Spring 4-10-2020

Reinventing Maternity in Chariton's Callirhoe

Christine Ellis
University of New Mexico - Main Campus

Christine Ellis

Candidate

Foreign Languages and Literatures

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Professor Osman Umurhan , Chairperson

Professor Lorenzo F. Garcia, Jr.

Professor Monica Cyrino

REINVENTING MATERNITY IN CHARITON'S CALLIRHOE

by

CHRISTINE ELLIS

B.A., CLASSICS, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, 2017

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Comparative Literatures and Cultural Studies

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 2020

Dedications

This thesis is dedicated to the parents in my life:

Patrick and Karen MacLean

Christa and Michael Delk

Jenny Blumer

Acknowledgements

My thesis would not have been completed without the direction, support, and editorial advice of my thesis committee. I would like to express my deep gratitude to each of you individually, but I also appreciate your collective voice and demonstration of academic collaboration and mentorship.

To Professor Luke Gorton, thank you for your eagle-eyed catches on my Greek and punctuation. Your encouraging words and edits helped make this process much more bearable.

To Professor Lorenzo F. Garcia, Jr., thank you for your enthusiasm for my project and inspiration to keep digging, learning, and reading. Your knowledge about ancient Greek particles and Homeric scholarship have helped to expand my thesis beyond what I believed possible.

To Professor Monica S. Cyrino, for your keen eye for style and grammar and your tireless patience with my overwrought prose. You have made me a better writer and your contribution to this thesis is immense and appreciated. Thank you for always having the perfect word.

Finally, thank you to my advisor and mentor Professor Osman Umurhan, for always pushing me to make my transitions smoother, my sentences less awkward, and my thesis more apparent. Thank you for questioning my assumptions about texts and for pushing me to extend my areas of interest. Above all, thank you for being there to lend an ear when I was frustrated with the project.

I must also thank my peers and classmates at the University of New Mexico for your support. I am profoundly grateful to Noah Holt and Lauren Alberti for always being across the hall and willing to laugh off our frustrations, to Ryan Gomez for giving me a confidence boost every time we spoke and for being my musical buddy, and finally to my roommate Cole Carvour for staying with me through the ups and downs, for the late night laughs and early morning grumbles, for being the most supportive roommate a person could ask for.

Thank you all for believing in me and in this thesis.

Reinventing Maternity in Chariton's *Callirhoe*

By
Christine Ellis

B.A., Classics, University of Arizona, 2017

M.A., Comparative Literatures and Cultural Studies, University of New Mexico, 2020

Abstract

This project analyzes Chariton's construction of maternity in his Greek novel *Callirhoe*. I argue that Chariton heavily employs intertexts and allusions throughout his novel, especially with regard to his female protagonists. Through these allusions, Chariton is not only able to insert himself and his work within the literary canon, but he is also able to develop his genre by juxtaposing his heroine with those of the genres of tragedy and epic. Topics of analysis range from debates about killing one's child to the importance of marital memory. By the end of his novel, Chariton is able both to establish the ideal traits of a female character within the novel and also develop the important *topos* of the blended family.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality, Genre, and Gender in the Novel

The ancient Greek novels have seen a steady increase of attention in scholarship recently. These texts provide a fun and exciting story for scholars of Greek, and recent work on the use of intertextuality by prose authors has sparked fresh avenues of inquiry otherwise overlooked, especially in regard to the complex uses of intertextuality and allusion produced by ancient novelists. From the conception of the first Greek novel, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, around the mid-first century BCE, Greek novels have struggled to find a legitimate place in the ancient canon. They are often ridiculed by ancient authors, such as Persius and the Roman emperor Julian, for being simplistic and almost vulgar:

> *…multum gaudere paratus,*
> *si cynico barbam petulans nonaria vellat.*
> *his mane edictum, post prandia Calliroen do.*
>
> …[the one] ready to laugh a lot,
> if an insolent whore pulls on a cynic's beard.
> To these ones I present a playbill in the morning and *Callirhoe* after lunch.
> (Persius *Satire* 1.132–134)

Despite this unenthusiastic reception, however, the novels continued into the fourth century CE, having their heyday in the second century.[1] The overlying *topoi* of the Greek novels, which may have accounted for their popularity despite their lack of acceptance in the canon, are the same: an attractive couple meet and fall in love, face several life-threatening scenarios that often force them to leave their homelands, and in the end, are reunited. However, in addition to these shared *topoi*, each author makes his mark on the genre through allusions, intertexts, and manipulations of these well-known *topoi*, which

[1] Reardon (1989) 1.

modern scholars, like Bowie, Whitmarsh, and De Temmerman, have begun to analyze in order to demonstrate the validity the novels hold as works of literature.[2]

My thesis analyzes the earliest Greek novel, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, in terms of its intertextualities with other genres, namely Greek tragedy and Greek epic. I narrow my investigation of intertextuality in Chariton's novel through an in-depth analysis of the female protagonist, Callirhoe, and how she aligns with Medea, Helen, and Penelope as protagonists in the genres of tragedy and epic. Through this examination, I compare Chariton's explicit references to paradigmatic mythological women as well as his echoes of the plot lines, levels and uses of female autonomy, and familial endings of these heroines to prove that Chariton intentionally alludes to these female protagonists in order to align his own text and main character within an existing tradition of women in literature. Because he alludes so often and consistently to female heroines of epic and tragedy, I argue that Chariton is simultaneously able to create a space for his novel within the canon and manipulate these allusions in order to establish precedents for characters within the genre.

The intent of this thesis is not to claim that the Greek novels are the first novels ever written; there is far too much evidence to support otherwise.[3] Instead, my project looks to evaluate the ways in which the author Chariton purposefully uses intertextuality, genre, and gender to legitimize his genre through the treatment of the female character of Callirhoe. I have chosen to examine Chariton alone since he is the first of the five main Greek novelists (writing as he does around the mid-first century BCE).[4] By focusing on one author and a single work, I hope to more thoroughly examine the ways in which

[2] Bowie (2002), Whitmarsh (2005), and De Temmerman (2014).
[3] See Whitmarsh (2018) for a more in-depth analysis of traditions of novels before the Greek novels.
[4] The others novelists are Achilles Tatius (early-second century CE), Longus (second century CE), Xenophon of Ephesus (late-second century CE), and Heliodorus (third century CE).

Chariton incorporates other genres and allusions into his text and offers a potential model for subsequent novelists in the tradition. Through this evaluation I hope to offer a new and exciting platform for the appreciation of these novels.

Intertextuality

Texts are not read or written in a cultural vacuum. Texts cannot be straightforward, self-contained vehicles of their author's intended meanings, but must be read through and within a complex cultural matrix.[5] The ancient Greek novels seem to emerge only after Greece has been colonized by Rome. During the first three centuries CE, over three hundred years after Greece was overtaken by the Romans, groups of men over all of the Greek-speaking parts of the Roman Empire would gather to hear their peers present oratorical declamations performed in the same style of the Greek sophists.[6] This period, between 50 and 250 CE, is known as the Second Sophistic. Authors, (especially Greek authors) during this time harken back to the traditions and styles seen in Classical Greek literature specifically in regard to oratory. This remembrance of past Greek literature reveals itself in direct quotations of Classical and Hellenistic works as well as allusions to themes and characters.[7] However, the Second Sophistic was not merely a time for nostalgic imitation of the past. During this period, as Whitmarsh notes,

[5] Morgan and Harrison (2008) 218. Morgan focuses on the Greek novels and their gradual development from Chariton's novel in the mid-first century to Heliodorus in the third century. Harrison, on the other hand, focuses on the two examples of the Roman novels: Apuleius' *Golden Ass* and Petronius' *Satyricon*, which have fewer direct allusions to each other, but many to other Roman literary works, such as Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphosis*. This chapter examines not only the intertextualities between the novels and previous works of literature, dating as far back as Homer, but also the intertextualities, allusions, and changes between the novels themselves.

[6] See Whitmarsh (2005a) for a detailed account of the Second Sophistic and the impact this made on Greek and Roman literature.

[7] Whitmarsh (2005a) 9.

there was "substantially more evidence for women's activities, and evidence for greater female mobility in later Greek culture than in the archaic and Classical period."[8] This is seen clearly in the Greek novels, in which both women and men leave the domestic home and travel over the ancient Mediterranean. According to Morgan and Harrison, two scholars of intertextuality and allusion in the Greek and Roman novels, respectively, the truths universally acknowledged and the cluster of ideas that they represent is conveniently termed intertextuality.[9]

I want to begin, however, by defining the terms allusion and intertextuality, since both are often used interchangeably, but actually have distinct differences. An allusion is something the author makes deliberately, perhaps decoratively, perhaps with profound meaning.[10] Intertextuality, a term coined by Julia Kristeva, famed psychoanalyst and feminist theorist, is "a property of texts when actuated by their readers, and not necessarily consciously deployed by their authors; it may relate to a specific intertext, but equally to a more general literary praxis."[11] Kristeva emphasizes that the difference between intertextuality and intersubjectivity is the transference of meaning through mediated or filtered codes provided in texts as opposed to directly from writer to reader.[12] Broadly speaking, intertextuality is a literary device that creates an interrelationship between texts and generates a related understanding in separate works.[13] Allusion, then, is a form of intertextuality which an author purposefully utilizes to make a connection to another text. For example, the Greek novels often use stock characters from Roman

[8] Whitmarsh (2005a) 9.
[9] Morgan and Harrison (2008) 218.
[10] Hinds (1998) 5.
[11] Kristeva (1980) 65.
[12] Kristeva (1980) 66.
[13] Friss (2017) 134.

comedy. In Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, the lecherous and gluttonous Gnathon is the perfect parallel to a comic parasite, a character who pretends to admire and esteem his wealthy friend in order to receive benefits from him. Furthermore, Classical literature is compulsively allusive. Stephen Hinds' work *Allusion and Intertext* (1998) highlights the allusive nature of Roman poetry and poets, especially Ovid, Virgil, and Catullus, and the diachrony involved in this process. Within the work, Hinds cautions on the limits of these methods, namely that one should not go too far in utilizing only an allusive or only an intertextual approach— the former because it runs the risk of assuming authorial intent without any way of proving it, and the latter because it washes out the interventions in literary discourse of the one intention-bearing subject, the alluding poet.[14]

However, the genre of the Greek novel cannot be considered universal or as "old as organized societies," as Cairns would put it, because its roots do not date back to Classical or Hellenistic Greece.[15] For Cueva, looking at the novel as a genre involves "broaching the question of why it appears when it does, how it relates to the literary culture of the period, and how its formal characteristics speak to the culture in which it is read."[16] Despite the lack of a direct tie to a Classical or Hellenistic genre, the novel does draw a lot of its inspiration from epic, specifically Homer's *Odyssey*, which it uses to root itself in the Classical canon.[17] Recently more attention has been paid to the allusions and intertextualities made in the Greek novels. More so than perhaps any other genre, the novel makes use of allusions and intertexts not only with other novels, but also to other

[14] Hinds (1998) 47–48.
[15] Whitmarsh (2018) 23.
[16] Cueva (2004) 12.
[17] I discuss the novel's tie to Homer in my second chapter.

literary forms.[18] The use of these allusions and intertexts, many of which are made by reference to Homeric, Platonic, Hellenistic, and tragic works, indicate a rich use of Greek literary and more broadly cultural heritage and help to demonstrate the aims and scope of these texts.[19] For example, Doulamis shows a connection between the trial scene in Book Five of Chariton's *Callirhoe* and traditional Greek legal oratory both in terms of structure (*prooimion, pisteis, diegesis, lysis,* and *epilogos*), and use of technical legal terminology.[20] In my first chapter, and in part following Doulamis, I consider Callirhoe's speech and her use of rhetoric alongside Medea from Euripides' *Medea* to examine how each female protagonist dissuades herself from killing her children. Although their respective monologues are not produced for a lawcourt, the dramatic shift of emotion and decision—from willingness to outright refusal to kill their children—provides the reader with a similar sense of cross examination as one might find in the context of an ancient lawcourt speech and setting.

Genre

According to Stephen Heath, a literary theorist who analyzes the cultural politics of literary genres, "there are no genreless texts."[21] This succinct statement emphasizes the social aspect of writing in that whenever someone approaches a text, whether as a writer or a reader, there is always a frame of expectation stemming from the society's practices of writing. Heath continues by stating, "To write or to read at a given time in a given society is to engage with current conventions of writing and the expectations of what it

[18] Doulamis (2011) vii.
[19] Bird (2018) 472.
[20] Doulamis (2011) 22–30.
[21] Heath (2004) 163.

can be."[22] This concept implies that genre is the term we use to refer to a given set of expectations based on various rules: that is, the use of genre dictates how authors write within a specific medium and the types of plots and characters an audience can anticipate. However, genre is also a name for how the representative or the societal norm is encoded.[23] In essence, genre not only supplies the formal attributes of text, prose, or poetry (in meters such as dactylic hexameter or iambic pentameter), but also the socially defined contexts for engagement with a text: for example, plays must be seen at a theatre.

Genre also has the ability to influence emotions; it is a way of organizing emotional expectations and structuring the reader's emotional contract with fiction and other forms of writing.[24] LaCourse Munteanu notes that the deliberation about the emotional impact of certain genres, especially tragedy, appears as early as Plato's *Republic* and continues through a long tradition of critical concern about the emotional effects of genres both as a psychological and social issue.[25] For example, there is ample evidence that the ancient Greeks believed that women were more emotional than men, or at least expressed their emotion more openly. LaCourse Munteanu argues that Hippocrates' fifth-century treatise, *The Diseases of Young Girls*, develops the idea that "biological differences between genders account for women's predisposition to delve into sorrow."[26] This evaluation of women's emotional expression is often represented in

---

[22] Heath (2004) 163.
[23] Goldhill (2008) 186 notes that the societal norms of a city or community are reinforced through genre. Certain genres, such as Old Comedy, make a point to depict seemingly outlandish scenarios, as in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, which in the end demonstrates the negative possibilities of women running the government.
[24] LaCourse Munteanu (2011) 2.
[25] LaCourse Munteanu (2011) 4.
[26] LaCourse Munteanu (2011) 5.

ancient literature from Medea's blind rage at Jason to Dido's tragic suicide following Aeneas' departure.

Most importantly, however, is the valorization of genres and the politics of representation. By valorization I mean the politics of which genres are employed, quoted, given recognition to, and incorporated into the canon. Genre defines what can be seen and accepted and who is able to depict these things. Goldhill notes that the specific attributes of genres are demarcated in a dynamic that cannot be separated from the politics of society; after all, should not the genre-defining Roman elegiac poets, Tibullus, Gallus, Propertius, and Ovid, be read as significantly coming into existence in and against the powerful social norms of the Principate?[27] More than anything, genre is meant to limit and define what is acceptable and unacceptable in society in a more productive light than laws. The rules of genre are seen explicitly through ancient rhetoric, from Isocrates to Libanius, where the rules of rhetoric serve as an integral element of rhetorical performance and its critical reception.[28] However, through genres, modern scholars can also see the shift in political and public interests. For example, by the time Chariton is writing in the mid-first century BCE, there is a shift in the representation of women as the more dominant partner in a relationship, especially expressed in both the novel and in Roman elegy.[29]

According to Goldhill, there are three major critiques of common strategies used when defining genre. The first is that genre is often treated primarily as a formalist question, where attributes of a genre are listed and then a particular work is considered a

[27] Goldhill (2008) 188.
[28] Braund (2001) 138.
[29] It must be noted that this literary construct of dominant women and more subservient men does not correlate to the reality of Roman society at large.

member of that genre according to whether it has enough of those attributes or not.[30] While this method is interesting and necessary in some ways, it forces the reader to focus on the *topoi* and ignore the social and cultural impact of the performance. This is not to say that recognizing *topoi* is frivolous, but that the investigation of genre should not end there. The second critique is that genres are often treated as ahistorical.[31] Cairns argues that "genres are as old as organized societies; they are also universal … in a very real sense antiquity was a time free zone."[32] This argument, however, ignores the relevance of the cultural context of the novel and makes it difficult to see any cultural or historical importance of a work of literature through a generic lens. The third critique stems from the first two in that if a genre is defined by its formal characteristics and exists in an ahistorical system, then it is extremely hard, as Goldhill notes, to "bring it into contact with the essential frames of politics, desire, and cultural change."[33]

One issue that often arises when discussing the novel's genre is that there is no ancient term for the novel.[34] Scholars have been able to come up with only three potential references to novels: Philostratus (*Lives of the Sophists* 254) refers to a work called *Araspes and Pantheia*, which is sometimes thought to be a novel; Philostratus also attacks a certain Chariton for his *logoi* in *Letter* 66, but it is unclear if this is the novelist

[30] Goldhill (2008) 189 gives the example of the Roman novels, which in earlier scholarship were not considered to be in the same genre of the Greek novels because the plotlines and *topoi* are completely different. More recent scholarship, such as Morgan and Harrison (2008) and Doulamis (2011), argues that the structural parallels of the prose composition and the heavy use of allusions and intertexts places both the Greek and Roman novels in the same genre.
[31] LaCourse Munteanu (2011) 7.
[32] Cairns (1972) 32–34.
[33] Goldhill (2008) 189.
[34] While the novel has no specific ancient term, according to LaCourse Munteanu (2011) 5, there is a range of vocabulary used for other ancient genres. Examples include: Menander Rhetor lists and defines the characteristics of various types of productions, such as *propemptika* for wedding songs; Lucian discusses his shifts between rhetoric and dialogue; Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.93) refers to satire as specifically Roman; epic and tragedy are discussed as recognized types of literature.

Chariton; finally, in *Letter* 89b, the emperor Julian dismissed "fictions" (*πλάσματα*) "in the form of histories, such as love stories and all that sort of stuff."[35] The novels' authors themselves rarely refer to their own compositions. Heliodorus, the latest novelist, refers to his work, *Aethiopica*, as a "composition" (*σύνταγμα*)[36] and Chariton announces that his "final book" (*σύγγραμμα*) will be most pleasant for the readers.[37] However, as Bowie points out, genre names are not attached to other literary innovations of the imperial period: for example, Lucian's comic dialogue and Aristides' prose hymns.[38] Whitmarsh also agrees that "the lack of any precise denotation does not itself mean that there was no genre, or that the genre lacked a strong sense of conviction."[39] Goldhill points out that using the term "novel" when there was no ancient equivalent might distort our understanding of the expectations of readers and writers to impose such a frame upon these texts.[40] However, he immediately counters this argument by pointing out that it is not only nominalist, but also that the non-existence of the name "novel" in ancient Greek does not outweigh the parallels of structure, form, and theme between the different texts.[41] I agree with Goldhill's argument that the parallels between the Greek novels, and Roman novels for that matter, far outweigh the lack of a direct name for the genre.

There are several benefits for the modern understanding of the novel that come with the recognition of the novel as a genre. The first is that seeing the novels together has allowed scholars to explore the narrative techniques of these texts.[42] The second is

---

[35] Goldhill (2008) 190.
[36] *Aethiopica* 10.41.4.
[37] *Callirhoe* 8.1.4.
[38] Bowie (1994) 442.
[39] Whitmarsh (2005) 589.
[40] Goldhill (2008) 191.
[41] Goldhill (2008) 191.
[42] Whitmarsh (2005b) 588.

that categorizing the novel as a genre requires a re-evaluation of its place in literary history.[43] Bowie notes that it is only by seeing the texts together as a genre that the full scale of their genealogy and the full impact of their bricolage can be appreciated.[44] Additionally, the uniqueness of the novel is more fully appreciated when one considers how it is written in and against a long literary and cultural tradition. Finally, the Greek novel has been taken as a sign and symbol of major ideological shifts in Imperial culture.[45] Stephens points out that the novel is a telling source for understanding the construction of the image of Greek cultural identity in the empire because it is a space to imagine Greekness without Rome.[46] I argue that Chariton's novel in particular, as the earliest available evidence of the Greek novels, provides the framework which subsequent Greek novelists will begin from and adapt. The representation of unique character traits, especially concerning women's roles and attitudes, takes form in Chariton's *Callirhoe* and helps to establish the genre of the novel. Chariton establishes these distinctive characterizations in opposition to the original source that he is alluding to..

Within my thesis, I examine the allusions Chariton makes to two important Greek genres: tragedy and epic. Within this analysis, I unpack the ways in which Chariton both writes his female protagonist, Callirhoe, alongside the existing representations of women in these genres. In addition, I explore how Chariton distinguishes Callirhoe from Medea, Helen, and Penelope by Callirhoe's rejection of their way of thought, as in the case of Medea, as well as by Chariton's depiction of the nuclear family and the loyalty owed to

[43] Goldhill (2008) 195.
[44] Bowie (1994) 458.
[45] Goldhill (2008) 196.
[46] Stephens (2008) 61.

that family. Through this investigation, I aim to point out the nuanced ways in which Chariton goes about establishing his work in the literary canon and ensuring his work stands as an example for later Greek novels.

Gender

There are many ways to explore gender within a text. According to Suzanne Dixon, who focuses on the representation, sexuality, morality, and legal and economic roles of women in Roman literature, the most traditional method of exploring gender is to assign certain actions, ways of speaking, and emotions displayed in a text as either masculine or feminine.[47] Based on this division, any deviation from this expected binary is considered unusual and worthy of mention. This technique of analyzing gender is acceptable in its basic appeal to a human's fundamental need to categorize; however, this is not the only way in which gender can be evaluated within and across texts. For example, one can easily assess that within Euripides' play, Medea assumes a stronger presence compared to Jason; however, stopping at that point would leave out any analysis of the political, societal, or gendered effect this subversion of gender roles creates.

One cannot discuss gender and sexuality without mentioning Michel Foucault's three-volume *The History of Sexuality*, which broadly examines the emergence of sexuality as an expansive subject and separate sphere of life. In particular, the third volume of this work, in which Foucault addresses antiquity and the shifting views of marriage, appeals to my project.[48] Traditionally, the connection between the act of sex and marriage was based on the need to procreate. However, as the relationships between

[47] Dixon (2001) 29.
[48] Foucault (1986) 159–194.

a husband and a wife seem to develop beyond the need for procreation, sexual ethics as portrayed in literature became more concerned with reciprocity.[49] This shift to the idea of an equally faithful marriage is best exemplified in the Greek novels, in which both the male and female protagonist are expected to stay faithful to one another. The method I apply in this thesis is to examine the ways in which Chariton manipulates his portrayal of the female gender against the expectations of gender set up in tragedy and epic in order to make the gender and character expectations within the novel distinct. This technique is especially appropriate for the novels, which draw heavily on previous literary works, and, according to Andrew Laird, who studies the style and rhetoric of the Greek novels, the swapping of expectations is as much a part of the novel's style as its utilization of *ekphrases*.[50] Doulamis takes this discussion a step farther by analyzing the complex layering that novelists put into their plots, in which they try to doubly trick the reader, such as in the court case between Chaereas and Dionysius in Book Five of Chariton's novel.[51] Dionysius' failure to win the lawsuit using the oratorical style of Lysias, the famous Greek orator, appears to hold a kind of literary irony.[52] Novelists also use shifts of expectations to develop qualities for the characters in their genre. In Chapter One, I examine how Chariton manipulates his plot and rhetoric so that the reader expects Callirhoe to follow Medea's example in killing her child. However, at the last second, he drastically changes the outcome and redefines how a tragic scenario might play out in the novel. Critical to this decision, however, is Callirhoe's relationship with her husband and

[49] Foucault (1986) 180.
[50] Laird (2008) 205. Bowie (2005) also examines the horizon of expectations in the Greek novels; in this chapter, Bowie analyzes the ending of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* as an unexpected rejection of the city and the biological family in favor of the natural landscape of the country that adopts the two lovers.
[51] Doulamis (2011) 45–46.
[52] Doulamis (2011) 45 notes that the Greek audience is unsure who they should cheer for: the Persian man utilizing the methods of one of their most famous orators, or the Greek man.

her loyalty to him and their family. In her decision to save her child, Chariton emphasizes the importance of the family and the wife's duty to preserve it.

Since the overarching *topoi* of Chariton's novel are love, marriage, and fidelity, my examination of gender also involves the politics of relationships. By the politics of relationships I mean the duties that are determined by the expectations that are assigned to that gender within each specific relationship. For example, in the *Odyssey*, it is Penelope's responsibility, as the wife, to stay home and keep watch over Odysseus' home while he is in Troy. I examine how this expectation for the wife to be tied to the *οἶκος* shifts in Chariton's novel, and what effect this shift has on their relationship. Additionally, through the use of allusions, Chariton encourages his reader to align certain characters in his narrative to their equivalents in epic and tragedy. This allows for the characters, and in particular the female protagonist Callirhoe, to be linked to someone other than their husband and to form a kind of literary autonomy in which they can be discussed outside of their relationship with their partner. Throughout my thesis, then, I examine the relationship Callirhoe builds between herself and these respective female protagonists: Medea, Helen, and Penelope. Exploring these allusion-relationships offers a better understanding of the protagonist Callirhoe and facilitates an analysis of the specific aspects of the reference characters Chariton draws upon, including whether they are coded negatively or positively by the author. Furthermore, my analysis allows for the assessment of the subtle yet distinct differences Chariton makes between his own protagonist and those of other genres, which then define the characteristics of a female protagonist in his novel.[53]

[53] Morales (2008) 42 importantly recognizes that even within the novels themselves, the characteristics of a protagonist, especially a female protagonist, change from novel to novel. For example, Chariton is the only

Chapter Synopsis

In Chapter One I argue that, despite their similarities, mothers in the novel make fundamentally different decisions from mothers in Greek tragedy. Maternal agency in the novel ultimately leads to the preservation of the family, while maternal agency in tragedy leads to the dissolution of families. Additionally, in this chapter I argue that Chariton establishes this difference in motherhood in order to create a critical distance that sets his novel apart from the genre of tragedy. I begin with an in-depth examination of the history of Medea, especially with regard to the mythology surrounding the murder of her children. In the first section, I bring attention to the ways in which Chariton's use of allusion calls for a natural alignment of the characters Medea and Callirhoe. In this section I focus on the main driving forces behind the deliberation of killing their children and examines how Chariton has manipulated Callirhoe's situation in order to align her familial and marital circumstances with Medea's. In the second section, I examine the motivations, deliberations, and outcomes of their contemplations to kill their children. In this section, I argue that Chariton introduces the possibility that Callirhoe might kill her child in order to momentarily draw his reader outside the realm of the novel into the world of tragedy. Ultimately, however, Callirhoe rejects the tragic path of killing her child, choosing instead to save her child and honor her husband. By doing this, Chariton begins to set up the qualifications of women and mothers in his novel as women who are more concerned with the preservation of family than they are with its destruction.

Greek novelist to marry his characters before the ending of the story and have his heroine marry twice. In comparison, Heliodorus' heroine is a foreigner by birth. These subtle changes mark the transformation of the genre and the historical and political changes happening outside the realm of the novel.

In Chapter Two I explore the epic influences and allusions within Chariton's novel, specifically in regards to Helen and Penelope. The first section examines how access to knowledge about Callirhoe's intentions and actions affects how the protagonists Callirhoe, Dionysius, and Chaereas align Callirhoe with either Penelope or Helen. I examine how each of these characters—Callirhoe, Dionysius, and Chaereas—have an unequal access to knowledge about Callirhoe's intentions and thoughts and how this gap in knowledge creates the opportunity for Callirhoe to be seen through different lenses. Through these three perspectives there emerges a collection of similar behaviors and mannerisms that invites the comparison of Callirhoe to Penelope and Helen. The second section examines the importance of memory and forgetfulness for maintaining a family and an *oἶκος*. Because marriage and fidelity are prominent tropes when talking about Penelope and Helen, it is only natural that I examine memory and forgetfulness in regard to the domestic sphere of the *oἶκος*. Furthermore, I examine how remarriage is discussed in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, focusing on the importance of remembering a husband's home and how this home is forgotten when a woman remarries. I then expand on how the same language and similar attitudes are displayed in Chariton's novel; however, the author takes the concept of domestic and marital memory farther by extending the responsibility and act of marital memory beyond the duty of the wife. By including husbands in the duty of marital memory, Chariton is able to expand the traditional nuclear family (husband, wife, and child), to one that can include adopted children and additional partners.

In conclusion, I argue that Chariton heavily employs intertexts and allusions throughout his novel, especially with regard to his female protagonists. Through these

allusions, Chariton is not only able to insert himself and his work within the literary canon, but he is also able to develop his genre by juxtaposing his heroine with those of the genres of tragedy and epic. By the end of his novel, Chariton is able both to establish the ideal traits of a female character within the novel and also develop the important *topos* of the blended family.

Chapter 1:

Mother Knows Best: Chariton's Play with Tragic Expectations

Introduction

From Apollonius to Seneca, the impact of Medea's story, actions, and inexorable descent into an uncontainable rage ensnared Greek and Roman authors and audiences alike. The earliest depictions of Medea come from an archaic text *Korinthiaka* by Eumelos, from which the Greek writer Apollonius of Rhodes heavily draws for his epic poem the *Argonautica*.[54] Eumelos' text introduces the establishment of the hero-cult of Medea's children at the sanctuary of Hera Akraia where in this version Medea buries her children alive after they are born, believing her children would become immortal. After Eumelos, subsequent authors also include the murder of Medea's children, though they do not always die by their mother's hand. In Kreophylos' text (fr. 3) Medea murders Kreon and leaves her children at the sanctuary to Hera Akraia believing Jason will care for them, but Kreon's family instead murders the children.[55] Renditions of Medea's myths continue to flourish and evolve through the Roman era. Pausanias, the second-century CE periegetic author, offers another layer to the myth whereby Medea's children are stoned to death by the Corinthians as revenge for the murder of Glauke, the Corinthian princess and daughter of Kreon.[56] However, it is much earlier in the fifth century BCE when Medea is depicted as killing her children as a revenge tactic against Jason. There has been a long-standing scholarly debate over which Greek tragedian first portrays this side of Medea. Dikaiarchos argues that Neophron first depicts Medea

[54] West (2002) 118.
[55] Scholia B at Euripides *Medea* 264 (ed. Schwartz); Fowler (2013) 232.
[56] Pausanias *Description of Greece* 2.3.6; Gantz (1993) 370.

murdering her children, though, of course, she does so most famously in Euripides' tragedy.[57] Despite these various accounts, it is clear that fifth-century BCE authors portrayed Medea as a child murderer.

Roman-era poets such as Ovid in his *Heroides* and Seneca in his *Medea* utilize Medea as a dramatic character in their texts to rebuke and scorn her actions. The Greek author Chariton of Aphrodisias, on the other hand, is able to exploit the notoriety of Medea, made infamous by previous authors, and draw an allusion to her ill-famed deeds without making her a character in his works. In his *Callirhoe*, a novel written almost five-hundred years after Euripides' play *Medea*, Chariton is able to draw upon Euripides' version of Medea and summon it to the minds of the audience in just three words: *Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμούς;* "Do you take up Medea's reasonings?" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.4).[58] This question reveals much about the impact Medea has had on subsequent narratives about female agency, or lack thereof, in Greek and Roman literature. Up to this point in literary history, Medea has been a figure for female agency insofar as she makes decisions about her own life and the life and death of her children, and expresses her rage toward her husband for abandoning them by murdering his new bride. Chariton purposefully depicts Callirhoe as exhibiting a similar mythological background and facing analogous choices as Medea. At the point in the novel when Callirhoe poses this question, she finds herself in a predicament very similar to Medea's: she has been

[57] Mastronarde (2002) 64 argues that there is insufficient evidence to support a dogmatic conclusion, though the textual evidence suggests that the fragments ascribed to Neophron come from a play dating later than Euripides' *Medea*.

[58] There are several debates centered around the actual date of the text. Scholars such as Gould (1995), Bowie (2008), and Tilg (2010) date the text to the mid-first century BCE. However, in his review of Gould's Loeb edition of *Callirhoe*, Hunter (1996) is disappointed with Gould's lack of engagement with the possibilities of other dates presented by earlier scholars. Bowie (2002) notes that the date used by most modern scholars comes from the papyri of the text, which dates to around 75 BCE. Due to the dating of the papyri, I have to agree with Gould and other scholars who date the text to the mid-first century BCE.

separated from her country (Syracuse), faces a life without her husband (Chaereas), and must decide what she will do both with herself and with the child she has recently found out she is carrying while separated from her home.

As wives who have recently lost their husbands' protection, both Medea and Callirhoe are afforded a rare opportunity, unlike many female characters in Greek literature, to make autonomous decisions about new alliances they believe will secure their futures; however, as mothers, both women are faced with an unconscionable decision about killing their suddenly fatherless children. Mastronarde brings up the fact that "[ancient] women are rarely imagined as autonomous agents, and thus are thought to be incapable of participating as free human beings in the fullest sense in the exercise of all the virtues valued by society and by dominant social and ethical philosophies."[59] I do not agree completely with Mastronarde's claim because there are so many ancient texts in which women are imagined as at least pseudo-autonomous agents (Antigone, Hecuba, Alcestis, etc.). While these women may not necessarily have full control over every decision in their life, as Medea does, they still exhibit forms of autonomy that perhaps the average Greek woman would not or could not show. Chariton's allusion to Medea, then, is not meant to draw attention to the solitary example of female autonomy in Greek texts. Instead, the intent of the allusion is to pick the strongest of many examples from which he can make the clearest juxtaposition in the traits he deems acceptable for a novel protagonist. By connecting Medea and Callirhoe, Chariton creates an expectation, based on the genre of the former protagonist, for how Callirhoe will handle the decision to kill her child. In addition, Chariton also encourages the audience to evaluate Callirhoe's

[59] Mastronarde (2010) 247.

behavior in light of the similar circumstances presented by the model of Medea in order to surprise them with an outcome that is completely different.

This chapter, then, primarily explores both the qualifications as well as the outcomes of autonomy exercised by the two female protagonists Medea and Callirhoe. It also examines their ability to make a decision that not only affects the private sphere of their households, where the majority of female decisions are made, but also the public sphere, which threatens to disturb the city where the majority of male decisions are made.[60] Foley notes the importance of this distinction between private and public spaces especially in tragedy, which as a genre "makes meaning by collapsing boundaries between private and public worlds; highlights crises and failures in the system; and imagines ways of escaping these intractable and contradictory problems."[61] It is my contention that the Chariton also uses women to test out theories of systemic freedom; however, as will be discussed later in the chapter, these explorations are hardly as destructive to the plot and family unit as those portrayed in tragedy.[62]

Furthermore, I argue that, despite their similarities, mothers in the novel are fundamentally different from mothers in Greek tragedy; maternal agency in the novel ultimately leads to the preservation of the family, while maternal agency in tragedy leads to the dissolution of families. In order to prove this, I first explore the similarities between Medea, a tragic woman, and Callirhoe, a woman from the novel, not only in

---

[60] Foley (2001) 8 notes that the majority of the autonomous decisions made by female characters in Greek tragedy involve domestic rather than public life, but that Medea is an exception to this because her decision to kill Kreon and his daughter affects the public, and thus pushes her out of the private sphere.
[61] Foley (2001) 59–60.
[62] McClure (1999) 28 notes that women in tragedies are often encouraged to stay within the home, and those that are outside are represented as "subverting male social hierarchy" and "represent the male anxiety about the transmission and consolidation of power among the political elite in the democratic polis through the control of speech." She further notes: "Decisions by tragic wives often have, intentionally or not, devastating consequences" (29).

terms of their life experiences, but also in the ways that both of these female protagonists are separated from male oversight. This newfound freedom allows Medea and Callirhoe to use their agency to make life changing decisions for themselves and their families. Second, I investigate the ways in which the motivations behind, deliberations before, and outcomes of these mothers' decisions are appropriate to their respective literary genres. This examination helps to showcase the points at which Callirhoe's behavior and thinking deviates from Medea's and, in the process, to delineate a novel from a tragic outcome. Finally, I explore the authorial intent behind Chariton's explicit citation of Medea and its implications for thinking about the genre of the novel itself. In doing this, I show that Chariton establishes a connection with Euripides' play through his allusion to Medea and use of Euripidean language, while simultaneously creating a critical distance that sets his novel apart from the genre of tragedy.

Mothers in Distress: Evoking Medea in the Greek Novel

Chariton's *Callirhoe* begins at Syracuse where we first find Callirhoe. In brief summary, the novel tells the tale of two young, very beautiful lovers, Callirhoe and Chaereas, who fall in love and get married. A while after their marriage, Chaereas is led to believe Callirhoe is cheating on him and, in a rage, kicks his pregnant wife. Believed to be dead, Callirhoe is buried and then found alive by tomb robbers. The robbers take Callirhoe from her tomb and convey her to Miletus where she is sold as a slave to the steward of the general Dionysius. Callirhoe marries Dionysius in Miletus in order to protect her child by Chaereas. After learning of Callirhoe's abduction, Chaereas leaves Syracuse to find his bride but is enslaved himself. While she is married to Dionysius,

Callirhoe's beauty enchants those who see her: the satrap Mithridates, Artaxerxes, and even the Persian king, who presides over a trial between Mithridates and Dionysius concerning Callirhoe. It is at this trial that Chaereas and Callirhoe are reunited and again torn apart. After a war between the Persians and the Egyptians, the couple is eventually reunited and they return to Syracuse to live out their lives without their child, whom Callirhoe has given to Dionysius for safekeeping.

In the first book, Chariton subtly builds similarities between Medea and his title character, Callirhoe, by having her experience the gradual loss of male guidance and control that also affected the life of the protagonist Medea. The result of this loss of male guidance is gained autonomy for the two women. However, this autonomy is not, and cannot be, the same as the autonomy given inherently to male characters in ancient literature because Medea and Callirhoe must make decisions for both themselves and their children. As a result, both of these women must negotiate their future marriages while also considering their status as mothers. This section investigates the conjugal status of these two women and the ways in which their recently gained agency allows them to choose their second husbands.

Although the audience might not feel the full weight of the allusion until Callirhoe explicitly refers to herself as a Medea (see more below), upon hindsight the reader can detect how Chariton first begins to recall Medea the moment Callirhoe gets married. The Greek wedding ceremony is one instance in which women are protected by their male relatives. The act of the father of the bride leading the bride from his home to the home of the bridegroom is known as *ekdosis* (giving out); this ceremony symbolized the beginning of the sexual relationship of the couple and also the ability the father had to

take his daughter back if he chooses.[63] The circumstances of Medea's and Callirhoe's marriages start off differently. Unlike Medea, Callirhoe is given away by her father in a proper wedding (*Callirhoe* 1.1.15–16)[64] and is happily settled in her fatherland after the wedding (*Callirhoe* 1.1.16). However, when the contrivances of scorned lovers causes Chaereas, Callirhoe's husband, to "kill" her in a fit of jealousy, Medea and Callirhoe's situations rapidly begin to align.[65] This gradual alignment sets up what I call a "tragic expectation," in which the audience, being familiar with tragic narratives, sees another character experiencing a comparable situation typically portrayed in tragedy and expects this character to act in a similar way to their tragic counterpart.

The Greek tragedian Euripides, though not the first author to have Medea kill her children, is the first to have her openly contemplate the action.[66] She finds herself taken from her fatherland: Medea is seized by Jason, but when Medea considers the full weight of her decisions, she concludes that women who reside in their homeland are more secure than those taken.

> *ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸς πρὸς κἄμ' ἥκει λόγος·*
> *σοὶ μὲν <u>πόλις</u> θ' ἥδ' ἐστὶ καὶ πατρὸς δόμοι*
> *βίου τ' ὄνησις καὶ φίλων συνουσία,*
> *ἐγὼ δ' ἔρημος <u>ἄπολις</u> οὖσ' ὑβρίζομαι* 255
> *πρὸς ἀνδρός, ἐκ γῆς βαρβάρου <u>λελησμένη</u>,*
> *<u>οὐ μητέρ'</u>, <u>οὐκ ἀδελφόν</u>, <u>οὐχὶ συγγενῆ</u>*
> *μεθορμίσασθαι τῆσδ' ἔχουσα συμφορᾶς.*
>
> But that is beside the point, since the story is not the same for me too.
> On the one hand you have this city and your father's home
> and the advantage of livelihood and a community of friends,

[63] Ebbot (2003) 22.
[64] All citations to Chariton's *Callirhoe* are from the edition by Reardon (2004). All translations are my own.
[65] It should be noted that Callirhoe is in fact not dead, but stunned to the point of death for approximately two days (1.5.1).
[66] Gantz (1993) 371.

> but I, desolate and <u>without a city</u>, am outrageously maltreated 255
> by my husband, since <u>I was plundered</u> from a foreign land,
> and have <u>no mother</u>, <u>no brother</u>, and <u>no kinsmen</u>
> to shift my anchorage from this misfortune.
> (Euripides, *Medea* 252–258)[67]

Here Medea points out the advantages for women who stay in their homeland, namely, that they have family to depend upon if things start going wrong with their husband, a privilege Medea calls *βίου τ'ὄνησις καὶ φίλων συνουσία* (the advantage of livelihood and a community of friends, 254). Furthermore, Medea describes her situation in stark binary terms. The women in Corinth have a *πόλις* while Medea is *ἄπολις* (without a city, 255); the Corinthian women have a *φίλων συνουσία* (community of friends, 254) while Medea is *ἔρημος* (desolate, 255). Mastronarde notes that this direct comparison of the Corinthian women made by Medea is meant to emphasize the special liabilities of isolation she faces as a foreigner. A normal Corinthian woman would be able to get divorced and have some sort of community to fall back on, whereas Medea has no one.[68] Foley points out that in the fourth and fifth centuries BCE, the vocabulary used in texts suggests that women were no longer, as in Homeric marriage, the valuable gift in an aristocratic exchange of gifts and services. Instead, women were the objects of an economic contract between the bridegroom and the father of the bride, in which the bride was lent to the bridegroom in order to procreate, but could be called back to her father's household should the father request it.[69] This shift in contract was mainly due to the laws of Solon and Pericles in Athens, which encouraged intercommunal marriages in order to make the city itself

[67] All citations of Euripides' *Medea* are from the edition by Van Looy (1992). All translations are my own.
[68] Mastronarde (2002) 214.
[69] Foley (2001) 67.

stronger.[70] In Medea's case, however, she is taken from her father and community entirely, and thus her father cannot protect her from his side of the contract.[71]

Medea's use of *ληίζομαι* (plundered, 256) and *μεθορμίζω* (shift anchorage, 258) are also of interest as both of these words are suggestive of the metaphor of sea voyage. While the verb *ληίζομαι* is not necessarily connected with ships, Euripides' usage in connection with the verb *μεθορμίζω* as well as the myth of Medea and the golden fleece, which has strong connections to sailing, lend the reader to interpret the verb with a nautical flare. It is debated whether Medea was taken from Colchis or she went willingly. Most accounts depict Medea either willingly following Jason to the ship Argo (Pindar, Apollodorus, Pherekydes) or wandering to the ship after hearing the crew moving about (Apollonius).[72] However, it seems as though Medea is using *λελῃσμένη* in conjunction with *μεθορμίζω* as a way to further convince the chorus of her helplessness. Not only is Medea depicting herself as an unanchored vessel floating helplessly out at sea, but she is also forcibly taken away from those that could anchor her such as her mother, brother, and kin. The parallel between Medea and a ship at sea emphasizes the point that she has no place of her own. There is literally nothing she can connect herself to in Corinth or really anywhere in Greece because Medea lacks everything that ties someone to a place: their city, parents, friends, and livelihood. Without these things,

[70] Ebbot (2003) 9–13.
[71] Foley (2001) 87 notes that tragedies were focused on reinstating legitimacy to children, and so plays, such as *Medea*, focus their attention on the negative aspects of marriages in doubt and possible illegitimacy of children. In addition, they point out flaws in the Homeric system of marriage in order to make Pericles' laws more appealing to the people. For further investigation into the imagery and fears of illegitimacy see also Ebbot (2003).
[72] Fowler (2013) 228.

Medea has no home.[73] Though Medea's rendition of events might not hold true to her myth, it is clear that she is using this deliberate wording to garner sympathy from the chorus as well as the audience.

In the novel *Callirhoe*, Chariton seems to be drawing off of Euripides' *Medea* through the use of similar vocabulary and set of circumstances to describe Callirhoe's situation. Callirhoe, like Medea, laments her newfound status as a foreign captive when she is captured and taken as plunder by pirates from Sicily to Miletus. The pirates turn Callirhoe into an object rather than a subject when they refuse to let her have any say about what will happen to her after they discover her in the tomb (*Callirhoe* 1.10.1–8). In addition, Theron, the pirate captain, refers to Callirhoe as *κέρδος* (profit,) stating that he would rather sell the girl than kill her (*Callirhoe* 1.10.8). Theron's referral to Callirhoe as *κέρδος* draws attention back to Medea stating she was *λελῃσμένη* (plundered, 256). Not only are both women objectified as something that can be taken from their rightful home, but also as objects that will soon cross the sea into a foreign land, which serves to emphasize the helplessness of both women in their situations. Callirhoe laments both herself and the child she is carrying *ἐπι ποίαις ἐλπίσι μέλλω σε κυοφορεῖν, ὀρφανὲ καὶ ἄπολι καὶ δοῦλε* "With what kind of hope am I to be pregnant with you, oh fatherless child and one without a city and a slave?" (*Callirhoe* 2.8.7). The use of *ἄπολις* (without a city) in connection to a woman is very Euripidean.[74] Callirhoe's speech also resonates

[73] Mastronarde (2002) 35 notes that "the image of the storm and voyage is well suited to the story of Medea…her woes are like the water in the bilge threatening to make the ship founder, she lacks a place to anchor herself safely until Aegus offers her a harbor to moor in."

[74] The word itself is used often in tragedy as a whole, however, it is usually connected with men such as in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* 1357, or referring to a ruined city as in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* 457 and Euripides' *Trojan Women* 1292. Euripides alone uses *ἄπολις* in connection with women who are forced to leave their homeland such as in *Medea* 255. It should also be noted about Euripides' *Trojan Women* that while Hecuba is never described as *ἄπολις*, she exhibits similar traits to Medea who calls herself this: she is

with Medea's lament about her circumstance. Medea describes herself by way of tragic tricolon as having *οὐ μητέρ', οὐκ ἀδελφόν, οὐχὶ συγγενῆ* "no mother, no brother, and no kinsmen" (*Medea* 257). Callirhoe echoes Medea's lament claiming that her son, and by extension herself, is *ὀρφανὲ* (fatherless). For all the comparisons Medea makes between herself and the Corinthian women, she never brings up the fact that she is not a citizen and does not have the same rights they do. Callirhoe, however, takes her predicament one step further by making explicit that to be without a city or fatherland means that one is a *δοῦλος* (slave). Though Callirhoe tends to focus her speeches on the impact her current predicament has on her child, it is clear that she is in the same situation as he is: both lack a country, both have lost their fathers, and both are now considered slaves. The child is still in her womb and thus a part of her, but throughout her speeches Callirhoe chooses to phrase her decisions and fears based around the child. Callirhoe's projection of her fears on to her child is one way she tries to disassociate from the situation. However, every decision she makes about the life of her child equally involves a decision she is making about her own life. In their respective speeches, both Medea and Callirhoe demonstrate the impact the *polis* and family have on decisions women choose to make.

Moreover, these women's first husbands, Jason and Chaereas, are directly responsible for the capture and subsequent journey of their former wives. Medea specifically lays blame on Jason when she describes her situation: *ὑβρίζομαι / πρὸς ἀνδρός, ἐκ γῆς βαρβάρου λελῃσμένη* "I am mistreated by my husband, since I was plundered from a foreign land" (*Medea* 255-56). Medea is not the only one who blames Jason for her current plight: in the prologue, the Nurse also laments the sailing of the

---

being forced to leave her home and she is husbandless. The entirety of this play describes the process of becoming *ἄπολις*.

Argo to Colchis and the consequences that followed (*Medea* 1–45). As for Callirhoe, she, too, suffers the fate of an unplanned relocation as a result of her husband's actions. Chaereas, Callirhoe's husband, orchestrates a citywide funeral for his wife after "killing" her on the very day that a band of pirates decides to visit Sicily looking for treasure. The pirate band, witnessing the vast amounts of gold being laid in the tomb can hardly wait until nightfall to claim their prize, at which time they discover Callirhoe alive in her tomb. After a heated debate about whether or not to kill her, the pirate captain decides to take and sell Callirhoe as a slave *(Callirhoe* 1.10.6–10). By this act of plundering, both women are represented as being nothing more than stolen objects. Medea's reference to herself as an object of plunder (*λελησμένη*, 256) essentially equates her to the golden fleece Jason also plundered from Colchis, while Callirhoe is included with the other funeral treasures (*Callirhoe* 1.9.6). However, after enduring this forced seizure from their homelands and being separated from their husbands, both women are able to combat and shed this title of helpless plundered object when they take their own fate into their hands and make decisions independent of their male overseers.

Similar, albeit unconventional, trials drive Medea and Callirhoe in particular to exercise their personal agency to murder their children. In addition to being without a father or the customs of their fatherland, both women also find themselves in a sort of liminal marital status, or in between husbands: this liminality is perhaps riskier than anything else they face because they cannot be categorized as one simple thing. Prior to the action of the Euripidean play, Jason has announced his divorce from Medea and is either preparing for or has already gone through with his marriage to Glauke the princess of Corinth. Meanwhile, Medea, after her meeting with her soon-to-be-husband Aegeus

(*Medea* 663–759), has arranged her exit strategy from Corinth as well as a future marriage. With Jason completely cut from her life and her new husband secured, Medea can now fully debate the merits and faults of continuing her plan of killing her children (1044–1064, discussed in greater-depth below). It is clear that this liminal space between having any male center of control over her allows Medea to take on what Foley describes as "tragic autonomous action," in which a character sees herself as taking deliberate action for which she is willing to be held accountable, and where she or others see her as adopting the relatively greater social independence of the Greek male.[75]

Callirhoe's transition to her new marriage with Dionysius, a Milesian general under the Persian king, is not as smooth as Medea's, due to the fact that it is unclear whether she is still married to Chaereas or not. While some scholars, such as Egger and De Temmerman argue that Callirhoe is able to maintain her morality and *sophrosyne* (sexual fidelity) to Chaereas because she is forced or coerced into the marriage with Dionysius, they do not address whether Callirhoe is still legally married to Chaereas at the time of her decision.[76] If Callirhoe is not married to Chaereas and is therefore in this liminal state, then she can independently make a decision in regards to her life and next marriage, much like Medea does. It is clear that Callirhoe still loves Chaereas and wants to remain faithful to him: *θέλω γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν Χαρρέου μόνου γυνή. τοῦτό μοι καὶ γονέων ἥδιον καὶ πατρίδος καὶ τέκνου, πεῖραν ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου μὴ λαβεῖν* "I wish to die the wife of Chaereas only. This is even more dear to me than parents, fatherland, or child, trying not

[75] Foley (2001) 17.
[76] Egger (1994) 41. De Temmerman (2014) 64–65.

to take another husband" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.1).[77] However, I argue that because Callirhoe has been buried and everyone, especially Chaereas, believes she is dead, Callirhoe's marriage has been dissolved by her presumed death. One might claim, as Chaereas does much later in Book 5, that because Callirhoe was never really dead, she is still married to her first husband. If this is the case, then Callirhoe has less autonomy in her decision to kill or save her son because she is still tied to Chaereas' household and must act primarily in the interest of that household, instead of in her own interest.

In Book 5, Dionysius asks the king of Persia for a trial against another Persian satrap Mithridates, whom he suspects is impersonating Chaereas to win over Callirhoe's affections (5.1.1–8). However, Mithridates wins his trial by calling on the gods to help him produce Chaereas, who then appears (5.7.10). After Callirhoe confirms that it is truly Chaereas, both Dionysius and Chaereas argue over who is Callirhoe's true husband.

> *Προῆλθον δὲ μέχρι ῥημάτων. Χαιρέας μὲν ἔλεγε 'πρῶτός εἰμι ἀνήρ' Διονύσιος δὲ 'ἐγὼ βεβαιότερος.' 'Μὴ γὰρ ἀφῆκα τὴν γυναῖκα;' 'Ἀλλ' ἔθαψας αὐτήν.' 'Δεῖξον γάμου διάλυσιν.' 'Τὸν τάφον ὁρᾷς.' 'Ἔμοὶ πατὴρ ἐξέδωκεν.' 'Ἔμοὶ δὲ αὐτὴ ἑαυτήν.' 'Ἀνάξιος εἶ τῆς Ἑρμοκράτους θυγατρός.' 'Σὺ μᾶλλον ὁ παρὰ Μιθριδάτῃ δεδεμένος.' 'Ἀπαιτῶ Καλλιρρόην.' 'Ἐγὼ δὲ κατέχω.' 'Σὺ τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν κρατεῖς.' 'Σὺ τὴν σὴν ἀπέκτεινας.' 'Μοιχέ.' 'Φονεῦ.'*
>
> They continued as far as words. Chaereas said "I am her first husband." Then Dionysius "I am more reliable." "Did I divorce my wife?" "But you buried her." "Show me the dissolution of the marriage." "You can see her tomb." "Her father gave her to me." "She gave herself to me." "You are unworthy of the daughter of Hermocrates." "You are more unworthy, since you were chained up by Mithridates." "I demand Callirhoe back." "I am keeping her." "You are holding onto the woman of another man." "You killed your own." "Adulterer." "Murderer."
>
> (*Callirhoe* 5.8.5–6)

[77] It should be noted that I am not making a claim against Callirhoe's *sophrosyne*, only on the fact that she is legally able to marry Dionysius without being accused of adultery. For a comprehensive investigation into Callirhoe's continuous *sophrosyne*, see De Temmerman (2014) 50–61.

This argument between Dionysius and Chaereas acts as a fulcrum for the rhetorical arguments that the two men make: Dionysius believes burial equates to the dissolution of a marriage, whereas Chaereas disagrees with this. Dionysius brings up Callirhoe's burial and that her husband is the one that caused this supposed death four times in this speech: 1. *ἀλλ' ἔθαψας αὐτήν* (but you buried her); 2. *τὸν τάφον ὁρᾷς.* (you can see her tomb); 3. *σὺ τὴν σὴν ἀπέκτεινας* (you killed your own); 4. *φονεῦ* (murderer). According to Dionysius it is bad enough that Callirhoe was buried, but it is worse that her husband was the one that put her there. It is through this act of attempted murder and subsequent burial that Dionysius supports his claim to Callirhoe.[78]

Dionysius' reply to Chaereas *Ἐμοὶ δὲ αὐτὴ ἑαυτήν* (but she [gave] herself to me) also speaks to the Milesian general's claim to Callirhoe. Chaereas draws on the Greek custom of the father giving his daughter to the groom when he argues for the validity of his marriage: *Ἔμοὶ πατὴρ ἐξέδωκεν* "her father gave her to me" (5.6.5). The use of *ἐκδίδωμι* in this quote draws on the previously discussed marital practice of *ekdosis*, in which the father literally gives away his daughter. Chaereas makes it clear in his speech that the validity of his marriage stems from tradition, which has been handed down, by the literal handing over of the bride, from generation to generation. Dionysius' reply, however, breaks away from tradition and aligns itself with the more radical concept of women being allowed to choose their own husbands. Medea's choice to remarry aligns similarly to Callirhoe. Both women have no father or kin to set up another marriage, both

[78] Schwartz (2016) 85 also notes that during this scene the women of Babylon remind Callirhoe of her two options when it comes to her marriage, though it is not ultimately her decision whom she marries. 1. If Callirhoe is returned to Chaereas, she will see her father and homeland, but she might end up back in the tomb. 2. If Dionysius gets Callirhoe, she will stay with her child but she will also live as a stranger in exile.

need someone to protect them in the foreign land they find themselves in, and both approach the marriage in the style of a negotiation. Medea acts as her own negotiator, ensuring that she will have a safe place to flee to after she leaves Corinth (*Medea* 708–730); whereas Plangon, the slave of Dionysius, acts as a mediator between the potential bride and groom, ensuring that both get what they want, but hiding the fact that Callirhoe is pregnant (*Callirhoe* 3.1.5–8). Callirhoe does not lose her autonomy in her decision to marry Dionysius even though she does not negotiate directly with Dionysius. It is she alone who can consent to the marriage, and Dionysius makes clear that he would not marry her against her will.

In addition to Dionysius' arguments against Chaereas, there is literary evidence to provide backing to Dionysius' claims to Callirhoe. Euripides' *Alcestis* also deals with the situation of a wife, Alcestis, returning from the grave and getting remarried, though Callirhoe has more say in her second marriage. In this play, Alcestis volunteers to take the place of her husband Admetus in death. Herakles, while visiting Admetus, learns of Alcestis' recent sacrifice and decides to bring her back. However, instead of simply returning the bride to her husband, Herakles performs something akin to a wedding ritual before giving Alcestis back to Admetus. It should be noted that Alcestis goes to her grave *εὐπρεπῶς ἠσκήσατο* "dressed becomingly" (*Alcestis* 160).[79] Rehm interprets Alcestis' clothing in this scene as typical funeral garments.[80] However, when Herakles returns Alcestis from the Underworld, she is adorned in some sort of veil and clothes that a young woman would wear: *νέα γάρ, ὡς ἐσθῆτι καὶ κόσμῳ πρέπει* "for she is young, as is evident in her clothing and adornment" (*Alcestis* 1050). The clothes Alcestis returns in

[79] For the Greek of Euripides' *Alcestis* I follow Hamilton and Haslam (1980). All translations are my own.
[80] Rehm (1994) 85.

are clearly not the same as those she is buried in because Admetus does not recognize them. Rehm notes that the reunion between Alcestis and Admetus assumes the ritually appropriate form of a second wedding, drawing on the vocabulary and iconography of contemporary practice.[81] Herakles takes three careful, deliberate actions resembling those taken by the father or male guardian of the bride in marriage to ensure Alcestis would return to her husband: 1. Herakles tells Admetus to take the girl into his house (1097); 2. to take her with his right hand (1113–1115); 3. to lift the veil and look at her (1121–1122).[82] The death, burial, and resurrection of Alcestis seem to have transformed her into a new woman, and as such the reunion between the two lovers demands a remarriage. However, the situation between Alcestis and Callirhoe differs slightly because Herakles, acts as the *kurios*, or the father/paternal figure who has the legal power to lend the bride to the groom, as Alcestis returns the silent bride to her first husband. On the other hand, Callirhoe's *kurios*-equivalent would seem to be the band of pirates, who sells her to the first buyer, but with no intention of any marriage. Thus it is Callirhoe herself, as Dionysius points out, that gives herself to her second husband and makes the decision to get remarried.

Another way in which Callirhoe's burial signals a second marriage is through the description of her burial. Though Callirhoe is asleep during her own funeral, the scene acts as a transition for Callirhoe from a traditional marriage to one that she chooses for herself. Early in the tale when Callirhoe is apparently killed by Chaereas, she receives an elaborate funeral. During this funeral, the narrator describes her in the following manner:

---

[81] Rehm (1994) 89.

[82] According to Pomeroy (1997), the *kurios*, guardian, takes these ritualistic steps in every wedding. The fact that Herakles is not Alcestis' father can be excused due to the fact that he is a demigod and because he is the one who brought her back from death.

κατέκειτο μὲν Καλλιρρόη <u>νυμφικὴν ἐσθῆτα</u> περικειμένη καὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης μείζων τε καὶ κρειττων, ὥστε πάντες εἴκαζον αὐτὴν <u>Ἀριάδνῃ καθευδούσῃ</u> "A greater and superior Callirhoe was laid down on a golden bier <u>dressed in her bridal clothes</u>, so that all were comparing her to <u>a sleeping Ariadne</u>" (*Callirhoe* 1.6.2). The description calls special attention to Callirhoe dressed in bridal clothing (*νυμφικὴν ἐσθῆτα*). While there are strong ritual links between weddings and funerals, clothing seems to be one way in which the two are usually distinguished. Most women were buried in a special funerary garment, typically a darker color and not as elaborate or finely made as a bridal garment.[83] Rehm notes that unmarried women were often depicted as being buried in bridal clothes, and that this clothing symbolized their "marriage to death;" however, this custom only extended as far as unmarried women.[84] Euripides' *Supplices* is the only other literary text that portrays a married woman being buried in her bridal clothes. The woman in question, Evadne, purposefully dons the garment before committing suicide to symbolize her love and desire for her husband (*Supplices* 1019–1020). Chariton does not suggest why Callirhoe is buried in her bridal clothes, but her burial in these garments does nicely foreshadow the events of the next book where, after Callirhoe arrives in Miletus, she will decide whether she should get remarried.

The comparison of Callirhoe to Ariadne also merits investigation because both of these women make the decision to get remarried without the negotiation of a *kurios*. Drawing on the account of Ariadne in Ovid's *Heroides*, the comparison elicits the image of two sleeping beauties left for dead by their husbands.[85] Although it might not have

---

[83] Rehm (1994) 29.
[84] Rehm (1994) 32.
[85] For the Latin of Ovid's *Heroides*, I follow Knox (1995).

been Theseus' intent for Ariadne to die, he did leave her on a deserted island in the middle of the ocean, so it is clear that he did not particularly care about her wellbeing. Ariadne, upon waking and becoming extremely vexed at Theseus' abandonment, is carried off into a new marriage to the god Dionysus. The similarities between Ariadne's myth and events surrounding Callirhoe's burial are beyond coincidence. Callirhoe also wakes up frightened and angry at her husband for abandoning her: *ἄδικε Χαιρέα, μέμφομαί σε οὐχ ὅτι με ἀπέκτεινας, ἀλλ'ὅτι με ἔσπευσας ἐκβαλεῖν τῆς οἰκίας. οὐκ ἔδει σε ταχέως θάψαι Καλλιρρόην οὐδ'ἀληθῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν* "Wicked Chaereas, I blame you, not because you killed me, but because you hastened to throw me from the house. You did not have to bury Callirhoe so quickly not even truly being dead" (*Callirhoe* 1.8.4). After this initial anger and fear, Callirhoe is taken from her isolated cave, freed from impending death, and brought to a new marriage with the Milesian general Dionysius.[86] Chariton seems to justify the remarriage of Callirhoe by likening her to Ariadne, Evadne, and Alcestis who also get remarried after their death or abandonment. By supporting the dissolution of Callirhoe's first marriage, Chariton places his protagonist in a liminal space in which she is no longer under the pressures and constraints of a husband or his household, thereby allowing her greater freedom to make decisions and act on her own behalf.

Furthermore, Chariton establishes a basis of comparison with tragedy by recalling the character of Medea from Euripides. With this tragic frame in mind, the reader is compelled to read Callirhoe's circumstances against Medea's. Thus far, I have

[86] Ebbot (2003) 41 notes that the imagery of the cave, where the unmarried girl is kept is a symbol of a vault; for she, the unmarried woman, is a treasure kept safe to be brought out for one purpose: to marry the man to whom her *kurios*, guardian, has chosen to lend her.

demonstrated the shared circumstances of both women: their forced exile, their liminal status between marriages, and the autonomy obtained by the separation from their first husbands. With their new found freedom, lack of male dominance, and forced isolation in a foreign environment, Medea and Callirhoe are able to exercise autonomy without legal constraint. The women use this autonomy specifically in terms of contracting future marriages in which each female character gives herself freely, and in terms of taking authority over the life and death of their children. Up to this point, I have established a connection between the circumstances leading up to the decision of filicide for Medea and Callirhoe as well as a dramatic frame through which the audience expects Callirhoe to make her decision. In the next section, I investigate the process in which Medea and Callirhoe shift the focus of their autonomy from themselves to the fate of their children and how the results of this change correlate to the respective genres of each mother. In order to do this, I consider the step-by-step process that mothers go through as they decide whether or not to kill their children: their motivations, deliberations and outcomes. This frame of comparison provides insight about how Callirhoe deviates from the expectation to behave like her tragic counterpart, Medea. Callirhoe sets herself apart from Medea by the way she deals with the question of filicide.

Motivations, Deliberations, and Outcomes

Both Medea and Callirhoe find themselves at a crossroads with what to do with their children: kill them or preserve them. Medea undertakes this decision while facing the reality of exile and the repercussions of her murder of the king and princess of Corinth; whereas Callirhoe approaches the decision fiercely opposing the idea of

remarriage, while also being unable to come up with another solution. Medea and Callirhoe both go through an intense, personal decision-making process. This parallel has not gone unnoticed by other scholars, such as Smith and De Temmerman, who separate the monologues of the two mothers in terms of their expression of reason and feeling.[87] However, I intend to investigate the monologues through the topics of motivation, deliberation, and outcome with a view to the demands of generic convention. This investigation focuses less on a literal line-by-line division of the speeches, and instead traces the emotional journey each mother takes individually and the point at which Callirhoe's reasoning is no longer parallel with Medea's. Through this examination, I hope to prove that, while both protagonists have come to the same crossroads in their life and must make a decision on the same matter, their personal motivations, deliberations, and the outcomes of their speeches could not be more different. Medea approaches her decision fueled by rage and vengeance towards Jason, while Callirhoe considers *Τύχη* "Fortune" her greatest adversary and fears what will happen to her and her child next. While such differences in motivations, naturally, are to some extent dictated by the conventions of genre, Chariton purposefully shifts away from the tragic expectations he set up between Medea and Callirhoe as wives. As a result, Chariton makes it clear that the genre of the novel differs from tragedy not in terms of women as wives, but in terms of women as mothers and their desire to protect not destroy the family unit.

[87] Smith (2007) 111–116 and De Temmerman (2014) 62–63.

Motivations

Medea and Callirhoe, whose levels of autonomy are analyzed above, have different feelings about their relationships to their children and whom they blame for their current circumstances. Medea, abandoned by Jason, is enormously upset at her former husband for discarding her for another woman.

> *ὅν ποτ᾽ ἐγὼ νύμφαν τ᾽ ἐσίδοιμ᾽*
> *αὐτοῖς μελάθροις διακναιομένους,*
> *οἵ᾽ ἐμὲ πρόσθεν τολμῶσ᾽ ἀδικεῖν.* 165
>
> One day, may I see him and his bride
> being violently destroyed with these homes,
> because they dare to commit such injustice against me first. 165
> (*Medea* 163–65)

While it is clear by her tone that Medea is upset with Jason and his new wife, there is an undertone of malice that is not initially evident when reading this section. The force of the expression in the optative wish *ἐσίδοιμι* (163) displays a violent need in Medea. Page notes it is not enough that Jason and his new wife should experience this violent ruin, but Medea wants to personally see it happen.[88] These are some of the first words the audience hears from Euripides' Medea and yet she has not even appeared on the stage. The first impression of Medea then is one of great suffering, but also one of great malice. Medea is intent on seeing someone she once loved be destroyed.

Callirhoe, similar to Medea, does not speak often before her burial. Aside from Callirhoe's plea to Aphrodite to have Chaereas as her husband (1.1.7) and her fight with Chaereas in their house (1.3.6), Callirhoe's first real speech takes place in the cave after she wakes up, as she admonishes her husband: *ἄδικε Χαιρέα, μέμφομαί σε οὐχ ὅτι με*

[88] Page (2001) 82.

ἀπέκτεινας, ἀλλ'ὅτι με ἔσπευσας ἐκβαλεῖν τῆς οἰκίας. οὐκ ἔδει σε ταχέως θάψαι Καλλιρρόην οὐδ'ἀληθῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν "Wicked Chaereas, I blame you, not because you killed me, but because you hastened to throw me from the house. You did not have to bury Callirhoe so quickly not even truly being dead!" (*Callirhoe* 1.8.4). Both women use a form of *ἀδικέω* (treat unjustly) to describe their husbands, showing that each feels as though they have been betrayed. Callirhoe, however, does not seem to be to be angry at Chaereas for his physical mistreatment of her, but for his moving her from her rightful place in his home and placing her in a situation where she does not know what will happen and how she will survive. Medea also uses the verb *ἀδικέω* to imply that Jason has not only hurt her, but also that he has left her in an unstable situation. Instead of focusing on her feelings of insecurity, Medea seems to channel her anger at those who have physically hurt her, whom she then feels she must see also physically harmed. On the other hand, once she is captured, Callirhoe quickly deflects her anger away from Chaereas and casts it upon the goddess of Fortune *ταῖς συμφοραῖς ὦ Τύχη προστέθεικας* "Oh Fortune, you have added to the misfortunes" (*Callirhoe* 2.8.6). The conventions of the novel, at a distance, are simple: the two main lovers must be reunited. However, when looking more closely, the conventions get more complex. Unlike in tragedy, the novel's goal is not catharsis but contentedness; the characters are not punished by the gods for their actions gods, but suffer trials which the novel characters have little to no control over. There is an overwhelming sense of passivity in the novels, as opposed to tragedy which is all action. This passivity, however, makes the moments of action and direct decision-making in the novel all the more exciting and important.

In Chariton's novel, Callirhoe has not done anything to warrant the wrath of Τύχη, however, goddesses such as Τύχη and Aphrodite often bear the brunt of blame for the various misfortunes that happen to the protagonists.[89] This blame stems, mostly, from the conventions of the genre, in which there is no direct person to blame, so characters blame Τύχη, as the goddess of fortune, or Aphrodite, who typically makes the two lovers fall in love. Unlike Jason, who repeatedly comes back to provoke Medea and her rage, Τύχη does not appear before Callirhoe, and so her anger dissipates. Medea, on the other hand, as a tragic heroine on a dramatic stage, comes face to face with those that have harmed her several times throughout the play and refuels her anger each time she encounters them. Medea's antagonistic mindset against Jason, Kreon, and Glauke is interwoven with her motivation for and her decision to kill her children, whereas Callirhoe approaches the decision with a cautious apprehension towards Τύχη.

Medea's motivation for killing her children is multi-layered. As I will discuss below about deliberation, Medea's anger and fear are what really drive her to decide to kill her children. She is, of course, angry at Jason for abandoning his family, but she also knows that the repercussions for the violent acts she is about to commit against the royal family at Corinth will fall back on herself and the children. In Euripides' play, Medea begins inside the house wishing to die instead of facing the pain: *φεῦ φεῦ· θανάτῳ καταλυσαίμαν / βιοτὰν στυγερὰν προλιποῦσα* "alas, alas, may I take rest in death / leaving behind a hated life" (*Medea* 145–146). Her attitude quickly morphs from self-despair into heroic revenge-seeking anger. Though Medea knows she wants to hurt her ex-husband, the path to proper retribution does not fully form in her mind until she is sure that she has

[89] Egger (1994) 33.

an escape route after committing the act. However, she begins plotting her retaliation early on in the play, making sure the Chorus promises to keep its silence until she can fully form her plot (260–264). As the play progresses, events rapidly fall into place for Medea: Kreon allows her one more day in the city (340–347), Aegeus promises her a safe abode in Athens (lines 708–730), and finally, she discovers Jason's weakness for his children (790–801).

Throughout her discussions with these men, Medea is both dominatingly persuasive and deceptive. She falsely portrays herself as a weak female in need of protection.[90] After her plan is assured, she reveals an additional motivation for her anger at Jason, and Kreon, which stems from the fact that she is often underestimated. Mastronarde notes, "Medea views herself as a heroic partner in Jason's adventures. She is not a normal citizen-woman, but a princess and a savior, and she has formed her bond with Jason not as a subordinate in an exchange between her father and her husband, but as an equal."[91] As such, there is a constant tension in Medea's decision-making between her maternal role, her love for her children, and her desire to be seen as equal to Jason.

μηδείς με φαύλην κἀσθενῆ <u>νομιζέτω</u>
μηδ'ἡσυχαίαν, ἀλλὰ θατέρου τρόπου,
βαρεῖαν <u>ἐχθροῖς</u> καὶ φίλοισιν εὐμενῆ
τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων <u>εὐκλεέστατος βίος</u>. 810

<u>May no one think</u> me a pitiful, feeble,

[90] In Medea's conversation with Kreon (272-356), Medea declares *ἀπόλλυμι* "I am destroyed" (277) and also claims *σιγησόμεσθα, κρεισσόνων νικώμενοι* "I will keep silent, yielding to those better than me" (315). In both of these examples Medea expresses that she is weaker and subservient to the will of Kreon. However, this is juxtaposed by the use of military language *νικώμενοι* "[Medea] having been conquered" and *ἀπόλλυμι* "to be destroyed utterly," which subtly suggests that Medea considers herself an equal masculine opponent to Kreon. Smyth (1956) 271 note 1009 states: "In tragedy, if a woman speaking of herself, uses the plural verb, an adjective or participle, in agreement with the subject, is feminine singular or masculine plural." In this way, then, Medea's decision to use the masculine plural participle over the feminine singular demonstrates her conscious effort to equalize herself to Kreon.

[91] Mastronarde (2002) 9.

> or quiet woman, but of a different character,
> one who is harmful to enemies and well minded towards friends.
> The life of these sorts of people is most glorious. 810
> (*Medea* 807–810)

According to McClure, there are three cardinal virtues prescribed for women in Classical literature: *σιγή* (silence), *τὸ σωφρονεῖν* (sexual self-control), and remaining within the home, though these terms are rarely met by heroines in Euripidean plays.[92] In her speech, Medea openly scorns the idea of being compared to a weak, dependent, passive woman who just stays at home. The prohibitive subjunctive used with the verb *νομίζω* (807) heightens her disdain for typical feminine characteristics. Instead, Medea sees herself as someone who is able to actively harm those she considers *ἐχθροὶ* (enemies). Mastronarde notes that another aspect of Medea's assimilation of masculine values is her positive attitude toward fame: *εὐκλεέστατος βίος* (most glorious life).[93] Although it is not unheard of for women to have glory in their life, the type of glory associated with women typically revolves around the home. Penelope, for example, claims that the only way her *κλέος* (glory) could be greater is if Odysseus would come home: *εἰ κεῖνός γ᾽ ἐλθὼν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολεύοι, / μείζον κε κλέος εἴη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτω* "If that one having come would care for my life, / then so my glory would be greater and more right" (*Odyssey* 19.127–28). Penelope has *κλέος* because she knows that she has been a good and faithful wife to her husband. However, she relies on Odysseus' presence to complete her *κλέος.* The form of *κλέος* available to Penelope is intrinsically tied to her role as a wife and mother and she is only fulfilling one of those

[92] McClure (1999) 25.
[93] Mastronarde (2002) 302.

roles when Odysseus is gone, but no one can doubt her wifely *κλέος* when her husband is present.[94] Medea, however, desires a more masculine sort of glory, one that leaves her as a victor over her enemies. Both Foley and Dihle compare Medea's plot for revenge and desire for glory with that of Achilles. Dihle describes Medea's "warrior code" as similar to Achilles': a product of both powerful emotion as well as intellect.[95] Foley also notes that the *Iliad* does not treat the motives for Achilles' wrath as irrational, despite conflicting with Agamemnon; instead, "the poem emphasizes the devastating effects of this (initially) justified wrath on Achilles' friends and its unforeseen consequences for the hero himself."[96] The main difference between the two is that Medea can anticipate how painful the emotional consequences of her wrath will be on herself as a woman, a mother, and a human.[97] Throughout the play, Medea criticizes the lack of power women have in their own lives: from the trials of marriage for all women (231–243), to her own personal plight in which she did everything in her power to help Jason succeed but receives no credit because of her status as a woman (465–499). It is due to the constant denial of her accomplishments by Kreon and Jason that Medea feels as though she must truly show them how unfeminine she can be by casting off any idea of femininity and maternal connection to her children by taking their lives.[98]

On the other hand, the driving force behind Callirhoe's motivations to kill her child stems not from her anger, but from her fear and the utter bleakness of the situation

---

[94] Segal (1983) 30.
[95] Dihle (1977) 14.
[96] Foley (2001) 249.
[97] Rabinowitz (1993) 112 notes an important shift that occurs with Medea's turn to masculinity in that "Medea, the victimized woman, whom we had initially felt sympathy for, is in combat with the victimizer, whom we abhor."
[98] Foley (2001) 244 states: "Medea seems finally able only to achieve her goals by disowning her sons and the maternal commitment that blocks her autonomy, thus accepting the permanent suffering that she inflicts on herself."

in which she finds herself. Unlike Medea, Callirhoe allows herself to feel something other than rage and does not turn away from admitting her helplessness. Callirhoe's actions and decisions are not a reaction of anger or malice against those who have harmed her. Instead, she allows herself to see past her initial anger and feel truly despondent. While allowing these negative feelings to affect her might not seem entirely beneficial in the situation, later, when Callirhoe's emotions turn towards pity and hope, she embraces these emotions and allows herself to change her heart. After she discovers her pregnancy while abroad, separated from family, and dispossessed, Callirhoe feels a sense of hopelessness for her child at being forced into this circumstance. She speaks to her unborn child in the following passage:

> *ἄθλιον πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι γέγονας ἐν τάφῳ καὶ χερσὶ λῃστῶν παρεδόθης. εἰς ποῖον παρέρχῃ βίον; ἐπὶ ποίαις ἐλπίσι μέλλω σε κυοφορεῖν ὀρφανὲ καὶ ἄπολι καὶ δοῦλε; πρὸ τῆς γενέσεως πειράθητι θανάτου.*
>
> You became wretched before you were born, you were given in a burial and to the hands of pirates. What kind of life do you come into? With what kind of hope am I to be pregnant with you, oh fatherless and without a country and a slave? Before birth be tried by death.
>
> (*Callirhoe* 2.8.7)

As mentioned earlier, Callirhoe projects her lack of hope in the child's future. He now faces similar circumstances to his mother, being fatherless (*ὀρφανὲ*), without a country (*ἄπολι*), and a slave (*δοῦλε*). Callirhoe uses this shared condition to mask the fears she holds about her own life by displacing them onto her unborn child. She is afraid of what Fortune will bring her next, afraid of carrying a child, and afraid of being forced to marry someone she does not wish to marry, which is anyone except Chaereas. A major motivation behind Callirhoe's pondering of feticide is her chastity and reputation. Similar to Medea, Callirhoe anticipates what her enemies will say about her: *τάκα δὲ ἐρεῖ τις τῶν*

φθονούτων 'ἐν τῷ λῃστηρίῳ Καλλιρόη συνέλαβεν' "Perhaps someone of those bearing ill-will say, 'Callirhoe conceived amongst the pirates'" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.2). Thinking about this potential rumor, Callirhoe's concern is that her child will not be recognized as the rightful son of Chaereas and that she will not be believed if her child should come across his father later in life. Callirhoe's apprehension about her child's future provides an interesting twist on the fear of bastardy. Typically, the fear stems from the father, who suspects his wife has cheated on him and that his son is not his. In this situation, Callirhoe knows she has been faithful and fears that her child will be wrongfully denied his rightful inheritance. Ebbot notes that legitimacy of children is determined by the marital status of their parents, and vice versa.[99] In fact, marriage in ancient Greek society was seen as a civilizing force through which men attempt to ensure that they are the father of the offspring.[100] Although Callirhoe knows she has been faithful to Chaereas, nevertheless she fears he will not believe that the child is his (I will return to this discussion of illegitimacy in fuller detail in the next chapter). However, it is clear that Callirhoe's apprehension about the unsteadiness of her own and her child's future is the main motivation behind her consideration to kill her child.

Overall, the driving forces behind Medea's and Callirhoe's decisions to kill their children are different. Medea is fueled by an injustice done to her both by Jason and by the established social hierarchy of the ancient world, which refuses to grant her the renown and glory she feels she deserves because she is a woman and a mother. Callirhoe, on the other hand, is driven by the fear of potential harm, or what could become of her and her child's legacy given Fortune's twisting of her life in unexpected and horrible

[99] Ebbot (1996) 8.
[100] Ebbot (1996) 9.

ways. Proceeding into the deliberations of the two women in their roles as mothers, it is clear that Medea's fixation on revenge pulls her away from her family, while Callirhoe shows constant concern for her child and for the nuclear family unit as a whole. In keeping with the heroic language of tragedy, Medea increasingly refers to Jason, Kreon, and Glauke as *ἐχθροὶ* (enemies) and refuses to call her final act against her children "murder." By doing this, Medea is able to push away her maternal instinct to protect her children and distance herself from the acts she is about to undertake.[101] As I will discuss, Chariton deliberately juxtaposes Callirhoe's use of familial language to Medea's heroic martial language in order to remind the audience of the novel's family-centered conventions. Callirhoe, simply by being a character in a novel, cannot make her decision based solely on her own interests. Instead, she must also take into consideration the best interests of her whole family.

Deliberations

The ability of a character to change her own mind in tragedy seems to be something primarily Euripidean.[102] Aeschylus and Sophocles rarely allow their characters to change their minds, and when it does happen, it is either attributed to a secondary character.[103] The use of a monologue, however, is not limited to the genre of drama. In fact, from Homer onward, authors utilize monologues to represent characters in crisis.[104] In ancient dramatic monologues, characters speak with themselves out loud, essentially

[101] Foley (2001) 244.
[102] Knox (1966) 213 refers to a change of mind as "the dramatic representation and formulation of a new decision or attitude which supplants and reverses a previously determined course of action."
[103] Rosenmeyer (1990) 189.
[104] For further investigation into the Homeric monologue see Schadewaldt (1926) and Garcia Jr. (2018).

giving voice to their inner thoughts, as they find themselves in moments of crisis and in need of decisive action. In such moments, characters are depicted as being at odds with themselves, as when Homer's characters are said to be *διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν* (deliberated in two ways, *Iliad* 1.189, 8.167, 13.445). Indeed, in Greek epic, characters' monologues are represented as conversations with themselves, as a character speaks with his own *θυμός* (spirit), as in the formulaic line: *ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε προς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν* "But being angered, he spoke to his great hearted spirit" (*Iliad* 11.403, 17.90, 18.5, 20.343, 21.53, 21.552, 22.98; *Odyssey* 5.298, 355, 407, 464).[105] In this standard introduction a great importance is placed on *θυμός* and its ability to lead a hero in the correct direction. In the case of Medea's monologue, we find a similar emphasis on Medea's *θυμός* and its influence on her decision making.[106] Medea's famous monologue depicts her battling between her vengeful (heroic) *θυμός* and her maternal love for her children. Euripides did not create a new style of monologue; however, he did introduce it to the tragic stage and permit a new type of character to give voice to non-heroic soliloquies by allowing women to speak. Fifth-century Athenian drama portrays women, particularly wives, as masterful and persuasive speakers whose words get the better of men.[107]

In lines 1044–1064 of *Medea*, Medea engages in an intense internal monologue both about her desire to kill her children, and her utter revulsion at the act. Her monologue takes the reader along a tumultuous journey that sees her decide for or against

[105] Garcia Jr. (2018) 300.
[106] See Gill (1987), Foley (1989), Gill (1996), and Lawrence (1997) for discussion.
[107] McClure (1999) 25.

the decision to kill her children as quickly as she considers one option over the other.[108] While initially this back and forth might make her seem like an unreliable decision-maker, this deliberative process only serves to emphasize the struggle Medea faces trying to break the gendered mold she has been placed in by Greek society. Throughout the process of making the decision to kill her children Medea constantly rejects the maternal pressures placed on her by society in order to cement her right to make an autonomous decision.

...χαιρέτω βουλεύματα
τὰ πρόσθεν ἄξω παῖδας ἐκ γαίας ἐμούς. *1045*
τί δεῖ με πατέρα τῶνδε τοῖς τούτων κακοῖς
λυποῦσαν αὐτὴν δὶς τόσα κτᾶσθαι κακά;
οὐ δῆτ' ἔγωγε χαιρέτω βουλεύματα.
καίτοι τί πάσχω; βούλομαι γέλωτ' ὀφλεῖν
ἐχθροὺς μεθεῖσα τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀζημίους; *1050*
τολμητέον τάδ'; ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης
τὸ καὶ προσέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί.
χωρεῖτε, παῖδες, ἐς δόμους. ὅτῳ δὲ μὴ
θέμις παρεῖναι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι θύμασιν,
αὐτῷ μελήσει χεῖρα δ' οὐ διαφθερῶ. *1055*
μὴ δῆτα, θυμέ, μὴ σὺ γ' ἐργάσῃ τάδε
ἔασον αὐτούς, ὦ τάλαν, φεῖσαι τέκνων
ἐκεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες εὐφρανοῦσί σε.
μὰ τοὺς παρ' Ἅιδῃ νερτέρους ἀλάστορας,
οὔτοι ποτ' ἔσται τοῦθ' ὅμως ἐχθροῖς ἐγώ *1060*
παῖδας παρήσω τοὺς ἐμοὺς καθυβρίσαι.
πάντως σφ' ἀνάγκη κατθανεῖν ἐπεὶ δὲ χρή,
ἡμεῖς κτενοῦμεν οἵπερ ἐξεφύσαμεν.
πάντως πέπρακται ταῦτα κοὐκ ἐκφεύξεται.

…Goodbye former plans
I will lead my children from the land. 1045

[108] Gill (1996) 216−226 notes that Medea's internal struggle is a key example of "objective strand of the ancient character" (218). One characteristic of this strand is the presentation of self and internal deliberation is described as if it were conversation with an external interlocutor. Gill continues on to note that this device is an important element for assessing moral character, especially in tragedy (224).

> Why should I grieve their father with their pain
> and myself grieving acquire twice as great a pain?
> I won't do it: goodbye plans.
> Indeed, why am I affected? Do I want to be laughed at
> letting my enemies go unpunished?
> Should I put up with these things? But I have weakness
> even admitting the tender words in my heart.
> Go away, children, to the home. For the one it is not
> permitted to attend my sacrifices,
> it will be a concern for them, but I will not slacken my hands.
> Oh heart do not do these things,
> let them go, oh suffering one, spare your children
> living with us there, they will gladden you.
> By the nether avenging spirits in Hades,
> I will not ever permit for my enemies
> to treat my children disdainfully in any way.
> Above all, it is necessary for them to die, and since they must,
> we who birthed them shall kill them.
> Above all, these things are settled and will not be undone.
>
> (*Medea* 1044–1064)

There has been much scholarly debate about the text and meaning of Medea's speech. The greatest source of discussion concerns the second half of the monologue (verses 1055–1080), which some editors, such as Diggle, choose to delete.[109] David Kovacs, on the other hand, disagrees with Diggle's deletion, and instead argues that "there is a much more economical way of dealing with [verses 1055–1080] than large-scale amputation."[110] The meaning behind the monologue has also sparked debate among scholars. Some, such as Snell, interpret the monologue as a psychological struggle between reason and passion. Snell argues that the speech provoked Socrates' belief that virtue is knowledge;[111] whereas other scholars, such as Dihle and Burnett, suggest

[109] Diggle (1984) 58 deletes lines 1055-1080 because he believes they were an interpolation by another author or editor.
[110] Kovacs (1986) 343.
[111] Snell (1948) 126.

reading the monologue in terms of gender where the heroic masculine self of Medea is in battle with the maternal feminine self.[112] My understanding of these lines lends itself more towards Burnett and Dihle's interpretations. I believe the middle portion of the speech (lines 1044-1064) best highlights Medea's rejection of her maternal instincts in favor of revenge and cements her claim to an authoritative voice over her children's lives.

This segment of the speech showcases Medea's use of male heroic and maternal language as she deliberates the fate of her children. On the one hand, Medea convinces herself that she needs to kill her children to prevent her enemies from mocking her: *βούλομαι γέλωτ' ὀφλεῖν / ἐχθροὺς μεθεῖσα τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀζημίους;* "Do I want to be laughed at / letting my enemies go unpunished?" (1049–1050). But she also seeks to deflect harm from her children: *οὔτοι ποτ' ἔσται τοῦθ' ὅμως ἐχθροῖς ἐγώ / παῖδας παρήσω τοὺς ἐμοὺς καθυβρίσαι* "I will not ever permit my enemies / to treat my children badly in any way" (1060–1061). Medea, after killing Kreon and his daughter, is well aware of the plight her children will face because of her actions. Accepting this reality, Medea rationalizes that they will be better off dead than paying for her deeds. Foley notes that Medea is not so much concerned that her treatment has been unjust, but that her enemies may have the chance to laugh at her.[113] Moral principle plays no part in her revenge but, instead, Medea's desire to avoid the laughter of enemies is a logical extension of her desired position in shame-culture.[114] Medea's fear of being mocked or laughed at (*γέλωτ' ὀφλεῖν*) is seen throughout the play. This sensitivity to mockery is usually seen in male heroes engaged in a contest for recognition and supremacy.[115] Medea's fear, then, is that she will

[112] Dihle (1977) 29; Burnett (1973) 13.
[113] Foley (2001) 248.
[114] Foley (2001) 248.
[115] Mastronarde (2002) 234.

not be seen as the heroic person she believes herself to be: a participant in male categories of value and social standing.

A few key words in this passage also highlight Medea's heroic masculine logic: *ἐχθροὺς* (enemies, 1050 and 1060); *μαλθακοὺς λόγους* (soft words, 1052); *θύμασιν* (sacrifice, 1054); and *καθυβρίσαι* (treat disdainfully, 1061). Medea's use of the noun *ἐχθροί* is compelling because it demonstrates Medea's antagonistic attitude. She uses *ἐχθροί* twice in her speech (1050, 1060), refusing to even say the names of those she considers enemies and devaluing their association with her. She asks whether her enemies should go *ἀζημίους* (unpunished, 1050). This reference to the punishment of enemies recalls line 164, when Medea says she wants to see Jason and Glauke violently destroyed (*διακναιομένοι*). Although Medea does not refer to Jason and Glauke as her enemies in the earlier section, it is clear that Medea's sense of betrayal strengthens throughout the play and that this wrong needs to be avenged.

The phrase *μαλθακοί λόγοι* (soft words) also draws our attention because Medea is directly contrasting her desires to save her children with her simultaneous desire to portray herself as masculine. In lines 1044–1048 she dismisses her plans of revenge and makes a new plot to save her children, but then reverses her decision on the grounds that this idea amounts to *μαλθακοὺς λόγους* (1052). Medea, in order to equate herself to her masculine enemies, views herself from a masculine perspective, in which maternal sentiments are soft and portray weakness. Other definitions for *μαλθακός* include soft, faint-hearted, girly, and feeble, qualities that Medea has already stated she does not want others to see in her (*Medea* 807–810). By reversing her decision not to kill her children, Medea detaches herself from her feminine and maternal side. Foley notes that the

arguments of the mother are counter-rational to Medea because they violate her opposing perspective, one of self-interest and reputation.[116]

Medea's use of the verb *καθυβρίσαι* is of note because it allows Medea to project her own fears of being mocked and treated spitefully onto the children. Mastronarde notes that Medea has in mind the fatal violence that the relatives of Kreon and the princess could be expected to apply to the children of their murderer.[117] As much as Medea believes that she has been treated badly, she fears that her children will be hurt even further. This expression of fear draws on the audience's awareness of the tradition that the Corinthians killed the children.[118] Foley notes that Medea's deliberations, except when she is pretending otherwise to Jason, consistently involve considering how to put into effect specific plans proposed to her by her emotions, her heroic code, her sense of what is good for herself, and her sense of injustice, and generally all of these in some combination.[119] In essence, because her enemies deserve punishment and will treat her children horribly, she cannot allow herself to be persuaded by soft words or feminine rationality.

Finally, the use of the noun *θῦμα* (sacrifice) in line 1054 is particularly disturbing. By calling this slaughter a sacrifice, Medea is giving the murder divine authority, even though she previously referred to this act, in line 796, as *ἀνοσιώτατον* (most profane). Mastronarde notes that in a typical sacrifice, unsuitable and impure witnesses are ordered to withdraw from the ritual to avoid contamination, but here the ritual is impure and the

---

[116] Foley (1989) 65.
[117] Mastronarde (2002) 340.
[118] Mastronarde (2002) 340.
[119] Foley (2001) 250.

pure (children) are ordered to stay away.[120] Pucci stresses that Medea fluctuates between equating her "I" with maternal feelings and with revenge. By introducing a rhetoric of self-pity and sacrifice, Medea succeeds in making the murder of her children appear to herself inevitable.[121] Essentially, the only person Medea has convinced that this is a good idea is herself, but in reality that is the only one she needs to convince. Medea knows that this action will bring her pain, twice as much even, as it will bring Jason: *τί δεῖ με πατέρα τῶνδε τοῖς τούτων κακοῖς / λυποῦσαν αὐτὴν δὶς τόσα κτᾶσθαι κακά;* "Why should I grieve their father with their pain / and myself grieving acquire twice as great a pain?" (*Medea* 1046–1047). Nevertheless, even this knowledge of what she will suffer is not enough of a deterrent to convince her to change her mind.

The contrivance, deliberation, and enforcement of Medea's plan to kill her children take up the whole of Euripides' play. However, the same cannot be said of Chariton's novel. The entirety of Callirhoe's turmoil about whether she should give birth takes place within four sections of the second book (2.8.1–2.11.6): from the moment Callirhoe discovers she is pregnant to her final decision to raise the child as Dionysius'. Nevertheless, by introducing Callirhoe's ability to make such an important decision so early in the work, Chariton sets up the expectation that Callirhoe will continue to make these types of decisions throughout the novel. Callirhoe's deliberations take on a similar form to those of Medea in that Callirhoe puts forth reasons based around logic and feeling. Unlike Medea, however, Callirhoe is less concerned about the status of her power, but instead focuses on her merits as a woman, her fidelity to her husband, her status as the daughter of Hermocrates, and her maternal hopes for her child. Because

[120] Mastronarde (2002) 339.
[121] Pucci (1980) 135.

Callirhoe does not completely disregard her feminine impulses like Medea does, she is able to persuade herself more easily not to kill her child. It should be noted that while Callirhoe debates killing her child, she simultaneously considers killing herself.[122] Plangon, the slave of Dionysius entrusted with getting Callirhoe to marry the general, promises Callirhoe *τῆς ὑστεραίας εὐκολωτέραν αὐτῇ ἔκτρωσιν παρασκευάσειν* "to find an easier miscarriage for her tomorrow" (*Callirhoe* 2.8.7). Plangon approaches the situation hoping to help her master marry Callirhoe and has no intention of bringing anything to induce an abortion or permitting Callirhoe to die. Instead, Plangon trusts that Callirhoe's maternal instinct will overpower her loyalty to Chaereas: *εὕρηται πειθοῦς ἐνέχυρον: νικήσει σωφροσύνην γυναικὸς μητρὸς φιλοστοργία* "She found a persuasive plan: a mother's devotion will conquer a wife's chastity" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.1). Callirhoe, ignorant of Plangon's true plan, seems to be counting on the fact that ancient forms of miscarriage and abortion were well known for killing women. She makes her intention to die along with her child clear when she claims: *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν πρώτη τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην ἀποφαίνομαι. θέλω γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν Χαρρέου μόνου γυνή. τοῦτό μοι καὶ γονέων ἥδιον καὶ πατρίδος καὶ τέκνου, πεῖραν ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου μὴ λαβεῖν* "First I will make my intention known. I wish to die the wife of Chaereas only. Trying not to be taken by two husbands, this is even more dear to me than parents, fatherland, or child" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.1). Despite Callirhoe's earlier lament about the child and herself being *ὀρφανὲ καὶ ἄπολι καὶ δοῦλε* (fatherless, without a city, and a slave, 2.8.7), Callirhoe shows that being forced to marry another man is worse to her than being a slave and losing her parents, her homeland, and even her

[122] Riddle (1992) 21 notes that some laws, especially in the Augustan period, charged women who try to have abortions or miscarriages with a double attempt at murder, because she has tried, or succeeded, in not only killing an unborn child and attempted to kill herself because "usually the women die in such attempts".

child. Callirhoe's quest to prove and maintain her *sophrosyne* with respect to Chaereas is clear. However, upon further internal contemplation, Callirhoe realizes that she does not necessarily have to die to prove her loyalty to her first husband. In this realization, Chariton redefines what a family is. No longer is a family solely considered the nuclear family of father, mother, and child; instead, it can take on different shapes to accept step-fathers.[123] With this new familial definition, Callirhoe can manage to preserve her family and remain faithful to her husband.

Callirhoe's refusal to kill her child follows an opposite path to Medea's acceptance of her decision to kill her children. Chariton reveals that Callirhoe's perception of maternal duty differs from Medea's by reversing the order of the path to Callirhoe's decision. In doing this, Chariton also separates the qualities of a mother in his novel from those in tragedy. Medea begins with dismissing her plan to kill her child, only to criticize her own weakness at feeling maternal love for her children, and finally she brings her argument back to the enemies who will mock her and go unpunished for their actions (1044–1064). Medea distances herself from the situation by referring to the murder she is about to commit as a *θῦμα* and refusing to say the name of her ex-husband and father of her children. Callirhoe, on the other hand, begins her reasoning by stating that she wants to protect her child from hearing gossip about his mother, then pity comes over her heart, and finally she questions her sanity for thinking such a thing: *'Μηδὲν ἀκούσῃς τῶν περὶ μητρὸς διηγημάτων.' Πάλιν δὲ μετενόει και πως ἔλεος αὐτὴν τοῦ κατὰ γαστρὸς εἰσήει. 'Βουλεύῃ τεκνοκτονῆσαι, πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη, Μηδείας λαμβάνεις*

[123] Other novels play with this idea: in *Daphnis and Chloe*, the parents of the protagonists are actually adoptive parents. Similarly, in the *Aethiopica*, Charikleia is raised by an adoptive parent and later reunited with her birth family.

λογισμούς;' "'May you hear nothing of the rumors about your mother.' Then she was changing her mind back and somehow pity towards the womb [child] entered her. 'Do you plan to kill your child, most profane of all women, do you take up the reasonings of Medea?" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.3–4). Early in the novel, Callirhoe draws on the familial link she has to her child calling herself his *μητήρ*, pitying her *γαστήρ*, and making it clear that she was planning on killing her child (*τεκνοκτονέω*). Through this familial connection, Callirhoe establishes her connection not only with the child, but also with the action she is about to commit. It is not some random person she is planning to kill, but her own child, and she cannot escape that fact. Additionally, unlike Medea, Callirhoe accepts the *ἔλεος* (pity) that enters her, and uses this as a way to reject her plan.

In the middle of her debate about killing her child, Callirhoe undergoes a serious reflection when she utters: *Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμούς;* "Do you take up the reasonings of Medea?" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.4); these three words are the catalyst for Callirhoe's change of heart. It was not her maternal instincts that took over, as Plangon had expected, but instead, Callirhoe was able to recognize that the *λογισμοί* (reasonings) she was using to decide with were completely wrong for her. Callirhoe is trying to use reasonings connected to familial destruction and tragedy which go against everything Callirhoe should be trying to achieve. Chariton uses this deviation from Callirhoe's tragic counterpart in order to reaffirm the ideal traits of a mother in the novel, namely that family preservation must always conquer self-serving desires. While Medea refers to the act of murdering her children as *ἀνοσιώτατον* (most profane), Callirhoe realizes that she herself would become *πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη* (most profane of all women) by committing this act. This might seem a trivial difference, but through this realization Callirhoe takes

ownership of the act of murder in a way Medea does not. Medea believes that she is in the right the whole time, and that all of her actions are justified and necessary. She can admit that the act of murdering children is very wrong, but does not seem to fully comprehend that she will become the victimizer if she commits the murder.[124] Schwartz notes the legal connections in Callirhoe's reasonings, stating that while making her decision Callirhoe is mindful of the role she is playing as judge, jury, and possible executioner, and because of these roles, she is able to assert control over her own body and pull herself out of the tragic mindset of Medea.[125]

It is after Chariton makes Callirhoe deviate from her tragic connection to Medea that she begins to see the potential in the child she is carrying. Instead of fretting that the child will be fatherless, she now sees him as a symbol of her marriage to Chaereas *σὺ δὲ τὸ Χαιρέου τέκνον θέλεις ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ μηδὲ ὑπόμνημα τοῦ περιβοήτου γάμου καταλιπεῖν. τί δ' ἂν υἱὸς ᾖ;* "But are you willing to murder the child of Chaereas, and not to leave behind a memorial of your famed marriage?" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.5). Callirhoe also sees her child as a potential for a better future, a messenger of her loyalty to Chaereas, who would one day reunite his mother and father:

> *πλεύσῃ μοι καὶ σύ, τέκνον, εἰς Σικελίαν. ζητήσεις πατέρα καὶ πάππον, καὶ τὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῖς διηγήσῃ. ἀναχθήσεται στόλος ἐκεῖθεν ἐμοὶ βοηθῶν. σὺ, τέκνον, ἀλλήλοις ἀποδώσεις τοὺς γονεῖς.*
>
> "Oh my child, you also shall sail to Sicily. You shall seek your father and grandfather and tell to them the deeds of your mother. From there an aiding fleet will be led to me. You, child, will deliver your parents to each other."
>
> (*Callirhoe* 2.9.6)

[124] Foley (2001) 256 states: "By suppressing altogether the claims of her maternal side, this interpretation confirms our sense that Medea's choice for revenge has been inevitable from the start, that her self-debate aims finally not at persuading herself to save the children (a plan in any case abandoned after 1058) but at making the crime seem inevitable to herself."
[125] Schwartz (2016) 90.

Callirhoe centers her argument against killing her child on family, as she repeatedly calls the child *τέκνον* instead of simply *σύ*. In the passage above, Callirhoe uses familial terms, such as *πατέρα*, *μήτηρ*, and *πάππος* six times in two lines, seemingly as a way to remind herself of the importance of the family unit, which she is currently lacking. Medea's speech (1044–1064), on the other hand, uses familial terms five times, four of which entail Medea lamenting over the upcoming loss of her children. However, in the twenty lines above, Medea makes no mention of herself as the *μήτηρ* of the children. Instead, she distances herself from her personal ties to her children and the crime she is about to commit by only acknowledging her connection to her children through the action of begetting (*ἐκφύω*, 1063). Much like Jason does to Medea, Medea objectifies her sons by casting them as the direct objects of her birthing; as such, she is able to proceed with their murders without a guilty conscience. It is clear that, in Callirhoe's eyes, the opposite of the *Μηδείας λογισμοί* is the importance of family, especially the preservation of the family line.

In sum, Chariton intentionally models Callirhoe's deliberations about family and filicide on Euripides' *Medea* in order to set his reader up with the expectation that Callirhoe will commit a tragic act in the way Medea does. But, ultimately, this expectation is undermined when Callirhoe adopts the different course of familial preservations in contrast to Medea's destruction of the family. Chariton also deliberately ensures that Callirhoe heeds the opinion of her entire family instead of making a decision based on her own emotions. As a result of this emphasis on familial preservation in a genre so focused on reconciliation, Chariton offers up Callirhoe as a model of feminine

virtue, as someone who is able to safeguard her family while simultaneously enduring hardships without the support of her husband, father, or country.

Outcomes

The outcome of both women's decisions undoubtedly shocked their original audiences. In keeping with the formula of tragic women, Euripides adapted his Medea to align both with the tendency in tragedy for plots with disruptive women, such as Aeschylus' Clytemnestra in his *Agamemnon* and Sophocles' Jocasta in *Oedipus Tyrranos*, and the necessity for legitimate male heirs, as in Euripides' *Ion*.[126] In accordance with these generic conventions, Euripides was able to revise the story of Medea in a shocking and powerful way while simultaneously setting the limit for the egregiousness of mothers in literary history.

Though Medea briefly considers taking the children with her (*Medea* 1056–1058), she finally decides that there is no alternative other than to kill them *πάντως σφ' ἀνάγκη κατθανεῖν ἐπεὶ δὲ χρή, / ἡμεῖς κτενοῦμεν οἵπερ ἐξεφύσαμεν* "Above all, it is necessary for them to die, and since they must, / we who begot them shall kill them" (*Medea* 1062–1063). It is uncertain whether these lines were included in this part of the text since they are repeated verbatim at verses 1240–1241; nevertheless, their message is clear: Medea has resolved to kill her children.[127] Medea has come up with the idea, debated it with herself, and now has finally resolved to complete the deed. Certain characters, such as the chorus, have added their opinion on the matter when they beg Medea to reconsider killing her children and the princess (*Medea* 811–813). Medea ignores these pleas in her

[126] Hall (1997) 104–106.
[127] Mastronarde (2002) 341.

insistence that only she has suffered *οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλως: σοὶ συγγνώμη λέγειν / τάδ' ἐστί, μὴ πάσχουσαν, ὡς ἐγώ, κακῶς* "It cannot be otherwise: it is allowed for you / to say these things, for you do not suffer as badly as I" (*Medea* 814–815). It is Medea and Medea alone who could change her mind, but that does not happen. Medea's refusal to listen to those around her as well as to her own maternal instincts is her downfall. She chooses to cast aside those dear to her in order to follow the path that she sees as most full of masculine glory and most in line for her future plans, which is what truly encapsulates the *Μηδείας λογισμοί*.

Callirhoe takes a drastically different approach when making her final decision by taking into account what her ex-husband and child would want. She prepares for the final vote on the subject by gathering those it affects the most: *τὴν εἰκόνα Χαιρέου τῇ γαστρὶ προσέθηκε καὶ "ἰδοὺ" φησὶ "τρεῖς γεγόναμεν, ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνὴ καὶ τέκνον"* "She held the image of Chaereas on her stomach and said, 'Behold, we became three: husband, wife, and child'" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.1). Just as in 2.9.3–4, Callirhoe emphasizes the importance of the nuclear family: *ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνὴ καὶ τέκνον*. Instead of referring to herself and Chaereas as *γονεῖς* (parents), as she had previously (2.9.6), she separates herself from her former husband, showing her own importance in the decision-making process about to come.[128] Equally as important to herself and her husband is the child. Though the child is not physically out of the womb, Callirhoe still considers the opinion the child might have. This is in direct contrast to Medea's children, who, despite their begging while still alive, are slaughtered by their mother (*Medea* 1273–1280). By taking the child's vote into consideration Callirhoe is essentially acknowledging the agency the child will have in the

[128] This separate set-up -husband, wife, and child- brings up a very specific image of Odysseus, Penelope, and Telemachus in the minds of the reader, which I will discuss in the next chapter.

future. This gives scholars an interesting peek inside the long-standing debate of abortion and the morality of feticide in the ancient world. Aristotle and Augustine seemed to be of the mindset that if the child in the womb is unformed and a shapeless thing (*informatus*), then there cannot be a living soul in the body because it lacks sense, but if the child has sense, then to kill it while in the womb would be murder.[129] However, by giving her child a voice, albeit a metaphoric voice, Callirhoe is acknowledging the autonomy and right the child has to its own life. In this way, if Callirhoe did kill this child, then she would be just as guilty of murder as is Medea.

In their votes, Callirhoe elects to kill both the child and herself: *θέλω γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν Χαρρέου μόνου γυνή* "I wish to die the wife of Chaereas only" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.1). Callirhoe then assumes what the child would want: *ἐναντίαν μοι φέρεις, τέκνον, ψῆφον καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεις ἡμῖν ἀποθανεῖν* "You incline against me, child, you do not cast your stone for us to die" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.3). Finally, she records the vote of Chaereas: *μᾶλλον δὲ εἰρηκεν: αὐτὸς γάρ μοι παραστὰς ἐν τοῖς ὀνείροις "παρατίθεμαί σοί" φησὶ "τὸν υἱόν"* "But rather he has spoken: for he, having stood beside me in my dreams, said, 'I entrust my son to you'" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.3). The idea that Callirhoe is calling on her former husband and unborn child to help her make a decision is puzzling at first. One might question whether Callirhoe actually has any autonomy in this decision if she is allowing it to be influenced by the projected desires of her unborn child and former husband, but I argue that she does. Many scholars have analyzed various forms of decision-making in ancient texts.[130] One area of interest for me is the concept of the phantom community, which Garcia Jr. defines as an internalized system of expectations,

[129] Riddle (1992) 20.
[130] Athens (1994), Gill (1996), Garcia Jr. (2018).

values, and judgments of a community that form our basic social identity in response to which our active and judging self decides what to do in a given situation.[131] Essentially, when a character is giving a soliloquy, whether they are alone in a room like Callirhoe or surrounded by a chorus like Medea, there is a voice in their head against which they are arguing. This voice is made up of the societal values and expectations the character has experienced within their life, against which they are trying to argue.[132]

With this concept of the phantom community in mind, I argue that in this voting scene with Callirhoe, Chariton takes the metaphorical argument that Callirhoe would be having with herself in her head and projects it through the picture of Chaereas and the voice of her unborn child. By doing this, Chariton not only presents to the reader the physical manifestation of who is impacted by Callirhoe's decision, but also the physical manifestation of the phantom community of a novel protagonist. Because Callirhoe addresses her soliloquy to those not physically present, the monologue itself is an internalization of her various social roles as a wife and mother, and her deliberations constitutes a working out of her impulses in accordance with her various roles and the responsibilities those roles require of her. Before this deliberation scene, Callirhoe was not affected by the societal expectations held for her by the general Dionysius or his slave Plangon. She knew that she wanted to die alongside her child. It is not until Callirhoe realizes that she is behaving like Medea by completely abandoning all thoughts of familial preservation that she begins to change her mind.

Authors such as Rosenmeyer and Garcia Jr. have discussed the concept of decision-making in regards to Homeric heroes, but the process of deliberation for a

---

[131] Garcia Jr. (2018) 301.
[132] Athens (1994) 526.

mother is not necessarily the same as a Homeric hero.[133] Medea's speech especially details the imbalance of trying to make a decision as a mother while simultaneously expressing heroic standards for herself. Callirhoe's speech is not predicated on whether she should flee from battle. The concept of *aidos* or *nemesis* does not come to Callirhoe's mind, as they do to Medea's, because these are not the social expectations that have been laid out for her as a Greek woman and mother. However, both women question if they should abandon their roles as mothers in exchange for safety. Medea's definition of safety entails her flight from Corinth to Athens, whereas Callirhoe's allows her an escape from an unwanted marriage. Medea and Callirhoe, as mothers, have a responsibility to their *oikos* and those inside. Callirhoe embraces this societal role, but Medea rejects this role of motherhood for the sheer power of vengeance over others.

The method of their deliberations assumes different forms. Medea takes on an internalized monologue arguing against herself with her different impulses acting as participants in the debate. Because Medea has already been cast out/ has cast herself out of the social community of Corinth, she experiences what the scholar Athens describes as "self-division":

> The division of self occurs when the individual is all too painfully aware of the sharp conflict between their "us" and "them." During their soliloquies, they will not only hear their "us" and "them" seemingly screaming to them at once, but also hurling contradictory directives at them.[134]

Medea, then, knows what the community wants from her, but she does not care what it wants. Medea chooses to disregard both the phantom community in her head telling her to spare her children as well as the physical community of the chorus in front of her

[133] Rosenmeyer (1990), Garcia Jr. (2018).
[134] Athens (1994) 529.

begging her to do the same. Casting herself as the injured party, Medea cannot forgive or listen to the community that has supported those who have harmed her. Callirhoe, on the other hand, envisions a democratic process instead of a monologue with herself. In doing this, Callirhoe engages with the individual members of her phantom community, who then combine their votes to overpower her. Because Callirhoe's phantom community has supported her and she has the desire to share support with it, she is less likely to turn against this community than someone like Medea. After she is outvoted in her deliberation by her phantom community (Chaereas and her unborn child), Callirhoe contemplates the decision to be made and ultimately decides to save herself and the child *ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἐν τούτοις ἦν τοῖς λογισμοῖς καὶ οὐ δι' αὑτὴν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ βρέφος ἐπείθετο ζῆν* "During this day and night she was in this reasoning, and not because of herself, but on account of her fetus, she was persuaded to live" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.4). Callirhoe makes the conscious decision not to take up Medea's destructive *λογισμοί*. Instead, she chooses to follow a separate set of *λογισμοί* that are more inclined to the societal expectations held for her as a mother and that lead to the preservation of herself and her family.

Conclusion

This chapter has investigated the intertextual play between Euripides' tragedy *Medea* and Chariton's novel *Callirhoe*. Both female protagonists have been taken from their homelands and separated from their husbands to find themselves at a crossroads, where they must make the decision whether they should kill their children or not. By allowing Callirhoe to even consider killing her child, Chariton temporarily draws his

reader out of the novel and into the world of tragedy. From the moment Callirhoe finds out she is pregnant, the reader is on edge, wondering what she will do with the child, with herself, and how Chaereas might react to this development. Suddenly, after all hope for saving the child has been lost, Callirhoe reverses her decision. In doing this, Callirhoe expresses her maternal love for her child and her devotion to her first husband to save both mother and child, and avoids a tragic act, like Medea. Instead of being the cause of her family's ruin, Callirhoe turns into a savior who chooses to preserve her family through a second marriage. In doing this, Chariton begins to set up the qualifications of women and mothers in his novel as women who are more concerned with the preservation of family, even if that means going outside of the nuclear family, as will be discussed in the second chapter.

Chapter 2:

A Penelopian Helen

Introduction

Many scholars have seen allusions to Homeric epic, especially the *Odyssey*, in Chariton's novel, ranging from direct quotations to personality resonances between characters.[135] The *Odyssey* has received special attention from scholars of the novel due to the two genres' shared tales of love and adventure. Just as Odysseus is forced to leave his land, face unimaginable trials, and fend off individuals trying to kill him or marry him, so, too, do the protagonists of the novel travel through hazardous waters facing pirates, bandits, and would-be rapists until they can be reunited with their lovers. Lefteratou notes, "The novelistic heroines, models of chastity par excellence, are molded on the wise, cunning and virtuous Penelope."[136] Most heroines in ancient novels can outsmart undesired suitors and remain faithful to their lovers.

Chariton's heroine, Callirhoe, is markedly different from other female protagonists in the novel because the author creates a situation that intertwines the stories and characteristics of Helen and Penelope. Lefteratou emphasizes that the "megatext" of Penelope and Helen bestows to the novel "a story about Beauty's abduction and her recovery by her beloved."[137] Chariton's novel *Callirhoe* tells the tale of a beautiful woman with two husbands, the first of whom travels east in search of her; the story climaxes in a war in which west confronts east, and eventually the heroine is recovered by her first husband. The trope of the abducted wife forced to go east and the husband

---

[135] Doulamis (2009) articulates the connection between the novel and oral storytelling traditions. Lowe (2000), and Lefteratou (2018) elaborate on the Homeric influences within Chariton's novel.
[136] Lefteratou (2018) 176.
[137] Lefteratou (2018) 200.

striving to regain his abducted wife obviously draws inspiration from the myth of Helen and her time in Troy. Simultaneously, Callirhoe has connections with Penelope, because she begins the story as the archetypal faithful wife and, after being taken, must regain her Penelopian status in order to reunite successfully with her husband after an extended chain of adventures.

Following the scholars De Temmerman and Lefteratou, in this chapter I first examine the ways in which Callirhoe reflects characteristics and plot details of the Homeric heroines.[138] However, it is not my aim simply to detail every instance in which Callirhoe resembles either Penelope or Helen throughout the novel. Instead, I argue that Chariton intentionally alludes to the characteristics of Helen and Penelope in his portrayal of Callirhoe in order to use his and his reader's familiarity with epic heroines to structure the ideal traits of a family in his novel. I argue that Chariton intentionally aligns his heroine with the epic protagonists Helen and Penelope in order to manipulate these similarities to create his own ideal protagonist. One way that Chariton finesses his allusions to Helen and Penelope is through his own characters' perception of Callirhoe's intentions. The amount of knowledge about Callirhoe's thoughts and actions possessed by Dionysius, Chaereas, and Callirhoe herself changes the lens through which Callirhoe's actions are interpreted both within the novel and by its readers. Chaereas, Callirhoe's first husband and the character with the smallest amount of access to knowledge about Callirhoe, sees his wife as a figure more aligned with Helen, whereas Callirhoe views herself more as a Penelope through her patience, loyalty, and utilization of dreams. From there, this chapter evaluates how the act of remembering and forgetting can preserve or

[138] De Temmerman (2014) 51–57; Lefteratou (2018) 205–229.

destroy a family. When wives such as Penelope and Callirhoe remember their absent husband, they preserve the *οἶκος* and the family unit. Chariton's novel takes the concept of remembrance as a preservation of the family a step further by introducing the importance of male remembrance. Callirhoe is able to preserve both her family in Syracuse with Chaereas and her family in Miletus with her child and Dionysius because all three characters remain equally mindful of each other and preserve their respective familial bonds. In doing this, Chariton takes the traditional family structure, as seen in epic, and transforms it into something more reproductive and innovative in the novel.

Myths of Penelope

The main ancient source text for Penelope's myth is Homer's *Odyssey*.[139] The *Odyssey* offers glimpses into the characters of Menelaus' and Odysseus' wives, pointing out the intelligence and the faithfulness of Penelope, as opposed to that of Helen and Clytemnestra.[140] More than any other traits, Penelope is known for her intelligence and loyalty to her husband; therefore, she is the static point of reference for Odysseus' active travels within the Homeric epic. However, a promiscuous, faithless Penelope is not unknown in antiquity. The Arcadian tradition introduces an unfaithful Penelope. The earliest reference for this tradition comes from fragments of the Greek historian Hecataeus and Pindar, which link Pan's birth to a love affair between Penelope and

[139] Ovid draws directly from Homer's tale in his *Heroides* 1 about Penelope. Plato and Livy use Homer's representation of Penelope, as a faithful, patient, and dutiful wife, to shape the character of an ideal wife.
[140] Lefteratou (2018) 181. Throughout the *Odyssey* Penelope is indirectly contrasted with Helen. Every time Penelope laments Odysseus' departure, the reader is reminded that Helen is the reason for it. Every time Penelope goes to her room and weeps for the state of her home, the reader knows that this fate could have been avoided for Penelope if the war had never happened. When Helen comes onto the scene in Book Four, she is living a version of the life that Penelope should be living: at home, with her husband safe, and entertaining guests.

Apollo.[141] There is also a variant version by Duris of Samos in which Pan is the offspring of Penelope sleeping with all of her suitors.[142] Mactoux also suggests an echo between Penelope's name in Doric, *Panelopa,* and Pan.[143] Despite these variations on Penelope's reputation and plot line, Penelope, unlike her female epic counter-parts Helen and Clytemnestra, does not appear in ancient drama. When Penelope is mentioned in later literature outside of the *Odyssey*, such as Ovid's *Heroides* and Plutarch's *Amatorius,* she upholds the wise and chaste characterization found in Homer's work. Although there is a broad tradition from which he could draw upon, the novelist Chariton does not seem to be interested in the Arcadian tradition, but rather in the Panhellenic tradition produced in the *Odyssey* that emphasizes Penelope's loyalty to Odysseus.

Myths of Helen

Much like the myth of Penelope, Helen's myth has its roots in Homer's texts, which later authors would manipulate to their own ends. As the mortal daughter of Zeus and Leda, Helen's family and beauty are important facets of her character. The long-standing debate of ancient and modern scholars about Helen is whether she left Sparta willingly or not, and whether she ever went to Troy. The scene in Book Three of the *Iliad*, in which Helen laments her decision to follow Paris and leave behind her family, homeland, and friends suggests that Helen does initially leave voluntarily.[144] However, debates surrounding Helen's willingness to leave Sparta spring up as early as Herodotus,

[141] Pindar fr. 100; Hecataeus *FGrHist 1* F 371; Herodotus 2.145.4.
[142] Duris of Samos *FHG* fr. 42.
[143] Mactoux (1975) 221–222. Although it fits with the tradition of the region, this etymology seems purely speculative.
[144] *Iliad* 3.171–180.

who maintains that Helen was stolen by Paris as an act of a long-standing feud between Greece and Persia.[145] Fantuzzi remarks that Stasinus' *Cypria* "seems to have transmitted other tales about Achilles' meeting with Helen in Troy" and that it "stressed the role of Aphrodite in Helen's love affairs."[146] There is also a version of the Helen myth, introduced by the lyric poet Stesichorus, that presents the Spartan queen as a faithful, chaste wife, who never visits Troy.[147] This line of thought continues with Euripides' *Helen*, in which Helen does not go to Troy with Paris, but instead is taken to Egypt by order of Hera. However, the *Helen* is not the only play of Euripides in which Helen appears; in Euripides' *Trojan Women*, Helen is present in Troy and attempts to prove her innocence to Menelaus, who remains unconvinced, in front of Hecuba and the other captured women of Troy. It is clear that ancient authors themselves draw from several different traditions and change how they depict the myth of Helen and demonstrate how complex her mythology really is.[148] Chariton himself seems to mostly draw inspiration for his heroine, Callirhoe, from the Homeric myth of Helen, specifically her journey east and the battle that happens between her two husbands, Menelaus and Paris.

Knowledge as a Connector of Characters

In the first book of Chariton's novel, Callirhoe marries. This union at the opening of the novel is unusual for the genre, as most couples marry at the very end of their story. At the same time, however, because the main characters wed so early in the story, their

[145] *Histories* 1.3.1-2.
[146] Fantuzzi (2012) 14–16.
[147] Gumpert (2001) 77.
[148] Edmunds (2016) 104 notes, "It is fairly clear that in the course of time attitudes towards Helen changed, from more forgiving in Greek verse to less forgiving in Athenian tragedy."

union allows the reader more opportunity to draw the connection between Callirhoe, Penelope, and Helen which will be seen throughout the novel.[149] In order for Callirhoe to be aligned with Penelope or Helen, she must be married. Almost the entirety of both Helen and Penelope's myths revolve around their wedding and marriage. It would be nearly impossible for Chariton to draw meaningful connections between these epic protagonists and his own heroine if she did not have their same marital status. Callirhoe, much like Helen and Penelope, is extremely sought after and young men flock to Syracuse for the opportunity to marry her.[150] However, it is not one of these external suitors who marries her, but a native Syracusan, Chaereas, who was not even attempting to win her hand, which leaves a sour taste in the mouths of the suitors:

> *Εἰ μέν τις ἐξ ἡμῶν ἔγημεν, οὐκ ἄν ὠργίσθην, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἕνα δεῖ νικῆσαι τῶν ἀγωνισαμένων: ἐπεὶ δὲ παρευδοκίμησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ μηδὲν ὑπὲρ τοῦ γάμου πονήσας, οὐ φέρω τὴν ὕβριν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ παρετάθημεν αὐλειοις θύραις προσαγρυνοῦντες, καὶ κολακεύοντες τίτθας καὶ θεραπαινίδας καὶ δῶρα πέμποντες τροφοῖς πόσον χρόνον δεδουλεύκαμεν καὶ, τὸ πάντων χαλεπώτατον, ὡς ἀντεραστὰς ἀλλήλους ἐμισήσαμεν: ὁ δὲ πόρνος καὶ πένης καὶ μηδενὸς κρείττων βασιλέων ἀγωνισαμένων αὐτὸς ἀκονιτὶ τὸν στέφανον ἥρατο.*
>
> If one of us had married her, I would not be angry, just as in athletic competitions one from those contending must win: but since he surpassed us, he having done nothing for the marriage, I will not tolerate the insult. We were stretched out lying awake at the doors of her house, and flattering the maids and nurses, giving gifts to those having reared her. How long have we been her slaves, and the worst thing of all is that we hated each other as rivals: but this fornicator, poor boy, nobody himself takes the crown without a struggle, while better kings were competing.
>
> (*Callirhoe* 1.2.2-3)[151]

[149] De Temmerman (2014) 50.
[150] *Callirhoe* 1.1.2.
[151] All citations to Chariton's *Callirhoe* are from Reardon (2004). All translations are my own.

This speech made by one of the suitors simultaneously brings to mind both of the famous suitor councils in Greek myth: one in Sparta, for the hand of Helen, and one in Ithaca, for the remarriage of Penelope. The speech starts out referencing a competition, which one of the competitors must win. The competition for Helen was similar to this. According to the fragments of Hesiod, between twenty-nine and ninety-nine men showed up for Helen's hand, among whom was not Menelaus, but instead his brother, Agamemnon, who competed in his brother's stead.[152] A similar uprising might have taken place at the marriage of Helen had the suitors not signed an agreement to uphold and support whomever was chosen.[153] Because no such pact of honor was made among Callirhoe's suitors, they band together to enact revenge on Chaereas for taking Callirhoe from them.

The tone and wording of the suitor's speech above also closely resembles that of Penelope's leading suitor, Eurymachus, who fears what people will say if Odysseus, disguised as the beggar, might string the bow:

> "*ἦ πολὺ χείρονες ἄνδρες ἀμύμονος ἀνδρὸς ἄκοιτιν* 325
> *μνῶνται, οὐδέ τι τόξον ἐύξοον ἐντανύουσιν:*
> *ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις πτωχὸς ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν*
> *ῥηιδίως ἐτάνυσσε βιόν, διὰ δ' ἦκε σιδήρου."*
> *ὥς ἐρέουσ' ἡμῖν δ' ἄν ἐλέγχεα ταῦτα γένοιτο.*
>
> "Truly far weaker men are wooing the wife of a noble man, 325
> and cannot string his polished bow:
> but some other beggar man arriving after wandering
> easily strung the bow, and shot through the iron."
> Thus they will say, but for us this would become a shame.
> (*Odyssey* 21.325-329)[154]

[152] Hughes (2005) 80.
[153] For the wooing of Helen see Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* fr. 154-155.
[154] All citations to Homer's *Odyssey* are from West (2017). All translations are my own.

The suitor's speech in the *Callirhoe* follows a very similar pattern to that of Eurymachus. In both texts, two issues are brought forward. The first is that these suitors have formed a bond in their pursuit of the heroine, and now someone from outside the group is trying to claim her. The second, and more serious, issue is that of class. Both of the speaking suitors use an image of an athletic competition to separate the group of suitors from the outsider contending for the hand of the heroine. The suitors in the *Callirhoe*, in particular, use this imagery of the *γυμνικός ἀγών* (athletic competition) to exclude Chaereas from their ranks as noblemen. Odysseus, in this part of the epic, is disguised as a beggar, who is about to attempt the same competition as these noble suitors. The distinction of classes between the suitors and Odysseus as beggar adds insult to injury for those seeking Penelope; the competition is no longer between social peers, but instead now includes a poor local man. Manual Fernández-Galiano notes that Eurymachus' use of *πολὺ χείρονες ἄνδρες* (far weaker men) is meant to be sarcastic, and the ending ἡμῖν has an emphatic meaning "for persons as important as us."[155] The suitors in Chariton's *Callirhoe* take a similar stance to those in the *Odyssey*. While Chaereas is far from a beggar, his father is only the second most important man in Syracuse. The other suitors, in comparison, are all of great noble birth seeking the hand of the most noble woman in Syracuse. While the distinction in class is less obvious in the *Callirhoe* the actions the suitors take in the novel to attempt to break up the couple and put a strain on their marriage are a direct result of this class difference. The suitors in both texts see the acceptance of their competition as an *ὕβρις*, or "insult," for which they will be mocked, and the speeches serve to unite each suitor as one joint unit against its competition.

[155] Fernández-Galiano (1992) 187.

The connection between Callirhoe and Penelope continues to develop after the meeting of the suitors. When Chaereas has to leave his new wife suddenly to tend to his father, the suitors concoct multiple plans to make it seem as though Callirhoe has been unfaithful to her husband. Chaereas, falling for the tricks of the suitors, ends up kicking Callirhoe in a fit of rage, temporarily stopping her breath.[156] Lefteratou states that this misunderstanding between what the suitors want Chaereas to believe and reality creates a suspense "by opposing the two levels of plot understanding, those of the external and internal readers."[157] From this point forward, a disconnect of knowledge concerning Callirhoe's loyalty and intentions will exist between Callirhoe and the other characters in the novel, especially Chaereas, who seems to be three steps behind every other character in terms of knowledge about his wife.

From the moment Chaereas storms into the house after being fooled into believing Callirhoe is having an affair, the external reader is presented with two contradictory points of view regarding Callirhoe's actions during the plot. The first point of view is a Helen-based one focalized through Chaereas, who wholeheartedly believes that his wife has been unfaithful to him and that he must reclaim his wife from another man.[158] The characterization of Chaereas as the Menelaus figure is made all the more emphatic by his insistence that he will forgive Callirhoe despite her actions toward him.[159] The second point of view is a Penelope-based understanding as presented by the narrator's description of Callirhoe:

---

[156] *Callirhoe* 1.3.1-1.4.12.
[157] Lefteratou (2018) 207.
[158] De Temmerman (2014) 59 notes "nowhere in the whole novel does Chaereas consciously characterize her as *sophron* … Chaereas' perception of Callirhoe's *sophrosyne* is intertwined with his self-position within the narrative."
[159] *Callirhoe* 1.4.4. It should be noted that this promise is quickly forgotten once Chaereas sees Callirhoe.

> *…ἡ δὲ Καλλιρρόη καθῆστο ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης ζητοῦσα Χαιρέαν καὶ μηδὲ λύχνον ἅψασα διὰ τὴν λύπην: ψόφου δὲ ποδῶν γενομένου πρώτη τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ᾔσθετο τὴν ἀναπνοὴν καὶ χαίρουσα αὐτῷ προσέδραμεν.*
>
> …but Callirhoe sat on her bed, longing for Chaereas and on account of her grief she had not kindled a lamp; but there was the noise of feet and she first perceived the breath of her husband and rejoicing she ran to him.
>
> (*Callirhoe* 1.4.11)

This image of Callirhoe sitting in her room, longing for her husband, who, in reality, has only been gone for a few days, evokes images of Penelope crying in her room awaiting her husband who has been away for twenty years.[160] An intriguing detail is added her that Callirhoe has no problem recognizing her husband's footsteps or breath. This could be because they are recently married and Chaereas has been gone two days, not twenty years; however, I also think Chariton is making a comment about Penelope in this scene. Scholars have long debated whether Penelope recognizes Odysseus when she sees him.[161] Callirhoe's recognition of Chaereas seems to indicate that Chariton, as the author, believes that Penelope does recognize Odysseus. The author specifically has Callirhoe recognize Chaereas in this scene to continue the catalogue of similarities between Callirhoe and Penelope. It can be argued that Callirhoe's recognition of Chaereas' breath and footsteps in the above scene is more a sign of fidelity than a true recognition. However, this is not the only place in the novel where Callirhoe is able to identify Chaereas without seeing him. In *Callirhoe* 8.1.1, a veiled Callirhoe recognizes Chaereas'

[160] *Odyssey* 1.361-365.
[161] See Katz (1991), Felson-Rubin (1994), and Clayton (2004) for discussion surrounding Penelope and her test and recognition of Odysseus.

voice. This recognition takes place after Callirhoe has traveled to Miletus, remarried, and has already traveled across Asia Minor.[162]

Moving into Book Two the option of remarriage and the question of fidelity continue to connect the heroines of Homer's epic and Callirhoe. Callirhoe's narrative evocation of Helen is introduced when she is abducted, taken east, and sold as a slave in Miletus. However, unlike Homer's Helen, Callirhoe is forcibly abducted from her tomb.[163] At the end of the first book, when the raiders are invading her tomb, Callirhoe conceives of herself in the role of an abducted bride, or even an abducted Penelope of sorts, whom Chaereas will finally fully appreciate now that she is gone:

> *"ἀληθῶς ἀπόλωλα, ὦ Χαιρέα" φησί, "τοσούτῳ διαζευχθεῖσα πάθει. Καὶ σὺ μὲν πενθεῖς καὶ μετανοεῖς καὶ τάφῳ κενῷ παρακάθησαι, μετὰ θάνατόν μοι τὴν σωφροσύνην μαρτυρῶν…"*
>
> She said, "Truly I am lost, oh Chaereas, being separated by so great an incident. You are mourning for me and repenting and you sit in an empty tomb, giving witness to my chastity after my death…
>
> (*Callirhoe* 1.14.9-10)

In her vision of events, Chaereas now sits alone in an empty room lamenting his missing lover, just as she had done for him earlier.[164] In her idealized world, Chaereas mourns her *σωφροσύνη* (chastity) rather than her beauty or even her life. Lefteratou notes about Callirhoe's abduction that "the cherished *σωφροσύνη* that assimilates Callirhoe to Penelope is questioned: not only is she in a foreign land but she also has a new lord, the

---

[162] Women in the novel seem to have the uncanny ability to recognize their spouse in any situation, but this power seems typically to apply to women alone. Cleitophon is unable to identify Leucippe when her hair is cut, but she can easily identify him after he has been beaten. Part of this is due to the female protagonist's willingness to believe that reunification is possible, whereas male characters tend to believe what they hear, even if it is not true.

[163] I discussed earlier in this chapter the various authorial beliefs surrounding Helen's departure from Sparta. However, for the purposes of this thesis, I interpret Helen's journey as the one depicted in Homer' s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

[164] *Callirhoe* 1.4.11

widower, Dionysius; furthermore, she is gorgeous."[165] Indeed, Chaereas continues to see Callirhoe as a Helen-figure after he discovers that she has been stolen from her tomb. However, he now casts himself as the heroic Menelaus figure, who must go east in order to reclaim his bride.

Ironically, Dionysius, Callirhoe's second husband, also envisions himself as a Menelaus figure after Callirhoe accepts his marriage proposal.[166] When Dionysius is first rejected by Callirhoe, he laments the love story he thought they could have shared, *φεύγει δὲ ἡ νεώνητος, ἣν ἤλπιζον ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης εἶναί μοι τὸ δῶρον, καὶ ἀνέπλαττον ἐμαυτῷ βίον μακάριον ὑπὲρ Μενέλεων τὸν τῆς Λακεδαιμονίας γυναικός* "The newly bought girl flees, whom I hoped was a gift for me from Aphrodite, and I was imagining for myself a blessed life beyond Menelaus, the husband of the Spartan woman" (*Callirhoe* 2.6.1). The cause of this misinterpretation by both Chaereas and Dionysius stems from the fact that both men believe that they know the entire story of Callirhoe's experience, but they are both missing crucial details. During their marriage arrangement, Callirhoe promises to tell Dionysius everything, but fails to mention that she is already married.[167] Because Callirhoe has concealed information from him, and because Dionysius refuses to force himself on her, he sees himself as a rightful suitor of a fair Helen, one who eventually wins in the end, rather than a lecherous suitor of another man's chaste, loyal wife. Chaereas, on the other hand, while not technically wrong in his interpretation of the

[165] Lefteratou (2018) 210.
[166] De Temmerman (2014) 61 comments on the parallels between Chaereas' and Dionysius' marriage to Callirhoe.
[167] *Callirhoe* 2.5.11.

actual events of the situation - since Callirhoe *was* still alive, kidnapped, and taken east - nevertheless, uses the fact of her abduction to focus attention on himself:[168]

> *...ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸ πέλαγος "ἄγε με" φησίν, "ὦ θάλασσα, τὸν αὐτὸν δρόμον, ὃν καὶ Καλλιρρόην ἤγαγες. Εὔχομαί σοι, Πόσειδον, ἢ κἀκείνην μεθ' ἡμῶν ἢ μηδὲ ἐμὲ χωρὶς ἐκείνης ἐνταῦθα. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ δύναμαι τὴν γυναῖκα τῆν ἐμὴν ἀπολαβεῖν, θέλω κἂν δουλεύειν μετ' αὐτῆς."*
>
> …looking towards the sea he said, "Oh sea, take me on the same course, which you also took Callirhoe. Poseidon, I beg you, either that she is with us, or that I not be here apart from her. For if I cannot take back my wife, I want to be a slave with her."
>
> (*Callirhoe* 3.5.9)

Not once in this speech does he ask for Callirhoe's safety or good health. Instead, he focuses his speech on himself and what he wants. The overall message of the speech appears self-sacrificing and noble; however, his language makes it clear that his speech focuses not on Callirhoe, but himself. Chaereas refers to Callirhoe by name only once, after which he uses demonstrative pronouns *ἐκείνη* (that one), and the non-specific adjective *αὐτῆς* (her). While Chaereas does refer to Callirhoe as his *γυνή* (wife); the first-person focus, emphasized by the use of the possessive adjective *ἐμὴ* (my), overshadows the noun. Chaereas refers explicitly to himself at least four times over these four lines. By doing this, Chaereas shifts the attention from Callirhoe, the woman who was abducted, and focuses it on himself as a victim. Chaereas' self-drawn attention evokes the self-serving interest of Menelaus, who never stops to question whether Helen was taken by force or, if the former was not the case, why she would have left. Instead, the entire war is centered around the insult he felt and the need to retrieve what was taken.

---

[168] Gregory (1996) 9 notes: "Those critics and translators who choose the reading of Helen as an agent of her own fate do so because they cannot support the incoherence that the abduction reading seems to involve."

The lack of literary representation of ancient women's reasonings and thoughts behind their actions is not new. Blondell notes that something similar to this happens in the *Iliad*. Helen must actively apply blame to herself in order to continue having an active presence in her own story in which the male characters downplay or eradicate her agency in the events that led to the Trojan War.[169] However, Helen must balance her self-blame. She certainly does not wish to be blamed for the entirety of the war. The consequence of not speaking up would be the erasure of her agency altogether and, even worse, a transformation from a person to stolen object.[170] Because Callirhoe is not present to explain the events of her abduction, Chaereas is able to frame her as an object that has been taken from him without taking a moment to wonder if she left on her own volition. The readers, having witnessed Callirhoe's abduction, know that she was taken unwillingly, but Chaereas does not have this information and still chooses to interpret the scene as such and take away any agency Callirhoe might have had in the moment.

Callirhoe's actions and represented feelings during her time in Miletus align her character more closely with Penelope. Although she sees the parallels between the events that she has experienced and those experienced by Helen, her own actions and thoughts are aligned more towards Penelope. Like Penelope, Callirhoe tries to stay faithful to her first husband, laments the loss of Chaereas, and expresses concern over the preservation of her family.[171] Much like this epic counterpart, Callirhoe is so uncomfortable with the interest of other men that she cries when Dionysius asks her about herself: *ταῦτα λέγουσα*

---

[169] Blondell (2010) 11. Gregory (1996) 10 also discusses the transformation of Helen's agency within the *Iliad*: "The *Iliad* portrays palimpsestically the process of a woman's transformation from self-willed agent to victim of the will of her seducer - a victim, who, given the chance, would have remained true to her husband."
[170] Blondell (2010) 5.
[171] Lefteratou (2018) 213.

ἐπειρᾶτο μὲν λανθάνειν, ἐλείβετο δὲ αὐτῆς τὰ δάκυρα κατὰ τῶν παρειῶν "Saying these things she was trying to avoid attention, but tears poured forth down her cheeks" (*Callirhoe* 2.5.7). These tears, like the tears of Penelope in front of the suitors, should have served as a sign of the sincerity of her feelings, and as response to the humiliation felt in this situation.[172] Callirhoe gives up hope that Chaereas will come to save her because he does not even know where she is.

Faced with an impossible task, to marry again or risk herself and her unborn son becoming slaves, Callirhoe goes off into her room to debate with herself. However, once she falls asleep, she is greeted by Chaereas in her dreams:

> *Ταῦτα λογιζομένῃ δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς ὕπνος ἐπῆλθε πρὸς ὀλίγον. Ἐπέστη δὲ αὐτῇ εἰκὼν Χαιρέου πάντ' αὐτῷ μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' εἰκυῖα, καὶ φωνήν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροὶ εἵματα ἕστο. Παρεστὼς δὲ "παρατίθεμαί σοι" φησίν "ὦ γύναι, τὸν υἱόν."*
>
> Considering these things through the entire night, sleep came to her a little. The likeness of Chaereas stood over her, being similar to him in every way both in stature and beautiful eyes and voice, and he had worn these sorts of clothes on his body. Standing by her he said, "I entrust my son to you, oh wife."
>
> (*Callirhoe* 2.9.6)

Before falling asleep, Callirhoe is faced with a dilemma similar to Penelope's: does she remarry or does she remain faithful and find out what Fortune has in store for her? Just in case the epic connection is not clear enough, Chariton directly quotes Book Twenty-three of the *Iliad* in which Patroclus comes back from the grave as a ghost to advise Achilles to move on: *μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' εἰκυῖα / καὶ φωνήν…* "being similar both in stature and beautiful eyes / and voice…" (*Iliad* 23.66–67). The imagery of Patroclus coming to Achilles emphasizes the importance of dreams and the usefulness of dreams for giving

[172] *Odyssey* 1.325-344; see Helleman (1995) 235-236 for discussion.

hard advice to a loved one. Callirhoe, just as Achilles, is less than eager to move on with her life, but with the advice of Chaereas in her dream, she is able to take the steps needed to preserve their child. In Book Nineteen, Penelope also has a dream that, once interpreted, encourages her to set forth the competition of the bow and move on to the next phase of her life.[173]

Penelope, on the other hand, asks the beggar/her husband to interpret her dream in which an eagle swoops down and kills twenty geese, which she cherishes.[174] The beggar disguised as Odysseus interprets this dream to mean that Odysseus will return to slay the suitors. However, this interpretation bears further scrutiny. As other scholars such as Katz Anhalt and Haller have noted, dreams, especially symbolic dreams, are open to misinterpretation or different interpretations.[175] According to Odysseus' prophetic interpretation, the dream geese symbolize the suitors, who will be slaughtered by a returning Odysseus. Penelope sets up the competition, not necessarily because she agrees with Odysseus' interpretation, but because she recognizes that enough time has passed and action needs to be taken. While I personally believe that Penelope does recognize Odysseus, in this situation it does not really matter whether Penelope recognizes her husband. Penelope already seems to know what should happen next, which is made apparent when she provides an interpretation of her dream within the dream itself. Instead of asking her husband's opinion, Penelope seems to be using the dream to urge him to take the action she herself could not take and destroy the suitors.

---

[173] *Odyssey* 19.554-559.
[174] *Odyssey* 19.535.
[175] Katz Anhalt (2001); Haller (2009).

Directly after this dream interpretation, Penelope devises the contest of the bow, which she knows only her husband can string, thereby allowing him to effectively beat the suitors at their own game. Callirhoe, on the other hand, decides to give in to her suitor and remarry, but before she tells Dionysius she states: *μαρτύρομαί σε, Χαιρέα, σύ με Διονυσίῳ νυμφαγωγεῖς* "I invoke you as a witness, Chaereas: you are marrying me away to Dionysius" (*Callirhoe* 2.11.3–4). Dream Chaereas leads Callirhoe to her second marriage-this is the only way she can think of to preserve her child. Callirhoe is not forced into the marriage, nor does she fall in love with Dionysius; instead, she follows the advice of her first husband, which results in her second marriage. Lefteratou and De Temmerman argue that Callirhoe's remarriage links her to Helen because she was taken from her first husband and remarried to an eastern leader, which is how both Chaereas and Dionysius interpret her marriage to the Milesian general.[176] However, Callirhoe, like Penelope in conversation with the disguised Odysseus, engages in decision making about remarriage in response to her interactions with a dream-figure of her husband. Her epic counterpart is also given the opportunity to remarry by her husband after their child comes of age, but she chooses to wait it out.[177] Callirhoe does not have the luxury of time that Penelope has since she is now pregnant, in a foreign land, without a husband, and with the possibility of slavery hanging over her head. Their differing situations call for a different outcomes, but both make sure to consult their husbands and heed their advice before making a decision about remarrying.

Overall, the amount of knowledge about Callirhoe's mindset and situation ultimately determines how Dionysius, Chaereas, and Callirhoe herself interpret and

[176] De Temmerman (2014) 54-56; Lefteratou (2018) 217.
[177] *Odyssey* 18.269-270.

connect Callirhoe's actions to Helen and Penelope. Some characters such as Chaereas or Dionysius believe that Callirhoe is a beautiful Helen waiting for her Menelaus and having been abducted by a Paris. However, Callirhoe herself recognizes that her marriages more closely resemble Penelope's to Odysseus. Although Callirhoe remarries, like Helen, she does so with the permission of her husband, and throughout her marriage to Dionysius she remains loyal and emotionally faithful to her first husband. Nevertheless, despite Callirhoe's emotional loyalty to Chaereas, her first husband, she does present their child as belonging to Dionysius and thereby creates a family and a life with her second husband. As a result, Callirhoe's family unit is severely altered after her second marriage. In the next section, I examine the ways in which the act of remembering, specifically by the wife, affects the preservation of the *οἶκος* (home) in epic and Chariton's novel. By tying this together with the idea of active remembering as a method of preserving the family and the family home, I also analyze how Chariton expands on the concept of family in the novel.

Memory and Forgetfulness as a Family Connection

A woman's relationship with her family in the ancient world was complicated. She lived at home until the appropriate age when her father found her a husband to marry, whether a foreign or local husband.[178] Before the laws of Solon and Pericles, women of high-ranking families were often sent to other city-states in order to forge alliances with other prominent families, and the loyalty of a woman, after she was

[178] Pomeroy (1997) 17.

married, switched from her natal kin to her husband and conjugal family.[179] This loyalty to her husband meant that a woman's identity and social standing relied upon the maintenance of her newfound *οἶκος*, and because of this reliance on the home as a source of identity, women often did not travel far from their homes. In the literary instances when women did leave their marital/familial *οἶκος*, their reputations suffered.[180] The relationship between the home and the woman is further complicated with the introduction of children.

Demosthenes gives an example of the idealized role of a wife in fourth century Greece: *τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἑταίρας ἡδονῆς ἕνεκ' ἔχομεν, τὰς δὲ παλλακὰς τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν θεραπείας τοῦ σῶματος, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως καὶ τῶν ἔνδον φύλακα πιστὴν ἔχειν* "We have *hetairai* for pleasure, *pallakai* for the daily care of our body, and *gynaikes* to bear children legitimately and to have a trusty guard of the things inside" (*Against Neaira,* 122).[181] In ancient Athenian society, both the *hetairai* and the *pallakai* are types of female sex workers; however, their places in society, both in terms of physical location and use, are distinct. *Hetairai* are the more high-status courtesans: they are well educated in instruments, literature, and rhetoric, and are associated with the private sphere of symposia.[182] *Pallakai*, on the other hand, are more aligned with concubines, who are household slaves that live closely with men.[183] *Gynaikes,* then, are the least accessible women in the city, remaining at or near their homes for most of their

[179] Pomeroy (1997) 64. This loyalty to a husband's family shifted after the laws of Pericles and Solon because women were more often kept in the communities and fathers could call their daughters back home if they wished.
[180] Examples of this include Helen, Medea, Antigone, and Dido, who leaves her family home after her husband is murdered.
[181] Xenophon's *Oikonomikos* also provides an excellent description on the role and duties of a *γυνή*.
[182] Gilhuly (2009) 113.
[183] Gilhuly (2009) 14.

lives. It is hard to say for certain what a "good" wife would have been like compared to a "bad" wife, but many ancient authors relied on Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as extreme examples of a "good" wife in Penelope, and a "bad" one in Helen and Clytemnestra.[184]

Penelope's chastity, constancy, and loyalty earned her the title of paradigmatic wife. Yet there is much more to Penelope than these qualities, just as Helen is much more than an unfaithful, devious wife. One of the main differences between these two epic characters, however, is that Penelope's *κλέος* (glory) was typically viewed in a positive light, whereas Helen's was not.[185] This distinction has led scholars, such as Katz, Suzuki, and Felson-Rubin to investigate the qualities of Penelope's *κλέος* and whether Helen's *κλέος* changes once she is returned to Sparta. Both Katz and Felson-Rubin argue that Penelope's *κλέος* stems from more than just her nature as the ever-faithful wife. They claim that her *δόλος* (scheming) and *μῆτις* (cleverness) must also contribute to her glory, even if they are considered less positive qualities.[186] Suzuki argues that Helen undergoes a massive change when she returns from Troy: she is still beautiful and back in her home and maintaining her wifely duties, but she has also returned with new skills that she did not have before, including her use of potions and medicines.[187]

This connection between Helen and particular knowledge links her with Penelope, who also uses her special knowledge to craft situations to her liking. Helleman, however, is less concerned with Penelope's *κλέος* and more concerned with what constitutes feminine *ἀρέτη* (excellence/virtue) because, while there are no examples of this noun

---

[184] Lesser (2019) 3.
[185] Helleman (1995) 229 notes: "The idealization of a virtuous Penelope - constant, dependable, pure, and faithful - is most pronounced in Augustan poets, like Ovid and Propertius, who used Penelope as a model of *fides* and *castitas*."
[186] Katz (1991) 21; Felson-Rubin (1994) 65.
[187] Suzuki (1989) 62. It is also important to note that Homer states that Helen received these *pharmaka* in Egypt, so it is clear that he is familiar with a tradition in which Helen visits Egypt.

used in association with females in the *Iliad*, the word is often used in descriptions of Penelope in the *Odyssey*.[188] Due to the limited use of *ἀρέτη* in descriptions of a female, Helleman also argues that whatever attributes combine to make up Penelope's *ἀρέτη*, namely her beauty and the deeds or accomplishments which establish her preeminence and the reputation she acquires from these deeds, should also be added to her *κλέος*.[189] Mueller, however, evaluates an often-ignored aspect of Penelope: her extraordinary memory and the impact this has on her *κλέος*.[190] She states that women and men remember differently in epic. For instance, men tend to focus less on the act of remembering and more on the concept of being remembered.[191] Women, on the other hand, are tasked with the job of remembering their husbands and of preserving their homes for them.

In Book Twenty-Four of the *Odyssey*, Agamemnon gives two distinct examples of female marital memory, one positive, the other negative. The first example he gives is Penelope: *ὡς ἀγαθαὶ φρένες ἦσαν ἀμύμονι Πηνελοπείῃ / κούρῃ Ἰκαρίου: ὡς εὖ μέμνητ' Ὀδυσῆος, / ἀνδρὸς κουριδίου…* "How good the senses were for blameless Penelope, / daughter of Icarus: how well she remembered Odysseus, / her wedded husband…" (*Odyssey* 24.194–196). In direct comparison to Penelope, Agamemnon chastises his former wife: *οὐκ ὡς Τυνδαρέου κούρη κακὰ μήσατο ἔργα, / κουρίδιον κτείνασα πόσιν…*

---

[188] Helleman (1995) 230: "such an approach to the question of feminine *ἀρέτη* would lead to a definition which clearly distinguishes it from masculine *ἀρέτη*, and differentiates from that of men the peculiar 'excellence' of women, particularly those of the privileged social classes portrayed in epic poetry." Instances of *ἀρέτη* being used to describe Penelope in the *Odyssey* include: 2.206, 18.251, 19.124, 24.193, and 24.197.

[189] Helleman (1995) 232.

[190] Mueller (2007) 337.

[191] In *Iliad* 9.410–416, Achilles reveals his two options: either stay, fight, and receive eternal glory; or go home, live a long time, and be forgotten. Odysseus' entire journey home focuses on his being remembered. Everywhere he goes, he either encounters someone that knows him or will know him by the end of his stay.

"Not thusly, the daughter of Tyndareus plotted evil deeds, / having killed her wedded husband…" (*Odyssey* 24.199–200). It is important to note the verbs in these two sections; Penelope is associated with the verb *μιμνήσκω* (remember), whereas Clytemnestra is linked with *μήδομαι* (plot/be minded). Both women use their minds and think about their husbands, but only Penelope does it in the correct way by actively remembering her husband and staying loyal to him. Clytemnestra, on the other hand, uses her mind for her own selfish motives to actively harm her husband. This distinction between actively remembering someone else and actively thinking about oneself contributes to the distinctive quality of Penelope's *kleos* in the *Odyssey* as well as, more generally, to the characterization of the ideal wife in archaic and Classical Greece.[192]

In the novel, marital memory operates at a different level than in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. The first difference is due to the fact that Callirhoe is simultaneously married to two men and recognizes both as her husbands. Secondly, the burden of remembering and recognizing one's spouse lands on both the husband and the wife. This shared responsibility of remembrance and dedication to the relationship strengthens the family bond, and in the case of Callirhoe, evokes a new concept of what a nuclear family can look like. In the following, I evaluate memory ability of Callirhoe, Helen, and Penelope in order to gauge the quality of their *κλέος* as wives. Furthermore, I examine the degree to which each family is preserved and, in the case of Callirhoe, expanded through the utilization of remembrance during the absence of a spouse.

Foley notes that there are three key passages in the *Odyssey* that offer points from which one can study female memory: a). 24.195, where Agamemnon awards Penelope

[192] Mueller (2007) 337 discusses how Penelope achieve *kleos* through her selfless actions.

κλέος for remembering Odysseus; b). 15.20-23, where Athena claims that a woman tends to forget her previous marriage and child when she remarries; and c). 19.581, where Penelope vows to remember Odysseus' house in her dreams.[193] In each of these passages, the speaker uses the verb *μιμνήσκω* to give evidence for the process of memory that indicates the level of faithfulness of a woman. Penelope, then, uses her memory as a constant source of reassurance and as an anchor of her position in Odysseus' house. Even if she must remarry, she remains faithful to Odysseus in her mind because she remembers him and his home. Zeitlin argues that fidelity is figured by Penelope's immobility in the house and her continuous weeping: "Fidelity is less an affair of the heart than the mind, and infidelity is equated as much with a changing of the mind or failing to remember as with engaging in conscious and active deception."[194] Penelope repeats the same speech about remembering the home of Odysseus twice, both to the beggar/Odysseus in Book Nineteen and to the suitors right before the contest begins:

> *ὅς δε κε ῥηίτατ' ἐντανύσῃ βιὸν ἐν παλάμῃσι*
> *καὶ διοιστεύσῃ πελέκεων δυοκαίδεκα πάντων,*
> *τῷ κεν ἅμ' ἐσποίμην, νοσφισσαμένη τόδε δῶμα*
> *κουρίδιον, μάλα καλόν, ἐνίπλειον βιότοιο,* 580
> *τοῦ ποτὲ μεμνήσεσθαι ὀΐομαι ἔν περ ὀνείρῳ.*
>
> Whoever most easily strings the bow in his hands
> and shoots an arrow through all twelve axe heads,
> I would follow him, after leaving this this wedded house
> especially beautiful, full of livelihood, 580
> I think I will remember it, especially in my dreams.
> (*Odyssey* 19.577–581)[195]

[193] Foley (1995) 105.
[194] Zeitlin (1996) 44.
[195] These exact lines are repeated at *Odyssey* 21.75–79 when Penelope announces the contest of the bow to the suitors. The first mention of these lines, in Book Nineteen, is an intimate confession to her husband. Felson-Rubin (1996) takes this scene as an indication that Penelope knows that Odysseus has returned and is assuring him of her loyalty. The repetition to the suitors in Book Twenty-One, then, acts both as an introduction to the contest and a public declaration of Penelope's faithfulness to Odysseus.

This scene is interpreted in two very different ways: either, as Katz and Zeitlin understand, Penelope is finally giving in to the suitors and Odysseus has arrived just in time to see his formerly faithful wife give into the men she has been denying for so long; or, as is claimed by Mueller and Foley, Penelope is asserting to the suitors and the beggar Odysseus that she will forever remain loyal to the house of Odysseus.[196] The crux of Mueller's argument, with which I agree, is that Penelope *οἴμαι* (believes) that she will *μιμνήσκω* (remember) her husband *ἔν περ ὀνείρῳ* (in [her] dreams).[197]

In the previous section, I discussed the importance of spouses and dreams, which effectively act as a point of communication where advice and permissions can be given. When Penelope tells the suitors that she will keep her husband's home in her dreams, it means that she is not letting go of the connection she has to his *οἶκος* and, thus, her marriage to him. Athena informs a concerned Telemachus that when a wife gets remarried, she forgets her former husband and children:

> *οἶσθα γὰρ οἷος θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γυναικός* 20
> *κείνου βούλεται οἶκον ὀφέλλειν ὅς κεν ὀπυίῃ,*
> *παίδων δὲ προτέρων καὶ κουριδίοιο φίλοιο*
> *οὐκέτι μέμνηται τεθνηκότος οὐδὲ μεταλλᾷ.*
>
> For you know what sort of heart is in the breast of a woman 20
> she wishes to care for the home of that one who marries her,
> but she no longer remembers her previous children and her dear
> wedded husband when he has died, nor does she ask about them.
> (*Odyssey* 15.20–23)

In this speech Athena does two things: she explains the expected actions of a remarried woman, while simultaneously specifying that, for a woman and wife, *μιμνήσκω* (to

[196] Katz (1991) 147, Foley (1995) 102-103, Zeitlin (1996) 49, and Mueller (2007) 345.
[197] Mueller (2007) 346.

remember) is equated with *ὀφέλλω οἶκον* (to care for the home).[198] Importantly, Athena notes that a typical woman, once she is remarried, *οὐκέτι μέμνηται* (no longer remembers) her husband. Penelope, far from a typical woman, states that she will remember Odysseus' house when she dreams. While this distinction might not seem important initially, especially to Telemachus who risks being forgotten by his mother, it is immensely impactful because it sets Penelope apart from problematic characters like Helen and Clytemnestra. By remembering Odysseus' home after remarrying, Penelope makes the claim that she will continue to care about their home and remain faithful and loyal to him, even if she is remarried. Penelope's remembrance of Odysseus and his home, as Moran points out, acts in the role of an epic poet, for "in remembering Odysseus' house, Penelope actively ensures that there will, in fact, be a house to which Odysseus will return, and therefore a tale of *nostos* for the bard to sing."[199] This act of remembering is then tied with the other aspects of Penelope's *κλέος* because she enacts and proves her fidelity and loyalty to her husband by remembering him and preserving his home and family.

Memory is also tied to Helen's *κλέος*, though in nearly the opposite way to Penelope's. Part of Helen's *κλέος* has to do with forgetting and helping others forget. In her analysis of Sappho's famous reference to runaway Helen (in fragment 16), Dodson-Robinson notes the connection between Helen, marriage, and memory, namely that Helen is celebrated for *not* remembering her family or child.[200] Initially it might be odd to think

[198] Mueller (2007) 345 points out, "The housewife is contained—both literally and figuratively—by the material limits of her husband's house, a space that proscribes the movements of her mind as well as her body."
[199] Moran (1975) 206.
[200] Dodson-Robinson (2010) 11. Sappho LP16.

that actively trying not to remember, which is different from passively forgetting, is something to be celebrated, nonetheless it is the case that within the realm of love poetry, two lovers being together outweighs the negatives of leaving family for a lover.[201] Helen is able to live fairly contentedly in Troy until she is reminded of her husband by Iris disguised as a maid in Book Three: *ὥς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἵμπερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ / ἀνδρός τε προτέρου καὶ ἄστεος ἠδὲ τοκήων,* "Thus after the goddess spoke, she threw tender longing into her heart/ for her former husband, town, and parents" (*Iliad* 3.139–140).[202] Here, Helen is forced to remember her old life by the goddess, which affects Helen so much that she weeps. Immediately after this, Helen sits next to Priam and lists off the attributes of each soldier as her two husbands prepare to battle for her hand.[203] This catalogue of Achaean soldiers does more than add further glory to each individual listed; it also shows the extent of Helen's knowledge and skill at memory. At *Odyssey* 4.265–289, Menelaus makes reference to Helen's ability to mimic the wives of the Achaean soldiers convincingly enough that they almost give up their secret in the wooden horse. The only reason they were not exposed is because Odysseus' rationality was stronger than Helen's mimicry. Many of these men tried for her hand in marriage and she knows that they are in Troy dying because she has left her home and forsaken her husband. After this scene, Helen's relationship with Paris is strained because she is no longer able to make herself *not* remember the people affected by her current predicament.

In the *Odyssey*, Helen goes so far as to use a drug to numb Telemachus' and Menelaus' pain of remembering Odysseus, as well as her complicated and less than

---

[201] Dodson-Robinson (2010) 14.
[202] All citations to Homer's *Iliad* are from the editions by West (1998) for Books I-XII and West (2000) for Books XIII-XXIV. All translations are my own.
[203] *Iliad* 3.179–244.

honorable Iliadic escapades.[204] This drug ensures that anyone who drinks it would not cry for the day, but more than that, they would not care if their parents died in front of them.[205] Doyle notes that this drug, while taking away painful memories, also numbs those who ingest it to cultural and personal memories.[206] A drug like this has dangerous potential, especially in the wrong hands of someone such as Circe, who uses a similar *pharmakon* to make Odysseus' men *λανθάνω* (forget) their homes.[207] Odysseus is spared from this drug by the antidote given by Hermes, but it is clear that if the god had not intervened, Odysseus too would have forgotten his home, which would have ended in the destruction of his marriage and household. Helen, on the other hand, does not want Menelaus and Telemachus to forget their families and lives; instead, she wants them to not feel the pain she has caused by previously forgetting her family.

Unlike Odysseus and Menelaus, Chaereas and Dionysius are expected by the genre to remember their wives after they are dead, not only as a sign of mourning but also as a test of their faith to their former wives. The ramifications for failing to do so include public disapproval and guilt. When Callirhoe awakens in her tomb, she reprimands Chaereas: *ἄδικε Χαιρέα, μέμφομαί σε οὐχ ὅτι με ἀπέκτεινας, ἀλλ'ὅτι με ἔσπευσας ἐκβαλεῖν τῆς οἰκίας. οὐκ ἔδει σε ταχέως θάψαι Καλλιρρόην οὐδ'ἀληθῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν. Ἀλλ' ἤδη τάχατι βουλεύῃ περι γάμου.* "Wicked Chaereas, I blame you, not because you killed me, but because you hastened to throw me from the house. You did not have to bury Callirhoe so quickly not even truly being dead. But already too early you are planning for

[204] Austin (1994) 1 notes: "Helen's scandal may be softened in the Odyssey—it seems to be almost a thing of the past—but it is never entirely erased."
[205] *Odyssey* 4.220–226.
[206] Doyle (2010) 6–7.
[207] *Odyssey* 10.229–238.

a marriage" (*Callirhoe* 1.8.4). Not only would it lawfully be too early for Chaereas to marry again, since he has not completed the required time of mourning, but also Callirhoe fears that Chaereas has completely forgotten her by literally shutting her out of his life.[208] Callirhoe's reproach follows what Athena described as typical behavior for a woman who gets remarried after a spouse's death, only Callirhoe is not dead. In the final book of the story, Chaereas almost leads her onto his ship as a slave because he believes Dionysius has been gifted Callirhoe by the Persian king.[209] Throughout the novel, Chaereas' memory is compared to his wife's and it often falls short. In every instance of recognition Callirhoe identifies her husband; it is only after Callirhoe exclaims her excitement that Chaereas recognizes her in turn.

In addition to his own failure to remember his wife, Chaereas is prone to accusing Callirhoe of betraying and forgetting him, even before she is remarried. In the first book of the novel, the suitors plot to drive Chaereas mad with jealousy by making him believe that Callirhoe has been unfaithful while he is away. Immediately when he finds the evidence of a party, he storms into the home and berates her: "*κλάω" φησὶ "τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ τύχην, ὅτι μου ταχέως ἐπελάθου."* "'I lament' he said 'my fate, that you forgot me so quickly'" (*Callirhoe* 1.3.5). The epic connection between Chaereas' use of the verb *ἐπιλανθάνομαι* (to forget) and *μιμνήσκω* (to remember) is evident, especially in the context that Chaereas uses it.[210] He is not claiming that Callirhoe has forgotten his existence, but instead that she has cast from her mind the role he plays in her life as her

[208] Pomeroy (1997) 117 notes that mourning practices for spouses typically lasted for around thirty days before one could remarry.
[209] *Callirhoe* 8.1.7.
[210] The adjective form of the verb *ἐπιλανθάνομαι* (*ἐπίληθος*) is used in *Odyssey* 4.221 to describe the *φάρμακον* used by Circe to induce Odysseus to forget his wife.

husband. Furthermore, at several points in the novel Chaereas laments the fact that Callirhoe has gotten remarried and the predicament he finds himself in after he chased her: *Ἄπιστε Καλλιρρόη καὶ πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη γυναικῶν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐπράθην διὰ σὲ καὶ ἔσκαψα καὶ σταυρὸν ἐβάστασα καὶ δημίου χερσὶ παρεδόθην, σὺ δὲ ἐτρύφας καὶ γάμους ἔθυες ἐμοῦ δεδεμένου,* "Unfaithful and most unholy of all women Callirhoe, on account of you I was sold, I dug, I raised up a cross, and I was given over to the hands of the executioner, but you live luxuriously and were celebrating your marriage, while I was chained" (*Callirhoe* 4.3.10). The force of the superlative *ἀσεβεστάτη* (most unholy) is extremely pronounced because it is used one other time within the novel, when Callirhoe asks if she wants to kill her child and become like Medea.[211]

The adjective *ἀσεβεστάτη* is used in Chariton's novel solely in dire situations in which the bonds of the family and marriage are being threatened. Though it turns out that Callirhoe never goes so far as to earn this superlative, it is clear that the act of killing her child or forgetting her marriage would earn her this descriptive. When initially reading this section above, one might agree with Chaereas that Callirhoe deserves this moniker because he has suffered so much because of her; however, that agreement is quickly cast aside for logic. Chaereas is the whole reason Callirhoe is ever put in the position to get remarried. Unlike Callirhoe's exclamation against Chaereas' faithfulness, which she utters in a tomb to herself, Chaereas' complaint harms Callirhoe's reputation among those present at the dinner and draws sympathy towards himself. However, any scorn he puts on Callirhoe should also be put on himself, but this is not the case. In the section immediately after cursing his wife, Chaereas writes her a letter asking her twice to

[211] *Callirhoe* 2.9.4.

remember their marriage bed: *Μνήσθητι τοῦ θαλάμου καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μυστικῆς…εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔτι μνημονεύσειας…* "Remember our marriage bed and the mystic night…therefore, if you should remember me still…" (*Callirhoe* 4.4.9–10) The fact that Chaereas repeats the verb *μιμνήσκω* twice in such a short period shows that he does not believe Callirhoe truly remembers him. Additionally, the use of the particle *ἔτι* (still) brings to mind Athena's warning that a remarried woman would *οὐκέτι* (no longer) remember her first husband. Overall, Chaereas' memory leaves something to be desired throughout the novel. However, at the very end of the novel, after he has reunited with Callirhoe, Chaereas shows character growth by not only recounting everything the couple has gone through, but also the help and care Dionysius gives to the child of Callirhoe and Chaereas.[212]

The Milesian general Dionysius, Callirhoe's second husband, is a perfect example of how men remember their wives in Chariton's novel. When he is introduced in Book Two, he is in mourning for his wife, who has recently passed, and displays active signs of grieving such as wearing dark colors, being mindful about not looking at other women, and remembering her in his dreams. Dionysius is describing his dream to one of his servants: *μίαν ταύτην ἐγὼ νύκτα μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς ἀθλίας ἡδέως κεκοίμημαι: καὶ γὰρ εἶδον αὐτὴν ἐναργῶς μείζονά τε καὶ κρείττονα γεγενημένην, καὶ ὡς ὕπαρ μοι συνῆν,* "this is the first night I was pleasantly lulled to sleep after the death of my pitiful wife: indeed, I visibly saw her, she became taller and better, and as though she was present beside me" (*Callirhoe* 2.1.2). This description of Dionysius' dream is extremely important because he, much like Penelope, remembers his wife and remains faithful to her through his dreams. As Penelope vows to remember the splendid house of Odysseus, which has

[212] *Callirhoe* 8.7.12.

recently declined in splendor due to the suitors, Dionysius believes he is remembering his wife in her most pristine state, enhanced by his dream. However, what he does not know is that this dream also introduces the fact that Dionysius will be taking on a new, more beautiful wife very soon. Throughout the *Odyssey* and Chariton's novel, dreams are seen as portents of the future, and mostly have an immediate result. Because of this, we as readers know that Dionysius will soon be introduced to a woman that is taller and better than his first wife. When Dionysius sees Callirhoe and falls for her, he is distraught at what the people might think of him, as a man in mourning who falls in love with another woman.[213] However, even Dionysius cannot stop Fortune when she has decided to intercede.

By the end of the novel, Dionysius is in almost the same position he was in at the beginning: a wifeless, single father, who misses his former wife dearly. Once again, he remembers the most resent of his lost wives, Callirhoe. However, this time he has tokens to remember her by: two children, one from his first wife and the other is Callirhoe's child; and a letter from Callirhoe. Dionysius' reaction to Callirhoe's letter makes it clear that not only will he be as diligent in his remembrance of his second wife as he was with his first, but also that he will follow the instructions of the letter and not take another wife, as Callirhoe requests.[214] Dionysius preserves the memory of Callirhoe not through dreams, as he did his first wife, but through physical manifestations of her likeness: her child, her letter, and the statue built for her while she lived in Miletus. The replacement of dreams with physical tokens of remembrance is not unprecedented in the novel. For example, Callirhoe has a ring with Chaereas' image painted into it. It is evident that

[213] *Callirhoe* 2.4.4.
[214] *Callirhoe* 8.5.13–15.

Dionysius continues to remember Callirhoe as a faithful husband of the novel, which is expected. Dionysius' devotion to marital memory remains constant throughout the novel and his portrayal ends in a ring composition of grief and memory.

Marital memory works differently for Callirhoe than it does for either Dionysius or Chaereas. This is so because she is technically legally married to both of them, and because of these two marriages, Callirhoe remembers whichever husband she is not physically with at the time. For example, in Book Two, Callirhoe states that she would rather die than live without Chaereas, and when she sees him in her dream she once again proclaims her love for him.[215] In fact, she preserves her son in part because she knows he will look like his father and serve as a physical reminder of her first husband.[216] However, once she is reunited with Chaereas and set to return to Syracuse, she writes a letter to Dionysius and asks Statira, the Persian queen, to give this letter to him and to keep in touch.[217] Scholars such as Kanavou and Schwartz have argued about Callirhoe's motivations behind leaving a letter for Dionysius with instructions to care for "their" child instead of simply leaving. Kanavou argues that it goes against the genre of the novel for the main protagonists to have a child at the end of the novel, which is where most novel couples marry and begin their lives.[218] She further mentions that Chariton relieves his work of this issue by leaving the letter and the child with Dionysius, so everything is wrapped up in a nice bow at the end.[219] Schwartz, on the other hand, argues that there was no other possible outcome for the child, since Callirhoe leaves the letter and the child

[215] *Callirhoe* 2.9.4.
[216] *Callirhoe* 2.9.6. Medea makes a similar argument about her children's likeness to Jason, however, Callirhoe sees this likeness to Chaereas as a positive means of remembrance.
[217] *Callirhoe* 8.4.6.
[218] Kanavou (2015) 941.
[219] Kanavou (2015) 943.

for Dionysius because he is legally the father of the child and she has no control over taking the child with her.[220] She adds that Callirhoe, through the letter, is giving Dionysius the acknowledgement he deserves as the father of the child.[221]

While I agree with Schwartz that legally Dionysius is the father of the child, I disagree that the only reason Callirhoe leaves the letter is to acknowledge his parental power. Instead, I believe that Callirhoe plans to continue to write to Dionysius. She gives the letter to Statira, but instead of simply asking her to deliver the letter, she asks her to write to her in Syracuse: *Στάτειρα, καὶ μέμνησό μου καὶ γράφε μοι πολλάκις εἰς Συρακούσας*, "Statira, both remember me and write to me often in Syracuse" (*Callirhoe* 8.4.8). On the outside, it looks like a friendly parting, but I believe that Callirhoe's use of *μιμνήσκω* has an underlying meaning of "make sure Dionysius remembers me." Her request for Statira to write often would provide Callirhoe with a channel through which she can communicate with Dionysius, whom she recommends to Statira and the King's care: *δός Διονυσίῳ τῷ δυστυχεῖ, ὅν παρατίθημι σοί τε καὶ βασιλεῖ*, "Give [this letter] to poor Dionysius, whom I entrust to you and to the king" (*Callirhoe* 8.4.9). This request recalls the phantom Chaereas in Book Two when he *παρατίθημι* (entrusts) his child to Callirhoe.[222] The act of remembering helps link the familial relationships between Callirhoe, Chaereas, and Dionysius. The relationship of Callirhoe and Dionysius bears some resemblance to that of Nausikaa and Odysseus, in which Nausikaa represents an acceptable alternative life Odysseus could have had if he had chosen to remain in Phaeacia.[223] However, Callirhoe and Dionysius proceed further in their relationship than

---

[220] Schwartz (1999) 24.
[221] Schwartz (1999) 33.
[222] *Callirhoe* 2.9.6.
[223] *Odyssey* 6.149–315.

Odysseus and Nausikaa. Because Callirhoe and Dionysius are married and remain in contact after she leaves Miletus, their relationship becomes a permanent fixture, as opposed to Odysseus' and Nausikaa's fleeting and only briefly imagined one. This relationship with Dionysius exists in addition to her permanent marriage to Chaereas.

Furthermore, the investigation of marital memory helps answer the question of Callirhoe's *σωφροσύνη* (chastity and sexual fidelity), which is strongly linked to her *κλέος*. Many scholars, including De Temmerman, Lefteratou, Trzaskoma, have argued over Callirhoe's *σωφροσύνη* and whether she could possibly maintain it while married to two men. Trzaskoma argues that because Callirhoe marries Dionysius and because Chaereas does not trust her, she loses the glory of her *σωφροσύνη*, even if she remains faithful to him in her heart.[224] De Temmerman and Lefteratou, on the other hand, believe that Callirhoe maintains her *σωφροσύνη* because she remains faithful to Chaereas.[225] I agree that Callirhoe maintains her *σωφροσύνη*; however, I disagree that it is because she remains faithful and chaste to Chaereas alone. Instead, I argue that she is able to retain her *σωφροσύνη* because she remembers Chaereas and honors his memory while still being married to another man. Something that is never fully discussed in the story by any character is the fact that Callirhoe had to have sex with Dionysius in order for him to believe that her child is his own. Because of this, Callirhoe is technically not faithful to Chaereas. In addition, Callirhoe is fairly happy being married to Dionysius. She may not passionately love him in the same way she does Chaereas, but she does respect him and consider him her husband. This is most evident at the trial in Book Five, when she does not fight Dionysius to run to Chaereas: *Καλλιρρόη μὲν εἱστήκει κάτω βλέπουσα καὶ*

[224] Trzaskoma (2010) 206.
[225] De Temmerman (2014) 64–65; Lefteratou (2018) 232.

κλάουσα, Χαιρέαν φιλοῦσα, Διονύσιον αἰδουμένη, "Callirhoe stood looking down and lamenting, since she loves Chaereas, but respects Dionysius" (*Callirhoe* 5.8.6). The choice between the two is not made clear, and because of that, it cannot be said that Callirhoe remained completely faithful to Chaereas. Furthermore, when she is asked by the Persian queen Statira, which one she would prefer to be married to, she makes no answer, but instead bursts into tears.[226] However, in her memory of Chaereas and later her memory of Dionysius, she is able to preserve her love for her former husband and also maintain her relationship with Dionysius. With this dual act of remembrance Chariton begins forming a new concept of what a nuclear family can look like in the novel, which is fully solidified when the male members of the relationship also remember each other.

Memory does more in the novel than simply preserve Callirhoe's *σωφροσύνη*; it also serves to connect Callirhoe's relationships, which form her family. Unlike in epic, which portrays a typical nuclear family of a father, mother, and child, the novel presents families with varying degrees of biological connection.[227] Chariton's novel offers a special familial connection between Callirhoe's two husbands based on the memory of all three participants, not just Callirhoe. When they are reunited in Syracuse, Callirhoe still remembers Dionysius and knows that one day her child will come visit her and Chaereas in Syracuse. If Chariton had left the story with only Callirhoe remembering Dionysius, then she would have preserved her *σωφροσύνη*, but they would not be connected as a family. However, both Dionysius and Chaereas also remember each other, and this act of

[226] *Callirhoe* 5.9.7.
[227] In Longus' novel *Daphnis and Chloe*, both Daphnis and Chloe are adopted; in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* Charikleia is exposed and adopted, and in Chariton's *Callirhoe*, the child of Callirhoe and Chaereas is left with Dionysius.

remembrance takes the tradition of familial remembrance and changes it into something more inclusive. Dionysius, having seen Chaereas in person, has to know that the child is not biologically his.[228] However, he still cherishes him and raises him in his home. By doing this, he is remembering both Chaereas and Callirhoe and will one day send him to Syracuse to meet the other side of his family.[229] Chaereas, who was so inept at remembering Callirhoe throughout the novel, defends Dionysius to the Syracusan people upon his return and credits him with raising his son: *Τρέφεται γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες Συρακούσιοι, πολίτης ἐν Μιλήτῳ πλούσιος ὑπ΄ ἀνδρὸς ἐνδόξου: καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνου τὸ γένος ἔνδοξον Ἑλληνικόν. Μὴ φθονήσωμεν αὐτῷ μεγάλης κληρονομίας*, "Syracusan men, a wealthy citizen is raised for us in Miletus by a distinguished man: for indeed that one has a distinguished Greek lineage. Let us not begrudge him his great inheritance" (*Callirhoe* 8.7.12). This speech both ensures that their son will be welcomed to Syracuse in the future and that Dionysius will be remembered as the one who cared for the boy. The memory of the child, of the strange situation they each found themselves in, and of each other makes them a family.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Chariton's novel shares many basic plot parallels with Homeric epic and, therefore, it is easy to understand why so many scholars would argue that epic is a precursor to the novel. Callirhoe, in particular, shares many character traits with both

[228] *Callirhoe* 2.9.4; Callirhoe introduces the idea that her child might look like his father and questions whether she would want to kill a living memory of her first husband. Based on this description, and the fact that the child is not described elsewhere in the novel, the reader has to assume that the child at least in part resembles his father, Chaereas.
[229] *Callirhoe* 8.5.15.

Penelope and Helen, yet she is also her own unique character. This chapter has argued that the amount of knowledge about Callirhoe's thoughts and actions held by Dionysius, Chaereas, and Callirhoe changes the lens through which Callirhoe's actions are interpreted. Chaereas, the character with the least access to knowledge, sees Callirhoe as more aligned with Helen, whereas Callirhoe aligns herself with Penelope through her patience, loyalty, and utilization of dreams. Additionally, this chapter evaluates how the act of remembering and forgetting is an indicator of *kleos* for women. When wives, such as Penelope and Callirhoe, remember their absent husband, they preserve the *οἶκος* and the family unit. Chariton's novel takes the concept of remembrance as a preservation of the family structure a step farther by introducing the importance of male remembrance. Callirhoe is able to preserve both her family in Syracuse with Chaereas and her family in Miletus with her child and Dionysius because all three characters equally remember each other and preserve that familial bond. In doing this, Chariton takes the traditional family structure, as seen in epic, and transforms it into something more productive and innovative to the novel.

Conclusion

This thesis has set out to demonstrate the ways in which Chariton, the author of the *Callirhoe*, both utilizes allusions to the genres of tragedy and epic in his novel and manipulates these intertexts in order to develop new aspects in the characters that star in the genre of the novel. In my first chapter I argued that Chariton establishes an allusion to Euripides' *Medea* when he depicts his protagonist Callirhoe as debating whether or not to kill her child. However, after introducing this shared debate of killing their children, Chariton makes it clear that a wife and a mother within the novel could not kill her child and firmly rejects the tragic consideration by snubbing Euripides' title character as Callirhoe asks herself, *Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμούς;* "Do you take up the reasonings of Medea?" (*Callirhoe* 2.9.4) This rejection serves two purposes for Chariton. The first is that the author is able to show that the novel is distinct from tragedy. While situations and plots might resonate with tragic elements, the outcomes of these situations will not be the same as they are in tragedy. The second purpose this serves is to set up the importance of familial preservation, which is a key theme throughout Chariton's novel.[230] Callirhoe has the opportunity to spare herself and her unborn child from a potentially dangerous situation by ending both of their lives, but chooses not to do so because she wants to preserve any remaining link she has to Chaereas, her first husband. Overall, the first chapter serves to demonstrate how Chariton manipulates the expectations that emerge for the reader when he introduces a tragic situation. The genre of the novel derives its themes, character traits, and *topoi* from these manipulations of other genres. Callirhoe is

[230] This is also an important theme in every Greek novel, which is observed through the protagonists' need to be reunited.

not Medea because she chooses to save her child. The novel is *not* tragedy because it promotes familial preservation.

My second chapter evaluates Chariton's allusions to Greek epic women, specifically Penelope and Helen. The first section analyzes how the three main characters of the novel, Callirhoe, Chaereas, and Dionysius, judge Callirhoe's disposition based on their knowledge of her actions and intentions. Each character in the novel has a different level of knowledge about Callirhoe's situation and what her motivations are. Because of this unequal access to knowledge, the reader is presented with several versions of Callirhoe based on each character's opinion of her actions. For example, Chaereas, Callirhoe's first husband, who has very little knowledge about Callirhoe's motivations, especially after she has been abducted by pirates, perceives her as an abducted Helen. This perception is further encouraged when he learns in Book Three that she has remarried. It is not until their reunion in Book Seven when Callirhoe is able to explain the events that led to her remarriage that Chaereas understands she has remained loyal and faithful to him, as Penelope does to Odysseus. The overall effect of this variance in knowledge is that Chariton is able to show the audience how complex and multi-layered his characters are and how much a character can transform. Callirhoe, although she remains constantly loyal to her first husband, does grow to respect Dionysius, her second husband, which is something neither Helen nor Penelope manages in Homer's epics.

Chariton further manages to push the parameters of a traditional marriage and family by creating the act of marital memory for husbands. While wives in early literature, especially epic, are expected to uphold the burden of memory, it is not typically expected of the husbands. In Homer's *Odyssey*, Athena cautions Telemachus

that a woman *οὐκέτι μέμνηται*, or no longer remembers her husband or home when she gets remarried.[231] A woman, then, is only expected to remember the home and the husband to whom she is currently married, and this remembrance keeps the family unit together and the home preserved. This responsibility of memory and preservation does not fall on the husband. Although Odysseus longs to return home throughout the *Odyssey*, his dalliances with other women do not destroy his home. If he had chosen to remain with Circe or Nausikaa, his home in Ithaca would have remained as long as Penelope remembered him. This is not the case in Chariton's novel. Callirhoe notably reprimands her hasty burial by Chaereas, believing he wants to remarry: *οὐκ ἔδει σε ταχέως θάψαι Καλλιρρόην οὐδ'ἀληθῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν. Ἀλλ' ἤδη τάχατι βουλεύῃ περι γάμου*, "You did not have to bury Callirhoe so quickly not even truly being dead. But already too early you are planning for a marriage." (*Callirhoe* 1.8.4) In this scenario, it is the husband, not the wife, who is presumably getting remarried and being chastised for forgetting his wife and their marriage. Within the first book of his novel, then, Chariton manages to introduce the idea that a husband should remember his wife and preserve their home in contrast to the model established in the *Odyssey*.

Chariton develops the concept of marital memory further when he introduces Dionysius, the Milesian general and Callirhoe's second husband. After their marriage, Callirhoe grows to respect Dionysius so much that in Book Five she is conflicted about her choice of which husband she wants to remain with. By the end of the story, Callirhoe is reunited with Chaereas and they return to Syracuse. However, she gives a letter to Satira, the Persian queen, asking Dionysius to care for her child, not remarry, and

[231] *Odyssey* 15.23.

remember her. Presumably Dionysius fulfills her wishes and actively remembers her as his wife. Callirhoe, for her part, also remembers Dionysius. She asks Statira to look out for Dionysius and to continue to write to her. This communication with the Persian queen allows Callirhoe to keep her memory of Dionysius active. The most surprising act of memory, however, comes from Chaereas, who chooses openly to remember and speak kindly of Dionysius to the men of Syracuse. This act, while seemingly unremarkable, is extremely important because it allows for Dionysius to be incorporated into their family. Because all three main characters keep an active memory of each other and are bonded through their shared experiences and children, Chariton is able to propose a new interpretation of the traditional family.

My thesis has attempted to expand the investigations of intertextuality in Chariton's novel; however, this is far from where studies should end. From this point, more work can be done on locating intertextualities not only in Chariton's novel, but also in the other Greek and Roman novels. For example, one could examine the historiographical texts that influence Chariton's portrayal of the battle between the Egyptians and the Persians in Books Six and Seven. Additional research can be done on the portrayal of the family in the novels and the shifting of familial responsibilities between Greek and Roman texts. A great example of this would be Chariclea's complex relationship with her biological and adoptive families in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica.* I believe that the novels have a plethora of interesting and relevant avenues that remain to be explored.

References

Allan, William (2002). *Euripides: Medea*. London: Duckworth.

Amory, Anne (1963). "The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope." In Charles H. Taylor, ed., *Essays on the Odyssey: Selected Modern Criticism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. 100–121.

Athens, Lonnie (1994). "The Self as a Soliloquy." *The Sociological Quarterly* 35.3: 521–532.

Austin, Norman (1975). *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*. London and Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Austin, Norman (1994). *Helen of Troy and Her Shameless Phantom*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Bird, Rachel (2018). "Achilles Tatius and Chariton: Reflections and Refractions." *Mnemosyne* 72: 471–487.

Blondell, Ruby (2010). "'Bitch That I Am': Self-Blame and Self-Assertion in the Iliad." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 140.1: 1–32.

Bowie, Ewen (1994). "The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World." In James Tatum, ed., *The Search for the Ancient Novel. Baltimore*, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 435–459.

Bowie, Ewen (2002). "The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B.E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions." *Ancient Narrative* 2: 47–63.

Bowie, Ewen (2005). "Metaphor in Daphnis and Chloe." In Stephen Harrison, Michael Paschalis, and Stavros Frangoulidis, eds., *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing. 68–86.

Bowie, Ewen (2008). "Literary Milieux." In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 17–38.

Braund, Susanna M. (2001). "Genre: Introduction." In S. J. Harrison, ed., *Texts, ideas, and the Classics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 135–142.

Burnett, Anne P. (1973). "Medea and the Tragedy of Revenge." *Classical Philology* 68: 1–24.

Cairns, Francis (1972). *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cueva, Edmund P. (2004). *The Myths of Fiction: Studies in the Canonical Greek Novels*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

De Temmerman, Koen (2014). *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Diggle, James (1984). “On the Manuscripts and Text of Euripides’ *Medea*: II. The Text.” *The Classical Quarterly* 34.1: 50–65.

Dihle, Albrecht (1977). *Euripides’ Medea*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Heidelberg: Winter.

Dixon, Suzanne (2001). *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres, and Real Life*. London: Duckworth.

Dodson-Robinson, Eric (2010). “Helen’s ‘Judgement of Paris’ and Greek Marriage Ritual in Sappho 16.” *Arethusa* 43.1: 1–20.

Doulamis, Konstantin (2011). *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing.

Doulamis, Konstantin (2012). “All’s Well That Ends Well: Storytelling, Predictive Signs, and the Voice of the Author in Chariton’s *Callirhoe*.” *Mnemosyne* 65.1: 18–39.

Doyle, Andrea (2010). “Unhappily Ever After?: The Problem of Helen in Odyssey 4.” *Akroterion* 55: 1–18.

Dunn, Francis M. (2005). “Euripides and the Rites of Hera Akraia.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 35.1: 103–115.

Ebbot, Mary (2003). *Imagining Illegitimacy in Classical Greek Literature*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Edmunds, Lowell (2016). *Stealing Helen: The Myth of the Abducted Wife in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Egger, Brigitte (1994). “Looking at Chariton’s *Callirhoe*.” In J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman, eds., *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. London and New York: Routledge. 31–48.

Emlyn-Jones, Chris (1984). “The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope.” *Greece and Rome* 31: 1–18.

Fantuzzi, Marco (2012). *Achilles in Love. Intertextual Studies*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Felson-Rubin, Nancy (1994). *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Felson-Rubin, Nancy (1996). “Penelope’s Perspective: Character from Plot.” In Seth L. Schein, ed., *Reading the Odyssey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 163–184.

Fernández-Galiano, Manuel, Joseph Russo, and Alfred Heubeck, eds. (1992). *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Volume III Books XVII-XXIV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Foley, Helene P. (1989). “Medea’s Divided Self.” *Classical Antiquity* 8.1: 61–85.

Foley, Helene P. (1995). “Penelope as Moral Agent.” In Beth Cohen, ed., *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer’s Odyssey*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 93–115.

Foley, Helene P. (2001). *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Foucault, Michel (1986). *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of The History of Sexuality*. Robert Hurley, trans. New York: Random House.

Fowler, Robert L. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography Vol. 2*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Friss, Elisabeth (2017). “Intertextuality.” In Mads R. Thomsen, Lasse H. Kjældgaard, Lis Møller, Dan Ringgard, Lilian M. Rösing, and Peter Simonsen, eds., *Literature: An Introduction to Theory and Analysis*. London, Oxford, New York, New Delhi, and Sydney: Bloomsbury. 125-139.

Futre Pinheiro, Marília P., Marilyn B. Skinner, and Froma I. Zeitlin, eds. (2012*). Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter.

Gantz, Timothy (1993). *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Garcia Jr., Lorenzo F. (2018). “Hektor, the Marginal Hero: Performance Theory and the Homeric Monologue.” In Jonathan L. Ready and Christos C. Tsagalis, eds., *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators, and Characters*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. 299–319.

Gilhuly, Kate (2009). *The Feminine Matrix of Sex and Gender in Classical Athens*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, Christopher (1987). “Two Monologues of Self-Division: Euripides Medea 1021-80 and Seneca Medea 893-977.” In Michael Whitby and Philip Hardie and Mary Whitby, eds., *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble. Bedminster*. Bristol and Oak Park, IL: Bristol Classical Press/Bolchazy-Carducci, 25–37.

Gill, Christopher (1996). Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gill, Christopher (2005). *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity: Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goldhill, Simon (2008). “Genre.” In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 185–200.

Gould, G.P., ed. (1995). *Chariton Callirhoe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Graverini, Luca (2014). “From the Epic to the Novelistic Hero: Some Patterns of a Metamorphosis.” In Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne, eds., *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. 288–300.

Gregory, Elizabeth (1996). “Unravelling Penelope: The Construction of the Faithful Wife in Homer’s Heroines.” *Helios* 23.1: 3–20.

Gumpert, Matthew (2001). *Grafting Helen: The Abduction of the Classical Past*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin University Press.

Hall, Edith (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hall, Edith (1997). “The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy.” In P. E. Easterling, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 93–126.

Haller, Benjamin (2009). “The Gates of Horn and Ivory in Odyssey 19: Penelope’s Call for Deeds, Not Words.” *Classical Philology* 104: 397–417.

Hamilton, Richard and Michael W. Haslam, eds. (1980). *Alcestis*. Bryn Mawr Commentaries.

Harsh, P.W. (1950). “Penelope and Odysseus in Odyssey XIX.” *American Journal of Philology* 79: 1–21.

Heath, Stephen (2004). “The Politics of Genre.” In Christopher Prendergast, ed., *Debating World Literature*. London and New York: Verso. 163–174.

Helleman, Wendy E. (1995). “Homer’s Penelope: A Tale of Feminine *ἀρετή*.” *Échos du monde classique* 39.2: 227–250.

Hinds, Stephen (1998*). Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Bettany (2005). *Helen of Troy: Goddess, Princess, Whore*. New York: Alfred K. Knopf.

Hunter, Richard (1996). “G.P. Gould, ed. *Chariton, Callirhoe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.” Bryn Mawr Classical Review.

Kanavou, Nikoletta (2015). “A Husband is More Important Than a Child: The Ending of Chariton’s Callirhoe Revisited.” *Mnemosyne* 68.6: 937–955.

Katz, Marylin A. (1991). *Penelope’s Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey. Princeton*. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Katz Anhalt, Emily (2001). “A Matter of Perspective: Penelope and the Nightingale in *Odyssey* 19. 512–534.” *The Classical Journal* 97.2: 145–159.

Knox, Bernard M. W. (1966). “Second Thoughts in Greek Tragedy.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 7.3: 213–232.

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

Kovacs, David (1986). "On Medea's Great Monologue (E. Med. 1021-1080)." *The Classical Quarterly* 36.2: 343–352.

Kristeva, Julia (1980*). Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Leon S. Roudiez, ed., Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, trans. New York: Columbia University Press.

LaCourse Munteanu, Dana (2011). "Introduction: Emotion in Literature: Genre and Gender." In Dana LaCourse Munteanu, ed.*, Emotion, Genre, and Gender in Classical Antiquity*. London: Bristol Classical Press. 1–14.

Laird, Andrew (2008). "Approaching Style and Rhetoric." In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 201–217.

Lawrence, Stuart (1997). "Audience Uncertainty and Euripides' *Medea*." *Hermes* 125.1: 49–55.

Lefteratou, Anna (2018). *Mythological Narratives: The Bold and Faithful Heroines of the Greek Novel*. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter.

Lesser, Rachel H. (2019). "Female Ethics and Epic Rivalry: Helen in the Iliad and Penelope in the Odyssey." *American Journal of Philology* 140.2: 189–226.

Lowe, N. J. (2000). *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mactoux, Marie-Madeleine (1975). *Pénélope: Légende et Mythe*. Paris: Belles Lettres.

Mastronarde, Donald J., ed. (2002). *Medea*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mastronarde, Donald J. (2010). *The Art of Euripides: Dramatic Technique and Social Context*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

McClure, Laura (1999). *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Morales, Helen (2008). "The History of Sexuality." In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 39–55.

Moran, William S. (1975). "Μιμνήσκομαι and 'Remembering' Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 20: 195–211.

Morgan, John and Stephen Harrison (2008). "Intertextuality." In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 218–236.

Mueller, Melissa (2007). “Penelope and the Poetics of Remembering.” *Arethusa* 40.3: 337–362.

Page, Denys L., ed. (2001). *Medea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pomeroy, Sarah B. (1997). *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press.

Pucci, Pietro (1980). *The Violence of Pity in Euripides’ Medea*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Rabinowitz, Nancy S. (1993*). Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Reardon, B.P. (1989). *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Reardon, B.P., ed. (2004). *De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Munich: K.G. Saur.

Rehm, Rush (1994). *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Riddle, John M. (1992). *Contraception and Abortion from the Ancient World to the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rosenmeyer, T.G. (1990). “Decision-Making.” *Apeiron* 23.4: 187–218.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang (1966). *Iliasstudien*. 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schwartz, Eduard, ed. (1966). *Scholia in Euripidem*, 2 volumes. Reprint edition. Berlin: Reimer. Original publication 1887–1891.

Schwartz, Saundra C. (1999). “Callirhoe’s Choice: Biological vs. Legal Paternity.” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 40.1: 23–52.

Schwartz, Saundra (2016). *From Bedroom to Courtroom: Law and Justice in the Greek Novel*. Groningen: Barkhuis; Groningen: Groningen University Library.

Segal, Charles (1983). “Kleos and its Ironies in the Odyssey.” *L’Antiquité Classique* 52: 22–47.

Sharrock, Alison (2000). “Intratextuality: Texts, Partis, and (W)holes in Theory.” In Alison Sharrock and Helen Morales, eds., *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 1–42.

Smith, S. D. (2007). *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*. Eelde: Barkhuis; Groningen: Groningen University Library.

Smyth, Herbert, W. (1956). *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Snell, Bruno (1948). “Das früheste Zeugnis über Sokrates.” *Philologus* 97: 125–134.

Stephens, Susan (2008). “Cultural Identity.” In Tim Whitmarsh, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 56–71.

Suzuki, Mihoko (1989). *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.

Tilg, Stefan (2010). *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Trzaskoma, Stephen M. (2010). “Callirhoe, Concubinage, and a Corruption in Chariton 2.11.5.” *Exemplaria Classica* 14: 205–209.

Van Looy, Herman, ed. (1992). *Medea*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

West, Martin L., ed. (1998). *Homerus Ilias: Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I-XII*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Munich: K.G. Saur.

West, Martin L., ed. (2000). *Homerus Ilias: Volumen Alterum: Rhapsodiae XIII-XXIV*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum Et Romanorum Teubneriana. Munich: K.G. Saur.

West, Martin L. (2002). “‘Eumelos’: A Corinthian Epic Cycle?” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122: 109–133.

West, Martin L., ed. (2017). *Homerus Odyssea*. Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter.

Whitmarsh, Tim (2005a). *The Second Sophistic*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitmarsh, Tim (2005b). “The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre.” *American Journal of Philology* 126: 587–611.

Whitmarsh, Tim (2011). *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitmarsh, Tim (2018). *Dirty Love*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Zeitlin, Froma I. (1996*). Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zerba, Michelle (2009). “What Penelope Knew: Doubt and Skepticism in the Odyssey.” *Classical Quarterly* 59.2: 295–316.