes' test as he wrangles a bull and fights with Ethiopian man, displaying his *sophrosyne* both as a suitable husband for Charikleia and as a Greek man.

His test begins when some bulls and horses, which are meant to be sacrificed to the Sun and Moon, get spooked at the sight of a giraffe, which has been presented as a gift for Hydaspes 10.28.1–3). Theagenes, thinking quickly, responds immediately in a way which showcases his *sophrosyne,* which here means his self–control and his control over animals.

> Ἐνταῦθα ὁ Θεαγένης, εἴτ' οὖν οἴκοθεν ἀνδρείῳ τῷ λήματι κινούμενος εἴτε καὶ ἔκ του θεῶν ὁρμῇ χρησάμενος . . . καὶ τῶν οὐ διαδράντων ἵππων ἑνὸς λαβόμενος τοῖς τε νώτοις ἐφίπταται καὶ τῶν αὐχενίων τριχῶν ἐπιδραξάμενος καὶ ὅσα χαλινῷ τῇ χαίτῃ χρώμενος μυωπίζει τε τῇ πτέρνῃ τὸν ἵππον καὶ ἀντὶ μάστιγος τῇ σχίζῃ συνεχῶς ἐπισπέρχων ἐπὶ τὸν διαδράντα τῶν ταύρων ἤλαυνε… προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ ἐγχειρήματος ὅτι μὴ ἀποδειλίασιςῆν μηδὲ ἀπόδρασις τοῦ σφαγιασθῆναι μετεδιδάσκοντο.
>
> At this Theagenes, whether moving because of his internal, courageous will or experiencing an impulse from one of the gods . . . having taken hold of one of the horses which had not run away, flew up to its back and, laying hold of the hair of its mane, using its hair like a bridle, spurred the horse with his heel. Urging it on continually with a piece of wood instead of a whip, he drove it toward the one of the bulls which was running away. . . as his undertaking continued, [the audience] changed their minds: this was not a show of gross cowardice or an attempt to escape being slaughtered. (10.28.4–5)

Theagenes here is inventive, quick, manly, and, most importantly, in control. He uses the same sense of timing he displayed earlier to Charikleia to take control of the situation. Though the word *sophrosyne* does not appear in this description, it is clear that Theagenes here is employing the restraint and control which are characteristic of chastity; Theagenes' *sophrosyne* conquers the

[75] North (1966) 381.

bull's chaos.

Once Theagenes has the bull in his control, he doubles his display of order over chaos. Through his self–control, he performs a creative, generative act: blending a bull with a horse to create the appearance of a new creature, the hippotaur, to the audience.

> τὸν δρόμον οὕτως ὁμόταχον ῥυθμίζων ὡς καὶ συμφυεῖς εἶναι τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ζῴων τοὺς πορρωτέρω φαντάζεσθαι καὶ τὸν Θεαγένην λαμπρῶς ἐκθειάζειν ξένην τινὰ ταύτην ἱπποταύρου ξυνωρίδα ζευξάμενον.
>
> He calculated their run so precisely that it appeared from far away that the heads of both animals were one being, and [the crowd] praised Theagenes as a god, so brilliantly had he yoked two animals into whatever strange being this was, a hippotaur. (10.29.1)

Not only has Theagenes found a way to solve the dangerous problem of runaway animals, but he has done so inventively, creatively – and apparently divinely. His performance of *sophrosyne* so impresses the audience that they praise him as god (ἐκθειάζειν). Further, his creation of the hippotaur has the same performative sense of seeming (rather, "making to seem," φαντάζεσθαι) which we saw in Charikleia's chastity test. Theagenes, by making two wild and distinct things seem like one created thing, performs a victory of order over chaos. All these elements contribute to Theagenes' display of *sophrosyne*, especially in light of North's paradigmatic reading of *sophrosyne* as a victory over chaos.

As the display continues, Theagenes next displays his *sophrosyne* to the crowd by imposing civilization on chaos by performing *taurokathapsia*, bull–throwing, which is traditional in Theagenes' home, Thessaly.[76] He lets the horse go, straddles the bull, and eventually pins the bull to the ground, throwing the bull over onto its back and shoulders to land, helpless, with its

[76] See Reardon (1989) 580, n.249. Winkler notes that "this description of the technique of bull throwing (*taurokathapsia)* accords fairly closely with that found in other references to the sport. It was practiced particularly in Thessaly, which is Theagenes' home."

belly on the ground.[77] This mastery of bull–throwing and, as a result, of his homeland's traditions, evokes the "victory of civilization over chaos" to which North refers; Theagenes has imposed a civilizing force through the Thessalian practice of bull–throwing. His victory restores order and displays his *sophrosyne* to the crowd, to Hydaspes, and to Charikleia. Theagenes ends his impressive shows of mastery with another performative touch which emphasizes his rhetorical chastity – *sophrosyne* as the ability to choose the right moment to perform.[78]

> Ἐπέκειτο δὲ ὁ Θεαγένης, ταῖν χεροῖν τὴν λαιὰν μόνην εἰς τὸ ἐπερείδειν ἀπασχολῶν, τὴν δεξιὰν δὲ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνέχων καὶ συνεχὲς ἐπισείων εἴς τε τὸν Ὑδάσπην καὶ τὸ ἄλλο πλῆθος ἱλαρὸν ἀπέβλεπε, τῷ μειδιάματι πρὸς τὸ συνήδεσθαι δεξιούμενος καὶ τῷ μυκηθμῷ τοῦ ταύρου καθάπερ σάλπιγγι τὸ ἐπινίκιον ἀνακηρυττόμενος.
>
> And Theagenes pressed down, using his left hand alone to apply pressure to the bull, and lifting his right hand toward the sky and waving continuously, he looked joyfully at Hydaspes and the rest of the crowd, welcoming them with a smile to rejoice with him and proclaiming his victory with the lowing of the bull just like a war trumpet. (10.30.5)

Theagenes, just as aware of his audience as Charikleia was of hers, uses their expectations of a delightful spectacle to display a double *sophrosyne* in his mastery over the hippotaur and his mastery over the narrative around his victory. His success is confirmed by the crowd's response.

> Ἀντήχει δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ δήμου βοή, τρανὸν μὲν οὐδὲν εἰς τὸν ἔπαινον διαρθροῦσα, κεχηνόσι δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ τοῖς στόμασιν ἐξ ἀρτηρίας μόνης τὸ θαῦμα ἐξεφώνει, χρόνιόν τε καὶ ὁμότονον εἰς οὐρανὸν παραπέμπουσα.
>
> And there rose from the people a shout, articulating nothing distinct for which they praised him, but with mouths wide–open from their very lungs they cried out their

---

[77] 10.30.2, 4. ἐπιρρίπτει δὲ ἑαυτὸν τῷ αὐχένι τοῦ ταύρου καὶ τοῖς κέρασι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πρόσωπον κατὰ τὸ μεταίχμιον ἐνιδρύσας τοὺς πήχεις δὲ οἱονεὶ στεφάνην περιθεὶς καὶ εἰς ἅμμα κατὰ τοῦ ταυρείου μετώπου τοὺς δακτύλους ἐπιπλέξας… ἀθρόον ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν σφενδονηθεὶς κύμβαχός τε ἐπ' ὤμους καὶ νῶτα ῥιπισθεὶς ἤπλωτο ὕπτιος ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, τῶν μὲν κεράτων τῇ γῇ προσπεπηγότων. "He hurls himself onto the neck of the bull and, setting his own face in the middle of its horns, putting his forearms like a crown around it and twining his fingers into a knot around the forehead of the bull…suddenly, having been slung tumbling over its head and onto its shoulders and back, bellowing, [the bull] is beaten onto its back, with its horns beating the earth."

[78] North writes that "Zeno defined *arete* generically as wisdom (*phronêsis*) and explained the other three principal virtues (*prôtae aretae* is the Stoic term) as manifestations of *phronêsis* in different situations: justice in rendering others their due, *andreia* in enduring, and *sophrosyne* in choosing . . . One [of Chrysippus' definitions of *sophrosyne*] says that sophrosyne is knowledge (*epistêmê*) of things to be chosen and avoided or neither; its antithesis, *akolasia*, is the ignorance of these matters." North (1966) 215.

wonder, sending it to the sky for a long time with continuous volume. (10.30.5)

As with Charikleia, the crowd's wonder is indistinct, total, and overwhelming. In the face of Theagenes' performance of control, the crowd seems to have lost their own ability to control themselves, which causes the narrative to take an unexpected turn – a second display of rhetorical chastity.

After Theagenes' victory over the hippotaur, the crowd calls for him to fight an Ethiopian man belonging to Hydaspes' nephew, Meroebos. This offers Theagenes yet another opportunity to prove his (Greek, refined) *sophrosyne* by defeating "barbarism and chaos" in the form of conquering the (Ethiopian, animalistic) other: Ὁ τὸν ἐλέφαντα λαβὼν τῷ τὸν ταῦρον ἑλόντι διαγωνιζέσθω. "Let the one who took the elephant[79] compete with the one who captured the bull!" (10.30.7). This set of events has doubly significant stakes for Theagenes, who must display his *sophrosyne* on two accounts. First, Theagenes must prove himself a more suitable husband for Charikleia than Meroebos, Hydaspes' nephew, who currently has Hydaspes' favor to marry Charikleia. As Hydaspes says before their contest, εἰς καιρὸν ἥκεις . . . ἡμῖν μὲν θυγατέρα σοὶ δὲ νύμφην, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐξευρήκασιν. "You have come at the perfect time! [The gods] for us have discovered a daughter, and for you, as it seems, a bride!" (10.24.1). As a result, the Ethiopian champion who is standing in for Meroebos presents a sort of transferred threat to Theagenes, who also wants to marry Charikleia. By conquering the champion sent from Meroebos, Theagenes would prove himself before the crowd and Hydaspes as a more suitable husband for Charikleia.

Second, and perhaps more subtly, Theagenes must prove himself as a Greek man, one

[79] Meroebos said his champion could defeat all comers, and Hydaspes promised an elephant to whomever won such a contest. No one stepped forward, so Meroebos' man received the elephant by default in a rather humiliating display, according to the crowd. For the full story, see 10.25.

whose civilized *sophrosyne* can grant him victory over a barbarian's *hybris.* North's characterization of *sophrosyne* as a victory of civilization over barbarism[80] again becomes evident when we watch Theagenes (a self–restrained, Greek man) conquer Meroebos' unnamed champion (an arrogant, Ethiopian man).[81] Theagenes' strategy is described as οἷα δὴ γυμνασίων ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀλοιφῆς ἐκ νέων ἀσκητὴς τήν τε ἐναγώνιον Ἑρμοῦ τέχνην ἠκριβωκώς, "indeed, the sort which is typical for a man of the gymnasium and one covered in wrestling oil from his youth and a precise practitioner of the competitive skill which belongs to Hermes" (10.31.5). This passage emphasizes Theagenes' skill, training, and refinement, but it uses animalistic, rustic language to describe the Ethiopian champion.

> ἔγνω καὶ ἀπόπειραν τῆς ἀντιθέτου δυνάμεως λαβὼν πρὸς μὲν ὄγκον οὕτω πελώριον καὶ θηριωδῶς τραχυνόμενον μὴ ὁμόσε χωρεῖν, ἐμπειρίᾳ δὲ τὴν ἄγροικον ἰσχὺν κατασοφίσασθαι.
>
> And [Theagenes], having already made a trial of his opponent's strength, decided not to come into the same space with a weight so gigantic and bestially rugged, but, from his experience, to employ cunning against rustic strength. (10.31.5)

This description pits the language of animalism and raw force (θηριωδῶς, ἄγροικον ἰσχὺν) against experience and wisdom (ἐμπειρίᾳ, κατασοφίσασθαι), further juxtaposing the two combatants. By describing the Ethiopian champion's actions as θηριωδῶς, Heliodorus deepens the divide North identified between "order, civilization, *sophrosyne"* and "chaos, barbarism, *hybris*." Throughout chapters thirty–one and thirty–two, the Ethiopian champion is also described as ἀποθαρσήσας, "incredibly confident," ἐπεγέλα βλακῶδες, "lazily mocking," and

[80] North (1966) 381.

[81] While ancient racial dynamics do not fall into precisely the same patterns of systemic violence we see today, such as anti–Black racism in the United States, the *Aithiopika* does emphasize ethnicity (i.e. Greek or Ethiopian) as a site of difference and otherness. In combination with the violence in this scene, I read the fight between Theagenes and the Ethiopian champion as a clash between Greekness (civilization, training, restraint) and barbarism (foreignness, impulse, arrogance). See Lye (2016) and McCoskey (2019) for further discussion.

ἐνορῶν ἐμειδία τε σεσηρὸς καὶ εἰρωνικοῖς τοῖς νεύμασιν ἐκφαυλίζειν ἐῴκει τὸν ἀντίπαλον, "glaring, he smiled,[82] showing his teeth, and with insincere nods he seemed to disparage his wrestling opponent." These descriptors play into Greek stereotypes about the barbarian other and thus allow Theagenes' *sophrosyne* to stand out against the Ethiopian champion's *hybris.* Theagenes' second victory confirms that he can use his Greek wrestling training to twist the Ethiopian's strength against him, select the most suitable plan of attack, and generate a crowd–pleasing performance. As we saw with Cleitophon and Charikleia, the ability to choose the right moment to perform or the right story to tell is also characteristic of *sophrosyne.* The crowd responds to Theagenes' *sophrosyne* with an enormous, out–of–control shout,[83] because he has given them not one but two incredibly dramatic, skillful spectacles. Theagenes' victory proves that his timing, drama, self–control, and skill under pressure – and therefore his *sophrosyne* – are as sharp as Charikleia's.

Both Theagenes and Charikleia, like Leucippe and Cleitophon, perform dramatic, captivating displays of chastity which confirm their *sophrosyne* on multiple levels. They possess bodily chastity, as proven by the gridiron, and they demonstrate rhetorical chastity in crafty performances of tragically beautiful womanhood and cunningly superior masculinity. While these scenes lack the outright overtones of deception which characterized Leucippe and Cleitophon's tests, they do highlight the inherent potential for performance in these chastity tests. In and out of the narrative, the audience watches Charikleia and Theagenes employ tools of performance and drama in order to control the narrative and convince the audience of their

[82] Winkler translates this "sneered," which captures the animosity presumably present in the Heliodorus' description of the Ethiopian. In Reardon (1989) 581.

[83] Μιᾶς δὴ οὖν βοῆς ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ γεγωνοτέρας ἢ τὸ πρότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους ἀρθείσης, οὐδὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκαρτέρησεν ἀλλ' ἀνήλατό τε τοῦ θρόνου. "So indeed, at these things one shout, sounding louder than the earlier one, was lifted up by the crowd, and not even the king restrained himself, but jumped up from his throne" (10.31.3).

sophrosyne. Rather than simply certifying the protagonists' virginity, these tests of chastity offer the protagonists a stage on which they can perform in order to soothe the novel's deep anxiety about *sophrosyne.*

Chapter Three: Shouts, Silence, and Sensing the End

Τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπηλλαττόμεθα, κατὰ κράτος ἤδη νικήσαντες καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων εὐφημούμενοι.
"So then we were free, having already won against his power and being praised by everyone."
– *Leucippe and Cleitophon* 8.14.6

I have outlined the chastity tests in the final books of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* to highlight two main ideas. First, the final tests of *sophrosyne* in these novels involve two dimensions: proof of virginity (bodily chastity), and a convincing performance of said bodily chastity (rhetorical chastity). Second, these chastity tests demand some level of deception, performance, and manipulation, because *sophrosyne* is itself a site of performance and uncertainty. The protagonists and their audiences are participating in a performance designed to reassure everyone involved that the ensuing marriage will be faithful, chaste, and thus legitimate. Whether the protagonists provide this reassurance by standing unburned on a hot gridiron, leaping from a cave at the right moment, or carefully revising the tale of their adventures, the novels' tests of *sophrosyne* necessitate and reward lies and performances.

I turn now to the aftermath of these tests of *sophrosyne.* What happens after the hero/ine performs for their audience? What rewards or reactions result from a successful performance of *sophrosyne*? How does performed *sophrosyne* impact the hero/ine's audience? In this chapter, I aim to answer these questions by reading the responses of the audiences within *Leucippe and Cleitophon* to the performance of each protagonist. I consider what reactions occur, what events unfold, and what role *sophrosyne* continues to play in the narrative once the protagonists are proven chaste. For the purposes of this chapter and the next, I use the term audience to refer only to the novel's internal audience: the people who observe the chastity tests as they unfold within the narrative. I also discuss how the ending of *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* which is usually dismissed as perfunctory at best, continues to pull the thread of *sophrosyne* through to the very

end of the narrative. I show how Achilles Tatius plays with audiences inside and outside the novel as he draws the idea of narrative control to its fullest – and most chaste – conclusion.

Crowd Control: Cleitophon's *Sophrosyne*

After hearing Cleitophon's skillfully revised version of events, his drunk (or at least drinking)[84] audience experiences a rush of various emotions in the brief time Cleitophon and Leucippe allow them to process the story. Cleitophon notes

> ταῦτα ἀκούοντες ὁ μὲν ἱερεὺς ἐκεχήνει, θαυμάζων ἕκαστον τῶν λεγομένων, ὁ δὲ Σώστρατος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυεν, εἴ ποτε κατὰ Λευκίππην ἐγεγόνει <τὸ> δρᾶμα.
>
> Upon hearing these things, the priest gaped, marveling at each of the things which were said, and Sostratos even wept, whenever the story was about Leucippe. (8.5.9)

These reactions – gaping, marveling, and weeping – all indicate an overwhelming amount of emotion which robs the listeners of their self–control. The witnesses to Cleitophon's display of *sophrosyne* seem to be losing their own.[85]

Cleitophon's post–narrative choices encourage this apparent loss of *sophrosyne.* Rather than giving his audience time to respond and process the story he has told, Cleitophon moves on almost immediately. He presses his audience – mostly drunk, weeping, astonished men who have just heard a disturbing story of violence, near misses, and fear – for a coherent response. Cleitophon redirects them from his own story of *sophrosyne* to a question about Thersander, and by extension, about Leucippe's *sophrosyne.*

> καὶ ἐπεί ποτε ἐπαυσάμην, "Τὰ μὲν ἡμέτερα," εἶπον, "ἠκούσατε· ἓν δὲ αἰτῶ κἀγὼ μαθεῖν παρὰ σοῦ, ἱερεῦ, μόνον· τί ποτέ ἐστιν ὃ τελευταῖον ἀπιὼν ὁ Θέρσανδρος κατὰ Λευκίππης προσέθηκε, σύριγγα εἰπών;"
>
> And whenever I had finished, I said, "You've heard our story; but I ask to learn only one

[84] Προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ πότου καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου κατὰ μικρὸν ἐξιλασκομένου τὴν αἰδῶ, "as the drinking went on and Dionysius little by little washed away our shame" (8.4.2).
[85] The exceptions to this loss of *sophrosyne,* as I will discuss shortly, are Melite and Leucippe, who are also performing *sophrosyne.*

> thing from you, priest: whatever was the last thing which Thersander added as he was leaving about Leucippe, talking about a syrinx?" (8.5.9)

Cleitophon's words offer several insights into his motivations for telling the story and his audience's reactions. First, I suggest that we see Cleitophon's *sophrosyne* on display again in his sensitivity to his audience. He knows that what he has just narrated (τὰ ἡμέτερα) will be hard to bear, particularly for Leucippe's father, and so he moves on to something which he hopes is simpler and easier to digest (ἓν μόνον). Especially given Sostratos' reaction to Cleitophon's story, and later to the story of the syrinx, it seems prudent for Cleitophon not to dwell on his story of pirates, mistaken identity, and risk, even edited as it is. We can also see a reiteration of Cleitophon's concern for Leucippe's wellbeing: he wants to know if Thersander is still a threat to her and thus to himself.

Cleitophon also shows awareness of his power as a narrator, behaving in accordance with the storytelling *sophrosyne* he has already demonstrated. He directs the story elsewhere not only out of courtesy for his listeners, but to obscure any holes in the plot and prevent any questioning of his narrative. John Winkler writes of the *Aithiopika* that "the deepest anxiety which informs this novel is the fear of *misinterpretation*," and I think a similar anxiety is present in Cleitophon's skillful redirection of the symposium's conversation.[86] If Cleitophon gives Sostratos any more time to worry about his daughter, Cleitophon may be subject to further questioning. Thus, when Cleitophon passes the narrative baton to the priest of Artemis, we can read his decision as a conscious manipulation of his audience. If Cleitophon has been paying attention (and we can assume by his careful editing and excellent recall that he has), he knows that this priest of Artemis is long–winded – the ideal distraction from any holes in his own story

[86] Winkler (1982) 120.

– and equally narrative–savvy.

> "Ἀλλὰ σύ γε," ἔφη, "καλῶς ἀνήρου· καὶ γὰρ εἰδότας ἡμᾶς τὰ περὶ τὴν σύριγγα τοῖς παροῦσιν οὕτως ἁρμόσασθαι προσήκει· κἀγὼ τὸν σὸν ἀμείψομαι μῦθον εἰπών."
>
> "But you," [the priest] said, "are raising a good point; for it is also fitting that we who know the story of the syrinx adapt ourselves in this way to those present; and I, telling my story, will answer yours." (8.5.9).

The priest not only delivers his characteristic long–windedess, but also demonstrates an awareness of Cleitophon's tenuous position by affirming Cleitophon's choice to redirect the narrative.[87]

As the priest of Artemis begins to wrap up his story, Leucippe then takes the reins of the narrative. She identifies yet another point of vulnerability – the insinuation that Cleitophon's *muthos* may not have fully covered the threats Leucippe experienced – and jumps in to redirect.

> "εἰ μὲν γάρ ἐστι παρθένος, ὡς ἔγωγε βουλοίμην, ἅπιτε χαίροντες τῆς σύριγγος τυχόντες εὐμενοῦς· οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποτε ψεύσαιτο τὴν κρίσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἴστε οἷα εἰκὸς ἐν τοσαύταις αὐτὴν ἐπιβουλαῖς γενομένην ἄκουσαν—" Καὶ εὐθὺς ἡ Λευκίππη, πρὶν τὸν ἱερέα εἰπεῖν τὸν ἑξῆς λόγον· "Ὡς γέ μοι δοκεῖ, μηδὲ εἴπῃς·"
>
> "For if she is a virgin (as I at least would wish), go gladly and optimistically when you meet the syrinx; for it would never falsify its judgment. But if she isn't, well, you yourselves know what sorts of things are typical in so many encounters which she has experienced —" And immediately Leucippe, before the priest spoke his next word, said "Well it seems to me that you should not say any more;" (8.6.15–8.7.1)

The longer the priest speaks (as he has been for two chapters now), the more he doubts the story Cleitophon has told. Acting quickly, Leucippe interrupts with force and speed, cutting off whatever well–meaning but possibly disastrous suggestion he was about to make. Her narrative control takes a particular form – silencing. By cutting off the priest's speech, Leucippe directs the priest toward the only good type of speech: *euphemia,* or silence. As I mentioned in the first

[87] We might even read the priest's use of τὸν σὸν μῦθον to refer to Cleitophon's story as the priest's awareness that Cleitophon has not really told, as he says, τὰ ἡμέτερα, but a more edited, less direct version of events.

chapter, the verbal threat of defamation is as harmful to Leucippe's rhetorical chastity as physical threats have been to her bodily chastity.

In this scene, Cleitophon and Leucippe exercise dual control over Cleitophon's audience in order to present themselves as chastely as possible. While we see no explicit communication between them about telling Cleitophon's story, we know that Cleitophon's narration usually downplays Leucippe's agency, as it does one scene later, when the priest's story of the syrinx – intended as a timely intervention – disturbs Leucippe's father.

> τὸν μέντοι Σώστρατον ἑώρων ὑποθορυβηθέντα τῷ τῆς σύριγγος διηγήματι, μὴ ἄρα τὰ περὶ τῆς παρθενίας δι' αἰδῶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ψευδώμεθα. διανεύω δὴ τῇ Λευκίππῃ νεύματι ἀφανεῖ τὸν φόβον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξελεῖν, ἐπισταμένῃ οἵῳ δὴ τρόπῳ μάλιστα οἴεται πείσειν. κἀκείνη δὲ ἐδόκει μοι ταὐτὸν ὑποπτεύειν, ὥστε ταχὺ μὲν συνῆκε· διενοεῖτο δὲ καὶ πρὸτοῦ παρ' ἐμοῦ νεύματος, πῶς ἂν κοσμιώτατα προσενεχθείη τῷ πιστώματι. μέλλουσα οὖν πρὸς ὕπνον ἀναχωρεῖν καὶ ἀσπαζομένη τὸν πατέρα ἠρέμα πρὸς αὐτόν, "Θάρρει, πάτερ," ἔφη, "περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ πίστευε τοῖς εἰρημένοις. μὰ τὴν γὰρ Ἄρτεμιν, οὐδέτερος ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἐψεύσατο."
>
> Then I saw that Sostratos was incredibly worried by the story of the syrinx that we had falsified the story of her virginity because of shame before him. So I motion to Leucippe with an unseen nod to allay her father's fear, since she knows in what manner she thinks she can best persuade him. And she seemed to me to understand the very same thing, so she quickly put it together; and she understood even before my first nod, how he could be led to reassurance most tactfully. So, being about to retire to sleep and saying goodnight to her father quietly, she said to him, "Take heart, father, about me, and trust the things that have been said. For by Artemis, neither of us has told a lie." (8.7.3–5)

Both Leucippe and Cleitophon here have the same instinctual response to preserve the appearance of their *sophrosyne.* While the protagonists do not actually communicate or plan together, this episode nevertheless reveals that Leucippe and Cleitophon are of one mind about their narrative. With both Sostratos and the priest of Artemis, then, we see that Cleitophon and Leucippe possess considerable rhetorical chastity. By imposing silence on Cleitophon's audience, both protagonists continue to demonstrate their *sophrosyne* as they prevent any negative comments or conclusions about Leucippe's bodily chastity. Though as yet unmarried,

the two are working together to tell their version of events as they set the stage for Leucippe's performance of *sophrosyne* the next day.

A New Narrator: Leucippe's *Sophrosyne*

Unlike Cleitophon, who performed *sophrosyne* for an intimate audience of symposiasts, Leucippe performs for the entire populace, πᾶς μὲν ὁ δῆμος (8.14.2). This audience has followed the public trials of Leucippe, Cleitophon, Melite, and Thersander, so they are eager for a resolution to the narrative. In response to Leucippe's well–timed leap from the cave, then, this audience can release their collectively held breath: ὡς δὲ ἐξέθορεν ἡ Λευκίππη, πᾶς μὲν ὁ δῆμος ἐξεβόησεν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς[88] καὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐλοιδόρουν. "As Leucippe leapt out, the entire deme shouted for joy and abused Thersander" (8.14.2). This reaction – a loud shout and physical abuse – emphasizes the moblike nature of Leucippe's audience. These responses perpetuate the thread of violence which has run through Leucippe's chastity test since we first learned what it would be.

The performance of Leucippe's *sophrosyne* also brings with it the revelation, or rather the public confirmation, of Thersander's treachery. Both the crowd and Thersander recognize that it is Leucippe who is now in control of the narrative around her bodily chastity, and their violent, loud reactions contrast starkly with Leucippe's restraint. Even Cleitophon, who proved his own *sophrosyne* and rhetorical skill only a day ago, loses control of his words and of himself: ἐγὼ δὲ ὅστις ἐγεγόνειν οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμι λόγῳ. "But I (whoever that man had become) could not have spoken a word" (8.14.2). Cleitophon's established eloquence deserts him, and his parenthetical philosophical ὅστις ἐγεγόνειν reveals that his relief – or perhaps his shock – is so great that it has

[88] We might even read ὑφ' ἡδονῆς here as a kind of personal agency – it is not the crowd themselves who decide to shout, but their joy forces them to do so. Such a reading further emphasizes Leucippe's control over the crowd and the narrative.

shaken his sense of self. This response to Leucippe's performance may remind us of his reaction to another one of her performances in Book III, when she, Menelaos, and Satyros conspire to fake her death on an altar by securing the stomach of an animal to her and ripping out its guts. Cleitophon, watching that horrible scene, says

> τὰ σπλάγχνα δὲ εὐθὺς ἐξεπήδησεν . . . ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκ παραλόγου καθήμενος ἐθεώμην. τὸ δὲ ἦν ἔκπληξις· μέτρον γὰρ οὐκ ἔχον τὸ κακὸν ἐνεβρόντησέ με. καὶ τάχα ὁ τῆς Νιόβης μῦθος οὐκ ἦν ψευδής, ἀλλὰ κἀκείνη τοιοῦτόν τι παθοῦσα ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν παίδων ἀπωλείᾳ δόξαν παρέσχεν ἐκ τῆς ἀκινησίας ὡσεὶ λίθος γενομένη
>
> And immediately her guts leapt out…but I, beyond the ability to reason, sat and stared. It was an incredible shock; for this immeasurable evil struck me dumb. And maybe the story of Niobe was not made up, but that woman too, having suffered this sort of thing at the destruction of her children, experienced because of her motionlessness a belief that she was becoming like stone. (3.15.5–6)

Leucippe's performance of death causes Cleitophon to lose his grip on reason and reality, truth and falsehood, just as he does at her performance of *sophrosyne* – both performances even involve leaping. This performance with the pseudostomach (τὴν πλαστὴν γαστέρα, 3.21.2), though much earlier in the novel, sets a precedent for an audience losing control over their voice, actions, and even their sense of reality.[89]

Cleitophon himself, the person most aware of Leucippe's virginity, is overcome with shock at her cunning display of *sophrosyne* – even he had his doubts as she entered the cave. Ὅτι μὲν παρθένος εἶ, Λευκίππη, πεπίστευκα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Πᾶνα, ὦ φιλτάτη, φοβοῦμαι. θεός ἐστι φιλοπάρθενος, καὶ δέδοικα μὴ δευτέρα καὶ σὺ σύριγξ γένῃ. "That you are a virgin, Leucippe, I have full confidence, but I fear Pan, my dearest. The god is a lover of virgins, and I fear lest even you may become a second syrinx" (8.13.2–3). That Leucippe's performance of *sophrosyne*

[89] The scene even makes it into Cleitophon's edited account of their adventures (τὴν παρὰ τῷ βωμῷ πλαστὴν γαστέρα, 8.5.1).

manages to silence the repeated, explicit doubts of her lover, her father, and an entire crowd is a testament to her narrative control – the only person unaffected by her display is Melite, the other woman performing chastity.

Cleitophon's final description of the crowd's reaction to these chastity tests also involves silence–via–praise. After Melite finishes her performance and Thersander flees the city, he says τότε μὲν οὖν ἀπηλλαττόμεθα, κατὰ κράτος ἤδη νικήσαντες καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων εὐφημούμενοι.[90] "So then we were set free, having already won against his power and being praised by everyone" (8.14.6). The crowd's praise is a type of silence; the only way to speak well or without consequence, to the Greek mind, is to remain silent. Thus, even as the crowd hurls insults at Thersander and joyous shouts at Leucippe, they are silent about the problem of the protagonists' *sophrosyne.* Sufficiently convinced that Cleitophon and Leucippe are chaste, they will speak no more for or against them. In a paradoxical combination, the crowd is simultaneously stirred up to a clamor and silenced. Intelligible, thoughtful responses are impossible; the populace loses their own self–control in the face of performed *sophrosyne.*

The audience's lack of control then allows the performers – Cleitophon, Leucippe, Melite – to control the narrative and thus the audience themselves. We see this most clearly after Leucippe's test, when she abandons the modesty she had been so carefully displaying and takes up the role of narrator, displacing Cleitophon as her father's source of information.

> ἡ Λευκίππη δέ, ἅτε δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν πατέρα μηκέτι αἰδουμένη ὡς ἂν σαφῶς παρθένος εὑρεθεῖσα, τὰ συμβάντα μετὰ ἡδονῆς διηγεῖτο.
>
> But Leucippe, because she no longer felt any more shame before her father, because she was found clearly a *parthenos,* narrated with pleasure the things which happened. (8.15.3)

[90] The manuscripts disagree on the text after ἀπηλλαττόμεθα and before καὶ ὑπὸ, but I have chosen to follow the editor of the Budé and provide κατὰ κράτος ἤδη νικήσαντες.

Cleitophon's narration explicitly links Leucippe's new narrative confidence to her lack of shame (μηκέτι αἰδουμένη) and her public, no longer questionable chastity (ὡς ἂν σαφῶς παρθένος εὑρεθεῖσα). While we have seen Leucippe interject confidently throughout the novel, this is the first time her speech is an act of solo narration, διηγεῖτο, the same word Cleitophon regularly uses of his own storytelling.[91] Further, Cleitophon cedes his capacity as narrator to Leucippe – an unusual turn of events.

> ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Φάρον ἐγεγόνει καὶ τοὺς λῃστάς, λέγω πρὸς αὐτήν· "Οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἡμῖν τὸν μῦθον τῶν τῆς Φάρου λῃστῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποτμηθείσης ἐκεῖ τὸ αἴνιγμα κεφαλῆς, ἵνα σου καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀκούσῃ; τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος."
>
> And when she came to the part about Pharos and his pirates, I said to her, "Will you not tell to us the story about the pirates of Pharos and the riddle of the severed head there, so that your father can hear it also from you? For this alone is missing from the recitation of the whole story." (8.15.4)

Cleitophon's purpose – ἵνα σου καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀκούσῃ – and the fact that he phrases this as a question – Οὐκ ἐρεῖς; – show that he and Leucippe are again working together to construct their story, as with the priest of Artemis and Sostratos. Leucippe, no longer hindered by modesty or public opinion, gives her longest speech in the novel thus far throughout all of Book VIII, chapter sixteen. Therefore, while Leucippe's display of *sophrosyne* may have robbed the crowd

---

[91] Usually, Cleitophon uses διηγέομαι of his own narration. E.g. 4.17.5: ἐγὼ δὲ ἰδὼν σωφρονοῦσαν ὑπὸ πολλῆς χαρᾶς ἔλυον μὲν μετὰ θορύβου τὰ δεσμά, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἤδη τὸ πᾶν αὐτῇ διηγοῦμαι. "And I, when I saw her in control of herself, with a shout for great joy released her bonds, and after these things I then narrated the whole story for her;" 6.14.2: ὁ μὲν δὴ τούτους ἀπήλασεν ἄκοντας, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐντειλάμενος αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης, εἰ παραγένοιτο, περὶ τὴν ἕω σπουδῇ πρός με ἥκειν, καὶ τὰς τῆς Μελίτης διηγησάμενος ὑποσχέσεις. "Indeed [the jailer] chased them [Satyros and Kleinias] off, though they were unwilling, but I, calling out to them about Leucippe, if she was present, that she should come to me at dawn with haste, and narrating the promises of Melite…;" 8.5.1: Κἀγὼ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν τὴν ἀπὸ Τύρου διηγοῦμαι, τὸν πλοῦν, τὴν ναυαγίαν, τὴν Αἴγυπτον, τοὺς βουκόλους, τῆς Λευκίππης τὴν ἀπαγωγήν. "And I narrated everything about our departure from Tyre, the sea voyage, the shipwreck, Egypt, the cowherds, Leucippe's capture;" and 8.5.2: τὴν ναῦν διηγησάμην, τὸν εἰς Ἔφεσον πλοῦν, καὶ ὡς ἄμφω συνεκαθεύδομεν, καί, μὰ ταύτην τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, ὡς ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀνέστη γυνή. "I narrated the part about the boat, the voyage to Ephesus, and how we both slept together, and how, by this Artemis, she rose from the bed as a woman from the bed of a woman." In contrast, Leucippe only ever hypothesizes narration in a first person singular deliberative subjunctive use of διηγέομαι (6.16.4), so this scene is her first solo, indicative venture into narration.

of their coherent speech, it enhances her own narrative control. The immediate reactions to Cleitophon and Leucippe's tests of *sophrosyne* show that the deception, manipulation, and performativity which characterized the tests themselves continue or even increase once the tests are complete. The rhetorical dimension of *sophrosyne* becomes especially apparent as the two protagonists work together (knowingly or otherwise) to direct and misdirect whatever questions and concerns remain about their chastity. By inspiring two disparate but complementary responses – silence and shouting – to their chastity tests, Leucippe and Cleitophon demonstrate their mastery over the narrative and their audiences.

Chapter Four: Identity, Indulgence, and Interrogating the End

«Τὸν μὲν ἀδελφὸν ἐψευσάμην» ἔφη «τῆς χρείας τὸ πλάσμα συνθείσης·»
"I lied that this man is my brother," she said, "but necessity constructed this pretense."
– *Aithiopika* 10.18.3

While *Leucippe and Cleitophon* ends with various forms of silence imposed on the internal and external audiences of the novel, the *Aithiopika* presents (again) a more complex, involved, and cunning series of reactions to the protagonists' performances of *sophrosyne.* At the end of the *Aithiopika,* Theagenes and Charikleia both perform for the same audience: the spectators before the *skene* set up for the ritual human sacrifice. After the protagonists demonstrate their *sophrosyne* to this audience, we see the crowd lose control, as we saw in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, and then go a step further: the internal audience, too, begins to perform. In the *Aithiopika*, the crowd's reactions show us that *sophrosyne* encourages participation; it draws those who see it into the performance.

In this chapter, I analyze the web of performances which result from three revelations: Charikleia's display of *sophrosyne,* the discovery of Charikleia's identity, and the announcement of the protagonists' relationship. I begin with the reactions of the crowd, Persinna, and Hydaspes to Charikleia's performance of *sophrosyne.* I then discuss the process of confirming Charikleia's identity, where everyone involved is swept into various performances. Finally, I explore the mass of performances which occur as Charikleia and Theagenes attempt to explain their relationship. For all three tests, I show that the initial responses to *sophrosyne* in the *Aithiopika* involve a loss of self–control, and then they progress to co–performance. I argue that *sophrosyne* inspires a chain reaction of performances throughout the final book of the novel.

(Mis)Interpretation: Charikleia's *Sophrosyne*

Immediately after Charikleia has leapt onto the gridiron and been proven chaste, the

crowd is in an uproar.

> Θάμβος γοῦν ἅμα πάντας κατέσχε· καὶ βοὴν μίαν ἄσημον μὲν καὶ ἄναρθρον δηλωτικὴν δὲ τοῦ θαύματος ἐπήχησαν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀγασθέντες καὶ πλέον ὅτι κάλλος οὕτως ὑπεράνθρωπον καὶ τὸ ὥριον τῆς ἀκμῆς ἄθικτον ἐτήρει καὶ ἔχειν ἐνεδείκνυτο σωφροσύνῃ πλέον ἢ τῇ ὥρᾳ κοσμούμενον.
>
> And so amazement at once seized everyone; and they uttered a shout, unified and indistinct and unintelligible, which indicated their wonder. They were astonished (even more than they were at the rest of the circumstances) that beauty so superhuman and flowering to its peak was kept untouched, and it was proven to have an even greater adornment in her chastity[92] than in her youth. (10.9.4)

While I described this response in chapter two as further evidence of Charikleia's *sophrosyne,* the crowd's reaction also reveals the power of *sophrosyne.* As often in Greek literature, an emotion takes hold of them, overpowering them beyond their control. Their shout, like the shouts of the mob in *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* does not make sense; the audience has lost their ability to respond coherently, turning to a reaction which is both ἄσημον and ἄναρθρον. They also receive exactly the message Charikleia wanted to send – her *sophrosyne* is her defining characteristic, overwhelming (for a moment) any other doubts about her identity, her status, or her virginity. Finally, Charikleia's display sways the crowd and their volatile emotions to her side. Their astonishment (θάμβος) is so great that it then turns into sadness and fear:

> Ἐλύπει μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλους τῶν ὄχλων ἁρμόδιος τῇ θυσίᾳ φανεῖσα, καὶ δεισιδαιμονοῦντες ὅμως ἥδιστα ἂν εἶδον ἔκ τινος μηχανῆς περισωθεῖσαν.
>
> So she also saddened others of the crowd, appearing fit for the sacrifice, and, although their superstitions remained, they nevertheless very happily saw that she had been kept safe by some scheme. (10.9.5)

The crowd has noticed the likelihood that Charikleia, who exists as a beautiful woman in the

[92] There are several textual difficulties surrounding *sophrosyne* here. According to the Budé editor, manuscripts V, Z, M, and P have σωφροσύνῃ, while Bas, A, and T have σωφροσύνην. Further, V, Z, and P have ἢ, while M, A, and T do not. The exact grammar is unclear, but in all cases the sense remains – Charikleia's chastity is the more impressive feature of her display.

world, would not have been able to preserve her chastity regardless of her circumstances. The display Charikleia provides soothes their fears to the extent that they are willing to exchange most of their disbelief for relief.

Persinna then confirms the success of Charikleia's display when she reflects on the sad necessity of sacrificing Charikleia, who now (presumably) has no escape.

> Πλέον δὲ ἠνία τὴν Περσίνναν, ὥστε καὶ εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν Ὑδάσπην «Ὡς ἀθλία καὶ δυστυχὴς ἡ κόρη σὺν πολλῷ καὶ οὐκ εἰς καιρὸν τῇ σωφροσύνῃ σεμνυνομένη καὶ θάνατον τῶν πολλῶν τούτων ἐπαίνων ἀλλαττομένη. Ἀλλὰ τί ἂν γένοιτο» ἔφη «ὦ ἄνερ;»
>
> But Persinna was more distressed, so that she even said to Hydaspes, "How miserable and unfortunate that poor girl is, having been exalted with so much chastity, but not at the right time, and being repaid death in exchange for these many praises. But what might become of her, oh husband?" (10.9.5)

While Persinna was intimidated by Charikleia earlier, she now pities her, and we can already see that she has been swayed to Charikleia's side. Persinna also explicitly ties Charikleia's performance for the crowd to her *sophrosyne.* In so doing, she inadvertently echoes the objections Theagenes (whom we know is attuned to Charikleia's performance and is on her side) voiced before Charikleia performed. Persinna raises the same points about Charikleia's (apparently bad) sense of timing, *kairos;* the sad fact that Charikleia's reward is death; and expresses the urge to act on her behalf. In the face of Charikleia's *sophrosyne,* both Theagenes and Persinna become performance–minded, considering ways Charikleia could have been (more) successful in her display of *sophrosyne.*

Hydaspes' reply to Persinna and his exchange with the gymnosophists reveals a similar trend of *sophrosyne* inspiring performance and sympathy, though perhaps not at first glance.

> Ὁ δὲ «Μάτην» ἔφη «μοι ἐνοχλεῖς καὶ οἰκτίζῃ τὴν οὐ σῳζομένην ἀλλὰ θεοῖς, ὡς ἔοικε, διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς φύσεως ἀρχῆθεν φυλαττομένην.» Καὶ ἀποστρέψας τὸν λόγον πρὸς τοὺς Γυμνοσοφιστάς, «Ἀλλ' ὦ σοφώτατοι» ἔφη «πάντων ηὐτρεπισμένων τί οὐχὶ κατάρχετε τῶν ἱερῶν;»

> "In vain," he said, "do you trouble me and pity her who is not saved but, as it seems, on account of her excess of spirit, has from the beginning been guarded by the gods." And having turned his speech to the gymnosophists, he said "But oh wisest ones, since everything has been prepared, why do you not start the sacrificial rites?" (10.9.6)

Hydaspes here seems unmoved by Charikleia's performance, and we have several cues that this response is not the correct one. First, while the gods may have been guarding Charikleia for the purpose of sacrifice, Hydaspes' language recalls Charikleia's own designs for her virtue in Book I, where she uses φυλάσσω repeatedly of the actions she will take to secure her own chastity. This reminder, however faint, of Charikleia's intentions points to the fact that Hydaspes seems to have missed Charikleia's own hand at work. His parenthetical ὡς ἔοικε also picks up on the issue of perspective and performance, continuing the thread of seeming in Book X. In such a performance–laden genre, Hydaspes needs to be pointed toward his role in the scene about to unfold. He receives a lengthy correction from the gymnosophists when, in response to Hydaspes' question about their delay, Sisimithres answers

> «Εὐφήμησον» ἀπεκρίνατο, ἑλληνίζων ὥστε μὴ τὸ πλῆθος ἐπαΐειν, «ἱκανῶς γὰρ καὶ μέχρι τούτων ὄψιν τε καὶ ἀκοὴν ἐχράνθημεν.»
>
> "Be silent!" he replied, speaking Greek so that the crowd would not hear, "For we have been sufficiently defiled already insofar as the sight and sound of these things." (10.9.6)

As in *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* we see that those who are not reading the story correctly are redirected or, in this case, silenced. Winkler notes this as a particular feature of the *Aithiopika,* asserting that

> Heliodoros' techniques of displaying incomplete cognition are designed to heighten our awareness of the game–like structure of intelligibility involved in reading a romance . . . Heliodoros' sophistication lies not merely in his mastery as a narrator but in his presentation of narrators and audiences caught in the fact of understanding or missing the romantic pattern.[93]

[93] Winkler (1982) 101, 127.

Something similar is at work here; Sisimithres, who can correctly interpret Charikleia's display as a signal that the rites will not proceed as usual,[94] steps in to adjust Hydaspes' "incomplete cognition" of Charikleia's performance of *sophrosyne*. He acts almost as an interpreter, switching languages and clarifying meaning; Sisimithres translates Charikleia's performance for Hydaspes by reframing it as theologically and ritually correct, even necessary. Through Sisimithres' corrections, the external audience can see the flaws in Hydaspes' reaction to Charikleia's performance.

The responses of the crowd, Persinna, and Hydaspes to Charikleia's initial display of *sophrosyne* are far from definitive. The crowd is in turmoil, Persinna thinks the story is going wrong, and Hydaspes seems to have missed the point entirely. At this point, however, Charikleia steps in – rather, *leaps* in – and again exercises her control over the narrative.

> Ἀλλ' ἥ γε Χαρίκλεια καθήλατό τε τῆς ἐσχάρας καὶ προσδραμοῦσα προσπίπτει τοῖς γόνασι τοῦ Σισιμίθρου, τῶν ὑπηρετῶν παντοίως ἐπεχόντων καὶ τὴν ἱκεσίαν παραίτησιν εἶναι τοῦ θανάτου νομιζόντων, καὶ «Ὦ σοφώτατοι» ἔλεγε «μικρὸν ἐπιμείνατε· δίκη γάρ μοι καὶ κρίσις πρόκειται πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεύοντας, ὑμᾶς δὲ μόνους καὶ τοῖς τοσούτοις δικάζειν πυνθάνομαι. Καὶ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς ἀγῶνά μοι διαιτήσατε· σφαγιασθῆναι γάρ με θεοῖς οὔτε δυνατὸν οὔτε δίκαιον εἶναι μαθήσεσθε.»
>
> But then Charikleia leapt down from the gridiron and, running forward, fell at the knees of Sisimithres, although attendants were trying all sorts of things to hold her and were assuming that her request was an intercession against her death, and she said "Oh wisest ones, wait a small moment; for I have a plea for justice, and the decision rests before those who rule, and I have learned that you alone pass judgement over such matters. Even the contest about my life you will decide; for you will realize that sacrificing me to the gods is neither possible nor just." (10.10.1–2)

Charikleia proves here that she has been paying attention to how things work in Hydaspes' court.

---

[94] We saw a signal of Sisimithres' correct cognition earlier in Book X, when he warns Persinna that not all may go as planned. «Ὦ Περσίννα» ἔλεγεν «ἡμεῖς μὲν ἥξομεν, οἱ θεοὶ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπουσι· θόρυβον δέ τινα καὶ ταραχὴν προμηνύει τὸ δαιμόνιον, ἐσομένην μὲν παρὰ τὰς θυσίας εἰς ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ ἡδὺ τὸ τέλος καταστρέψουσαν» "Oh Persinna," he said, "we will come, for the gods permit it; but the divine spirit predicts some disturbance and agitation which will happen alongside the sacrifices, resulting in a good and sweet end" (10.4.2).

Charikleia also knows Greek, so she may even have heard Sisimithres' rebuke of Hydaspes and realized her chance to intervene and stop the sacrifice. Even if she is simply acting from instinct, her second timely interruption in the final book steers the narrative back on course, away from the sacrifice. In this way, both Sisimithres and Charikleia correct Hydaspes' misinterpretation of her chastity test.

These displays of narrative control by both the audience and the performer illustrate the multi–sided nature of performances of *sophrosyne* in the *Aithiopika.* The performer must capture their audience's attention through dramatic, timely actions, of course, but the audience also has a role: they must respond in an equally appropriate manner, reinforcing the performer's message and correctly interpreting their motivations. When Hydaspes does not read Charikleia's performance properly, those in the audience who do, like Sisimithres, step in as guides, instructors, and perhaps even interpreters.

Like Father, Like Daughter: Charikleia's Identity

Unfortunately, one correction is not enough to teach Hydaspes how to interpret *sophrosyne*; he continues to be incredulous and disbelieving, just as Charikleia predicted he would be. For example, as John Morgan observes,

> The wording which Charikleia uses to describe the king's likely reaction (χλεύην, ἂν οὕτω τύχῃ, καὶ ὕβριν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἡγησάμενον, 9.24.6) is recalled later, in authorial narrative, in a form too close for coincidence, at exactly the point where Charikleia makes her first explicit claim to be the king's daughter (ἀγανακτῶν ἐφαίνετο, χλεύην τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ ὕβριν ποιούμενος, 10.12.2).[95]

Hydaspes' suspicious reaction here shows not only his inability to interpret Charikleia's

[95] Morgan (1989) 309. The full sentence is: : Ὁ δὴ βασιλεὺς τὸ ἐντεῦθεν οὐχ ὑπερορῶν τὰ λεγόμενα μόνον ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ ἀγανακτῶν ἐφαίνετο, χλεύην τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ ὕβριν ποιούμενος· "Indeed the king at this point seemed not only to be overlooking the things which were said but also already to be growing angry, considering the matter a joke and an outrage." (10.12.2). The language of seeming here may be a suggestion that Hydaspes catches on more quickly than I have given him credit for doing, though the translations of Morgan and others do not reflect this possibility.

performance, but also that Charikleia, before and after her test, is alert to her audience, to dramatic timing, and to the need for performance. It is no surprise, then, that Charikleia directs her second performance – proving her identity as the Ethiopian princess – primarily toward her mother, who almost immediately grasps Charikleia's point and reacts to her *sophrosyne* with pity and affection. Charikleia has been watching Persinna intently, and the first piece of evidence she produces is targeted toward Persinna specifically: the story Persinna herself wrote.[96]

> «μάρτυρα μὲν οὐχ ἕνα τῶν πολλῶν ἀλλ' αὐτόν γε δὴ τὸν δικάζοντα προκαλουμένη (μεγίστη δὲ οἶμαι τῷ λέγοντι πίστις ἡ τοῦ διαιτῶντος γνῶσις), γράμματα δὲ τάδε τύχης τῆς ἐμῆς τε καὶ ὑμῶν διηγήματα προϊσχομένη.» Καὶ ἅμα λέγουσα τὴν συνεκτεθεῖσαν ἑαυτῇ ταινίαν ὑπὸ τῇ γαστρὶ φέρουσα προὔφερέ τε καὶ ἀνειλήσασα τῇ Περσίννῃ προσεκόμιζεν.
>
> "The witness being called is not one of the crowd, but is the very same one who is judging me (and I think the greatest evidence for a case is the knowledge of the one trying it), and these documents being presented are stories about fate – both mine and yours." And while speaking, bringing the band exposed with her out from under her stomach, she displayed it, and bringing it to Persinna, she unwrapped it. (10.12.4–13.1)

Persinna, who wove the story of Charikleia's birth onto the *tainia*, is the person most familiar with the truth of the situation around Charikleia's birth and has been the most receptive to Charikleia's rhetoric thus far. These narrative choices continue to pay off; in response to Charikleia's narrative decision – to her rhetorical chastity – Persinna is wholly overcome.

> Ἡ δὲ ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρῶτον εἶδεν ἀχανής τε καὶ αὖος ἐγεγόνει καὶ χρόνον ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα τῇ ταινίᾳ καὶ τὴν κόρην αὖθις ἐν μέρει περιεσκόπει· τρόμῳ τε καὶ παλμῷ συνείχετο καὶ ἱδρῶτι διερρεῖτο, χαίρουσα μὲν ἐφ' οἷς εὕρισκεν ἀμηχανοῦσα δὲ πρὸς τὸ τῶν παρ' ἐλπίδας ἄπιστον, δεδοικυῖα δὲ τὴν ἐξ Ὑδάσπου τῶν φανερουμένων ὑποψίαν τε καὶ ἀπιστίαν ἢ καὶ ὀργήν, ἂν οὕτω τύχῃ, καὶ τιμωρίαν.
>
> Then she, at the first sight of it, was struck dumb and went weak and for a long time looked at the things written on the band and then at the girl, and back again in turns; and she was taken by trembling and shaking and she dripped with sweat, rejoicing at what she found but helpless in the face of this unbelievable thing beyond her expectations, and

[96] As clarified in chapter fourteen, when Sisimithres tells Hydaspes: Περσίννης δὲ αὐτοχειρίᾳ κατεστίχθαι παρὰ σοὶ μάλιστα γνωριζομένην. "And that it was woven by Persinna's own hand is obviously known to you." (10.14.1).

> fearing suspicion from Hydaspes about these revelations, or disbelief, or even anger, since this happened, and even vengeance. (10.13.1)

Persinna is clearly in shock, and the constant stream of participles and emotional nouns emphasizes the wild, incredible nature of what has happened. As with audiences in *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* Persinna's emotions are thrown into confusion and her physical stability is swept away.

Unlike in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, however, Charikleia's second performance also inspires Persinna to turn her mind toward one of the most important elements of performance: her audience. She considers the possible responses Hydaspes might have, and when he asks her why she is so shaken, she moderates her reply according to her fear of his anger.

> Ἡ δὲ «Ὦ βασιλεῦ» εἶπε «καὶ δέσποτα καὶ ἄνερ, ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἂν εἴποιμι πλέον, λαβὼν δὲ ἀναγίνωσκε· διδάσκαλός σοι πάντων ἡ ταινία γενήσεται.» Καὶ ἐπιδοῦσα αὖθις ἐσιώπα κατηφήσασα.
>
> And she said, "Oh king, and master, and husband, I should not say anything more, but taking [the band], read it; the *tainia* will become the chorus–master of everything." And, having given it back, she went silent, casting her eyes downward. (10.13.2).

Persinna's response – downcast eyes, silence, an abundance of titles – clearly communicates deference. This deference, though, is not simply instinctual,[97] because we know that Persinna was just now thinking about avoiding Hydaspes' violent response. Persinna's use of διδάσκαλός also hints that she has dramatic intentions in mind. While διδάσκαλός can mean teacher or instructor,[98] the LSJ also defines it as the term for the producer of a play or the trainer of a

[97] Morgan reads Persinna's response as a non–response, calling it "an abortion of Persinna's putatively decisive role." "Charikleia produces the *tainia* at 10.13.1. It elicits the expected violent reaction from Persinna. This is the moment when her recognition of her child becomes conscious, but far from acting on that recognition and exerting a decisive influence on the course of events, she lapses into silence at 10.13.3 and plays no further part in the scene, other than passively confirming that she recognizes the other *gnorismata*, which have been brought into the argument by Sisimithres (10.14.2)." Morgan (1989) 313.

[98] Even if teaching and instruction are the only overtones in διδάσκαλός here, those meanings would still point us toward Persinna's lack of deference. If the *tainia* is a teacher, she tells Hydaspes to submit to the written/woven

dithyrambic or dramatic chorus – Persinna's weaving is producing the play in which Charikleia's identity is revealed. Thus Persinna, like Charikleia, is now offering a performance of her own: that of the deferential wife.

Her dual responses to Charikleia's *sophrosyne*, losing control and performing, may appear paradoxical – how can someone without self–control give a performance? – but they fit surprisingly well with evidence from the crowd's reactions in *Leucippe and Cleitophon.* Those performing alongside the protagonists, like Melite, do not succumb to the same loss of control that the general audience does. Instead, they are able to consider timing, word choice, and audience responses, all necessary elements of performance. I suggest, then, that one way (and possibly the only way) to escape the shattering of one's self–control in the face of performed *sophrosyne* is to join into the performance itself.

Persinna's reactions as Charikleia adds more evidence for her identity further support this. Because Hydaspes requires more proof,[99] Charikleia produces necklaces left with her at birth, and finally a ruby ring, the *pantarbe,* which she says she reserved specifically for Hydaspes.[100] As Sisimithres continues interpreting, explaining Charikleia's skin color and prompting her to show her black birthmark,[101] Persinna can no longer hold back her emotion at incontrovertible proof of her daughter's return.

---

word of a woman, to trust her own account of the story. This, too, suggests that Persinna is conscious of the power dynamics at play and is manipulating her audience.

[99] Despite the many cues Charikleia offers, Hydaspes must be led, point by point, through Charikleia's explanation of her identity first as a chaste young woman (chapter nine), then as an Ethiopian (chapters ten and eleven), then as the Ethiopian princess (chapter twelve), his daughter (chapter thirteen), then as his white–skinned daughter who looks like Andromeda (chapters fourteen and fifteen), and finally as his daughter with the correct black birthmark (chapter sixteen).

[100] Yet another indication that Charikleia is still thinking about her audience: σὸν δὲ ἴδιον ὅδε ὁ δακτύλιος, "this little ring here is distinctly yours." (10.14.3).

[101] Ἐγύμνωσεν αὐτίκα ἡ Χαρίκλεια τὴν λαιάν, καὶ ἦν τις ὥσπερ ἔβενος περίδρομος ἐλέφαντα τὸν βραχίονα μιαίνων. "Immediately Charikleia bared her left arm, and there was something just like a ring of ebony staining her ivory arm." (10.15.2).

> Οὐκέτι κατεῖχεν ἡ Περσίννα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀθρόον τε ἀνήλατο τοῦ θρόνου καὶ προσδραμοῦσα περιέβαλέ τε καὶ περιφῦσα ἐδάκρυέ τε καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀκατάσχετον τῆς χαρᾶς μυκηθμῷ τινι προσεοικὸς ἀνωρύετο (ὑπερβολὴ γὰρ ἡδονῆς καὶ θρῆνόν ποτε ἀποτίκτειν φιλεῖ), μικροῦ τε ἔδει συγκατενεχθῆναι τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ.
>
> Persinna no longer restrained herself, but suddenly rose up from her throne and, charging forward, embraced Charikleia, and, hugging her, Persinna wept and howled an uncontrollable shout of joy, like some animal bellowing (for an excess of joy is sometimes wont to beget even a death lament); and she nearly took Charikleia down with her. (10.16.1)

Immediately, we can see the utter lack, even the impossibility, of self–control in the face of Charikleia's display of the band. Persinna's disturbance is physical, mental, emotional, and even existential; the lines between joy and grief, animal and human begin to blur because of her emotion. As with Cleitophon, a powerful display of *sophrosyne* disrupts the very selfhood of those who see it. Further, the prose itself has taken on a blurry quality. The sound play of ἀλλ᾽ ἀθρόον τε ἀνήλατο τοῦ θρόνου lends itself to confusion with the abundance of alpha, lambda, and theta sounds. The alpha–privitive ἀθρόον primes an audible slip into the α–θρόνος: Persinna is both out of order and out of her chair.

But Persinna does not remain in her overwhelmed state; her daughter's *sophrosyne* also prompts her to take dramatic action. Her response – weeping, wailing, even giving a *threnos,* a funeral lament – would suit the tragic stage well, as would the sententious maxim in parentheses.[102] Further, we know from her worries in chapter thirteen that she is conscious of her

[102] This line is repeated verbatim in *Scholia in Lucianum* alongside Lucian's nineteenth dialogue, Κατάπλους ἢ Τύραννος. In the dialogue, Hermes asks: Μίκυλλε, σὺ δ᾽ οὐδὲν οἰμώζεις; καὶ μὴν οὐ θέμις ἀδακρυτὶ διαπλεῦσαί τινα. "Mikyllus, are you not crying *oimoi* at all? Indeed, it is not right for someone to sail over [the river Styx] without tears!" Mikyllus replies: Ἄπαγε· οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐφ᾽ ὅτῳ ἂν οἰμώξαιμι εὐπλοῶν. "Go away! There is nothing at which I should lament, since I am sailing smoothly." Hermes then commands him Ὅμως κἂν μικρόν τι ἐς τὸ ἔθος ἐπιστέναξον. "Nevertheless do some groaning, even if only a little bit, for custom's sake." (19.20). In the margins of this passage, a scholion in the delta manuscript (Vat. Gr. 3322) reads: **οὐ λύπη ταυτησὶ τῆς οἰμωγῆς σοι, Μίκυλλε, πρόξενος ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον χαρά**· ὑπερβολὴ γὰρ ἡδονῆς καὶ θρῆνόν ποτε ἀποτίκτειν φιλεῖ. "Have you never had the grief of this cry of oimoi, Mikyllus, or had joy, its opposite, as a friend? For an excess of joy is sometimes wont to beget even a death lament." (19.20, Rabe (1906) 50). Perhaps some scribe has recently read and is quoting Heliodorus, but I think it more likely that the sentiment of excessive joy producing the accoutrements of mourning

audience, specifically Hydaspes. As Persinna performs in response to Charikleia's performance, she moves Hydaspes toward an emotional reaction which fits with the narrative Charikleia (and Persinna herself) want to construct. When Hydaspes witnesses his wife's response, he, too is moved nearly to tears.

> Ὁ δὲ Ὑδάσπης ἠλέει μὲν τὴν γυναῖκα ὀδυρομένην ὁρῶν καὶ εἰς συμπάθειαν ἐκάμπτετο τὴν διάνοιαν, τὸ ὄμμα δὲ οἱονεὶ κέρας ἢ σίδηρον εἰς τὰ ὁρώμενα τείνας εἱστήκει πρὸς τὰς ὠδῖνας τῶν δακρύων ἀπομαχόμενος· καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῷ πατρικῷ τῷ πάθει καὶ ἀνδρείῳ τῷ λήματι κυματουμένης καὶ τῆς γνώμης ὑπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων στασιαζομένης καὶ πρὸς ἑκατέρου καθάπερ ὑπὸ σάλου μετασπωμένης τελευτῶν ἡττήθη τῆς τὰ πάντα νικώσης φύσεως καὶ πατὴρ οὐκ εἶναι μόνον ἐπείθετο ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσχειν ὅσα πατὴρ ἠλέγχετο.
>
> But Hydaspes pitied his wailing wife when he saw her and was moved to sympathy in his mind, and stretching his gaze like horn or iron toward the sights, he stood, fighting off the pangs of tears. But because his soul was being swept seaward by his paternal feeling and manly resolve and because his judgment was being thrown into rebellion in the face of them both and was being swayed toward each side just as if by a wave, finally he was defeated by the nature which conquers all things, and he was not only persuaded to be a father, but also was proven to suffer all the things a father suffers. (10.16.2)

Hydaspes' response, like Persinna's, is emotionally and physically complex. His wife's performance clearly convinces him and washes away the last of his resistance to Charikleia's declarations, finally drawing him toward the correct interpretation of the events in the last several chapters. We see Hydaspes lose control in reaction to Persinna's performance, but like his wife, he then begins performing, as the Homeric allusion used to characterize his actions suggests. The horn and iron of Hydaspes' gaze recall Odysseus' expression in *Odyssey* Book XIX, when Odysseus spins a lie about his own death to Penelope.

> ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα:
> τῆς δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀκουούσης ῥέε δάκρυα, τήκετο δὲ χρώς:
> ὡς δὲ χιὼν κατατήκετ᾽ ἐν ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσιν,
> ἣν τ᾽ Εὖρος κατέτηξεν, ἐπὴν Ζέφυρος καταχεύῃ:
> τηκομένης δ᾽ ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες:

was (and still is) a common idea. In any case, the sententious nature of this statement, combined with Persinna's shouting, wailing, and embracing, is reminiscent of a tragic performance.

> ὣς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δάκρυ χεούσης,
> κλαιούσης ἐὸν ἄνδρα παρήμενον. αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
> θυμῷ μὲν γοόωσαν ἐὴν ἐλέαιρε γυναῖκα,
> ὀφθαλμοὶ δ᾽ ὡς εἰ κέρα ἔστασαν ἠὲ σίδηρος
> ἀτρέμας ἐν βλεφάροισι: δόλῳ δ᾽ ὅ γε δάκρυα κεῦθεν.
>
> He spoke, telling many lies which resembled truths:
> And as she listened, her tears flowed, and her skin melted
> Like snow that melts down among the high–ranging mountains
> Which Eurus melts once Zephyr has poured it down:
> And when it has melted, the flowing rivers are full of it:
> So, did her beautiful cheeks melt as she flowed with tears,
> Lamenting her husband even as he was present. But Odysseus
> In his heart pitied his weeping wife,
> And his eyes just like horn or iron stood
> Motionless under his eyelids: with cunning he concealed his tears. (*Odyssey* 19.203–212)

Hydaspes is moved not only to tears but to performance. Like Odysseus, Hydaspes is so moved by his wife's emotion that he weeps, and like Odysseus, he works to conceal his feeling through deception, through performance. Even the crowd, when Hydaspes turns to look at them, can feel the weight of performance in this scene.

> ἀλλ᾽ ὀλίγον ἐπιστὰς τόν τε δῆμον κατοπτεύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἴσων παθῶν κεκινημένον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιΐαν τῆς τύχης ὑφ᾽ ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλέου δακρύοντας.
>
> But [Hydaspes was] standing a little bit away and scoping out the people, who were moved by equally intense feelings and were crying from joy as well as pity at the stage management[103] of fortune. (10.16.3)

We can see that Charikleia's display of *sophrosyne* both forces her audience into emotional responses and inspires them to join her in thinking about performance, if not in actually performing. We can map a chain of performances from Charikleia's display of *sophrosyne* to Persinna's deferential and tragic attitudes to Hydaspes' emotional Odyssean deception[104] to the audience's theatrical response, but Hydaspes' complementary performance does not end here.

---

[103] I have taken the delightful translation of σκηνοποιΐαν as "stage management" from Morgan's translation of the *Aithiopika* in Reardon (1989) 570 and from Walden's discussion of the term in Walden (1894) 42.
[104] See Rutherford (1986) for more discussion of the themes of deception and self–restraint in this passage.

Hydaspes leans into the roles of dutiful king and grieving father in order to get Charikleia out of the sacrifice, manipulating the emotions of his people so that their outrage motivates her exclusion from the sacrifice, not his own paternal emotions. His entire speech is a masterful emotional manipulation of the crowd,[105] as the ending makes clear.

> «Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἱλήκοιτε ὦ θεοὶ τῶν εἰρημένων [καὶ] εἰ δή τι πρὸς τοῦ πάθους νικώμενος οὐκ εὐαγὲς ἐφθεγξάμην ὁ τέκνον ὁμοῦ καλεσάμενος καὶ τεκνοκτόνος γινόμενος.» Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ μὲν ἐπέβαλλε τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ τὰς χεῖρας, ἄγειν μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῶν πυρκαϊὰν . . . τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν τῶν ἐνηδρευμένων τῇ δημηγορίᾳ λόγων ἀπευχόμενος.
>
> "And you, oh gods, be gracious to what has been spoken, even if indeed I, conquered by emotion, have uttered something which is not pure – I, a man who is calling out "child" in the same breath as he is made a child–murderer!" And having said these things he took Charikleia's hands, making as if to lead her to the altars and the funeral pyre on them . . . praying against the success of the words which had been set up to fail by his rhetorical performance. (10.16.10–17.1)

Heliodorus does not leave Hydaspes' deception or his intentions to subtext; when his gambit succeeds, the narrator confirms what we may have already suspected – Hydaspes is performing. Ὁ δὲ Ὑδάσπης ἑκών τε καὶ χαίρων προσίετο τὴν ἧτταν, "and Hydaspes willingly and happily admitted defeat" (10.17.3). The two main responses to Charikleia's timely performance choices, then, are a loss of control and more performance. Her *sophrosyne* inspires her audience into storytelling, highlights the theatrical nature of the entire scene around her, and encourages Persinna, Hydaspes, and the crowd to participate in the well–intentioned and necessarily manipulative process of proving her chastity, status, and identity.

Necessity is the Mother of Deception: Charikleia and Theagenes' Relationship

At this point in the narrative, the series of performances spirals rapidly out of control, and it begins to resemble not so much a chain as a very tangled web. As Charikleia and Theagenes

[105] For the sake of brevity, I cannot include Hydaspes' entire speech, but it may be found in Greek at *Aithiopika* 10.16.4–10, and in English at Reardon (1989) 570–71.

work to reveal their relationship, the narrator starts jumping back and forth between scenes; more and more audience members become performers; and no performance initiated after the revelation of Charikleia's identity reaches its conclusion. Eventually, all the players on the stage (Charikleia, Theagenes, Hydaspes, Persinna, and Sisimithres) are giving simultaneous performances which both confuse and clarify the nature of Charikleia's relationship with Theagenes.

Charikleia, who has already given one stunning performance, must continue performing in order to convince her audience to save Theagenes' life. At the same time, she must work to preserve her newly–displayed *sophrosyne* by making oblique, roundabout statements about the nature of their relationships. She makes three attempts to reveal her relationship with Theagenes first to Hydaspes and then to Persinna. She begins with Hydaspes, who has demonstrated by now that he is both susceptible to and capable of performance. He infers on his own that Theagenes cannot be Charikleia's brother, for Persinna was only pregnant once.[106] In response, Charikleia begins a new performance. She is no longer playing the defiant sacrificial virgin, and she has adopted instead the role of the modest, discreet royal daughter.

> Καὶ ἡ Χαρίκλεια σὺν ἐρυθήματι κατανεύσασα «Τὸν μὲν ἀδελφὸν ἐψευσάμην» ἔφη «τῆς χρείας τὸ πλάσμα συνθείσης· ὅστις δέ ἐστιν ἀληθῶς αὐτὸς ἂν λέγοι βέλτιον, ἀνήρ τε γάρ ἐστιν ἐμοῦ τε τῆς γυναικὸς εὐθαρσέστερον ἐξαγορεύειν οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσεται.»
>
> And Charikleia, nodding with a blush, said "I lied that this man is my brother, but necessity constructed this pretense; for whoever he truly is, he himself would explain better, for he is a man and will not be shamed if he speaks out more boldly than me, a woman." (10.18.2)

[106] «ἀλλ' οὑτοσὶ τίς ποτέ ἐστιν, ὁ σοὶ μὲν ἅμα συλληφθεὶς καὶ εἰς τὰς ἐπινικίους σπονδὰς τοῖς θεοῖς φυλαχθείς, νυνί τε τοῖς βωμοῖς εἰς τὴν ἱερουργίαν προσιδρυμένος; Ἢ πῶς αὐτὸν ἀδελφὸν ὠνόμαζες ὅτε μοι τὸ πρῶτον κατὰ τὴν Συήνην προσήχθητε; οὐ γὰρ δήπου καὶ οὗτος ἡμέτερος υἱὸς εὑρεθήσεται· ἅπαξ γὰρ Περσίννα καὶ σὲ μόνην ἐκυοφόρησε.» "But whoever is that man who was captured along with you and preserved by the gods for the victory sacrifices, and now is near the altars for the sacrifice? Or how were you calling him your brother, when you were first led before me at Syene? For I don't think that he, too, will be discovered to be our son! For Persinna was pregnant only once – with you." (10.18.2)

Citing necessity and feminine modesty as the forces which compelled her to deceive, Charikleia absolves herself of responsibility for the deception involved in her previous performance. Her use of *plasma* – "pretense" or "lie" – also recalls her wordplay with the same term in Book I. As Winkler notes,

> [Charikleia] then recommends that in view of the dangers which surround them they hold to his lie (πλάσμα) as a sort of jiujitsu feint or wrestling trick (πάλαισμα) and not trust even Knemon with the truth. The effect of her cunning and caution is that we will be given no opportunity to learn what we want to know in order to begin appreciating her situation as part of an intelligible plot.[107]

Winkler's analysis of this scene in Book I, the first instance wherein Charikleia lies for the sake of necessity,[108] maps easily onto the scene here in Book VIII. Although the external audience may understand Charikleia's situation now, Hydaspes does not. As a result, Charikleia's performance – we may even say her overperformance – add layers of feints and twists (παλαίσματα) on top of her existing lies (πλάσματα). She is further obscuring her relationship to Theagenes even as she attempts to explain it more clearly.

When Hydaspes fails to understand[109] this admittedly confusing shift, Charikleia dons another costume, repeating her performance as the bold sacrificial victim.

> πάλιν ὑφεῖρπε τὸν σκοπὸν καὶ «Ὦ δέσποτα» ἔλεγεν «ἀλλ' οὐδὲ κόρην μὲν ἴσως ἔτι ἐχρῆν σε ἐπιζητεῖν, ἅπαξ τοῦ δήμου τὸ ἱερεῖον τὸ θῆλυ δι' ἐμοῦ συγχωρήσαντος. Εἰ δ' οὖν προσφιλονεικοίη τις ἄρτιον καὶ ἐξ ἑκατέρου γένους ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὴν ἱερουργίαν, ὥρα σοι μὴ κόρην μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ νεανίαν ἄλλον ἐπιζητεῖν, ἢ μὴ τοῦτο ποιοῦντα μηδὲ κόρην ἄλλην ἀλλ' ἐμὲ πάλιν σφαγιάζειν.»
>
> Again she crept around to her goal and said, "Oh master, but perhaps it is not still necessary for you to seek out a girl, since the people have already given up a female sacrifice once, for me. So if anyone would insist that the sacrifice be completed fully and with a victim from each gender, take care that you seek out not only another girl, but another young man; or, if you won't do this, take care that you sacrifice not some other

[107] Winkler (1982) 111.
[108] See my discussion of *Aithiopika* 1.25 in chapter one.
[109] μὴ συλλαβὼν τὸν νοῦν τῶν εἰρημένων, "Not fitting together in his mind the things that were said." (10.18.3).

girl, but me, as before." (10.19.2)

The language of creeping under (ὑφεῖρπε), while not necessarily negative, certainly suggests Charikleia's lack of straightforwardness, and we begin to see her desperation. She puts her own life on the line for Theagenes, but Hydaspes again misunderstands, reading her love as compassion (φιλανθρωπία) for a stranger (10.20.1). Finally, Charikleia tries her hand at a third role: the lover who would rather kill her beloved than live without him.

> «ἓν γοῦν μοι χαρίσασθαι νεῦσον· αὐτήν με κέλευσον αὐτουργῆσαι τὸ θῦμα καὶ τὸ ξίφος ὡς κειμήλιον δεξαμένην περίβλεπτον ἐπ' ἀνδρείᾳ παρ' Αἰθίοψιν ἀναδειχθῆναι.»
>
> "At least agree to grant me this one thing: order me myself to perform the sacrifice and, that I, have taken the sword in hand like a widely–admired stored–up relic, be displayed before the Ethiopians for my manliness!" (10.20.1)

Charikleia's performance of manliness (ἀνδρεία), her sword–grasping,[110] and her revelation of something once hidden[111] add even more layers of gendered confusion to an already jumbled scene. She is giving too many conflicting performances to an audience already alert to performance, and she risks her *sophrosyne* in the process. As Hydaspes grows increasingly frustrated and confused after Charikleia's various lies, he finally exclaims

> «πῶς γὰρ τόν γε μηδὲ ὄντα μηδὲ γεγενῆσθαι αὐτῇ διὰ τῆς ἐσχάρας ἀποδειχθέντα; εἰ μὴ ἄρα παρὰ ταύτῃ μόνῃ ψεύδεται μὲν τὸ παρ' Αἰθίοψιν ἀψευδὲς τῶν καθαρευόντων πειρατήριον καὶ ἐπιβᾶσαν ἄφλεκτον ἀποπέμπεται καὶ παρθενεύειν νόθως χαρίζεται· μόνῃ δὲ ἔξεστι φίλους καὶ πολεμίους τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀκαρεῖ καταλέγειν, ἀδελφοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄνδρας τοὺς μὴ ὄντας ἀναπλάττειν.»
>
> "For how could she have a husband who does not exist and who has been proven by the gridiron not to exist? Unless for this girl alone the test of those who are pure is lying, the test which has never lied to the Ethiopians, and is letting her walk away unburnt and is showing favor to a bastard virgin; for her alone is it possible to call the same people friends and enemies in a single moment, and to craft brothers and husbands who do not exist!" (10.22.3)

---

[110] Both masculine militarism and, potentially, Freudian euphemism. Take your pick.
[111] I am referring here to the κεῖμαι root in κειμήλιον; many thanks to Dr. Slater for noticing this.

Hydaspes' awareness of performance, however slow to take root, allows him to see the holes in Charikleia's performances. In his attempts to decipher her many roles, he casts doubt on even the surest conclusion which can be drawn: the validity of the ἐσχάρα itself, the only definitive confirmation of Charikleia's (and Theagenes') virginity. As Charikleia stretches her *sophrosyne* to its limit – or to the limit of the audience's trust – she risks unmaking it.

As a last resort, Charikleia turns to her most sympathetic audience: her mother, Persinna, who has also demonstrated an awareness of performance. Charikleia tries three more times to reveal her relationship to Theagenes without compromising her story, but twice is unsuccessful, nearly turning her audience against her. Her first attempt fails because Hydaspes interrupts,[112] and her second attempt fails because Theagenes' performance has drawn the audience's attention.[113] Persinna, for her part, begins to wonder whether or not Charikleia is even chaste at all,[114] casting doubt on her *sophrosyne* just as the priest of Artemis began to do with Leucippe. Finally, Charikleia realizes that she must either come forward with the entire story or risk the

[112] ὁ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο πληρῶν, εἰ καὶ ὑμεῖς βουληθείητε.» «Βουλησόμεθα» εἶπεν ἡ Περσίννα μειδιάσασα «καὶ αὐτίκα μάλα ἐκδώσομεν, θεῶν νευόντων, σοῦ τε καὶ ἡμῶν ἄξιον ἐπιλεξάμενοι.» Καὶ ἡ Χαρίκλεια γεγωνότερον «Οὐδὲν δεῖ ἐπιλέγειν» ἔφη «τὸν ὄντα ἤδη.» Καὶ λέγειν τι φανερώτερον μελλούσης . . . οὐκέτι κατασχὼν ὁ Ὑδάσπης. "Charikleia, secretly and bending toward Persinna's ear, said "For I have, mother, one who completes this name [i.e. the name of husband], if you would consent." "We will consent," said Persinna, smiling, "and we will give you to him very quickly, gods willing, if he is selected as worthy of you and of us." And Charikleia said, more loudly, "it is not at all necessary to select a man who already exists." And although she intended to speak something more clearly…Hydaspes, containing himself no longer, said" (10.20.1).

[113] Ἐπιδακρύσασα οὖν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἡ Χαρίκλεια «Καὶ τοῦτο» ἔφη «δυστυχῶ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅτι καὶ τοῖς συνετοῖς ἀσύνετα φθέγγομαι καὶ λέγουσα τὰς ἑαυτῆς συμφορὰς οὔπω λέγειν νομίζομαι· πρὸς γυμνὴν δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀπαρακάλυπτον χωρεῖν τὴν ἐμαυτῆς κατηγορίαν ἀναγκάζομαι.» Ταῦτα εἶπε, καὶ βουλομένη τὰ ὄντα ἀνακαλύπτειν αὖθις ἐξεκρούσθη βοῆς πολυηχεστάτης πρὸς τοῦ πλήθους ἀρθείσης. "So, weeping even more, Charikleia said, "And in this I am unfortunate beyond other things, that I speak unintelligible things even to intelligent people, and even if I speak my own misfortune, I think they do not understand; I am forced to release my own defense speech in favor of what remains: undisguised nakedness." She said these things, and though she wished to uncover what was happening, again she was diverted, because a many–toned shout was lifted up by the crowd." (10.29.4–30.1).

[114] «κἂν τι νεώτερον <ἦ> κίνημα κἂν παρθενίᾳ μὴ πρέπον, ἡ μητρῴα φύσις τὸ θυγατρὸς καὶ τὸ θῆλυ συμπαθὲς τὸ πταῖσμα τὸ γυναικεῖον οἶδεν ἐπισκιάζειν.» "Even if some more youthful passion or something unbecoming to virginity, my motherly nature toward my daughter and my female sympathy know how to conceal a womanly [i.e. not virginal] stumble." (10.29.4).

destruction of her life and her narrative.

> Καὶ τῆς Περσίννης πολλὰ παρηγορούσης καὶ «Εἰκὸς σωθῆναι τὸν νέον, εἴ μοι καὶ τὰ λειπόμενα καὶ σαφέστερα τῶν κατὰ σαυτὴν ἐξαγορεύειν βούλοιο» λεγούσης, ἡ μὲν Χαρίκλεια βιασθεῖσα καὶ τὸν καιρὸν οὐκ ἐνδιδόντα ὑπέρθεσιν ὁρῶσα, πρὸς τὰ καιριώτερα τῶν διηγημάτων ὥρμησεν. Ὁ δὲ Ὑδάσπης εἴ τινες ὑπολείπονται τῶν πρεσβευσάντων τοῦ εἰσαγγελέως ἐπυνθάνετο.
>
> And when Persinna was consoling her and saying, "It is possible for the young man to be saved, if you wish to reveal to me even more clearly the things which have been left out about yourself," Charikleia, feeling the pressure and seeing that the right time would not allow for postponement, set off for the more time–sensitive parts of her narrative. But Hydaspes was inquiring of his herald if any of the ambassadors still remained to be seen. (10.33.4–34.1)

Yet even here, as Theagenes' imminent sacrifice necessitates Charikleia's third and final attempt to reveal their relationship, Heliodorus does not actually describe Charikleia's conversation with her mother. He leaves it to the external audience's imagination, transitioning immediately back to Hydaspes. Instead of allowing the narrative to reach its climax here, the narrator steps in to make Charikleia's final (and presumably successful) attempt at revelation a private performance.

It appears, then, that Charikleia cannot give the public performance need to finally reveal her relationship with Theagenes. This aligns well with what we know of the anxiety inherent to displays of *sophrosyne.* Charikleia has already proven herself chaste before a crowd, but too much further investigation into the surety of that proof will cause it to crumble. *Sophrosyne,* as we have seen, is itself an unstable performance, so further conflicting performances can and do continue destabilizing Charikleia's already–fraught first performance. For Charikleia, convincing the audiences that she can hold the identities of wife and virgin simultaneously is too great a task even for her considerable *sophrosyne*. She has stretched their patience for manipulative storytelling – and the concept of *sophrosyne* itself – to the limit.

Theagenes' own attempts to reveal their relationships are also unsuccessful, because

Meroebos and Hydaspes, like Persinna and Hydaspes in previous scenes, still cannot understand the conundrum of a wife who is a virgin. Theagenes, too, occupies at least three roles, playing first the grateful but resigned sacrificial victim as he asks Hydaspes «εἰ τὸ διαδρᾶναί με τὴν ἱερουργίαν πάντως ἀνέφικτον, χειρὶ γοῦν τῆς εὑρημένης σοι νυνὶ θυγατρὸς κέλευε.» "If escaping the sacrifice is completely impossible for me, at least order it done by the hand of your now–discovered daughter" (10.32.4). As the narrator reminds us,[115] Charikleia requested the exact same thing in chapter twenty, when Hydaspes begged her to explain her relationship to and pity for Theagenes. While the two (like Leucippe and Cleitophon) likely did not plan this together, the similarity of the roles they attempt to occupy points toward their suitability for one another and their predilection for performance.

Theagenes then attempts to lean into a different aspect of his sacrificial status, painting himself as a prophet. When Hydaspes claims Meroebos will marry Charikleia, Theagenes interjects

> «Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐσόμενον πρόσθες» εἶπεν ὁ Θεαγένης, «εἴ τι ἐγὼ τοῦ Χαρικλείου φρονήματος ἐπῄσθημαι· κἀμοὶ ὡς θύματι μαντευομένῳ πιστεύειν ἔσται δίκαιον.»
>
> "But add that this will not come to be," said Theagenes, "if I know anything about the mind of Charikleia. It will be correct for you to trust in me as I give this prophecy, because I am a sacrificial victim." (10.33.2)

Meroebos quickly discredits Theagenes, pointing out that sacrificial victims are prophetic only once slaughtered, and it is at this point that Charikleia makes her final, private performance for Persinna.

Theagenes' final role is that of the scoundrel, the abductor of Charikleia, the role we may

[115] Δηχθεὶς δὴ πρὸς τὸ εἰρημένον ὁ Ὑδάσπης καὶ πρὸς τὸ ὅμοιον τῆς Χαρικλείου παρακλήσεως τὸν νοῦν ἀναπέμπων. "Indeed, Hydaspes was stung by what was said and also, calling it to mind, by Charikleia's similar request" (10.33.1).

have forgotten he occupied.[116] Charikles suddenly returns to the scene, adding his own deception to the jumble of performances onstage as he conceals "the real story" (τὰ ἀληθέστερα) from his audience and accuses Theagenes of abducting his daughter. As Morgan notes, "Theagenes' abduction of Charikleia from Delphi has always been characterized as morally ambivalent, so that the reader must concede that Charikles' case has some force."[117] Though the text in Book IV says Charikleia was willing and aware and prepared for the abduction,[118] Theagenes throws this into confusion in Book X with his final performance, where he validates the accusations Charikles makes.

> Ὁ δὲ Ὑδάσπης πρὸς τὸν Θεαγένην «Τί» ἔφη «πρὸς ταῦτα ἐρεῖς;» Ὁ δὲ «Ἀληθῆ» ἔφη «πάντα τὰ κατηγορηθέντα. Λῃστὴς ἐγὼ καὶ ἅρπαξ καὶ βίαιος καὶ ἄδικος περὶ τοῦτον, ἀλλ' ὑμέτερος εὐεργέτης.»
>
> Hydaspes said to Theagenes, "What will you say to these things?" And he said "It's true, all his accusations are true. I have been a pirate and a thief and a violent man and a wrongdoer to this man, but I have been your benefactor." (10.37.1)

Theagenes claims to be guilty, which is unlikely both in light of the account given in Book IV and because of Charikles' deceptions within this scene. Why should Theagenes, who will die

---

[116] In Book IV, as told by Kalasiris, we see Theagenes abduct Charikleia by force but apparently with her consent, removing her from her impending marriage to another man. ἐπειδὴ μέσαι νύκτες ὕπνῳ τὴν πόλιν ἐβάπτιζον, ἔνοπλος κῶμος τὴν οἴκησιν τῆς Χαρικλείας κατελάμβανεν, ἐστρατήγει δὲ Θεαγένης τὸν ἐρωτικὸν τοῦτον πόλεμον εἰς λόχον ἀπὸ τῆς πομπῆς τοὺς ἐφήβους συντάξας. Οἳ δὴ μέγα τι καὶ ἀθρόον ἐμβοήσαντες καὶ δούπῳ τῶν ἀσπίδων τοὺς κατὰ μικρὸν αἰσθομένους ἐμβροντήσαντες ὑπὸ λαμπάσιν ἡμμέναις εἰσήλαντο εἰς τὸ δωμάτιον, τὴν αὔλειον οὐ χαλεπῶς ἐκμοχλεύσαντες, ἅτε τῶν κλείθρων εἰς ῥᾳδίαν ἄνοιξιν ἐπιβεβουλευμένων, καὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν εὐτρεπῆ καὶ ἅπαντα προειδυῖαν καὶ τὴν βίαν ἑκοῦσαν ὑφισταμένην ἀναρπάζουσιν. "When midnight plunged the city into sleep, an armed band of revelers seized the household of Charikleia, and Theagenes was the general of this erotic war, having organized the ephebes from the parade into an ambush. Indeed, shouting something great and overwhelming and striking dumb with the thud of their shields those who heard even a trace of the noise, under lit torches they invaded the house, levering the door without difficulty, because the bars of the door had been secretly meddled with for easy access, and they snatched up Charikleia, who was prepared and completely aware and submitted willingly to their force." (4.17.3–4).

[117] Morgan (1989) 317.

[118] ὁ πρεσβύτης (ἦν δὲ ἄρα ὁ Χαρικλῆς) τὰ μὲν ἀληθέστερα τοῦ γένους τῆς Χαρικλείας ἀπέκρυπτε μή πη ἄρα καὶ κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν ἐκείνης τὴν ἄνω προαφανισθείσης πόλεμον καθ' ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς τῶν ἀληθῶς γεννησάντων ἐπισπάσηται διευλαβούμενος, ἐξετίθετο δὲ ἐπιτέμνων ἃ μηδὲν ἔβλαπτε. "The old man (who indeed, was Charikles) concealed the real events of Charikleia's ancestry, lest somehow she had vanished in her escape, guarding against drawing a war down on himself from her real parents." (10.36.1)

momentarily, assent to a false charge when he has nothing to gain *and* nothing to lose? The answer comes in the following scene, where Hydaspes then demands Theagenes return Charikleia to Charikles. Theagenes then has the opportunity to yell the truth about Charikleia's identity to the crowd; when he does, no one (except Sisimithres, who has known the truth all along[119]) can bear it.

> «Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ἀδικήσας» εἶπεν ὁ Θεαγένης, «ἀλλ' ὁ τὸ ἀδίκημα ἔχων ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιος· ἔχεις δὲ αὐτός. Ἀπόδος, εἰ μὴ σὴν θυγατέρα εἶναι Χαρίκλειαν καὶ οὗτος ὁμολογήσειεν.» Οὐκέτι καρτερεῖν οὐδεὶς ἠνέσχετο, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντων σύγχυσις ἐγίνετο.
>
> "But it is not the wrongdoer," said Theagenes, "but he who possesses the profit of wrongdoing who is responsible for its return; and you yourself are that man! Give her back, unless even this man would agree that Charikleia is your daughter!" No one could bear to hold back any longer, but at once there was confusion for everyone. (10.37.2–3)

Theagenes' performance, bolstered by Sisimithres' interpretive work, confuses the audience further, wresting self–control from their grasp and adding even more confusion to the scene. His performances, like Charikleia's, add to the audience's confusion and risk their relationship further.

When Charikleia runs out of the *skene* like a Maenad (her seventh role in Book X, by my count), claiming to be a parricide and asking for punishment (also her last words in the novel),[120] Persinna finally reveals that Theagenes and Charikleia are married.

> Ἡ Περσίννα καθ' ἕτερον μέρος τὸν Ὑδάσπην ἐνηγκαλίζετο, καὶ «Πάντα οὕτως ἔχειν, ἄνερ, πίστευε» πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλεγε «καὶ νυμφίον εἶναι τοῦ θυγατρίου τὸν Ἕλληνα τουτονὶ νεανίαν ἀληθῶς γίνωσκε, ἄρτι μοι ταῦτα ἐκείνης καὶ μόλις ἐξαγορευσάσης.»
>
> Persinna, at a distance, took Hydaspes in her arms and said to him, "Be confident that everything is so, and know truly that this Greek young man is the bridegroom of our

---

[119] <Ὁ> Σισιμίθρης δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαρκέσας καὶ πάλαι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα γνωρίζων, εἰς τὸ ἀκριβὲς δὲ περιελθεῖν τὰ φανερούμενα πρὸς τοῦ κρείττονος ἀναμένων προσέδραμέ τε καὶ τὸν Χαρικλέα περιεπτύσσετο. "But Sisimithres, having full control of himself to a great degree and comprehending from the beginning the things said and done, waiting for the things made manifest to him by a higher power to become completely clear, ran forward and embraced Charikles." (10.37.3).

[120] 10.38.1.

> daughter, because just now she betrayed these secrets to me, even though it was difficult." (10.38.2)

These words are meant to reassure Hydaspes, but they do not, I think, reassure the external audience. Persinna asks Hydaspes to accept things as they are (οὕτως ἔχειν) and to trust words spoken in secret between women. Hydaspes and the audience are explicitly asked to let things go, to join in the performance of celebrating a not–entirely–certain series of revelations. From Charikleia's initial demonstration of *sophrosyne* all the way to the re–revelation of her two fathers and her relationship with Theagenes, it is clear that the "real story," whatever it may be, is now hopelessly tangled in performances.

The narrative has reached its breaking point. Morgan characterizes the sequence of attempted revelations I have outlined as "the game of ambiguity and incomprehension" with a system of signs that are set up as definitive, undermined, and then rewritten so that Heliodorus can showcase his narrative skill.[121] While this may be a motivation for the twists and turns in these scenes, I think reading these events as a system of performances, rather than signs, offers clearer insight into Heliodorus' strategy for ending. The protagonists have proven their *sophrosyne,* and therefore their skills at performance, as they overwhelm their audience's ability to maintain self–control. At the same time, however, their performances and the performances they elicit from their audience pose a conundrum – a virgin wife, a virgin husband, a sacrifice–making sacrifice, an innocent criminal – which the internal audience, in their overwhelmed state, cannot understand. Even the performance–savvy characters have trouble making meaning from this series of performances. *Sophrosyne* at the end of the *Aithiopika,* then, offers the viewer a kind of narrative ultimatum: either make up an ending for the story and declare it so via

[121] Morgan (1989) 316, 319.

performance, or be swept away while trying to maintain a sense of self–control and reality in the face of so much manipulation.

Chapter Five: Close, Closure, and Craft

"The text of, say, a romance is not just a dead letter or inscribed memorial but a semantic performance in which both author and reader have active parts to play."
– John Winkler, "The Mendacity of Kalasiris"[122]

The reactions of the internal audiences in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* reveal that performances of *sophrosyne* encourage and even demand a response. Those watching the chastity tests in these two novels are overwhelmed by the protagonists' performances, just as we, the external audience, are overwhelmed by the pace and intricacy with which the plot appears to be resolving. We can sense that both novels in their final chapters are hurtling toward the end which has been looming since the start, and the two problems I have identified – the knowability of *sophrosyne* and the possibility of ending a polyphonic novel – remain unsolved at both the narrative and metanarrative level. At the narrative level, the reactions of internal audiences to performances of *sophrosyne* suggest that the solution to both of these problems is either to go silent, as in *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* or to join in the performance, as in the *Aithiopika.*

In this final chapter, I argue that resolving the problems of *sophrosyne* and endings at the metanarrative level of each novel requires these same solutions: silence and performance. We as readers, the external audience, must demonstrate our own *sophrosyne*. We need not necessarily be chaste, but we must notice when the time for an ending has arrived, restrain or exercise our curiosity at the appropriate points, and understand the stakes of our performance. Like the internal audiences, we must agree to keep quiet in order to end *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* and we must agree, despite our confusion, to perform joy and celebration at the end of the *Aithiopika*. If

[122] Winkler (1982) 139.

we refuse to play these roles at the end of the novel, we will not reach our long–desired happy ending. The final performance of *sophrosyne* in these two novels, then, is not the protagonists' grand demonstrations of bodily and rhetorical chastity, but the external audience's response, the *sophrosyne* we display as we agree to participate in the "semantic performance" of an ending.[123]

Leucippe and Cleitophon*: Encouraging *Euphemia

The internal audience's reactions to *sophrosyne* in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* include, as I have shown, silence and a loss of physical, emotional, and even existential control. Those watching performances of *sophrosyne* are reduced to silence, to *euphemia,* the only harmless kind of speech. The metanarrative dilemma posed by Achilles Tatius' ending demands *euphemia* of the external audience as well. We are silenced and cut out of the narrative by Cleitophon's narrative pacing, and there are consequences if we do attempt to speak. If we make any further comments on Cleitophon and Leucippe, we risk *Leucippe and Cleitophon* collapsing altogether.

The notoriously problematic final scene of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* makes the threat of collapse very clear. As many scholars have noted, the Cleitophon we see at the end of the novel who is finally married to Leucippe contrasts sharply with the Cleitophon who is narrating the novel, who we find in the temple of Astarte at Sidon in Book I lamenting τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος, "so many outrages of love" (1.2.1). Cleitophon is not with Leucippe at the beginning of the novel, and love has (apparently) done him wrong. Further, he is in a temple at Sidon, where he stopped at the end of the novel, not the Byzantium to which he planning to sail with Leucippe. Glenn Most identifies many of the questions this situation raises.

> Where is Leucippe when Cleitophon meets the anonymous narrator in the temple at Sidon? Has Cleitophon lost her yet again? If so, why does he not say so? If he still has her, what is he doing alone at the temple and why does he spend eight long books talking

[123] Winkler (1982) 139.

> about her to a stranger? Why is he not at home reading Greek romances in bed with her?[124]

These disconnects between the beginning and the ending of the novel are not the only curious features of Achilles Tatius' novel.

After Leucippe and Cleitophon finish their performances of *sophrosyne,* more and more stories are told at a faster and faster pace. After Leucippe finishes recounting her adventures, her father leaps into the storytelling. Curiously, Sostratos does not address his daughter, for whom he has expressed so much concern, but Cleitophon. Sostratos says he wants to take a turn as narrator ἵνα μὴ ἀσύμβολος ὦ μυθολογίας παντάπασι, "so that I am not one who doesn't pay their share in all the storytelling," and promises to tell Cleitophon about his sister, Kalligone (8.17.1). Sostratos' story reads like a miniature version of the Greek novel: Kalligone and Kallisthenes, a prince who was supposed to marry Leucippe, meet, fall in love, promise to remain chaste (τηρήσω δέ σε παρθένον μέχριπερ ἂν σοὶ δοκῇ, 8.17.3), travel around, go to war, reunite, and finally, having remained chaste (παρθένον γὰρ τὴν κόρην μέχρι τούτου τετήρηκα, 8.18.2), they promise to marry. Though much shorter than *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* this inset novel is obviously more conventional, perhaps even more ideal, than the novel in which it is told, and it is certainly less interesting now that we have had a taste of Cleitophon's tricky, biased narration.

More curiously still, there are no audience reactions to the quickly–told stories at the end of Book VIII. In fact, there has been no reaction or interpretation to any story told in Book VIII after Cleitophon's chastity test, where he does not give his audience the space to react and redirects their attention to the priest's story. Likewise, any responses to the priest's story are prevented by Leucippe's interruption, and Sostratos' storytelling prevents any response to

---

[124] Most (1989) 117.

Leucippe's newly–exercised narration. After Sostratos' narrative about Cleitophon's sister, Cleitophon and Leucippe simply go to bed as usual: καὶ ταῦτα διαμυθολογήσαντες ἐκοιμήθημεν τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον. "And after having exchanged these stories, we went to sleep in the typical way" (8.18.5). Finally, there is no description from our usually verbose narrator of his marriage ceremony, his voyage home, or his bride. The obsession with narration, the forced return to normalcy and to an ideal novel, and the lack of space for reader reactions in Book VIII convey a deep anxiety. There is no room for disturbance. If Cleitophon or Leucippe's *sophrosyne,* and by extension their stories, are questioned – indeed, if any story at the end of the novel is questioned – the ending is undermined.

If we are to understand these strange narrative features at the end of *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* we cannot forget that, within the novel, Cleitophon is still narrating and pacing even these final, hasty chapters. It is he who is managing the space in which other characters and even the external audience can react to the final (and initial) events of the novel. Even in the beginning of the novel, [125] Cleitophon is cinching the openings in the story shut, silencing his audience and directing them away from the many unanswered questions and loose ends which remain at the end of the novel. Gradually, the narrators tighten their hold on the narrative until even we, the external audience, are excluded from their private sphere of performative, cooperative storytelling. I suggest that rather than solely displaying narratological subversion, this ending is yet another playful demonstration – this time for the audience outside the novel – of *sophrosyne*. Achilles Tatius, though Cleitophon, is nudging us away from the instability which inevitably results from questioning an ending.

[125] If, as Repath suggests, the Cleitophon who opens the novel is very close in age, time, and experience to the Cleitophon who ends the novel, then we can read his opening words as a continuation of the ending of the narrative. Repath (2005) 262.

The buildup I have outlined in the last book of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* – the need for proof of *sophrosyne,* the public performances of it, the ensuing narrative tricks the protagonists play on their audience – reveals that the last chapters of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* not only contain tests of *sophrosyne* but are themselves a test of *sophrosyne.* This test, embedded as it is into the fabric of the novel's ending, invites readers to use not just their virginity or chastity,[126] but their skills at performance, storytelling, timing, and keeping quiet. As Ian Repath notes,

> There could be any number of ways to explain away these doubts and to account for the initial situation, but the fact that Achilles Tatius does not provide such an explanation only increases these doubts.[127]

The presentation of these tantalizing doubts are the reader's test of *sophrosyne.* We must carefully ward off questions as we watch the end of the novel, just as the author and characters do, in order to safely reach a sense of closure. We must go along with the performance of an ending. We are reduced to euphemism by the characters' discreet narration, just as Cleitophon and Leucippe's internal audiences are. We, too, threaten their performances of *sophrosyne* if we ask questions which might disrupt the carefully constructed happy, chaste wedding and safe journey to Byzantium.

There are also consequences if question the ending – that is, if we fail the test. If we do not heed the warnings scattered throughout Book VIII, we receive the unpleasant shock of discovering that there is not really an ending, nor is it happy. Repath writes that "Achilles Tatius has pulled off the biggest trick of them all: a Greek novel with a non–happy non–ending."[128]

---

[126] Some scholars, including Rachel Bird and John Morgan, read the ending of the novel as an injunction to the reader to restrain their sexual desire, to turn toward marriage and faithfulness in their own lives. My reading more closely follows the readings of John Winkler and Simon Goldhill, who take a more playful appraoch to the novel's relationship with its readers.
[127] Repath (2005) 260.
[128] Repath (2005) 265.

This claim is true if and only if we make the mistake of disrupting the ending. If we agree instead to keep silent, to euphemize, to let Cleitophon close the curtains of his and Leucippe's narrative, then we can walk away from the novel with our hopes for the protagonists' *sophrosyne* and their happily married life intact. We can end this polyphonic novel which rests on the unstable "virtue" of *sophrosyne* by collapsing our many questions about the ending into one monophonic statement in agreement with Cleitophon's suggested narrative course.

The *Aithiopika*: Celebrating Confusion

The *Aithiopika's* internal audience models a response to *sophrosyne* almost completely opposite the response in *Leucippe and Cleitophon.* We see Heliodorus use *sophrosyne* not as a means for subverting the ideal novelistic ending, as Achilles Tatius does, but for interrogating it. Rather than silencing his readers, he encourages the external audience to add their own responses to the chain of performances which runs throughout Book X. These performances, as we have seen, do not require full comprehension of the often paradoxical situations at the end of the novel but merely an understanding that performance is occurring. I suggest that as the internal audiences learn to perform in the face of paradox, they provide a model for the external audience. We, too, must learn to respond to the many paradoxes of Book X by performing, even if we do not fully understand the situation. This learning process, though messy, allows the *Aithiopika* to turn what Winkler calls its "greatest fear" – misinterpretation – into its greatest indulgence, the tool by which it encourages the audience to agree to construct an ending.[129]

The narrator of the *Aithiopika* and the crowd of people watching the events of Book X offer the first demonstration of performances which are not dependent on correct interpretation.

[129] Winkler (1982) 120.

After Persinna asks Hydaspes to accept things as they are, to believe the conversation Persinna had with Charikleia in secret even to the audience, the spectators before the *skene* erupt into celebration and *euphemia.*

> Ὁ δῆμος ἐτέρωθεν σὺν εὐφήμοις ταῖς βοαῖς ἐξεχόρευε, πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τύχη συμφώνως τὰ γινόμενα θυμηδοῦντες, τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ συνιέντες, τὰ ὄντα δὲ ἐκ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐπὶ τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ συμβάλλοντες, ἤ τάχα καὶ ἐξ ὁρμῆς θείας ἡ σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες. Ὑφ᾽ ἧς καὶ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα πρὸς συμφωνίαν ἡρμόζετο, χαρᾶς καὶ λύπης συμπεπλεγμένων, γέλοτι δακρύων κεραννυμένων, τῶν στυγνοτάτων εἰς ἑορτὴν μεταβαλλομένων, γελώτων ἅμα τῶν κλαιόντων και χαιρόντων τῶν θρηνούντων, εὑρισκόντων οὓς μὴ ἐζήτουν καὶ ἀπολλύντων οὓς εὑρηκέναι ἐδόκουν, καὶ τέλος τῶν προσδοκηθέντων φόνων εἰς εὐαγεῖς θυσίας μεταβαλλομένων.
>
> The populace from the other side broke out into a chorus with shouts of praise, every age and status harmoniously rejoicing at the things that happened, although most did not understand the things which were said, either having put the situation together from the things which had happened before concerning Charikleia, or perhaps even coming to a realization about the truth from the divine driving force which had staged all these things. By which driving force even opposites were joined together in harmony, joy and sadness entangled, tears mingled with laughter, the most dismal things changed into a festival, people at once weeping and laughing and rejoicing and mourning, those who found people they were not seeking and those who lost people they thought they had found, and finally the anticipated blood changed into a pure sacrifice. (10.38.3–4)

The narrator's description crowd's reaction, though joyful, reveals a deep and lingering confusion. It is unclear what, exactly, the audience is reacting to, since only Persinna's private words to Hydaspes precede this scene. The narrator, who knows that the audience's reactions do not make sense and are likely uninformed, asks how they could have known to react to something they cannot have understood: did they piece it together themselves, or did a divine director visit them with the script to the play? The narrator of the *Aithiopika* asks questions, speculates, and thereby encourages the external audience to do the same. As we watch the narrator watch the crowd in Book X, we learn that the crowd, despite their lack of understanding, does perform the correct response. The language of performance (ἐξεχόρευε, ἐσκηνογράφησεν)

present in the narrator's description confirms that the crowd's apparently nonsensical reaction is in fact a part of the system of performances in Book X. Even without a correct or complete understanding of the situation, the crowd senses that a performance has occurred and responds with a performance of their own. They rejoice in and through their confusion, and we, the external audience, must do the same. We, like the narrator, may not be exactly sure what is happening, or why, or how, but we should be able to take our cue to start celebrating the ending, just as the crowd does.

If we have not yet learned to balance our confusion with the sense of celebration at the end of Book X, we have a model for responding in Hydaspes. As often in Book X, he needs help to interpret the situation, so he turns to Sisimithres, the most informed and performance–alert character, for guidance in his performance.

> Τοῦ γὰρ Ὑδάσπου πρὸς τὸν Σισιμίθρην «Τί χρὴ δρᾶν, ὦ σοφώτατε» εἰπόντος «ἀρνεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν θεῶν θυσίαν οὐκ εὐσεβές, σφαγιάζειν τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν δωρηθέντας οὐκ εὐαγές. ἐπινοητέον ἡμῖν τὸ πρακτέον.»
>
> For when Hydaspes said to Sisimithres, "What must we do, wisest one? It would not be reverent to refuse a sacrifice to the gods, and it would not be pure to slaughter those who have been gifted by them. It is necessary to think about what we must do." (10.39.1)

Hydaspes knows he should be gleaning something from the situation which would enable him to respond, but his confusion overwhelms him. Sisimithres replies with a very clear reading of the ending, which explains that the gods caused all the confusing revelations and performances which just occurred.

> «Ὦ βασιλεῦ» εἶπεν, «ἐπισκιάζονται, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὑπὸ τῆς ἄγαν χαρᾶς καὶ οἱ συνετώτατοι τῶν ἀνδρῶν. Σὲ γοῦν καὶ πάλαι συμβάλλειν ἐχρῆν ὅτι μὴ προσίενται οἱ θεοὶ τὴν εὐτρεπιζομένην θυσίαν… νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφήναντες. Ἀλλ' αἰσθανώμεθα τοῦ θείου θαυματουργήματος καὶ συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τοῦ ἐκείνων βουλήματος καὶ ἐχώμεθα τῶν εὐαγεστέρων ἱερείων, τὴν δι' ἀνθρώπων θυσίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἑξῆς αἰῶνα περιγράψαντες.

> "Oh king," he said, "even the most intelligent of men are cast into darkness, as it seems, by too much joy. You indeed much earlier ought to have figured out that the gods do not agree to the sacrifice which is being readied…and now as the completion of good things, and just like the finale–torch[130] of a drama, they are revealing that this young stranger is the bridegroom of the maiden. But let us sense the divine wonder–working and be fellow workers of their will and make a purer sacrifice, drawing a line through human sacrifice, even to the next age!" (10.39.2–3)

Hydaspes can now play his role correctly. He affirms Sisimithres' words and provides an explanation of all these performances to the crowd.

> ὁ Ὑδάσπης τὴν ἐγχώριον γλῶτταν καὶ αὐτὸς νῦν ἱείς, τῆς τε Χαρικλείας καὶ τοῦ Θεαγένους ἐπιδεδραγμένος, «Οὐκοῦν, ὦ παρόντες» ἔλεγε, «θεῶν νεύματι τούτων οὕτω διαπεπραγμένων τὸ ἀντιβαίνειν ἀθέμιτον… πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ τρεπώμεθα»
>
> Hydaspes, now himself also using his native language, holding Charikleia and Theagenes, said, "So, you who are present, by the will of the gods, opposing the things which have happened in this way is unlawful…let us turn ourselves toward the sacrifices." (10.40.1–2)

Hydaspes' words show that he has accepted Sisimithres' explanation that the gods are now working in a new way and have changed their minds about what sacrifices are acceptable. Hydaspes has learned to accept with the situation, and he has learned to perform his newfound acceptance for his people. Hydaspes also declares that Theagenes and Charikleia are married,[131] which shows that he has decided to put aside the paradox of married virgins which has stymied

---

[130] Walden notes in "Stage–Terms in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*" that there has been much controversy over what a *lampadion* is, but he discusses manuscripts of Terence which have drawings of characters about to enter the scene. These appear with dramatic masks and a lighted torch. "We can imagine that it may have been the custom in Greek theatre, at the conclusion of a piece, for one or more persons to come forth and make a burnt–offering to the god, or even to march across the orchestra with lighted torch in symbolic reference to Dionysus…the torch in that case, as having an actual function to perform in connection with the play, would not be so much out of place among the masks. It would be to the end of the piece much as the *prologus* (who also appears in the MSS.) is to the beginning." Walden (1894) 35. His discussion is lengthy and mentions many other possibilities, but he seems to conclude that the torch is, at the very least, certainly a symbol of the end to a drama.

[131] ὥστε ὑπὸ μάρτυσιν αὐτοῖς τε τοῖς ταῦτα ἐπικλώσασι καὶ ὑμῖν ἀκόλουθα ἐκείνοις φρονεῖν ἐνδεικνυμένοις ξυνωρίδα ταύτην γαμηλίοις νόμοις ἀναδείκνυμι καὶ συνεῖναι θεσμῷ παιδογονίας ἐφίημι. "So, by these witnesses, both the ones who spun these things and you all who in agreement with them have been proven to be prudent, I proclaim these two a couple, by the marriage laws, and I say that they can live together by the ordinance for bearing children." (10.40.2).

him throughout Book X. Silvia Montiglio argues that the readers, with their knowledge of the whole novel, should be able to recognize this paradox, even if Hydaspes remains ignorant of it.

> Hydaspes does not know the truth but the reader, who knows it, sees highlighted in these rejoinders a leitmotif in this couple's proclivities: Theagenes and Chariclea have both cultivated chastity and considered themselves married all along their journey.[132]

In other words, the audience outside the narrative, should be able to recognize their married chastity as a paradox and, unlike Hydaspes throughout most of Book X, should be comfortable with it despite the tension it creates. These developments show the external audience that we can ask questions when we are confused, as Hydaspes does, and then take the answers we are given to help perform the ending, whether we truly understand it or not.

In the final scene of the novel, the external audience must prove that we have learned our lesson about performing while confused. The description of Theagenes and Charikleia's wedding is shrouded in mystery, and, as with all the Greek novels, we do not know anything about the quality of their wedded life.

> Στεφθέντες οὖν οἱ νέοι λευκαῖς ταῖς μίτραις, τήν τε ἱερωσύνην ἀναδησάμενοι καὶ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτοὶ καλλιερήσαντες, ὑπὸ λαμπάσιν ἡμμέναις, αὐλῶν τε καὶ συρίγγων μελῳδίαις, ἐφ' ἅρματος ἵππων μὲν ὁ Θεαγένης ἅμα τῷ Ὑδάσπῃ (ὁ Σισιμίθρης δὲ καθ' ἕτερον ἅμα τῷ Χαρικλεῖ), βοῶν δὲ λευκῶν ἡ Χαρίκλεια ἅμα τῇ Περσίννῃ, σὺν εὐφημίαις καὶ κρότοις καὶ χοροῖς ἐπὶ τὴν Μερόην παρεπέμποντο, τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ γάμῳ μυστικωτέρων κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ φαιδρότερον τελεσθησομένων.
>
> So the young people, crowned with white miters and having been bound to priestly service and making a well–omened sacrifice themselves, under lit torches, with the melodies of flutes and pipes, on a chariot with horses went Theagenes with Hydaspes (and Sisimithres with Charikles on another), and on a chariot with white cows went Charikleia with Persinna, and with praises and applause and dancing they were escorted toward Meroe, in order that the more mystic part of the marriage would be completed in the brighter city. (10.41.3)

Even in our ignorance of the details about their marriage and our lingering questions about who

[132] Montiglio (2020) 238.

knows what at the end of the *Aithiopika,* we can see that the ending is well–omened and heading toward completion (τελεσθησομένων). Morgan says of this ending that

> [Charikleia's] story has come full circle and can now relapse into non–narratability. Likewise in her relations with Theagenes, we as readers can only presume that nothing narratable ever happens to Charikleia again. Their story only makes moral sense if they pass the rest of their lives in a happiness so complete and so uniform as to present no purchase for narration. This is in fact a classic closed ending; no questions are left to be asked, the text closes because there is nothing more that could be told.[133]

In light of the confusion we have seen in the final scenes of the *Aithiopika,* I think it unlikely that "nothing narratable ever happens to Charikleia again." If nothing remains to be narrated, it is only because the time for narration, and thus for processing or resolving confusion, has finished. Here and now, at the end of the *Aithiopika,* is the time for rejoicing in our confusion as it stands, just as we have learned from the internal audience, Sisimithres, Hydaspes, and the narrator himself. John Winkler writes that this ending is a reflection of reality – after all, in real life, we rarely receive all the answers to our questions.

> The *Aithiopika* is an act of pure play, yet a play which rehearses vital processes by which we must live in reality – interpretation, reading, and making a provisional sense of things.[134]

Heliodorus, by providing a model of simultaneous celebration and confusion, has constructed for the reader "a provisional sense of things." He encourages his reader to appreciate and recognize the intricacy of the questions his narrative does not answer while still participating in the final celebrations necessary for a happy ending. At the end of the novel, we are both happy and confused, just as Charikleia and Theagenes are both married and chaste.

In the *Aithiopika,* then, the external audience also has a performance of *sophrosyne* to

---

[133] Morgan (1989) 320.
[134] Winkler (1982) 158.

offer. We must use our skills of reading and interpreting first to sense that the ending is a performance, and then Heliodorus encourages us to add our own voice to join in that performance. If we do not understand what, precisely, happens at and beyond the ending of the *Aithiopika*, we can nevertheless demonstrate *sophrosyne* by correctly watching the performance, navigating through our confusion, and mirroring the emotions present in the text. Rather than the forced monophony we see at the end of *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* Heliodorus offers a kind of organized polyphony, the opportunity for us as readers to echo the voices which appear in the text and carry them with us out of the novel.

As with Achilles Tatius, there are consequences if we read the ending incorrectly, because the last book of the *Aithiopika* has put as much pressure on the generically expected happy ending as possible. We are so mired in performance, manipulation, and confusion at the end of the *Aithiopika* that if we do not agree to perform despite our confusion, we will not see an end to the novel at all. Our questions will overwhelm the opportunity for relief provided by the hasty prophecy fulfillment and marriage rites. With such high stakes, we are happy to agree to help the protagonists perform the ending in order to relieve the pressure their convoluted stories have created. There is a kind of narrative ultimatum here: either decide that the story will end and declare it so via performance, or be swept away while trying to maintain a sense of self–control and reality in the face of so much confusion. I suggest that we think of this approach as the hyper–happy hyper–ending to Achilles Tatius' threatened non–happy non–ending. At the end of *Leucippe and Cleitophon,* Achilles Tatius steers the audience toward a silence which will become overwhelming if we do not agree to it. We must silently step back from the stage. At the end of the *Aithiopika,* Heliodorus directs the audience toward a cacophony which will become overwhelming if we do not participate in it. We must chose a role and perform.

Conclusion: Making Provisional Sense[135]

"The novel is a lie only as our quotidian inventions are lies. The power which goes into its making – the imagination – is a function of man's inescapable freedom."
– Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending*[136]

The strategies for ending we see in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* are not the simple or ideal tropes so commonly accepted in novelistic scholarship, but a series of complex, self–aware, and inherently unstable conditions. The final scenes of both novels are liminal, messy spaces onto which we must project – or perform – certainty, stability, and happiness in a narratively relevant way if we wish to reach the ending. In *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, we must agree to remain silent, following Cleitophon's directions, so that we may emerge unscathed from an ending fraught with inconsistencies. In the *Aithiopika*, we must consent to the confusion which pervades the final book so that we can celebrate the triumph of identity, marriage, and religion which Heliodorus has dangled before us since the beginning. We do these novels a disservice when we read their endings as happy, ideal, and simple – or worse, as poor attempts at narrative. To make sense of the lies and loose ends which pervade the end of the ancient Greek novel, we must read the ending itself as a performance, a shifting, polyphonic web of manipulation and deception in which the reader can and should engage.

If we read the final books of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* through the dual lenses of performance and *sophrosyne*, we can begin to understand the chastity test scenes not merely as entertaining resolutions to the novel's anxiety about virginity, but as complex narrative and metanarrative devices for constructing closure for a polyphonic novel. The ability to correctly read the chastity test scenes as sites of performance, deception, and manipulation is

[135] Winkler (1982) 158.
[136] Kermode (2000) 135.

what then allows us, the external audience, to construct a false – or at least not entirely true – sense of closure for the novel. To use the phrasing of Nimis and Morgan, among others, it is our ability to "sense the ending" which allows the novel to end happily. I conclude, then, that the ending of the ancient novel is not, in fact, happy. It is rather a space wherein we can display the rhetorical dimensions of our own *sophrosyne:* our ability to learn, to interpret, to emulate the performances we have just seen, and to catch on to the shifting layers of truth and narration which swirl throughout the ending.

Though the lens of *sophrosyne,* we can identify levels of performance which touch everyone involved with the novel, from the characters to the readers. As I argued in chapters one and two, the protagonists understand *sophrosyne* as a performance, as we can see in the language of theater, deception, and manipulation which surround their chastity test scenes. Likewise, as I showed in chapters three and four, the responses the internal audiences offer to the protagonists' performances of *sophrosyne* reveal that the internal audiences, too, are performing. Even we, the external audience, are caught in this web of performance, as I argued in chapter five. Across all three levels of performance at the end of the novel, we see the boundaries between narrative and metanarrative, performer and audience begin to blur. The performances of *sophrosyne* at the end of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Aithiopika* ripple further and further outward until the responsibility of ending the novel is firmly on our shoulders. Whether we must agree to be silent in the face of *sophrosyne*, as in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, or take up our own performances as a way to navigate conflicting narratives, as in the *Aithiopika*, we must play along with the endings Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus have constructed.

Some scholars understand morality as the only or most relevant dimension of *sophrosyne* in the novel, reading the end of the novel as a call for readers to recognize and then regulate the

most transgressive, erotic parts of the novel.[137] I suggest instead that the chastity test scenes at the end of these two novels invite and even command characters and readers to engage knowingly with the novel's ending tableau of erotic performances and storytelling. While *sophrosyne* in the novel may include readers' bodily chastity, it extends well beyond virginity and its accompanying moral aspects to include self awareness, an understanding of storytelling, and a keen sense of narrative timing. These qualities – all necessary for and proven through performance – allow us to read *sophrosyne* in the novel as more than just its "cardinal virtue."[138] Rather, we can expand our reading of *sophrosyne* to something more productive and more playful: a stage direction. *Sophrosyne*, in the fullest sense of the word, is the key to reading and giving the performances necessitated by the narrative tension (are the protagonists chaste?) and the metanarrative tension (can the novel end?) at the end of the novel. The "happy ending" of the novel therefore relies on readerly *sophrosyne*: our ability to notice and follow that stage direction, and then to perform *sophrosyne* ourselves.

When we read the endings of these novels as performative, imaginative spaces rather than lessons in chastity, we encounter newer, broader questions about performance and *sophrosyne* in the ancient Greek novel. First, and most obviously, what of performance do we find at the end of the earlier three extant novels? Is a performative ending a hallmark of the genre, or a response to the established happy endings of earlier novels? On a more historical level, what conclusions might we draw about the presence of almost–modern performativity in ancient literature? And finally, as scholars, how can we continue to revisit assumptions we make about the quality and

[137] E.g. Bird (2020) 179, 184. "*Sophrosyne* is central to characterization and is central on the level of readerly response, as it regulates the erotic impetus in characters and readers…Readers must understand how their own possession or lack of this cardinal virtue fundamentally governs how they read these novels"
[138] Bird (2020) 184.

value of literature based on its audience and/or content? The ancient novel has certainly risen in academic esteem over the past fifty years, but it is clear that scholarly assumptions and biases about "literary merit" continue to consciously and subconsciously limit the questions we ask about erotic and popular literature.

This cunning, playful, performance–laden genre asks us to remain alert to our false assumptions and internalized bias. Morgan, reflecting on novelistic scholarship at the end of the twentieth century, claims the observations we make about the novel function as a "reflection of our changing selves."[139] Goldhill, too, argues that our responses to the novel tell us as much about ourselves as they do about the text; the ancient Greek novel "puts the reader in the frame."[140] Kermode, speaking more broadly, notes that "it is ourselves we are encountering whenever we invent fictions."[141] Any meaning we can make of the ancient Greek novels therefore depends on our self–awareness, our sense of performance, our willingness to notice and participate in their hidden humor. Perhaps we can say, then, that reading the novels, and thus reading ourselves, offers yet another opportunity for performance – a test of scholarly *sophrosyne.*

[139] Morgan (1996) 73.
[140] Goldhill (1995) 14.
[141] Kermode (2000) 39.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Garnaud, Jean–Philippe. 1991. *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie. Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Godley, A. D. (Ed.). 1920. *Herodotus. The Histories.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Perseus Digital Library.

Goold, G. P. (Ed., Trans.). 1995. *Chariton. Callirhoe.* Loeb Classical Library 481. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harmon, A. M. (Trans.). 1915. *Lucian. The Downward Journey or The Tyrant.* Loeb Classical Library 54. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Henderson, Jeffrey (Ed., Trans.). *Longus, Xenophon of Ephesus*. *Daphnis and Chloe, Anthia and Habrocomes.* Loeb Classical Library 69. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lumb, T.W., J. Maillon, and R.M. Rattenbury. 1960. *Héliodore. Les Éthiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée)*. 3 volumes. Second edition. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Murray, A.T. (Ed.). 1919. *Homer. The Odyssey.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Perseus Digital Library.

Rabe, Hugo. 1906. *Scholia in Lucianum*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae: In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

Vilborg, Ebbe. 1955. *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Michael. 1997. "The ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ of Persinna and the Romantic Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *Classical Philology* 92 (4): 303–22.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

_____. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Edited by Emerson Caryl. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bartsch, Shadi. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Bird, Rachel. 2017. "Virtue Obscured: Theagenes' *Sōphrosynē* in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *Ancient Narrative* 14, 195–208.

_____. 2020. *Sophrosune in the Greek Novel*: *Reading Reactions to Desire.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Bossu, Annelies. 2015. "Steadfast and Shrewd Heroines: The Defence of Chastity in the Latin Post–Nicene Passions and the Greek Novels." *Ancient Narrative* 12: 91–128.

Brooks, Peter. 1984. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. First edition. New York: Knopf.

Burrows, Don. 2014. "The Art of Deception: Longus and the Ancient Novel." PhD diss. University of Minnesota.

Chew, Kathryn. 2000. "Achilles Tatius and Parody." *The Classical Journal* 96 (1): 57–70.

De Temmerman, Koen. 2014. *Crafting Characters : Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*. First edition. Oxford University Press.

Doody, Margaret. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Dunn, Francis. 1996. *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama.* Oxford University Press.

Goldhill, Simon. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge University Press.

Haynes, Katharine. 2002. "Power of the Prude: Configurations of the Feminine in the Greek Novel." *Ancient Narrative* 1: 73–92.

Henderson, Jeffrey. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy.* Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kermode, Frank. 2000. *The Sense of an Ending : Studies in the Theory of Fiction with a New Epilogue*. Oxford University Press.

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

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. 1940. *A Greek–English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lye, Suzanne. 2016. "Gender and Ethnicity in Heliodorus' Aithiopika." *Classical World* 109, no. 2: 235–262.

McCoskey, Denise. 2019. *Race: Antiquity and Its Legacy.* Bloomsbury Academic Publishing.

Montiglio, Silvia. 2020. "Erotic Desire and the Desire to Marry in the Ancient Greek Novels." In *The Discourse of Marriage in the Greco–Roman World*, edited by Beneker Jeffrey and Tsouvala Georgia, 219–44. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Morales, Helen. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon. Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2008. "The History of Sexuality." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, edited by Tim Whitmarsh, 39–55. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, John. 1989. “A Sense of the Ending: The Conclusion of Heliodoros’ *Aithiopika*.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974–2014)* 119: 299–320.

Most, Glenn. 1989. "The Stranger's Stratagem: Self–Disclosure and Self–Sufficiency in Greek Culture." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109: 114–33.

Nimis, Stephen. 1999. “The Sense of Open–Endedness in the Ancient Novel.” *Arethusa* 32 (2): 215–38.

North, Helen. 1966. *Sophrosyne: Self–Knowledge and Self–Restraint in Greek Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Ormand, Kirk. 2010. “Testing Virginity in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus.” *Ramus* 39 (2): 160–197.

O’Sullivan, James. 1980. *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius.* New York, NY: De Gruyter.

Purves, Alex. 2019. *Homer and the Poetics of Gesture.* Oxford University Press.

Reardon, Bryan (Ed.). 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels.* First edition. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Rutherford, R. B. 1986. “The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 145–162.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae® Digital Library. Ed. Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. http://www.tlg.uci.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu. Accessed Aug. 2020 to April 2021.

Walden, J. W. H. 1894. “Stage–Terms in Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5: 1–43.

Whitmarsh, Tim (Ed.). 2008. *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. First edition. Cambridge University Press.

Wiersma, S. 1990. “The Ancient Greek Novel and Its Heroines: A Female Paradox.” *Mnemosyne* 43 (1–2): 109–23.

Winkler, John. 1982. “The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*.” In John Winkler & Gordon Williams, *Later Greek Literature*, 93–158. Yale Classical Studies. Cambridge University Press.

Wohl, Victoria. 2015. “Dramatic Means and Ideological Ends.” In *Euripides and the Politics of Form*, 19–38. Princeton University Press.