# Heliodorus' Reading of Lucian's *Toxaris*

*Aldo Tagliabue*

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

ERC Project "Experience and Teleology in Ancient Narrative"

Seminar für Klassische Philologie, Marstallhof 2-4, 69117 Heidelberg

*aldo.tagliabue@skph.uni-heidelberg.de*

## Abstract

This article demonstrates that Cnemon's story in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* intertexts with the novella of Deinias in Lucian's *Toxaris*. The closeness of three textual parallels, along with a subtle use of characters' names, proves that Heliodorus is deliberately recalling *Toxaris*. The focus of this intertextuality is Chariclea, the courtesan of Deinias' story. This immoral figure is a striking counterpart to the lustful Demaenete, the main character of Cnemon's story and the first immoral lover of the *Aethiopica*. At the same time, the evocation by Heliodorus of a lustful woman who has the same name as the protagonist Chariclea, paradoxically enriches the characterization of the latter as chaste. Furthermore, this subtle evocation of Chariclea seems to have metaliterary implications as well. In the *Aethiopica* Chariclea stands for the entire novel: Heliodorus appears to define the nature of his text in opposition to Lucian's *Toxaris* and to the different kind of fiction it represents. Heliodorus' definition of his own novel by means of establishing a contrast with other texts is an important function of his intertextuality with Imperial literature and possibly sheds new light on the status of ancient fiction as a whole.

## Keywords

Intertextuality is a key feature of the Greek literature of the Imperial era. This is especially true of the Greek novels which often recall Homeric epics, Attic

historiography and drama, and Platonic dialogues—the literary genres which at that time constituted the core of the Greek canon and the educational curriculum.[1] Less frequently, works of the Hellenistic era, such as Theocritus' *Idylls*, are used as intertexts. The reason for this extensive use of past models is usually considered by scholars to be the novelists' desire "to negotiate a respectable position within a self-validating literary tradition" and "to re-enact the glorious Greek past",[2] in line with an attitude typical of the Imperial Era.

Within this framework, Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (possibly 4th century AD)[3] stands out as an exception. More than any other work in the genre, this novel contains references to texts written from the second century AD onwards. While scholars have noted this phenomenon,[4] its function still requires proper interpretation. Since no source from the fourth century AD attests that the texts of the Imperial Era had been introduced into the literary canon, their adoption by Heliodorus was unlikely to have had the same motivation as his re-use of Homer and Classical texts.

In this paper I will shed new light on this issue by demonstrating that Cnemon's story in the *Aethiopica* intertexts with Deinias' novella in Lucian's

---

1   For a recent discussion of the Greek literary canon, cf. Hägg 2010; for the inclusion of the listed genres in this selection, cf. Davies 1998, 36. On the contribution of Egyptian papyri on this topic, cf. Willis 1958. Finally, for the reading of the same genres in the school of the Imperial era, cf. T. Morgan 1998, 99, who relies upon Quintilian's list of the readings recommended to future orators (*Inst.* 10.1.46-72) and shows that Homer, Menander and Euripides were among the most important for the education of Imperial literati. Cf. also Bowie 2008, 18: in the Imperial Era "the vast majority of the texts read were poetry and prose of the classical period. [. . .] Such texts were studied and used at all levels of education".

2   Morgan and Harrison 2008, 219.

3   Cf. Whitmarsh 2011, 262: "Usually dated to the fourth century CE on the basis of perceived borrowings from the emperor Julian; but sometimes put in the third century (. . .)". For the former interpretation, focused on the similarity between the fictitious siege in book nine and the historical third siege of Nisibis described by Julian (350 AD), cf. e.g. van der Valk 1941 and Morgan 1996, 417-421; for the latter interpretation, based on the fact that Heliodorus stresses his identity as 'a Phoenician coming from the city of Emesa' (Hld. 10.41.4) and that the fortune of this city declined around 280 AD, cf. e.g. Rohde 1914³, 496-497 and Swain 1996, 423-424. This latter view is also supported by those who identify the novelist with Heliodorus the Arab mentioned by Philostratus (*VS* 2.32), who died around 240 AD: cf. e.g. Rattenbury and Lumb (1960²), vol. 1, XIV-XV, and again Swain 1996, 423-424.

4   Dickie 1991 demonstrates the *Aethiopica*'s debt to Plutarch's *Moralia* in the description of the evil eye; Morgan 2005 and 2009 shows Heliodorus' intertextuality with early Christian texts, especially *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, and possibly with Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*; Whitmarsh 2011, 117 and 2013, 45-47 discusses the intertextuality between the *Aethiopica* and the *Ephesiaca*.

*Toxaris*, a dialogue written in the second century AD.[5] This intertextuality revolves around the figure of Chariclea, the lustful courtesan of Deinias' story. The reference to this figure has two main effects upon the *Aethiopica*. On the one hand, due to her lustfulness Lucian's Chariclea reinforces the immoral characterization of Heliodorus' Demaenete, and further marks the contrast between Cnemon's novella and the protagonists' love-story. On the other hand, the evocation by Heliodorus of a lustful woman who has the same name as the protagonist Chariclea, paradoxically enriches the portrait of the latter as chaste. Furthermore, this subtle evocation of Chariclea also includes a metaliterary aim. Since in the *Aethiopica* Chariclea is a figure for the entire novel, by recalling the Lucianic Chariclea Heliodorus connotates his text in opposition to Lucian's *Toxaris* and to the different kind of fiction it represents. This kind of metaliterary self-assertion by means of establishing a contrast with other texts, known in antiquity since Sappho's famous preference to love over epic war,[6] appears to be an important function of Heliodorus' intertextuality with Imperial literature, and possibly sheds new light on the status of ancient fiction as a whole.

## 1      Heliodorus, a Reader of Lucian? The Scholarly Debate

Did Heliodorus read Lucian?

In the last 150 years, a few scholars have suggested that he did, but none have offered conclusive proof. In my view, however, such proof can in fact be offered.

To begin with, scholars have shown that at least some of Lucian's works were read in the third and fourth centuries AD. Although "it is uncertain when the Lucianic corpus was gathered together",[7] the five ancient sources which mention the author's name suggest that Lucian was known and despised by his contemporaries, who portray him as a charlatan and as a "scharfer […]

---

5    The precise dates of Lucian's works are very difficult to establish. For the purpose of my article, however, it is sufficient to refer to Lucian's life-time for which cf. Costa 2005, VII: Lucian "was born probably around AD 120 and died sometime after 180".

6    Cf. Sappho fr. 16 and Rissman 1983, 53. Archilochus too has since long been considered as anti-epic (cf. e.g. Morris 1996, 35 and Barker and Christensen 2006). However, as recently shown by Swift 2012, nowadays scholars tend to associate this poet with a more varied and subtler relationship to Homeric epic.

7    Obbink 2005, 174. Possibly this did not happen before the Byzantine period: cf. Müller 1955, 274.

Kritiker seiner Zeit".[8] Furthermore, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Alciphron's *Letters*, the *Clementine Romance*, Julian the Apostate's *Caesars* and Claudian's *In Rufinum* intertext with some of Lucian's works such as *Dionysus, Menippus, Auction of Lives* and *Icaromenippus*;[9] their different backgrounds and dates provide good evidence that at least some of Lucian's writings were accessible in the first centuries after his death.[10] What is more, the inclusion of *Daphnis and Chloe* in this list even suggests that these Lucianic texts were of interest to the novelists.[11] Given this context, it is not unlikely that *Toxaris*, too, was read in Heliodorus' time.

Moreover, in the last 150 years four scholars have even alluded to the possibility that Heliodorus read Lucian's *Toxaris*. In 1860 Guttentag pointed out the existence of intertextuality between Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* and this Lucianic text; although the evidence provided is insufficient, his thesis is at the core of my article.[12] In 1966 Feuillâtre highlighted the surprising presence in Lucian's *Toxaris* of a "débauchée" Chariclea, who "réunit les défauts de Démaénété et d'Arsacé",[13] the two immoral women of the *Aethiopica*. In my paper, I will prove the correctness of the first part of Feuillâtre's quotation.[14]

---

8     Baumbach 2002, 20. For this criticism of Lucian, *cf.* Eunap. *VS* 2.1.9, Gal. *In Hipp. Epid.* 2.6.29, and a passage of Galen's *Commentary on the Hippocratic Epidemics* which has reached us only through the Arabic translation (cf. Strohmaier 1976). Conversely, Lactantius comments on Lucian's atheism (cf. *Inst. Div.* 1.9.8), while Isidore of Pelusium numbers Lucian among the Cynic philosophers (*Epist.* 4.55).

9     Alpers (2001) convincingly argues that Longus shapes his description of Philetas' garden on that of Dionysus' grove in Lucian's *Dionysus* (cf. Longus 2.3.3 and Luc. *Dion.* 3). Conversely, other cases of intertextuality between Lucian and Longus discussed by Anderson (1976, 85) and Bernsdorff (1993) are not convincing as they are based on motifs that are too general. Baumbach (2002, 20) mentions the other four intertexts; for individual demonstrations, cf. Pinto 1973 for Alciphron, Helm 1906, 45, n. 1 for the *Clementine Romance* and Nesselrath 1994 for Julian and Claudian.

10    Further support for this statement comes from papyrological evidence: as argued by Obbink (2005, 174), "Lucian is sparsely represented among literary papyri from Egypt".

11    Lehmann (1910) and Schwartz (1976) demonstrate that some of Lucian's dialogues share textual expressions with Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. Two convincing cases concern passages from Lucian's *On the Hall* and *Dialogues of the Sea-Gods*. However, since the chronological relationship between these works and Achilles Tatius' cannot be established, we cannot include *Leucippe and Cleitophon* in the early reception of Lucian's writings.

12    Cf. Guttentag 1890, 62-80.

13    Feuillâtre 1966, 134.

14    An obvious difference will concern the chronological order, as Feuillâtre believes that the *Aethiopica* was written before Lucian's *Toxaris*.

Finally, in recent years two other scholars have noted that the protagonist of the *Aethiopica* shares the name of a character in Lucian's *Toxaris*. While in 1996 Birchall considered this connection irrelevant, relying upon the immorality of the latter,[15] in 2006 Meriel Jones argued that "in view of the scarcity of the name in everyday life" the readers of the *Aethiopica* were meant to recall the Lucianic Chariclea, "the antithesis of Heliodorus' Chariclea".[16] Jones' suggestion appears to be more reasonable than Birchall's as the sophistication of the *Aethiopica* makes it likely that, due to her immorality, Lucian's Chariclea could have been deliberately evoked in the novel rather than being incompatible with it.[17] The validity of Jones' point is further supported by the case of Demaenete. This Heliodorean character, proposed as a possible counterpart to Lucian's Chariclea by Feuillâtre, appears in two of Lucian's writings: in *The Lover of Lies*, 27 and *The Scythian*, 2. In the former dialogue Demaenete is portrayed as a virtuous wife[18] while in the *Aethiopica* she is a lustful woman. Since this combination of name repetition and change in characterization is very similar to Heliodorus' alleged interplay with Chariclea's name, Jones' suggestion that the novelist could have deliberately recalled and modified Lucian's Chariclea is supported: the possibility that there might be a meaningful intertextuality between *Toxaris* and the *Aethiopica* becomes likely.

In the following section, I will prove the existence of a deliberate connection between the two texts by showing that Heliodorus' story of Cnemon clearly recalls expressions and themes of Chariclea's novella in Lucian's *Toxaris*.

---

15    Cf. Birchall 1996, 103.

16    Jones 1996, 552. Cf. also 552, n. 30: "Only six instances were found in the epigraphical and papyrological evidence". On this correspondence of names, cf. also Pervo 1997, 167, n. 20, who does not offer any interpretation of the phenomenon.

17    On the sophistication of the *Aethiopica* and of its intended readers, which is proven by the frequency and subtlety of intertextuality with earlier literature, cf. Bowie 1996, 92; on the actual audience, cf. Stephens 1994, 412-414 and Bowie 1994, 93-95, who both show that the extant papyri of the novels have the same type of writing as high literary texts, including the single papyrus of the *Aethiopica* (P. Amh. 160 = Pack² 2797).

18    Cf. Luc. *Philops.* 27: 'it is well known to every one how fond I was of my sainted wife (τὴν μακαρῖτίν μου γυναῖκα), their mother; and I showed it in my treatment of her, not only in her lifetime, but even after her death; for I ordered all the jewels and clothes that she had valued to be burnt upon her pyre here on the couch, just as I am now, consoling my grief'.

## 2      Lucian's *Toxaris* and Cnemon's Story in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*: Demonstration of Intertextuality

Lucian's *Toxaris* is a dialogue in which the Greek Mnesippus and the Scythian Toxaris exchange exemplary stories of love and friendship in order that each may claim the superiority of their own civilisation above the other. However, the lack of a judge leads them to resolve the dispute and become friends. This collection of stories, which also includes a negotiation of cultural boundaries, makes *Toxaris* potentially close to the *Aethiopica*.[19]

Mnesippus' first tale illustrates the friendship between Agathocles and Deinias: this bond was threatened by the latter's encounter with the lustful Chariclea. Her arts of seduction were so successful that Deinias was brought into complete subjection and from this love many troubles arose: Chariclea's subsequent betrayal led Deinias to kill her and her father. However, after these terrible deeds, Agathocles remained Deinias' only friend.

Interestingly, in a very limited sequence of the story—from chapter 13 to 15—there are three expressions and three themes which are reiterated close to one another in the *Aethiopica*—the three chapters of the first book where Cnemon's story begins. The related passages are close not only spatially in the text but also thematically, as they all focus on the seduction by a lustful woman. In the *Aethiopica*, Cnemon tells the protagonists how his father Aristippus had a second wife, Demaenete, who soon brought him into complete subjection. Later, she also conceived a passion for her stepson, Cnemon. His resistance, however, generated Demaenete's anger and her consequent plan for revenge for which she asked the help of the servant Thisbe. The story ends in tragedy since, due to the failure of her strategy, Demaenete commits suicide.

The first textual connection concerns Lucian's characterization of Chariclea: ἡ Χαρίκλεια δὲ ἦν ἀστεῖον μέν τι γύναιον, ἑταιρικὸν δὲ ἐκτόπως καὶ τοῦ προστυχόντος ἀεί ('Chariclea was a dainty piece of femininity, but outrageously meretricious, giving herself to anyone who happened to meet her', Luc. *Tox*. 13).[20] The expression ἀστεῖον γύναιον occurs only on one other occasion in Greek literature, that is in Heliodorus' story of Cnemon. Aristippus, Cnemon's father, after

---

19     Cf. Whitmarsh 2001, 126 on *Toxaris*: "This harmonious resolution makes the narrative structure a parable of the thematic content: Greek and barbarian are united" and Whitmarsh 2011, 116 on the *Aethiopica*: "Like the second-century romancers, but even more radically, Heliodorus plays off against each other distinct cultural perspectives (…)".

20     Throughout the whole paper, apart from justified exceptions, text and translation of Lucian's dialogues are from Harmon 1913, while the Greek text of the *Aethiopica* is from Rattenbury—Lumb 1960[2] and the translation from Morgan 1989b.

the death of his wife, τοῖς οἴκοις ἐπεισάγει γύναιον ἀστεῖον μὲν ἀλλ' ἀρχέκακον, ὄνομα Δημαινέτην ('took to wife a woman, a dainty piece of femininity, but the cause of much evil for his house. Her name was Demaenete', Hld. 1.9.1).[21]

   The second parallel concerns the seductive art of Lucian's Chariclea, who is δεινὴ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα (…) ἐπισπάσασθαι ἐραστὴν καὶ ἀμφίβολον ἔτι ὄντα ὅλον ὑποποιήσασθαι ('she was clever too, in every way (…) at alluring a lover, bringing him into complete subjection when he was still of two minds', Luc. *Tox.* 13). Heliodorus' Demaenete, from the moment she entered Cnemon's house, ὅλον ὑπεποιεῖτο ('she brought him into complete subjection',[22] 1.9.2). In fact, δεινὴ δέ, εἴπερ τις γυναικῶν, ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἐκμῆναι ('if ever a woman knew how to drive a man mad with passion, she did', 1.9.2). The repeated transitive use of ὑποποιοῦμαι meaning 'win by intrigue'[23] with the adverb ὅλον—'entirely'—has no other parallel in Greek literature, which makes it likely that Heliodorus was taking this expression from Lucian. This hypothesis is supported by the shared construction of δεινή plus infinitives to express the woman's seductive power.

   Furthermore, the development of Chariclea's plan of seduction has three possible thematic parallels in Cnemon's story. The first is the motif of 'running towards the coming beloved': cf.

Luc. *Tox.* 15
ὑπὸ γυναικὸς καλῆς (…) ἐπισταμένης (…) εἰσελθόντι προσδραμεῖν
a beautiful woman, who knew how (…) to run up to him when he came in

Hld. 1.9.2
εἰσόδοις προστρέχουσα
when he came in, she ran to meet him

The second and third parallel concern Chariclea's threat to commit suicide and pretending to be pregnant, behaving in the same way as Heliodorus' Demaenete in her attempt to seduce Aristippus and Cnemon: cf.

---

21   My translation. One might also recall here Lycaenion, the lustful woman of Longus' novel, who teaches Daphnis sexual love, as she is introduced as γύναιον […] ἐξ ἄστεος ('a little lady from the city', 3.15.1). This parallel would strikingly complete the construction of Heliodorus' Demaenete as a lustful woman. However, since there is no certainty that Heliodorus was reading Longus (only Bowie 1995, 278-280 suggests this possibility when he argues that a passage of the former intertexts with the latter: cf. Hld. 5.14 and Longus 1.9.1) and it is difficult to establish the exact chronological relationship between Lucian and Longus, the real significance of Lycaenion for our demonstration cannot be determined.

22   My translation.

23   *LSJ*, s.v. ὑποποιέω, 3 Med.

Luc. *Tox.* 14

τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνα ἐπ᾽
αὐτὸν καθίει τὰ γραμματεῖα, (…) ὡς
ἐδάκρυσε καὶ (…) τέλος ὡς ἀπάγξει
ἑαυτὴν ἡ ἀθλία ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος

From the very first she kept baiting
him with those notes, (…) making
out that she had cried (…) and at last
that she would hang herself for love,
poor girl

Hld. 1.9.2

μεμφομένη καὶ ὡς ἀπώλετ᾽ ἂν εἰ ὀλίγον
ἐμέλλησε

she complained and said she would
have died if he had been a second
later

Luc. *Tox.* 15

κύειν τε γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῦ σκήπτεται

she pretended to be with child by
him

Hld. 1.10.4

ὁ κοινὸς ἡμῶν παῖς (…) κύειν με πρός
τινων αἰσθόμενος

That son of ours (…) discovered
somehow that I was pregnant

Finally, the third textual connection, already noted by Guttentag, focuses on
Deinias' inability to resist Chariclea.[24] Her seduction is so well arranged that ὁ
μακάριος ἐπείσθη καλὸς εἶναι ('the blessed simpleton became convinced that he
was handsome', Luc. *Tox.* 14). In the *Aethiopica*, the successful erotic attack made
by Thisbe, Demaenete's servant, leads the victim Cnemon to make this com-
ment on his "defeat": ἐγὼ δὲ ὁ μάταιος ἀθρόον καλὸς γεγενῆσθαι ἐπεπείσμην ('like
an idiot, I was convinced that I had suddenly become good-looking', 1.11.3). The
identical use of καλὸς and πείθομαι with an infinitive—εἶναι and γεγενῆσθαι—
and Lucian's ironical touch on μακάριος—which makes the meaning of this
adjective close to that of μάταιος—opens the possibility that Heliodorus had
this passage in mind.[25] This reference is different from the model as in the
*Aethiopica* this statement of pride is pronounced not by Aristippus, the first
victim of Demaenete's seduction, but by Cnemon in response to Thisbe's ini-
tiative. However, this variation does not seem to be significant, as it is part of

---

24    Cf. Guttentag 1860, 68.

25    The motif of the blind lover who praises his own beauty is a topos of Hellenistic and Latin
      poetry: its first occurrence is in Theoc. *Id.* 6.34-8, where Damoetas *in persona Polyphemi*
      persuades himself that he is good-looking. Then, as shown by Gow 2008[2], vol. 2, 125, Latin
      poets adopt the same motif: cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.25-7, Ov. *Met.* 13.840, Calp. 2.88, Nemes. 2.74.
      Only in Lucian's and Heliodorus' passages, however, this *topos* is the immediate result of
      an erotic seduction. Therefore, I would not use this framework to dismiss my demonstra-
      tion of a deliberate parallel between *Toxaris* and the *Aethiopica*.

Heliodorus' process of replication of Demaenete's seduction with that of her servant Thisbe.[26]

To conclude: Cnemon's story in the *Aethiopica* intertexts with Deinias' account in Lucian's *Toxaris*.

### 3    Lucian's *Toxaris* and Cnemon's Story in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*: Characterization of Chariclea and Metaliterary Definition by Means of Contrasting with Other Texts

This observation requires interpretation: what can we make of this relationship between Lucian's and Heliodorus' texts?

The whole series of parallels has two remarkable features: it is limited to two specific sections of the texts, the novellae of Deinias and Cnemon, and, apart from the last parallel, it focuses on the female protagonists of the two stories: Lucian's Chariclea and Heliodorus' Demaenete. This latter element leads to an identity between the two heroines which is not difficult to recognise: as later in Cnemon's story Demaenete calls Cnemon ὁ νέος Ἱππόλυτος ('my young Hippolytus', 1.10.2), in this section of the novel readers are explicitly encouraged to find literary counterparts for the characters.[27]

Once the comparison between Demaenete and Lucian's Chariclea was established, how would readers interpret it? The answer is twofold. As argued by John Morgan, in the *Aethiopica* Cnemon's story "provides a prolonged portrait of perverted, immoral, simply bad love, which, by being placed programmatically at the start of the whole novel, will inform and structure the reader's appreciation of the true love of the central character".[28] Heliodorus' identification of Lucian's Chariclea with Demaenete clearly supports the immoral

---

26    Cf. Hunter 2008, 811-812. A fourth textual connection, again noted by Guttentag 1860, 64, is subjected to a significant displacement in the novel. Deinias' lovesickness is expressed with the word διάβροχον ἤδη τῷ ἔρωτι […] γεγενημένον ('by that time become thoroughly permeated with love', 15). In the *Aethiopica*, when Chariclea falls in love with Theagenes, she has τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ ἔρωτι διαβρόχους ('her eyes moistened with love', 3.7.1). The use of διάβροχος with τῷ ἔρωτι has no other occurrence in Greek literature: Heliodorus might be again referring to Lucian, but here caution is needed as it could have been difficult for the readers of the *Aethiopica* to identify this isolated connection.

27    On the Euripidean intertextuality in this passage, cf. e.g. Rocca 1976; Morgan 1989, 112; Lefteratou 2010, 213; Webb 2013, 293 (with the suggestion of a "mimic model […] alongside the tragic").

28    Morgan 1989, 107.

connotation of Cnemon's story, since the former woman's libertine attitude towards love emphasises the lustfulness of the latter.[29]

This conclusion, however, is made more complex by the fact that, as already noted by Jones, readers of the *Aethiopica* were also invited to acknowledge a further level of intertextuality based on characters' names[30] and thus to compare Lucian's Chariclea with Heliodorus' homonymous protagonist. In my view, the text of the *Aethiopica* actually makes explicit this further level of intertextuality, as in his story, Cnemon plays a game with the names of Chariclea and Demaenete. In the second textual parallel between *Toxaris* and the *Aethiopica*, Cnemon subtly recalls Demaenete's name through the verb ἐκμαίνω, "to drive mad":[31] she was δεινὴ δέ, εἴπερ τις γυναικῶν, ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἐκμῆναι (1.9.2). As argued by Jones, "the central part of her name, -μαιν-, could be interpreted as deriving from verbs connoting madness"[32] like ἐκμαίνω.[33] As a result, while at the beginning of the sentence readers were invited by δεινή—an echo of *Toxaris*—to think of Lucian's Chariclea, the subsequent ἐκμῆναι was likely to remind them of the new character of the *Aethiopica*. As a result, this subtle reference to Demaenete led the readers to realize that Lucian's Chariclea has changed name in the novel. Furthermore, in the first textual parallel Cnemon's game is even subtler: while Lucian places Chariclea's name at the beginning of the sentence—ἡ Χαρίκλεια δὲ ἦν ἀστεῖον μέν τι γύναιον, ἑταιρικὸν δέ (Luc. *Tox.* 13)—Cnemon delays the introduction of Demaenete's name until the very end of his phrase and stresses it with the noun ὄνομα: τοῖς οἴκοις ἐπεισάγει γύναιον

29  In Contean terms, this is a traditional instance of intertextuality: the "competition" due to the "simultaneous presence of two different realities", the Lucianic Chariclea and the Heliodorean Demaenete, "produces a single more complex reality" (Conte 1986, 24), a woman who stands out for her lustfulness. Furthermore, we also see here a common concern of ancient intertextuality: its status as "characterization device" (cf. Doulamis 2011, XIV, with reference to novelistic intertextuality, but more broadly cf. Fowler 2000, 120: "One area in which intertextuality comes to play a central role when expanded in this way is that of the construction of character").

30  This pattern was not uncommon in Imperial literature: cf. e.g. Morales 2005, 66 for the Platonic resonance of the name of Leucippe, Achilles Tatius' protagonist; Hodkinson 2013, 339-340 for pseudo-Aeschines' use of Callirhoe to evoke Chariton's novel; Morgan 2013, 317 for Phlegon of Tralles' introduction of the character Charito with the same purpose. For a general reflection on the role played by personal names in intertextuality, cf. Broich and Pfister 1985, 33-43.

31  *LSJ*, s.v. ἐκμαίνω.

32  Jones 2006, 559.

33  This possibility is supported by Demaenete's following use of ἐκμαίνω while she imagines making love with the exiled Cnemon: ταῦτα ὑπεκκαίει, ταῦτα ἐκμαίνει ('These thoughts fan the flames of desire and drive me mad with longing', Hld. 1.15.4).

ἀστεῖον μὲν ἀλλ᾽ ἀρχέκακον, ὄνομα Δημαινέτην (Hld. 1.9.1). This difference in word order was likely to create suspense in Heliodorus' readers and to increase the expectation that a second Chariclea—the Lucianic one—could appear on the scene.[34] This tension was possibly also heightened by the adjective ἀρχέκακον, 'beginning mischief',[35] which associates with this anonymous character a key role which would suit a protagonist. As a result, once the appearance of Demaenete's name at the end of the phrase deflated this expectation, readers could then not resist comparing Lucian's Chariclea not only with the new Heliodorean character but also with the protagonist of the *Aethiopica*.

Which kind of reaction to this special association was the novelist expecting from his audience?

The comparison between a novelistic protagonist—traditionally a faithful woman—and the lustful Lucian character produces a *paradox*,[36] which fits well into a novel like the *Aethiopica*. Heliodorus' narrative, in fact, focuses on "the amazing paradox of an Ethiopian girl born white",[37] and from there the poetics of paradox extends to other sections of the narrative, such as the illusionistic description of the Delphian parade and of the amethyst, Calasiris' deceptive appearance in Greek clothes, and the substitution in the final book of the protagonists' recognition by the sacrifice.[38] This framework suggests that the readers of the *Aethiopica* were expected to notice and interpret each of these paradoxes. In our case, because Chariclea is a "paradigm of chastity" (Morgan 1989, 110) since the beginning of the novel,[39] the comparison with Lucian's figure would then produce an *antithesis*—making the *Aethiopica*'s readers realize that Heliodorus was shaping his protagonist in contrast to a literary character.

---

34      We see here an example of that "easing play between revelation and concealment" (Hinds 1998, 23) which, according to Hinds, is typical of the allusive process and also a sign of its reflexivity (Hinds 1998, 1-16).

35      *LSJ*, s.v. ἀρχέκακος.

36      For "paradox" I intend "a statement or expression so surprisingly self-contradictory as to provoke us into seeking another sense or context in which it would be true" (Baldick 2008, s.v. "paradox"). Although this is a modern definition, the notion of paradox was part of ancient literature, as shown by the existence of paradoxography (cf. Schepens and Delcroix 1996). Scholars have even argued for a direct influence of this genre on the ancient novels (cf. e.g. Rommel 1923 and Scobie 1969, 43-54) but this, in our case, seems unlikely.

37      Whitmarsh 2011, 111. Cf. also Hilton 1998.

38      Cf. Morgan 1989 and Whitmarsh 2002 for the analysis of these sections of the *Aethiopica*.

39      Cf. De Temmerman 2014, 252, who comments on Chariclea's "own emphasis on chastity in the opening scene" of the *Aethiopica*, giving further details.

This process of characterization by means of borrowing literary characters from other texts and modifying them occurs elsewhere, both in the *Aethiopica* and in other texts of the Imperial Era[40]—which clarifies and greatly supports our interpretation. Internal evidence is particularly significant as it comes from Cnemon's story. As is rightly observed by Bowie, in two other cases "Heliodorus exploits the potential of names to create expectations, partly simply to entertain the reader by offering a character or actions that defeat these expectations, partly to force the reader's attention on the all-important ethical qualities of his principal characters".[41] Cnemon, whose name recalls Menander's misanthrope, is transformed into a "malleable youth, easily interested in sex",[42] while "the inconstant Thisbe bears the name of a famous paradigm of the committed lover",[43] the beloved of Pyramus, whose story may have reached Heliodorus through a lost Hellenistic source.[44] In both cases it is reasonable to conclude that the Heliodorean characters are meant to recall, and, at the same time, modify their literary models, since the memory of their intertexts is activated in the novel. In Cnemon's case New Comedy is recalled through the setting of the story in Classical Athens and the inclusion in it of hetaerae and slave girls, characters proper to that genre.[45] In Thisbe's case the Hellenistic love-story of Thisbe and Pyramus is evoked in events concerning the protagonists later in the novel, such as Theagenes' desire for suicide with a sword and Thisbe's concealment in the cave.[46] Furthermore, in Thisbe's case the variation is so marked that it generates an antithesis comparable to that between Lucian's and Heliodorus' Chariclea.

External evidence comes from Longus' and Achilles Tatius' novels, as well as from Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. In *Daphnis and Chloe*, in which Theocritus is clearly an important intertext,[47] the name of the protagonist of the novel is a "continual reminder of Theocritus' most famous pastoral figure",[48] yet at the same time there is a meaningful variation between the two. Longus' Daphnis is not a tragic lover like the Theocritean one, but a happy one who achieves union

---

40    Cf. below.
41    Bowie 1995, 269.
42    Bowie 1995, 272.
43    Bowie 1995, 276.
44    Cf. Bowie 1995, 274.
45    Cf. Bowie 1995, 270-271.
46    Cf. Bowie 1996, 276 for details.
47    Cf. Morgan 2011, 141 for evidence and further bibliography.
48    Morgan 2011, 141.

with his beloved.[49] A similar characterization by means of variation of a literary model takes place in Achilles Tatius' text with the introduction of Chaereas: due to his name this character recalls the protagonist of Chariton's *Callirhoe*, but his attitude differs from his model's, as Achilles Tatius' Chaereas is not a faithful lover but a lustful one who threatens the protagonists' love by kidnapping Leucippe.[50] Finally, in Aristomenes' story in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* we see the appearance of Socrates: his name recalls the great Athenian philosopher portrayed in Plato's dialogues but his lack of self-control produces a contrast with the model—a contrast deliberately evoked by Apuleius, since in the tenth book instead "Lucius speaks highly of the historic Socrates".[51]

Within this framework, Heliodorus' choice of characterizing Chariclea by means of modification of a literary model becomes clearer. At the same time, it is worth noting that Longus offers the parallel closest to ours: his Daphnis is a character who, unlike the Theocritean one, fulfils his erotic desire and he can thus be taken as an improved version of his model. The same conclusion can be drawn with Heliodorus' Chariclea as she is the moral counterpart of the Lucianic homonymous figure. Conversely, in both Achilles Tatius' and Apuleius' texts a degenerative transformation of the characters takes place, which generates irony.[52]

---

49    On Longus correcting Theocritus, cf. e.g. Morgan 2004, 6: "Theokritos' Daphnis dies, programmatically, of unhappy love (…). For Longus, Eros is a benevolent deity (…). This difference leads him to correct Theokritos on a number of occasions (…)".

50    Furthermore, in the paper *Clitophon as Romance Heroine* delivered at the CA Conference 2012 at the University of Exeter, Stephen Trzaskoma convincingly demonstrated a precise textual relationship between Achilles Tatius' presentation of Chaereas and *Callirhoe*.

51    Cf. Michalopoulos 2006, 174 for this interpretation of Socrates' name. For further bibliography on the matter, cf. van der Paardt 1978, 82, n. 59.

52    In Achilles Tatius' novel Chaereas' generation of irony is supported by the focus on this device proper to the novel as a whole: cf. Durham 1938, Chew 2000 and Whitmarsh 2003. Jones 2006, 553 argues that irony might also concern the readers of the *Aethiopica* in their interpretation of Heliodorus' subtle evocation of Chariclea. As I suggested before, however, since at the beginning of the novel and throughout the text emphasis is placed on Chariclea's chastity (cf. e.g. Hld. 5.4.5, with the protagonists' chaste embrace, and Hld. 6.8.6, with Chariclea's chaste dream of Theagenes), Heliodorus' interplay with Lucian's Chariclea appears to me seriously to contribute to the characterization of the protagonist of the *Aethiopica* (cf. also Paulsen 1992, 42-47 for a demonstration of the lack of ambiguity in Chariclea's portrait). For this reason I take issue with Lateiner 1997, 430-437 and Ormand 2010, 181-191, who argue for the ambiguity of Chariclea's attitude to chastity until the very end of the novel, and I would dismiss Jones' attribution of irony in Heliodorus' interplay with Lucian. If there is an evolution in Chariclea's chastity, as De Temmerman 2014, 257 has recently shown, this is internal as it concerns the nature of this virtue, which

Finally, I come to the other key feature of the discussed intertextuality between Lucian and Heliodorus—the fact that the noted parallels are limited to the two novellae of Deinias and Cnemon. What can we make of this selective focus? Here, I identify a *metaliterary* aim. In Morgan's convincing interpretation,[53] Cnemon's story in the *Aethiopica* functions as a counter-model to the protagonists' love, implying that this section of the text must be read in contrast with the novel as a whole. Building upon this view, Bowie suggests that an intertextual agenda might be part of this construction:[54] with the comic characterization of Cnemon[55] and the setting of the story in Classical Athens, the *Aethiopica* might recall a genre—New Comedy—which was one of the ancestors of the Greek novel. By using this genre to characterize Demaenete's and Thisbe's erotic actions, Bowie believes that Heliodorus "gives it a subordinate role, only as a counter-plot against which the true love of Theagenes and Chariclea can be measured".[56] In this way, this contrast with New Comedy enriches the literary definition of the *Aethiopica*. We are dealing here with a common expedient used in ancient literature to establish literary authority:[57] self-definition by means of opposition to previous authors and texts—an attitude which reflects the ancient writers' desire to emulate their predecessors and develop the literary tradition.[58] This is shown earlier by Sappho in her preference to love over epic war, and later by Theocritus and Callimachus who both define their poetic production in opposition to Homer's extensive poems.[59] In prose, ancient historians provide a relevant precedent. As shown by Marincola, almost every writer of this genre "by a process of

---

"changes from being a problematic rejection of love altogether to a learned conforming of it to institutional narrativity"—but no immoral hint is part of this process.

53    Cf. Morgan 1989.

54    Cf. Bowie 1995, 271-272.

55    Cf. Paulsen 1992, 82-102 and Brethes 2007, 167-170.

56    Bowie 1995, 272.

57    For a definition of literary authority, I follow that coined by Marincola for ancient historians apart from obvious generic differences: "rhetorical means by which the ancient historian claims the competence to narrate and explain the past, and simultaneously constructs a persona that the audience will find persuasive and believable" (Marincola 1997, 1). For dynamics of literary authorization in Latin poetry, cf. Hinds 1998, 52-98.

58    Cf. Rosenmeyer 1997, 145: "Any poet working within an established canon of literature must seek his or her own niche. While an author may change the tradition by a successful act of self-assertion, she will not destroy it; it will expand to include her".

59    Cf. Sappho, fr. 16 and Rosenmeyer 1997; Theoc. *Id.* 7 and Serrao 1995, 146-148; Call. *Aet.* 1 and Harder 2012, vol. 2, 10-11.

contrast and continuity seeks to mark out for himself a place in the historio-graphical tradition".[60]

I suggest that Heliodorus' intertextuality with Lucian's *Toxaris* in Cnemon's story could also be part of this kind of metaliterary criticism. This possibility is suggested not only by the analogy with Heliodorus' approach to New Comedy and with the aforementioned writers but also by the fact that, as I have shown earlier, his use of Lucian affects the characterization of the protagonist of the novel. In fact, in the *Aethiopica* it has been correctly argued that Chariclea "stands for the romance itself".[61] Her special band is in fact decorated with a text which describes the origin of the novel and which, in the manner of a token, leads the story to its fulfilment.[62] How then can Lucian's *Toxaris* shed new light on the literary definition of Heliodorus' novel?

A novella like that of Deinias in *Toxaris* is a fictional text of a different kind from that of the *Aethiopica*, since the Lucianic story is short and offers a model of lustful love which is opposite to the novelistic model of faithful love. As in the case of New Comedy, Heliodorus might be using intertextuality to highlight that his novel is *not* the short and licentious kind of fiction we find in *Toxaris*.

This suggestion is significant for the study of the ancient Greek romances. As is commonly known, in antiquity "the novel was drastically undertheorized",[63] and while the five traditional novels seem to develop a generic self-awareness,[64] the relationship between this corpus and other forms of fiction is far from clear. With his use of *Toxaris*, Heliodorus appears to declare his interest in establishing a metaliterary dialogue between different fictional texts—a device unusual in ancient literature (at least according to the extant texts).

At the same time, the lack of ancient theorization of the novel makes the identification of a specific target in Heliodorus' definition of his work by opposition to other texts very problematic: only speculative hypothesis can be advanced. On the one hand, Heliodorus' opposition to *Toxaris* might be seen as a specific reaction to Lucian. From the ancient extant evidence, Lucian is an anomalous writer of fiction since, despite his great number of writings which include the "science fiction novel"[65] *True Story* and possibly a version

---

60      Marincola 1997, 218.

61      W. Stephens 1994, 72.

62      Cf. Hld. 4.8.1 and 10.12.4, Hilton 1998, 82 and Whitmarsh 2011, 126.

63      Morgan 1993, 176.

64      Cf. Whitmarsh 2013, 35-48, for a balanced and up-to-date view of the novelistic traditional genre, which benefits from and, at the same time, rejects the recent criticism by Morales 2009.

65      For this definition of the novel, cf. Georgiadou and Larmour 1998.

of the comic novel *Onos*,[66] he has not written a romance with a circular plot comparable with that of the Greek traditional novelistic genre and in his texts he never focuses on faithful love.[67] In the second half of the second century AD, this genre seems to have been known in the contemporary literary world[68] so Lucian's choice can even be interpreted as a deliberate detachment; in Anderson's words, "Lucian knew the Ideal Romance but opted out of writing it".[69] This possibility has some textual confirmation, since some of Lucian's references to novelistic themes parody the traditional Greek novels.[70] As a result of this framework, I propose that with the intertextuality with *Toxaris* Heliodorus might have aimed to define his novel in opposition to Lucian's approach to fiction.[71]

On the other hand, the short lustful kind of fiction which characterizes *Toxaris* might represent a larger repertoire of brief erotic stories. In Hellenistic Greek literature, fragments and indirect testimonies give evidence for a proliferation of a class of realistic, short erotic tales. This is a genre which had one of its first exemplars in Aristides' *Milesiaca*, a collection famous for its sensationalism and obscene portrayal of love that was popular in the Imperial Era.[72] Another plausible representative of this tradition was the *Sybaritica*.[73]

---

66    On this debated issue, cf. Winkler 1991, 253-256.

67    Cf. Anderson 1976, 86.

68    This is not only indicated by the earlier composition of Chariton's *Callirhoe* (1st century AD) and possibly of Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* (between the 1st and early 2nd century AD), but also by the way in which both Longus' and Achilles Tatius' texts subtly interplay with novelistic features, which suggests that the generic framework was clearly established before their writings. Furthermore, the extant papyrological evidence makes it likely that other traditional romances had been produced earlier, but unfortunately were not preserved.

69    Anderson 1976, 89.

70    Cf. Anderson 1976, 99-114.

71    To some extent, such interpretation could fit well with Lucian's early negative reception in the Imperial Era. However, since the attested criticism of this author does not focus on this element but on Lucian's attitude as charlatan and critic of his time (for precise references, cf. the first section of this paper), I do not stress this point.

72    For more information on the *Milesiaca* and its popularity in the Imperial Era, cf. Schissel von Fleschenberg 1913; Trenkner 1958, 172-175; Harrison 1998, 61-64; Tilg 2010, 34 and Bowie 2013.

73    For more information on the *Sybaritica*, cf. Trenkner 1958, 175-176 and Tilg 2010, 47. For other representatives of the same tradition, see Whitmarsh 2013, 25: "the *Suda* also attests to such works. Philip of Amphipolis (of unknown date) composed *Coan Events, Thasian Events*, and *Rhodian Events* (. . .)."

Since Cnemon's story focuses on Demaenete's lustfulness, it is not impossible that Heliodorus was using this novella to contrast his writing to this class of erotic tales. Scholars have often suggested the existence of a connection between the Greek novel and both the *Milesiaca* and *Sybaritica*, because the romances and these two collections of stories share fictional status, historiographical titles, focus on love and—in the case of the *Milesiaca*—biographical provenance and/or setting of the narratives in Ionia.[74] To my knowledge, however, there is only one case where a conscious metaliterary dialogue between Greek novelists and Milesian stories or *similia* has been proposed. As first suggested by Goold, Chariton's decision of deviating the plot to Miletus might link this section of the novel to both Aristides' *Milesiaca* and the *Sybaritica*.[75] As argued by Tilg, both collections would be recalled by Chariton through Theron's characterization of Ionia as a place of luxury (Char. 1.11.7) and of Callirhoe as a Sybaritic slave (Char. 1.12.8), and, moreover, through the setting in Miletus of Callirhoe's "adultery story".[76] The aim of this combined reference lies in Chariton's desire to acknowledge the existence of different kinds of fiction and to distance his writing from them: the falsity of Theron's story is in fact openly declared by Callirhoe when she denies any knowledge of Sybaris (2.5.5)—a comment that due to the protagonist's key role in the entire novel "might well imply a disassociation from the *Sybaritica*, or more generally from low-life stories of its kind".[77]

Goold's reading as elaborated by Tilg is fascinating and promising, but not conclusive, as it is based on a certain amount of speculation. However, it does help to understand Heliodorus' possible intention in recalling *Toxaris*' Chariclea: establishing a dialogue not only with Lucian's writings but also with a larger repertoire of fiction.

---

[74]    Cf. e.g. Harrison 1998, 63-64. As shown by Goold 1995, 9-10, and Harrison 1998, the connection between Milesian tales and the novels is closer and clearer in the case of Petronius' and Apuleius' romances, of the fragmentary Greek novel *Iolaus* and of Lollianus.

[75]    Cf. Goold 1995, 9.

[76]    Cf. Tilg 2010, 46.

[77]    Tilg 2010, 149. Fakas 2005, 417 offers a different interpretation of this phenomenon: this literary interplay rather aims to attribute to Callirhoe "eine charakterliche Komplexität" which shares characteristics of both the low-life and the ideal tradition of storytelling. However, Callirhoe's explicit declaration of her lack of connection with Sybaris makes Tilg's interpretation more correct.

### Conclusion

The fact that Cnemon's story intertexts with Lucian's *Toxaris* gives new evidence to the intertextuality between Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* and Imperial literature, and confirms that writers of that time were interested in recalling not only classical texts but also more recent ones. As a result, the question about the nature of this second phenomenon becomes more pressing.

More specifically, through his engagement with Lucian's *Toxaris* Heliodorus gives a characterization of both his female protagonist and his novel by means of opposition: Chariclea is *not* the lustful Chariclea of his predecessor, and the *Aethiopica* is *not* a short story focused on lustful love as Deinias' is. While a comprehensive interpretation of Heliodorus' intertextuality with post-classical texts is still to come, this article highlights an important function, namely the novelist's willingness to intertext and compare his writing with different kinds of fiction. This point is significant because, if we exclude the Christian texts, all the authors of the other Imperial intertexts of the *Aethiopica* so far discovered are related to fiction, namely Plutarch, Xenophon of Ephesus, Philostratus and possibly Longus.[78] When Whitmarsh comments upon the *Aethiopica*'s debt to the *Ephesiaca* in the Delphian parade, he shows that the former novel compares itself with and expands upon the latter and, as a result of this, "Heliodorus' romance, twice the length of Xenophon's, is also (its author hints) twice the romance."[79] My analysis of Heliodorus' use of Lucian leads to a similar metaliterary interpretation: I propose that one function of Heliodorus' intertextuality with Imperial literature is to establish a close dialogue with other narrative texts in order to clarify his own position in the ancient world of fiction.

Moreover, this conclusion possibly helps to shed new light on the status of ancient fiction as a whole. As is commonly known, in antiquity many authors of fiction strove to validate their texts through the so-called pseudo-documentarism—"an author's untrue allegation that he (or she) has come upon an authentic document of some sort that he (or she) is drawing upon or passing on to his (or her) readers".[80] As shown by Ní Mheallaigh, this device did not only purport to authenticate the narrative it supports but also to ironize it, multiplying and relativizing the sources of authority:[81] in this way, "the novels both proclaim and pretend to conceal their fictionality".[82]

---

78    Cf. n. 3.
79    Whitmarsh 2011, 117.
80    Hansen 2003, 302.
81    Cf. Ní Mheallaigh 2008, 404.
82    Morgan 1993, 197.

Using intertextuality to relate with and distance himself from other writers of fiction, Heliodorus highlights the existence of another kind of authorizing device. Its originality could be due to the late date of the *Aethiopica*, but the fact that Chariton possibly adopted a similar technique suggests that writers of ancient romances might have used this expedient more broadly. As a result, with this device the ancient novelists' generic self-awareness and the existence of an ancient categorization of different types of fiction become more likely propositions.[83]

### Bibliography

Alpers, K. 2001. *Der Garten des Philetas. Longos und Lukian*, ZPE 136, 43-48

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

Baldick, C. 2008. *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford)

Barker, E.T.E., Christensen, J.P. 2006. *Flight Club: the New Archilochus and its Resonance with Homeric Epic*, MD 57, 9-41

Baumbach, M. 2002. *Lukian in Deutschland. Eine forschungs - und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Analyse vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich)

Bernsdorff, H. 1993. *Longos und Lukian* (*zu Verae historiae 2,5*), WS 106, 35-44

Birchall, J. 1996. *Heliodoros* Aithiopika I*: a Commentary with Prolegomena*, PhD. Diss. (London University College)

Bowie, E.W. 1994. *Who Read Ancient Novels?*, in: Tatum, J. (ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore), 405-418

——— 1995. *Names and a Gem: Aspects of Allusion in Heliodorus' Aethiopica*, in: Innes, D., Hine, H., Pelling, C. (eds.) *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford), 269-280

——— 2008. *Literary Milieux*, in: Whitmarsh, T. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge/New York), 17-38

——— 2013. *Milesian Tales*, in: Whitmarsh, T., Thomson, T. (eds.) *The Romance between Greece and the East* (Cambridge), 243-257

---

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

Broich, U., Pfister, M. 1985. *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Tübingen)

Chew, K. 2000. *Achilles Tatius and Parody*, CJ 96, 57-70

Conte, G. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca)

Costa, C.D.N. 2005. *Lucian, Selected Dialogues, translated with an Introduction and Notes* (Oxford)

Davies, P.R. 1998. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (London)

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

Dickie, M.W. 1991. *Heliodorus and Plutarch on the Evil Eye*, CP 86.1, 17-29

Doulamis, K. 2011. *Introduction,* in: Doulamis, K. (ed.) *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction* (Groningen), vii-xv

Durham, D.B. 1938. *Parody in Achilles Tatius*, CP 33, 1-19

Fakas, C. 2005. *Charitons Kallirhoe und Sybaris*, RhM 148, 413-417

Feuillâtre, E. 1966. *Études sur les Éthiopiques d'Héliodore* (Paris)

Fowler, D. 2000. *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford)

Georgiadou, A., Larmour, D. 1998. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* (Leiden)

Goold, G.P. 1995. *Chariton: Callirhoe* (Cambridge, MA)

Gow, A.S.F. 2008². *Theocritus* (Cambridge)

Guttentag, I. 1860. *De subdito qui inter Lucianeos legi solet dialogo Toxaride* (Berlin)

Hägg, T. 2010. *Canon Formation in Greek Literary Culture*, in: Thomassen, E. (ed.) *Canon and Canonicity. The Formation and Use of Scripture* (Copenhagen), 109-128

Hansen, W. 2003. *Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature*, in: Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., Keulen, W. (eds.) *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden), 301-313

Harder, A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia* (Oxford)

Harmon, A.M. 1913. *Lucian, with an English Translation*, vol. I (Cambridge, MA)

Harrison, S.J. 1998. *The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel*, GCN 8, 61-73

Helm, R. 1906. *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig)

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge)

Hilton, J. 1998. *An Ethiopian Paradox: Heliodorus, Aithiopika 4.8,* in: Hunter, R. (ed.) *Studies in Heliodorus* (Cambridge), 79-92

Hodkinson, O. 2013. *Epistolarity and Narrative in ps.-Aeschines Epistle 10*, in: Hodkinson, O., Rosenmeyer, P.A., Bracke, E. (eds.) *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), 323-348

Hunter, R. 2008. *The Aithiopika of Heliodorus: beyond Interpretation?*, in: Hunter, R. (ed.) *On Coming After: Studies in Post-classical Greek Literature and its Reception*, vol. 2, (Berlin/New York) 804-828

Jones, M. 2006. *Heavenly and Pandemic Names in Heliodorus' Aethiopica*, CQ 56.2, 548-562

Lateiner, D. 1997. *Abduction Marriage in Heliodorus' "Aethiopica"*, GRBS 38.4, 309-339

Lefteratou, A. 2010. *Myth and Narrative in the Greek Novel* (Oxford PhD. Diss.)

Lehmann, W. 1910. *De Achillis Tatii aetate. Accedit corollarium de Achillis Tatii studiis Lucianeis* (Wrocław)

Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge)

Michalopoulos, A. 2006. *Naming the Characters: the Cases of Aristomenes, Socrates and Meroe in Apuleius' Metamorphoses 1.2-19*, in Booth, J., Maltby, R. (eds.) *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature* (Swansea), 169-187

Morales, H. 2005. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon. Cambridge Classical Studies* (Cambridge)

——— 2009. *Challenging Some Orthodoxies: the Politics of Genre and the Ancient Greek Novel*, in: Karla, G. (ed.) *Fiction on the Fringe: Novelistic Writing in the Post-Classical Age* (Leiden)

Morgan, J.R. 1989. *The Story of Knemon in the Aithiopika of Heliodoros*, JHS 109, 99-112

——— 1989b. *Heliodoros, Ethiopian Story*, in: Reardon, B.P. (ed.) *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley), 349-588

——— 1993. *Make-believe and Make Believe: the Fictionality of the Greek Novels*, in: Gill, C., Wiseman, T.P. (eds.) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter), 175-229

——— 1996. *Heliodorus*, in: Schmeling, G. (ed.) *The Novel in Antiquity: a Handbook* (Leiden), 417-456

——— 2004. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Oxford)

——— 2005. *Le blanc et le noir: perspectives paiennes et perspectives chrétiennes sur l' Ethiopie d' Héliodore*, in: Pouderon, B., Crismani, D. (eds.) *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance* (Lyon), 309-318

——— 2009. *The Emesan Connection: Philostratus and Heliodorus*, in: Demoen, K., Praet, D. (eds.) *Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii* (Leiden/Boston), 263-281

——— 2011. *Poets and Shepherds: Philetas and Longus*, in: Doulamis, K. (ed.) *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction* (Groningen), 139-160

——— 2013. *The Epistolary Ghost Story in Phlegon of Tralles*, in: Hodkinson, O., Rosenmeyer, P.A., Bracke, E. (eds.), *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), 293-322

Morgan, J.R., Harrison, S. 2008. *Intertextuality*, in: Whitmarsh, T. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge), 218-236

Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge)

Morris, I. 1996. *The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy*, in: Ober, J., Hedrick, C. (eds.) *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (Princeton)

Müller, C.W. 1975. *Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica* (Munich)

Nesselrath, H.G. 1994. *Menippeisches in der Spätantike: von Lukian zu Julians Caesares und zu Claudians In Rufinum*, MH 51, 30-44

Ní Mheallaigh, K. 2008. *Pseudo-Documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction*, AJPh 129.3, 403-431

Obbink, D. 2005. *P.Oxy. 4738*, in: Obbink, D. et alii, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 69 (London), 173-175

Ormand, K. 2010. *Testing Virginity in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus*, Ramus 39.2, 160-197

van der Paardt, R.Th. 1978. *Significant Names and Their Function in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, in: Hijmans, B.L., van der Paardt, R.Th. (eds.) *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen), 107-122

Paulsen, T. 1992. *Inszenierung des Schicksals: Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor* (Trier)

Pervo, R.I. 1997. *With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the Toxaris*, in: Fitzgerald, J.T. (ed.) *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship* (Atlanta), 163-180

Pinto, P. 1973. *Echi lucianei nelle Epistole Parassitiche di Alcifrone*, Vichiana 2, 261-268

Rattenbury, R.M., Lumb, T.W. 1960². *Les Éthiopiques* (*Théagène et Chariclée*) (Paris)

Rissman, L. 1983. *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho* (Königstein)

Rocca, R. 1976. *Eliodoro e i due Ippoliti euripidei*, MCSN 1, 25-31

Rohde, E. 1914³. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig)

Rommel, H. 1923. *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios* (Stuttgart)

Rosenmeyer, P.A. 1997. *Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer*, Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici 39, 123-149

Schepens, G., Delcroix, K. 1996. *Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception*, in: Pecere, O., Stramaglia, A. (eds.) *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino* (Cassino), 373-460

Schissel von Fleschenberg, O. 1913. *Die griechische Novelle: Rekonstruktion ihrer literarischen Form* (Halle a. S.)

Schwartz, J. 1967. *Quelques observations sur des romans grecs*, AC 36, 536-552

——— 1976. *Achille Tatius et Lucien de Samosate*, AC 45, 618-626

Scobie, A. 1969. *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage: Essays on Apuleius, Petronius, and the Greek Romances* (Meisenheim a. Glan)

Serrao, G. 1995. *All'origine della Recusatio-excusatio: Teocrito e Callimaco*, Eikasmos 6, 141-152

Stephens, S.A. 1994. *Who Read Ancient Novels?*, in: Tatum, J. (ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore), 405-418

Stephens, W. 1994. *Tasso's Heliodorus and the World of Romance*, in: Tatum, J. (ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore), 67-87

Strohmaier, G. 1976. *Übersehenes zur Biographie Lukians*, Philologus 120, 117-122

Swain, S.C.R. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (Oxford)

Swift, L.A. 2012. *Archilochus the 'AntiHero'? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P.Oxy LXIX 4708)*, JHS 132, 139-155

Tilg, S. 2010. *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel* (New York)

Trenkner, S. 1958. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge)

van der Valk, M. 1941. *Remarques sur la date des Éthiopiques d'Heliodore*, Mnemosyne 9, 97-100

Webb, R. 2013. *Mime and the Romance*, in: Whitmarsh, T., Thomson, T. (eds.) *The Romance between Greece and the East* (Cambridge), 285-299

Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford)

——— 2002. *Written on the Body: Ekphrasis, Perception and Deception in Heliodorus' "Aethiopica"*, Ramus 31.1-2, 111-125

——— 2003. *Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatius*, in: Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M., Keulen, W. (eds.) *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden), 191-205

——— 2011. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance. Greek Culture in the Roman World* (Cambridge/New York)

——— 2013. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London)

Willis, W.H. 1958. *Greek Literary Papyri from Egypt and the Classical Canon*, Harvard Library Bull. 12, 5-34

Winkler, J.J. 1982. *The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' Aithiopika*, YCS 27, 93-158