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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Although the use of rhetoric in ancient Greek novel was recognised early on in modern scholarship, this important aspect of the ancient novels has never been extensively discussed. In this thesis the rhetorical dimension of three Greek novels is given principal attention; the investigation is focused on the use of rhetoric by three novelists representing three different centuries. In these novels we trace rhetorical elements back to various sources, such as rhetorical handbooks used for teaching or parallels found in actual speeches, we attempt a definition, analysis, and illustration of the most prominent rhetorical features and show how and to what extent rhetoric is employed by the novelists.

The first part investigates the rhetorical dimensions of the courtroom speeches and their relationship with rhetorical principles of forensic oratory. In chapter one we examine the use of rhetoric by Chariton who seems to show a good degree of awareness of theoretical forensic principles and makes a surprisingly extensive use of rhetoric. In chapter two we show with the assistance of various rhetorical handbooks that Achilleus Tatios' speeches hide an enormous amount of careful rhetorical planning. In chapter three the discussion of Heliodoros' use of forensic oratory shows that he uses selectively advanced rhetorical techniques and transforms them into literary tools by putting them at the service of literature. The fourth chapter attempts an investigation into the use of rhetoric in the fragments with the main aim to show that the use of rhetoric is not coincidental in the three authors chosen for this investigation.

The second part looks at rhetoric in the novel from a different point of view. Chapter one investigates the possibility of direct influence of classical rhetoric on the novel. The second chapter examines the way rhetorical exercises taught at the highest and last level of education influenced different sections of the works of the novelists. The third part illustrates the extensive use of epideictic oratory in all three novels and shows that epideictic oratory in them is greatly influenced by contemporary rhetorical studies (from progymnasmata to declamation). Finally, the fourth part explores the creative manner in which rhetoric was used by the three novelists and the issue of their readership.

In conclusion, the result of this study is that rhetoric is much more extensively used in the novels than has been appreciated until now; these works presuppose rhetorical training of their authors who derived much of their inspiration and writing abilities from close contact with rhetorical studies.
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Introduction.

1. a. Aims of this study.

This research project is an exploration of one of the ancient novel's most prominent features: the use of rhetoric. Although it is concerned with three novels, those of Chariton, Achilleus Tatos, and Heliodoros, this study can be used as a basis for wider conclusions on the genre in general. In this survey we attempt to locate, analyse, compare, and evaluate some of the most significant aspects of rhetoric in the novels in question and assess the way rhetoric is used by the ancient novelists. By establishing certain connections between speeches in the novels and rhetorical material originating from the actual rhetorical context of the time we try to elaborate on the depth to which rhetoric has pervaded the novels and to trace its sources. This study tries to advance the view which accepts that the novels have been “influenced” in one way or another by rhetoric, and define its features. Although accepted in general terms today as present in the novels, the use of rhetoric in the novel has never received a thorough examination. A study with a single aim to investigate the rhetorical procedures in the ancient novel and establish relationships with current rhetorical theory has never, to our knowledge, been conducted. Because of this, the relationship between rhetoric and the novel has always been either too vague or incompletely appreciated. As a result, the role of rhetoric in the novel has meant different things to different people, and generalisations found in various books have not helped us to get a clear picture of the case.

The first step of this survey is to explain how the relationship of rhetoric and the novel is manifested, where exactly in the novels we find rhetorical features and how we can establish that the highly rhetorical passages are following rhetorical principles traceable in handbooks and/or real speeches. This study allows us to see how rhetoric functions in each novel respectively and to pinpoint the personal preferences and the ingenuity of the different authors. It reveals their educational background and their aspirations. It also uncovers a lot of information about the structure of the novels and the anticipated audience. Furthermore, it allows comparison and evaluation of similarities and differences in the deployment of rhetorical themes and structures in the three novels. By establishing how this material changes we can find a new path of
interpretation. Without getting too much involved in the still ongoing discussion of the actual dates of the novels,\textsuperscript{1} we deal with Chariton (first century), Achilleus Tatios (second century), and Heliodoros (third or fourth century). Each of these authors represents a different stage in the history of the novel. Also some of the early fragments are assessed in order to give a more complete perspective on the history of the genre.

To give an idea of where this analysis can lead we only need anticipate one of the conclusions; that Chariton's novel is much more rhetorical than has been appreciated until now. Therefore, if somebody would try to give a general overview of the use of rhetoric in the ancient novel, the starting point - in respect of sophistication - in the diagram of rhetoric in the novel would be much higher than it is today, peaking with Achilleus Tatios and staying still quite high with Heliodoros.

To sum up, the aim of this study is to identify and evaluate rhetorical procedures in some highly rhetorical passages of the three novels under examination; also to compare and contrast this material with handbooks and other material of late antiquity. Finally, another objective is to compare the novels from this particular aspect and to assess the role of rhetoric in them.

1. b. Method.

Our analysis and appraisal of the rhetorical aspects of the ancient novels is based on rhetorical sources of Roman times and later Greek antiquity. These have two forms; firstly, the manuals that survive give a very good picture of the standard rhetorical theory of their time and of various trends. Particular emphasis is placed on them. Second, additional evidence is sought, to some extent, in surviving actual speeches, especially when the information found in the manuals is not elaborate enough or is non-existent. These two main instruments of work can be related to the novels directly and indirectly. The former happens when there is evidence of close correspondence between the principles found in the rhetorical manuals and in the speeches in the novels. The latter takes place on a larger scale in the whole construction of a speech, the way

\textsuperscript{1} For the chronology of the novels in question see the discussions of each novel's date in Schmeling (1996) on the respective author.
the ideas are discovered and built and in the marshalling of arguments which recalls processes recommended in the handbooks and followed in rhetorical schools by students.

The rhetorical aspects of the novels are isolated and analysed according to the traditional tripartite division of rhetoric: forensic, deliberative, and epideictic. Obviously, for the first type of speeches there is a lot of material to base a survey on, but for the other two types the handbooks of antiquity give far less attention, especially on the theoretical level.

A great number of direct sources preserving rhetoric of the Hellenistic era has been lost. The information we have today survived mainly through manuals of later antiquity and through Roman authors who showed interest in rhetoric. Luckily, rhetorical theory is a very traditional discipline in its basic principles which remained stable in general terms. The different trends and fashions do not seem to have upset its basic structure. This is very fortunate because it allows some liberty in using material predating and post-dating the novels in question. Apart from the classification of the speeches according to their general family in which they belong, we found it practical to study them in groups in which a certain rhetorical feature is dominant, as, for example, the chapters of the funeral speeches (p. 224ff. and p. 247ff.) or the section on eschmatismenos logos (p. 145ff.). Furthermore, in various places, the analysis is expanded into speeches which are adapted to fit each author's aims; the discussion reveals their rhetorical nature and their special relation with rhetoric.

Since the use of rhetoric affects much more than just the stylistic level, the speeches that are incorporated in the novel are quite different from proper rhetorical speeches. Since these speeches are not independent from their context, their length, contents, and nature are often substantially distorted compared to a real speech. The author often wishes to elaborate on different dimensions of an issue or provide information useful for his narrative strategy and, therefore, some compromise takes place to satisfy different - not immediately apparent - priorities. Consequently, although in the discussion of the speeches we analyse them as if they were proper rhetorical speeches, we always keep in mind this idiosyncrasy.
1. c. Reasons for the selection of the three novels.

In our attempt to examine as wide a range of novels as possible within the word and time limits of a doctoral thesis, we have isolated three novels from three different centuries of our era. Our preliminary investigation took into consideration all novels and fragments, but a selection had to be made based on the following criteria. First, the selection was to represent a wide chronological span from the earliest complete novel to the latest. Second, the frequency and extent of rhetorical material - thematic, structural, and stylistic - is much more prominent in the novels selected than in the other complete novels, and this allows for investigation of a wider range of evidence of the impact of rhetoric on the novels. Longos was excluded as a maverick case, a novel with a great deal of idiosyncrasy within the genre; and Xenophon's novel has been excluded because it shows little evidence of the influence of rhetoric.

Because our selection means that the other two complete novels have been excluded from our investigation we cannot claim that our results apply to them. However, it is interesting to compare these two novels with the other three in terms of rhetorical influence.

As has been noted, Longos is "the most marked individualist among the writers of Greek novels."\(^2\) His novel does not conform to the picture we have for the genre; "travel and long periods of enforced separation are absent"; language and style are extremely stylised.\(^3\) In general, Longos' priorities are of a different nature from those of the other novelists;\(^4\) the pastoral tradition, admiration of nature and poetic language take precedence over any kind of rhetoric. Nevertheless, the use of rhetoric in his novel is not insignificant.\(^5\)

In fact, there is evidence of a considerable variety of rhetorical devices in his novel. A short selection made by McCulloh (1970) shows that in his novel we find examples of the *suasoria* ("Daphnis trying to decide whether to knock at the door of Chloe's cottage" in 3, 6), the *controversia* ("the court speeches of the

\(^2\) Hägg (1983) p. 35.
\(^4\) For a convincing explanation for this see Holzberg (1995) p. 97f. where further bibliography can also be found.
Methymnaean youths and Daphnis" 3, 15-16)," lamentation ("Lamon over the ravaged park" 4, 8), stories explaining "the origin of something - pan-pipes (2, 33, 3 - 34), or the echo (3, 23), or the moaning of the dove" (1, 27),7 or even ekphrasis.8

Schönberger (1960) also identifies the use of rhetorical showpieces in the novel of Longos and characterises the novelist as a representative of the sophistic era. The description of the garden in 4, 2-3 and the speech of Chloe when she thinks that Daphnis is no longer interested in her (4, 27) belong to the type of the exercise of "what x would say in y circumstances" (ethopoiia). To this list of examples we should also add the trial scene in 2, 15-16 with a speech for the prosecution and a speech for the defence. Furthermore, in 1, 16 we find a "beauty contest"10 where both Daphnis and Dorkon are making speeches and Chloe is the judge ("έδικαζε" 1, 15), who in the end gives the winning prize (a kiss) to Daphnis, both because she was pleased with his praise ("ηοθετοκ τω ἐγκυμωφ" 1, 17) and because she always wanted to.11 According to Hock "readers would have appreciated Longus's rhetorical ability to argue both sides of an issue."12

Likewise, the use of rhetoric in Xenophon's novel deserves some attention.13 A cursory reading of Xenophon's novel shows that there is extensive evidence of laments and lament-like speeches,14 various speeches of pleading (1, 13, 6; 3, 5, 7-8; 3, 8, 4 and 6-7; 5, 7, 6-9) or advisory speeches (1, 16, 3-5) or even a deception speech (Manto addressing her father: 2, 5, 6-7).15 This speech belongs to a trial

---

5 See, for example, Holzberg (1995) p. 94: "Longus parading all the rhetorical devices at his disposal and illuminating his show-pieces - these include magnificent nature scenes - with as much colour as possible."


7 For all these examples see McCulloh (1970) p. 41.

8 Ibid. p. 31: "the book is first of all presented under the guise of an ekphrasis, of rhetorical-educational description." See also Hunter (1983) p. 52.

9 Schönberger (1960) p. 23.


14 Some of the most notable are: Anthia: 2, 11, 5-6; 3, 5, 2-4; 3, 6, 2-4; 4, 6, 6-7; 5, 5, 5-6; 5, 7, 2-3; 5, 8, 7-8; Habrokomes: 2, 1, 2-4; 2, 8, 1; 5, 1, 12-13; 5, 7, 3-4; 5, 10, 8; Habrokomes' tutor: 1, 14, 5; Mantox 2, 11, 2.

15 For a discussion of this speech which is identified as an ethopoiia see Hock (1994) p. 457ff., where there is also additional information on other ethopoiias and ekphraseis in Xenophon and Longos.
scene. Furthermore, Hägg identifies descriptions "on the introduction of a new character into the action" (e.g. 1, 13, 3; 1, 14, 4; 2, 3, 1), the digression in 1, 8, 2-3 and other descriptions as well as general observations, etc.  

As stated above (p. 9), to examine in depth all the surviving Greek novels would have been beyond the scope of a PhD thesis. Nevertheless, the observation that all five complete novels show to a greater or lesser extent familiarity with rhetorical devices invites comparison from this perspective and raises interesting questions; how can the differences be accounted for?

The extent to which a novelist makes use of rhetorical techniques may be a matter of personal choice. Even in the three novels examined in this study there are great differences in the treatment of rhetoric. Chariton, for example, makes much less use of rhetoric when compared to Achilleus Tatos; Heliodoros, on the other hand, makes a much more restrained and selective use of rhetoric in comparison to both, using rhetoric mainly to satisfy needs of his plot.  

Xenophon's novel is seen in the light of "personal stylistic urges" by Ruiz-Montero. Furthermore, according to Hägg "long sections of Xenophon's romance are dominated by pure "summary." The narrator has quite definitely placed his "emphasis on narration."  

For Xenophon, emphasis on adventures and plot has taken precedence over rhetorical speeches; descriptions and any kind of digressions are rare. His characterisation is more stereotyped than that of the other novelists and "external events, partly of a violent nature, dominate."  

Although half as long in comparison to that of Chariton and a quarter to that of Heliodoros, Xenophon's novel, according to Hägg, is full of narrative material: "hero and heroine visit an astonishingly large part of the Mediterranean world" encountering numerous adversities and adventures (shipwreck, pirates, death and burial, crucifixion, confinement to a brothel, etc.). This has been attributed to an "abridgement of
an originally much longer or more "even" novel." Whether or not this is the case is still under discussion. There are still today scholars who claim that "the followers of the epitome theory undoubtedly have far more convincing arguments than its opponents." The fact that in this short novel, full of narrative and adventure, there is still some scope for rhetorical speeches seems to us remarkable. In a novel of such a nature one would not normally expect to find any kind of rhetorical digression.

In conclusion, although all five Greek novels that survive complete display familiarity with rhetorical techniques to a greater or lesser extent, the present study focuses on the three that offer the richest and most interesting material for our investigation. It goes without saying that its results will therefore be valid only for those three novels, not for the genre as a whole. On the other hand, they have so many essential features in common, as far as plot, characters and style are concerned, that taken together they appear fairly typical of the genre as a whole. To examine how the other two - the fast moving, action-packed narrative of Xenophon and the idiosyncratic tale of Longos, a kind of Theokritean idyll in prose - might fit into the picture, would be a worthwhile undertaking for which the results of the present study, if valid, might serve as a starting point.

1. d. Rhetorical manuals and the criteria for the selection of the rhetorical texts.

All the rhetorical handbooks used in this thesis offer "technical instruction in the art of rhetoric" or in certain aspects or areas of the art of rhetoric. As

---

23 Ibid; see also Ruiz-Montero (1994b) pp. 1094-1096 where there is further bibliography on this matter.

24 For example, people against the epitome theory try to refute it by attributing the simple style of the novel and the lack of detail to the "insufficient imagination or energy in the author" (Hägg (1983) p. 21); also "contradictions and logical flaws" are explained as "natural features of a simple adventure story" (Hägg, ibid) or "corruption in the manuscript tradition" (Hägg, ibid). O'Sullivan (1995) attributes the idiosyncratic "compositional technique" (pref. P. VII) of Xenophon's novel not to the epitomization of an original but to the oral background of the novel. Thus, in order to explain this novel's oddities, the author reopens the question of the origins of the novel and suggests that Xenophon's novel predates that of Chariton (p. 169); cf. Ruiz-Montero's criticism in Gnomon (1999) 71, pp. 303-306; see also Morgan in Journal of Hellenic Studies (1996) 116, pp. 199-200.

25 Holzberg (1995) p. 52; Kytzler, however, in Schmeling ed. (1996) claims that although "this is certainly a highly probable explanation" (p. 348) it is difficult to be proven or unequivocally refuted either (p. 349).

Clark rightly points out, Clark (1957) p. 68. “the art of rhetoric aimed to present the general principles of effective public speaking in a systematic form as a guide to students who were learning to write and speak.” De partitione oratoria, for example, was written by Cicero “for the instruction of his son.” Clark (1957) p. 68. Quintilian clearly states in his introduction that his aim is “the education of the perfect orator” and his books offer specific instruction on how to speak effectively in any department of oratory. In this sense all manuals lay out rules for the speaker to follow, as for example in the “delivery” part in Ad Herennium (III. xi. 19ff.) “the speaker is told precisely what use of voice, pause, and gesture he ought consciously to make in a variety of situations.” Similar in Quintilian XI, III, 1ff. In the same way Menandros presents specific rules and principles to make an enkomion of a city (346, 15 – 346, 25), for example, and Dionysios of Halikarnassos on how to create an eschematismenos logos. Therefore, the rhetorical material included in these handbooks represent rhetorical material used in teaching.

Moreover, the rhetorical textbooks in which the Romans managed to preserve much of the Greek rhetorical theory is based on the Greek tradition “that instruction in public speaking could be reduced to a system, and the necessary precepts learned by heart and applied in practice.” After Hermagoras, manuals, which “had been produced in Greek for generations,” “became quite stereotyped in form” and “though, naturally, individual authors liked to introduce their own modifications of the divisions and subdivisions, and to refine on the work of their predecessors” “there was a certain family likeness about these manuals of rhetoric.” In the De Oratore, for example, the interlocutors are “critical of the professional rhetoricians” and their handbooks (I, 32, 145; II, 18, 75; III, 19, 70) but “when they come to expound their own views on oratory, we find that they themselves accept the traditional divisions

27 Clark (1957) p. 68.
28 Ibid.
29 Butler (1921) p. 9 (I, pr., 9; I, pr., 21-25).
31 See p. 145.
32 Bonner (1977) p. 68.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid pp. 68-69.
of Greek rhetoric, and take for granted many of the traditional precepts." Although the handbooks are not replicas of one another, their agreement is far more extensive than their few substantial divergences even if this is never acknowledged openly.

The extent of rhetorical material found in the novels made it necessary to try to verify their rhetorical nature with firm first-hand evidence from ancient handbooks. In order for this to be achieved with precision we had to base our investigation on specific rhetorical handbooks. Although the continuity in the rhetorical tradition is such that use of various rhetorical texts could be made here, on a strictly methodological basis we thought it inappropriate to exceed the chronological limitations too much. Therefore, the selection of the rhetorical handbooks in relation to each novelist was made on a chronological basis (e.g. the Ad Herennium in the case of Chariton; Quintilian, Hermogenes, etc. in the case of the second century Achilleus Tatios, etc.) to the extent that it was possible. As a result, the earlier the novelist the more exclusive this selection was. Whereas this criterion could lead to an exclusion of discussion of significant rhetorical material present in the novels, this criterion was violated with the least possible negative consequences; this happens especially in the case of epideictic rhetoric for which firstly, there is a limited range of (mainly later) sources and secondly, the continuity of rhetorical theory appears to be beyond doubt. Apart from the chronological criterion, we tried to adapt our selection to the needs of the rhetorical material found in the three novels. We avoided treatises as, for example, the Rhetorica ad Alexandrum because it was felt that they would not contribute anything more to our specific discussion than a more contemporary handbook. Apart from that, especially for the Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, its impact on the development of rhetorical theory and terminology has been regarded as non-existent. Aristotle's Rhetoric, on the other hand, apart from its exclusion on chronological grounds, was frequently consulted (e.g. in the divisions of a speech or the emotions and character in book

---

35 Ibid. p. 69.
2), but for our novelists we preferred to use more contemporary sources which preserve Aristotelian material anyway and could be expected to be much more straightforwardly related to the schools of later antiquity. The Ad Herennium and Quintilian are some of the most comprehensive and detailed rhetorical handbooks that have survived from antiquity. The works of Cicero (in the same first century BC tradition as the Ad Herennium) complete the picture. The various treatises on progaumnasmata, Hermogenes’ *On Issues* and Dionysios of Halikarnassos’ *Peri eschermatismenon logon* proved to be valuable sources as they completed the picture of the rhetoric of the time, and Menandros Rhetor’s works, although later than (at least) Chariton and Achilleus Tatos, is the only comprehensive source on epideictic oratory.

Our selection of texts, however, does not imply that it is the only one possible. The area is still fertile for various approaches based on other rhetorical texts which focus on different aspects of rhetoric.

**1. e. The implications of a study on the use of rhetoric in the novels.**

When one starts isolating incidents in the novels where rhetoric is applied with the intention of assessing the exploitation of rhetoric in them, one is suddenly in front of fundamental issues of the genre. The question of chronology in relation to the use of rhetoric, the extent and role of literary loans, the author’s education, his rhetorical abilities and creativity, the role of rhetoric as a means for producing narrative/fiction, the reasons of the use of rhetoric in the novel and its interpretation, the peculiar form and content of the novel, the impact of “rhetorically charged” novels on the reader, the question of readership, the value of rhetoric as a unifying common denominator of the genre, the multiplicity of the rhetorical forms and concepts found in them, etc., are only some of the matters arising. Unfortunately, rhetoric in the novel has been regarded as so obvious that it did not attract a closer look with the aim of a detailed appraisal. The “how,” “where,” “what,” and “how much” questions in respect of rhetoric have never received a proper answer.
2. The treatment of the topic by previous scholars.

The history of the issue.

The history of the question of rhetoric and the novel in modern times goes back to Rohde. This issue is indirectly related to the question we are concerned with in the present work, which is more specifically defined as "rhetoric in the novel." There is limited research on this area, with some good contributions coming mainly from the last decade.


Scholars have not failed to notice the existence of rhetoric in many novels from a very early stage in the "modern" bibliography but the assertion never led anybody to conduct a special investigation into it. On the contrary, many scholars have shown (personal) dislike towards rhetoric as a feature in the novel. As a result, discussion of this topic has been deflected by various secondary concerns in the area of this genre. Thus, it has been discussed as a part of the whole question of the origins of the novel, the style of the novelists, their chronology, their reception, etc., but very little has been done to treat the issue on its own merit by conducting an analytical discussion of the rhetorical features. It seems that rhetoric has served modern scholarship only as a means, a catalyst which prompted research into various aspects of the novel not directly relevant to rhetoric.

Erwin Rohde, in his 1876 discussion on the basic ingredients of the Greek novel, claims that the novel of Antonios Diogenes is a very early novel because, among other reasons, we do not "hear" from Photios' account any pathetic speeches, descriptions of works of arts etc.; therefore, in this novel there is "nichts von all jenen rhetorischen Prunkstücken der späteren Romanschreiber." He recognises, however, that the novels that were produced later were different

---

38 See p. 22ff.
39 Rohde (1876); (repr. 1960).
40 Ibid. p. 277=258.
41 Ibid. p. 308=286.
because in the meantime a new force ("eine neue Macht") appeared which influenced it and this was the "sophistische Redekunst." Rohde regarded rhetoric of the second sophistic as a factor which influenced the formation of the novel and this is apparent mainly in the novels that exist today in a complete form. His main idea was that the second sophistic contributed to the "crossing" of the erotic stories with travelling stories.

Although Rohde's dates have had to be significantly revised, what we have to keep from his inspired - for its time - theory is that he did not overlook the role of sophistic rhetoric in the development of the novel. It is in his remarks, however, that we find his rather hostile attitude towards the use of rhetoric in the novel, which he saw as an artificial element. Even so, Rohde's work in this early stage of research in the area is important since he recognises the role of rhetoric in the development of "phantasie" and the use of the progymnasma (mainly ethopoia) in the novels etc. Although the careful use of stylistic-rhetorical language in the novel was always a noticeable issue for scholars much earlier than Rohde, as the Byzantine scholars Photios, Psellos, etc. noted, rhetoric was treated as evidence of the quality of the novels on a stylistic level and was never, as happened with Rohde, explained in the general context of the (mainly sophistic) novel.

From now on the issue is taken up mainly in the discussions of the origins of the novel. Schwartz notes in his 1896 study that the novels contained rhetorical speeches, monologues, descriptions, rhetorical style and most importantly figures (Figuren) which exist also in rhetoric. He uses these remarks as evidence of his central theory that the novel originated in the "environment" of

---

42 Ibid. p. 308=286.
43 Ibid. p. 309=287.
44 See also W. Kroll's account in RE 37 (1937) 1208.
45 See, for example, Rohde (1960) p. 336=312ff., etc.
46 Rohde (1960) p. 348=323.
47 See ibid chapter III, esp. pp. 343(=318) - 387(=360).
48 See, for example, several testimonia of Achilles Tatios in Vilborg's edition (1955) pp. 163-168, where principally "μη" is the main concern of these authors. Also Photios, Bibliotheca cod. 87 (Vilborg ed. (1955) p. 163-164); cod. 94 (Vilborg ed. (1955) p. 164); Michael Psellos, De Charickea et Leucippe iudicium in Vilborg (1955) p. 165-166. I.P. Rhakendytes (Σύνοψις ζητομαχίας, see Vilborg ed. (1955) p. 168), for instance, advises that Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros can be used as models in making what he calls "ἄνθρωποι ζητομαχίας ἐννοώμενος" (Walz vol. 3 p. 521) and in Walz (ibid) p. 526 Achilles Tatios' name is found among authors, such as I. Chrysostomos, Isokrates, Libanius, etc.
49 Schwartz (1896) p. 145.
the rhetorical schools of Asia Minor where rhetoric had played a role in the transformation of historiography into “quasi-poesie” which together with Alexandrian love poetry constituted the parents of the novel as a genre.

In one century of research into the rhetorical origins of the novel the presence of the rhetorical element in the novel was explained only as a result of its biological parentage. As a consequence scholarship on the topic restricted itself to just accepting in general the presence of rhetoric in the novel and circling around this idea. Rarely was the rhetorical aspect considered as deserving any sympathetic discussion as an integral part of the novels. Whenever this happened the discussion privileged mainly the stylistic elements.

Norden turns his attention to the “new style,” as he calls it, as manifested in genres of the time of Hadrian to the end of the empire. In the chapter on the erotic romances, Norden touches some of the still important rhetorical aspects of the novel mainly in the area of style. He underlines that we can only understand the novels if we take into consideration that they were written by rhetors and if we take their rhetorical aspect seriously. Even in such a short discussion this scholar manages to give some examples of the relationship between rhetoric and the novel by drawing a parallel between Seneca’s *controversiae* and passages from the novel, by comparing the style with

---

50 Ibid. p. 146.
52 In 1902 Borneque, based on common elements shared by the two genres, regards declamation as the origin of the novel, a suggestion which strangely enough did not become subject to much discussion (p. 130). Others also followed suit and agreed with this view during the last century. Rohde's theory had an impact on Cataudella's views published in 1958. His theory of the formation of the novel takes into account the activities of the sophists. Furthermore, Rohde's theory instigated the publication of a significant article (1962) by another Italian scholar, Giagrande. He challenges the theories of Rohde (1876) and Schwartz (1896) on the one side, and the views of Lavagnini (1922) on the other, basically on the basis of the parental ingredients that they proposed and the way the novel was created. Giagrande proposes a new parental ingredient; the prose paraphrasis which was made for practical purposes and was taught and practised extensively in schools (ibid. p. 152ff.). His main conclusion is the “origin of the Greek love-romances must reside in prose paraphrases of Alexandrian love-elegies and *epyllia*, paraphrases which the rhetors must at first have started to compose as models for their pupils.” In his theory Giagrande rejects any idea of “fusing” of ingredients in the schools of the second sophistic proposed by others but keeps the role of the sophists and their occupations (here paraphrasis) as a significant factor in the creation of the genre. Giagrande's theory shows for one more time that without explaining the occurrence of rhetoric in the novel we cannot appreciate the genre completely.

53 Norden (1915) published his work as early as 1898.
54 Ibid. p. 407.
55 Ibid. pp. 434-442.
Hermogenes’ views in his *Peri ideon* and by unreservedly accepting the overshadowing role of rhetoric on their works of literature.

An important study in this area was that of Wolff. In the analysis of the ancient novels, contained in the first part of his study, he considers all these rhetorical themes and motifs – which scholars today tend to look at with a sympathetic eye as “functional” in the novel - as “irrelevancies.” In the case of Achilleus Tatos, in particular, who “in the number and the bulk of irrelevancies . . . far exceeds Heliodorus,” he compiles lists of “irrelevancies” of the plot (e.g. the story of Menelaos), of characterisation (e.g. “the needless analysis of “psychological” commonplace), irrelevancies of setting (e.g. the painting of Europa, the garden, etc.), irrelevant science and pseudo-science (e.g. the phoenix, the crocodile, etc.). He finds a good side in all these “irrelevancies” which is the effect created “by turning the expectant mind away from the continuation that is not essentially connected with what precedes.” This is examined along with a similar phenomenon, the “element of the unexpected” in which he includes irony and antithesis which is analysed into several categories.

His conclusion is that the rhetorical elements were stretched so much that they became “artifices” which he analyses. His overall view on the irrelevancies is that for Heliodoros “about a quarter” is “out of its frame” while for Achilleus Tatos it “must be nearly half out!” Especially for the latter Wolff seems to show little tolerance:

“But such is the mass, and such the damnable iteration of the irrelevancies in “Clitophon and Leucippe,” that for the most part they simply put the reader out of patience!”

---

56 Wolff (1912).
57 Ibid. p. 201.
58 Ibid. p. 203.
59 Ibid. p. 206.
60 Ibid. p. 207.
61 Ibid. pp. 207-208.
64 Ibid. p. 213.
65 Ibid. esp. p. 217ff.
66 Ibid. p. 221ff.
Therefore, by using interrelated stories and incidences and "tricks of rhetoric," the novelists are perceived by Wolff as having some kind of odd obsession or lack of sense of "relevance." On the other hand, both the categorisations of several rhetorical tricks and their analysis provide a good rudimentary basis for further (mainly stylistic) analysis on a more proper basis.

Fortunately, from Perry's 1967 book onwards the question of the origins receded considerably and scholars started taking a closer look at the novels themselves. Perry's rejection of the previous method of trying to find biological parents which scholars had followed up to his time put an end to the dispute over the "father" and the "mother" of the novel and opened the way for a fuller appreciation of the novels in their literary-cultural context.

In his attempt to define the creation of the novel based on what he calls the deeper "idea" that generated it, Perry fails to pay sufficient attention to the role of rhetoric in the shaping of the genre and its overwhelming power of creating literature, of generating long parts of fiction, as we will see in this survey. In the analysis of Chariton's novel for example (ibid. chapter III), Perry pays little or no attention to the rhetorical abilities of the author - he considers this novel as a part of the presophistic stage based on the (admittedly sound) principle of its internal nature rather than its date and considers this novel as "fundamentally drama in substance and historiography in its outward form."

In his 1969 article, Reardon introduces the idea that the novel attracted sophisticated writers because "it offers obvious scope for literary development," since other rhetorical activities (progymnasmata, speeches, etc.) leave little space for creative initiatives on the author's part.

In his review of the origins of the novel Lesky notes that we should take into consideration the preparatory role that rhetorical schools played in the way of thinking and writing which was fruitful for the authors of novels, although the earlier theory that the novel was produced in the rhetorical school of the second sophistic is no longer valid.

---

69 Ibid. p. 220.
71 Ibid. p. 140.
Concerning declamation Russell notes that declamation and the novel are “expressions of a common culture” since we find both rhetorical/declamatory elements in the novel and novelistic features in the declamations.\(^74\) In similar terms, Cataudella in 1957 suggests that there is some influence on the “romanzo” by the Greek and Roman declamation.\(^75\) As obvious by now, the concentration on the origins of the novel led to limited research on the rhetorical elements of the novel.

The issue of the relationship between rhetoric and the novel is closely related to another still ongoing discussion on the issue of readership. The present study is indirectly involved in this as the use of rhetoric may be taken into consideration in determining not only the readership targeted by the author but also independently the readers whom it really had.\(^76\) This research project supports and advances Bowie’s view\(^77\) that the novel of “Chariton comes closest to the “sophistic” novel in its exploitation of allusion to classical texts, . . . , and I would not doubt that Chariton aimed at and reached well-educated readers.”\(^78\) As we will see later on,\(^79\) rhetoric in Chariton’s novel is too highly sophisticated to let us believe that this author targeted anything less than a sophisticated audience.

Even until recently it has been suggested that the poor textual tradition of Chariton’s novel “suggests that the novel was not held in high esteem by the educated” and, Reardon continues, “in all probability educated people did read it” but not as literature of high quality.\(^80\) But we feel this judgement is too harshly applied in Chariton’s case. The evidence of the textual tradition cannot be used to draw conclusions on the readership of the novel - since the novel’s textual tradition is not significantly large. The role of “Tyche” in the textual tradition of these texts – similarly to its role in the stories - should also not be underestimated. The fact that we possess *Chaireas and Kallirhoe* from a very poor tradition does not suggest that it was unpopular while, it is true, a rich tradition might have indicated the opposite.

\(^75\) Cataudella (1957) pp. 117-126.
\(^76\) For a discussion of the readership issue, see p. 293ff.
\(^77\) Bowie (1996) pp. 87-106.
2. b. Rhetoric in the novel.

The general discussion on rhetoric in the novel in the last two decades can be traced back to the 1984 work of Anderson who in chapter 3 discusses the rhetorical features of the ancient novels. Anderson tries to illustrate some rhetorical features, as for example the rhetorical display, the use of paradox and antithesis, other stylistic elements, etc. The chapter discusses all these elements in passing and presents Anderson's views on rhetorical "snapshots" of the ancient novels. Similarly, Reardon (1991) gives some examples of the influence that rhetorical education had on the novel. The discussion offers a general overview on the overall use of rhetoric in the novel. Pernot again in his 1992 article goes through some rhetorical influences on the novel of Heliodoros in which Charikleia's rhetorical dexterity is singled out as unique and quite unexpected for a female character.

During the last decade more progress has been made in the area of rhetoric in the novel than ever before. The main reason for this is that scholars turned their attention from the issue of origins to the investigation of rhetoric in the surviving novels. Scholars started re-evaluating this important compositional element of the novel, some of them with the aim of using it as evidence for their views on the novel's chronology, others to find correspondence between rhetorical or legal proceedings and the real world of the time and others to view some aspects of the style of the erotic fiction based on ancient stylistic manuals. In the still very few articles or chapters dealing straightforwardly with the topic of rhetoric in the novel, the issue is treated briefly, mainly with the aim of establishing certain relationships (mainly generic) on a small scale basis, but to the best of our knowledge, this feature has never been regarded as deserving a more comprehensive analysis. It is only in the 1998 thesis of Schwartz that the

---

83 Reardon (1991) p. 84ff.
forensic speeches are given special attention and this is in the context of the author's interest of the "courtroom scenes in the ancient Greek novel."\(^85\)

One very sympathetic treatment of rhetoric in the novel can be found in the 1990 book of Yatromanolakis on Achilleus Tatos. In this book the author claims that the dominant views on the language and style of Achilleus Tatos - which range from "extravagant" to "absurd" - are static (not productive) because they simply present a series of phenomena without any attempt to find any reasons that prompted the author to choose them. Therefore, he suggests that all these "unnecessary" or "absurd" elements of Achilleus Tatos' speeches have to be analysed in the light of "the erotic author who tries to present a sensual love story in an (appropriately) sensual manner."\(^86\) The author seems to disapprove of previous scholarship on the matter, which saw "stylistic daring" as a negative feature, by approaching it in a positive way with the aim to appreciate the amazing potentiality that prose can have.\(^87\)

Apart from this, and still on the stylistic level, Yatromanolakis analyses certain linguistic and stylistic features (considered as daring) of Achilleus Tatos in the context of the novel,\(^88\) namely the element of γλυκύτης in Achilleus Tatos based on the remarks of Hermogenes (On the Ideas), the structural balance in sentences of Achilleus Tatos, and he cautiously offers an explanation of the difference in style and language between the purely narrative line of the novel and the several areas of the novels which retard the progress of the plot. According to him, these passages provide a kind of "lyric pockets" (pools/areas) and so the alternation is reminiscent of the double nature of tragedy where the dramatic episodes are interrupted by the lyric stasima. If this is true, then we can explain those elements in the same way as we justify and appreciate differences between lyric and epic elements in tragedy.\(^89\)

The 1990 book of Yatromanolakis marked the beginning of a number of sympathetic approaches to rhetoric. In his 1990 article Hernadez Lara analyses three rhetorical-stylistic elements in the novel of Chariton, namely, rhetorical figures, rhythmical clausulae, and the presence of atticisms, and questions the

\(^87\) Ibid. p. 160.  
\(^88\) Ibid. p. 161ff.
traditional (early) dating of Chariton and his characterisation as belonging to the “presophistic stage.”\textsuperscript{90} The author of this article challenges the dominant view that Chariton wrote his novel before the middle of the first century. Although Hernandez Lara’s work aims at setting a new date for Chariton, the analysis of figures and other rhetorical-stylistic features offers a new insight in the rhetorical abilities of Chariton which, as we will see later,\textsuperscript{91} are much more complicated than previously suspected. Similarly, in her 1991 article “Aspects of the vocabulary of Chariton” Ruiz-Montero questions Papanikolaou’s conclusions on Chariton’s chronology (as early as the second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.).\textsuperscript{92} Based on a number of observations about Chariton’s language she concludes that she prefers a date “towards the last years of the first century A.D. or the beginning of the second.”\textsuperscript{93}

In 1991 Ruiz-Montero\textsuperscript{94} investigates the use of \textit{progymnasmata} by Chariton and Xenophon, and although she devotes a very short discussion to such a wide topic, she offers innovative suggestions on the relationship between \textit{progymnasmata} and the novel of Chariton.\textsuperscript{95}

Ferrini in a number of articles deals with the wider issue of monologues in the novel\textsuperscript{96} as a group which is quite distinct from the rest of each novel. More significantly, in the 1987-88 article Ferrini discusses the speeches of Melite at the end of book 5 of Achilleus Tatios where Melite manages to convince Kleitophon to accept her advances through melodramatic and oratorical means of persuasion. Her discussion reveals many rhetorical tricks which Melite uses to achieve her aim. Her 1991 article deals with the judicial, military and a few

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid. p. 171.
\textsuperscript{91} Hernandez Lara (1990) p. 267.
\textsuperscript{92} See p. 44ff., p. 198ff., p. 247ff., and p. 262ff.
\textsuperscript{93} Cf. Papanikolaou (1973) pp. 160-163.
\textsuperscript{95} Ruiz-Montero (1991a) pp. 709-713.
\textsuperscript{96} In the same year (1991) Billault published his 1987 thesis in which he discusses some rhetorical aspects of the novels, especially \textit{ekphrasis} (pp. 245-265) and digression (pp. 265-301), in the context of the rhetorical tradition. A. Billault’s (1990) article concentrates on the use of \textit{ekphrasis} in the Greek novels and complements the work made by Bartsch in (1989) (and Harlan in her 1965 dissertation) which looked mainly at the equally important issue of their function in the novels.
\textsuperscript{96} Ferrini (1990).
other direct speeches which, she claims, make the reader think that s/he participates in the whole process.\footnote{Our survey is concerned with the location and analysis of the rhetorical aspects of the novel based on a number of rhetorical sources. However, in places, we have independently arrived at a similar conclusion that the public speeches, especially the judicial ones, put the reader in a position where he has to appreciate and judge each side’s speeches. We think that these speeches not only create the illusion that the reader participates in the story but they actually draw the reader into the story in a compulsive way and raise the dramatic tension and suspense as well as being a means of intellectual challenge.}

Ruiz-Montero,\footnote{Earlier in 1976 Anderson in his paper “Redating the Second Sophistic” (in Reardon (1977) p. 80) expresses his reservations over the dating of the second sophistic and in his conclusions he claims that is “increasingly difficult to accept Chariton and Ninos as “presophistic once their deliberate pretension are taken into account” and that “it might be more useful to discard the term “sophistic” altogether in favour of “late Greek rhetoric.”} who in a series of articles has provided a fresh look at many aspects of the ancient novel during the last decade, is in particular “rhetorically alert” when discussing the ancient novels. In her most recent 1996 article she takes seriously the rhetorical aspect of the novels as an important criterion for the classification of the ancient novels. She challenges the over-simplistic traditional terms “sophistic” and “pre-sophistic” novel,\footnote{Ruiz-Montero (1996) p. 30f.} by applying the only viable criteria of “spirit” and “chronology.”\footnote{Ibid. p. 30.} When both criteria are applied we face a series of discrepancies – especially with Chariton (and Ninos) - where the use of complicated rhetorical material by Chariton puts into doubt either his novel’s chronology or its “pre-sophistic” labelling or both.

Furthermore, based on the chronology of the beginning of the second sophistic set “in the second half of the first century A.D.”\footnote{Ruiz-Montero (1996) p. 30ff.} she claims that “only Ninus could with any certainty be said to predate it.”\footnote{Ibid. p. 30.} However, still in this novel, as we will see later on in the relevant chapter on rhetoric in the fragments (p. 162ff.) we find the application of complicated rhetorical techniques and this in a high proportion of the surviving parts.\footnote{This is also implied by her on p. 47 where she talks about Ninos’ “heavily rhetorical nature.” Furthermore, Jenistova (1953) in the analysis of Ninos takes into consideration its rhetorical aspect (esp. on p. 218 ff.) and accepts that the novel has taken over “motifs from rhetorical exercises” (p. 319).}
According to Ruiz-Montero's conclusions on *Chaireas and Kallirhoe*\(^\text{104}\) and *Ninos* there is a "high level of rhetorical awareness and mastery of both authors;"\(^\text{105}\) in discussing the "rhetorical context" she tries to make the reader aware of some rhetorical motifs in the ancient novels.

Ruiz-Montero views the laments in Chariton, Xenophon, and Ninos as a direct influence of tragedy, especially Euripides.\(^\text{106}\) In part III (p. 222ff.) of the present study there is a discussion of the direct relationship of the material contained in the lament speeches with epideictic oratory, too.

As far as the fragments are concerned, in her most recent comprehensive article on the surviving fragments of the ancient Greek novel, Stephens (1996) among her conclusions underlines that "the style even of very small fragments, like the majority of the larger ones, adheres for the most part to rules of ancient rhetoric, employing the series of highly artificial conventions that were taught and assiduously practised in the schools."\(^\text{107}\) And she goes on to raise the question whether style is an important criterion in the rough dating of the fragments. Her conclusion is that style has often been used - especially in the case of the novels where other chronological information is scarce - for an estimate of their time of production.\(^\text{108}\) Perhaps, we add, a new comprehensive study of Chariton's novel can provide some clues for estimating his still problematic dating.

The article of R. Hock\(^\text{109}\) deals, at least thematically, more straightforwardly with the issue of rhetoric in the novel. In this informative article Hock makes a clear case for the relationship between romance and the *progymnasmata* and attempts a general appreciation of the primary evidence of rhetoric in the novel. The treatment of such a neglected issue is always welcome and the variety of information is quite good, but the nature of this article does not allow the author to go deeper into the rhetorical presence in the novel than a short treatment of the topic with a few prominent examples. Apart from the conclusion that there is a serious relation between rhetoric and the novel - still insufficiently

---

\(^{104}\) In his most recent article on Chariton, Reardon (1996) estimates that "Chariton was fairly well-educated" (p. 323) and in monologues he "uses a whole battery of rhetorical figures" (p. 325). Also on p. 332 he provides a general estimate on Chariton's rhetorical tendencies.

\(^{105}\) Ruiz Montero (1996) p. 68.

\(^{106}\) Ibid pp. 48-49.


\(^{108}\) Ibid p. 682.

researched - there is an additional remark on the rarity of such works: "the romances may well be one of the hottest properties in town, as has been noted, but the rhetoric of the romances is not one of the hot topics." Looking back on what has been achieved in the area, he notices with dismay that the issue has been so much misunderstood and maltreated that "clearly, then, sustained, sophisticated, and sympathetic analyses of rhetoric in the romances are a desideratum." A new study, which appeared at a very advanced stage of our survey, is Schwartz's dissertation on the courtroom scenes in the ancient Greek novel (1998). In this work Schwartz is concerned throughout her study with the relationship of the imaginary courtroom scenes to the world of real life. She offers a discussion of the trial scenes and often she refers to rhetorical features of the courtroom speeches, although she seems to rely on secondary sources for that. However, in this work the priority is not to investigate the bearings of rhetorical theory on the forensic speeches of the novels, and courtroom speeches are seen as a part of the trial scene which starts with the crime and ends with the punishment. The closest that the author gets in her analysis to the association of certain rhetorical techniques with a certain handbook is that of Aristotle's Rhetoric (see, for example, pp. 90-91 for the case of Dionysios' speech in Chariton 5, 5, 9). We have kept our original discussion, which was done independently at an early stage of this project, since we view our subject from different angles (she is mainly concerned with the relationship of courtroom scenes with legal realia) and our analysis relies heavily on sources different from the ones Schwartz (1998) uses. Schwartz is focused on discussing the adaptation of the motif of trial scenes by the novelists, and this is reflected in the method she follows, the material she examines, and the contents of her project. However, in the discussion of her topic one finds valid points on the use of forensic rhetoric by the five novelists.

110 Ibid. p. 448.
111 Ibid. p. 453
112 See, for example, her identification of certain rhetorical features of Mithridates' speech Chariton 5, 7 which relies directly on Russell (1983); see Schwartz (1998) p. 94 and p. 96.
113 In her introduction she defines her three perspectives; the first is "narratological," the second "considers the generic convention of the trial scene," and the third considers "the novels from a legal perspective;" see Schwartz (1998) pp. 12-13.
she examines, and her work is a very sympathetic reading of some rhetorical features used in the courtroom scenes of the extant novels.

In the discussion of the history of the issue of rhetoric we have seen that rhetoric is principally mentioned and utilised as evidence either in the discussion of the origins, or rather briefly in general overviews of the novels, or completely ignored, but it has never been an independent issue worth of a large scale survey. As a result, we are still short of evidence and conclusions for the presence and function of all branches of rhetoric in the novels. This leads to unsatisfactory readings with low rhetorical awareness. Literature can be read for pleasure by anyone, but scholars should try to read it with the eyes of the intended or actual reader with the aim to appreciate it fully. This low "rhetorical alertness" has lead many scholars to overlook the rhetorical dimension of the novels; all this goes back to the lack of conclusive studies and information in this particular area. As Hock has rightly pointed out for one aspect of rhetoric, "the value of these progymnasmata for reading the romances is immense, as knowledge of them helps us to recover some of the conventions of thought that governed both writer and reader;" this conclusion has further application to all forms of rhetoric in the novel.

---

3. Rhetoric and characterisation in the three novels.

When dealing with the use of rhetoric in the novels we need to distinguish whose rhetoric we are talking about. Does rhetoric belong to the character making the speech, so that it can be seen as a means of characterisation, or does it belong to the author, in which case it would mean that the novel contains rhetorical pockets directly coming from the authorial voice?

Rhetorical speeches of the novels can be produced by the speakers themselves, the narrator-participant in the story, or the author. The question that arises then is: how does the rhetoric employed by a character in a novel suit his/her characterisation or status? Why do we often find people of a different status such as women, servants, robbers, etc. having rhetorical abilities? What makes them have these abilities?

In Achilleus Tatios, for example, rhetorical techniques used in speeches sometimes appear to be unlikely for their speakers; rhetoric seems to be imposed on them for the sake of epideixis. This may be because the novel is a first person narrative by the main hero, Kleitophon. The narrator-protagonist takes over and presents show-pieces for the sophisticated reader. In these instances rhetorical principles are taken very seriously indeed, leading to a richness of rhetorical techniques and motifs.

The novel of Achilleus Tatios is the first Greek ego-narrative novel. The novel, however, is the story of Kleitophon narrated to the authorial voice which is clearly heard in 1, 1 - 1, 2 in first person; “the reader experiences events through the eyes of the narrator-hero and can more easily identify with him and the other characters.”

The first narrator - the authorial voice - and Kleitophon - the narrator-protagonist of the story - appears to have similar interests and tendencies. The first narrator is attracted by a certain picture which he describes in great detail, presenting thus an excellent ekphrasis (1, 1, 2 - 1, 1, 13). Earlier (1, 1, 1) his description of the Sidonian port has similar qualities, and also later (1, 2) the first narrator appears irresistibly attracted to Kleitophon’s story whom he
encounters near the place where the picture was. Kleitophon is going to offer his story as evidence of how true the first narrator’s explanation of the picture is: “οἶνον ἄρχει βρέφος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης” (1, 2, 1). In their short discussion the first narrator appears eager to listen to Kleitophon’s story even if it might look like a fiction: “Μὴ καταξνήσῃς, ὁ βέλτιστος,” ἔφην, “πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Ἐρωτος σύντοι, ταύτῃ μᾶλλον ἤσεν, εἰ καὶ μῦθος ἔσκε” (1, 2, 2-3). Soon we realise that both the authorial voice and the narrator-protagonist tend to be attracted to stories. All the information we get from the beginning of the novel about the first narrator point in this direction. In the rest of the novel the second narrator behaves in a similar way.  

The novel is thus presented as the result of the accidental meeting and conversation of two people: two characters (the first narrator is also a character no matter how small his participation in the initial chapters is) who could be easily identified as two *scholastici* or two *pepaideumenoi*  

Their initial exchanges are also the author’s introduction to his readers. First, it is made clear that Kleitophon is narrating his own story in which he is the main hero. Second, this initial dialogue and the rhetorically charged *ekphrasis* serve to attract people who are equally interested in such stories and rhetoric. The rhetoric used by the speakers serves as a preparation for the abundance of the rhetorical material contained in the novel, and perhaps is indicative of the intended readership of this novel. 


116 For an enlightening comparison between the narrator-protagonist and the initial narrator—the authorial voice or “the ideal listener” (as called by Yatromanolakis), see Yatromanolakis (1990) *Achilleus Tatios* pp. 94-95.  

117 The term is found in Chariton 5, 4, 1 where the narrator characterises Dionysios as such. It has been widely used by Anderson for the intellectual educated people of the sophistic schools in the age of the second sophistic; see esp. in his (1989) p. 79ff. and (1993) p. 171 and *passim* for *scholasticus*, see Bonner (1977) p. 30ff.; also Conte (1996) *passim*.  

118 Conte (1996) identifies the main hero (and others) in the novel of Petronius as *scholastici*. There, Conte claims, the *scholastici* are “made objects of derision by the ironic strategy by the “hidden author.” In this way the author invites “his reader to chuckle at the mania for grandeur of declamatory, scholastic culture. The aim of striking at the vanity of his culture explains why the author hid himself, preferring to hand over his stage to degraded characters nourished on great literary models” (p. vii); see also *ibid.* chapter 1, pp. 1-36; also pp. 37-38 and elsewhere. This reference along with the initial question of this chapter (p. 29) and encouragement to view Achilles Tatios’ novel in the light of Conte’s interpretation of Petronius was given to me by Dr. J. Morgan for which I am grateful to him.  

119 See the chapter on readership p. 293ff., esp. p. 300ff.
As Harrison has rightly noted, because of the set-up of the prologue there is "a clear distancing of the plot of the novel from the voice of the author" and, at the same time, "failure to return to this frame at the end, surely deliberately, adds to the impression of complexity in the matter of narrative voice."\textsuperscript{120}

In Achilleus Tatios' novel rhetoric is a pre-eminent characteristic of the main hero, the narrator-protagonist, who has the tendency to be drawn into situations which are given rhetorical treatment and, thus, he produces rhetorical showpieces, such as *ekphraseis*, various descriptions, rhetorical speeches, etc. This is apparent from the very beginning and it gives a clue for the way we should read this novel. It is not confined to his own speeches but seems to appear in the speeches of other characters, betraying the narrator-protagonist's inclination to reproduce rhetorical speeches.\textsuperscript{121} The result is an abundance of showpiece rhetoric in the novel. This, we assume, was destined to be appreciated by its readers who would get enjoyment by recognising what they knew from schools; it is also instructive principally for the characterisation of the protagonist. The educated person at the peak of the second sophistic, the product of the schools, had similar tendencies to the ones that the narrator-protagonist shows. The *pepaideumenos-scholasticus* does not miss any occasion to show it. The speeches are rhetorically charged because the narrator is ironically presented as a typical product of the schools of oratory of the second sophistic. If this is true, then we see an ironical detachment of the author from his main character to the point that he can be considered as making fun of his hero's misadventures and his response to them. The narrator-protagonist is presented as favouring rhetorical speeches because of his inclination to produce rhetorical showpieces and live through them the excitement that they offer. In this way the rhetorically aware and trained reader may have identified and, ultimately, sympathised with the main hero and narrator.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{120} Harrison (2000) p. 234.

\textsuperscript{121} See also Anderson (1993) p. 163: "We are dealing ... with a lover straight out of a Tyrian declamation school. Clitophon is physically as well as intellectually experienced; there has been sexual experience for a start, and a distinctly academic approach to sexuality ..."

\textsuperscript{122} Furthermore, see the ingenious comparison of the "pathetic power" of Encolpius' rhetorical questions with the *On the Sublime* by Conte (1996), which leads to the conclusion (among others) that such rhetorical devices bring the "narrative alive with pathetic colors" and thus the effects produced have an impact upon the reader (Conte (1996) p. 9ff.).
This may be the main reason why we experience the all-pervasiveness of rhetoric in the novel of Achilleus Tatos. In this novel all characters show some kind of rhetorical ability. We seem to be visiting a world full of well-trained speakers like the protagonist himself. Perhaps this is an indication that the intended readership of this novel was likewise aware, interested, and appreciative of rhetoric.

As we saw earlier (pp. 29-30), right from the beginning of the *Leukippe and Kleitophon* we see the two voices – the authorial voice and that of the narrator-protagonist – in strong agreement on one theme: the omnipotence-supremacy of Love. This is what the initial picture illustrates, for which the author shows great admiration and respect. The narrator-protagonist not only accepts the authorial interpretation of the picture, but also agrees with its basic idea and sets out to prove the point with another story – his personal experience which contains many examples of what adventures/suffering Love can cause ("τοσοῦτας ὑβρεῖς ἐς ἔρωτος παθῶν" 1, 2, 1).

Despite his education which shines through on every occasion, ranging from various samples of oratory to a great mythological knowledge, the character Kleitophon shows a number of signs which are not compatible with his educational experiences. A fine example of this contrast can be found at the end of book 2, while on board on a ship Kleitophon meets Menelaos, who explains the reason for his immigration as the result of his love of a nice young boy (2, 34, 4); to that Kleinias responds with his own bad experience with love. After that Kleitophon, wanting to cheer his co-travellers up, as he admits in his narration, introduces for discussion a question on homosexual and heterosexual love. In response to Menelaos’ argument favouring homosexual love, Kleitophon (who does not share Menelaos’ view) employs a formidable rhetorical presentation of his view which is highly indicative of his education:

“Πῶς δριμύτερον, ” ἔρην, “ὅτι παρακύψαν μόνον οἶχεται καὶ οὐχ ἀπολαύσαι δίδωσι τῷ φιλοῦντι, ἀλλ’ ἔοικε τῷ τοῦ Ταντάλου πώματι; πολλάκις γὰρ ἐν ὃ πέντεται πέφευγε, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἐραστής οὐχ εὐρίων πειέν τὸ δὲ ἔτι πινόμενον ἀφάγεται πρὶν ὁ πίνων χορευθῇ. καὶ οὐχ ἔστιν ἀπὸ παιδὸς ἀπελθεῖν ἐραστήν ἔλυπον ἐχοντα τὴν ἥδονήν καταλείπει γὰρ ἔτι διψῶντα” (2, 35, 4-5).
This initial response is only a sample of the quality of rhetoric that Kleitophon employs and constitutes only the beginning of a speech which is coming soon as a response to Menelaos' arguments, which again are of a high rhetorical value (2, 37, 1-10). In this second speech Kleitophon excels himself by showing not only rhetorical mastery but also formidable knowledge of mythology on which he bases many of his arguments. The strength of his speech is acknowledged indirectly even by Menelaos at the beginning of his last speech (2, 38, 1). By contrast Kleitophon, the master of speaking, is still the character we saw only days earlier asking his cousin, Kleinias, for advice on how to woo Leukippe: “τί λέγω; τί ποιῶ; πῶς ἄν τύχοιμι τῆς ἔρωμένης; σὺν οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὀδοὺς” (1, 9, 7).

This obvious contradiction between theoretical expertise and practical naivety follows the narrator-protagonist in his adventures. In his speech to Menelaos he claims inexperience with women, although he makes a meticulously detailed and mythologically supported case. His picture from his speeches at the end of book 2 comes in contrast with the word-bound boy (in book 1) who seeks help from somebody else more experienced in 1, 9 where he confesses his love for Leukippe to Satyros, and again in 2, 4 where he admits cowardice in love-matters (“δέδοικα δὲ μὴ ἵπτολμος καὶ δείλος ἔρωτος ἰθητής γένωμαι”; 2, 4, 4-5). All this indicates a considerable discrepancy between Kleitophon's eloquence due to his education and his ineffectiveness in action. His thorough education does nothing to help him in facing his personal “reality.” Elsewhere, he appears credulous: he falls an easy victim to Thersandros' trap and takes as true without questioning any claims his deceitful co-prisoner makes in 7, 3-4. His response to Kleinias, who tries to make his friend wait until he is certain about Leukippe's death, is that he is absolutely convinced: “τούτου ἀσφαλέστερον πῶς ἄν μάθοις” (7, 6, 2).

Earlier in book 5 after a long persistent persecution, Kleitophon succumbs to Melite's wishes without being able to help himself escape from her amorous attention (5, 25-26) with the assistance of his education. In book 3, captured by the Egyptian robbers (3, 9ff.) Leukippe, according to his account, is apparently killed and her entrails eaten in front of him (3, 15, 3). At that moment, while everybody averts from looking at the disgusting spectacle, he is looking (3, 15,
5). His strange inclination to look at the spectacle makes him identify with Niobe instead of helping him appreciate what is really going on (καὶ τάχα ὁ τῆς Νιόβης μάθος οὐκ ἦν ψευδῆς . . . 3, 15, 6).

Again later in 5, 7, 4ff. Leukippe falls victim to robbers. After a swift persecution they apparently decapitate her and this happens in front of Kleitophon's eyes who watches from a distance. When finding the headless body, Kleitophon, quick to accept that the body in front of him belongs to his fiancée, verbalises his pain in a lament (5, 7, 8-9).

All these examples show that, although well educated, Kleitophon fails to cope with life and appears as an easy victim who suffers at the hands of the god of love. Is this not what the authorial voice and the protagonist have agreed right from the beginning? Is this not the occasion for the whole account of Kleitophon? Is this not what the reader has been clearly warned that he is going to hear? "Οἶον ἄρα ἀδέσποτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης"123 is not only the author's and the narrator's theme but would also be the reader's conclusion after Kleitophon's account of his suffering. Love's omnipotence finds no match in the protagonist's education.124 The fact that his schooling in rhetoric and mythology does not help him to overcome adversity portrays Kleitophon as a pathetic figure; Achilleus appears to have treated him with ironic detachment.125

Further on this, as Reardon has noted, the various divergences in the treatment of conventional motifs (love, rivals and fidelity, reunion, etc.)126 in Achilleus Tatios can be explained as a result of sophistication and, ultimately, creativity.

---

123 A.T. 1, 2, 1.
124 See also Harrison (2000) pp. 215-220. Harrison compares Lucius (from Apuleius' novel) "the narrator of the novel" and Apuleius "its author" and finds that there is much resemblance between them (pp. 218-219). Lucius "shares the social origins of almost all the major Greek sophists of the first and second centuries AD," (p. 216) and "though Lucius has many traits of the elite intellectual in the Metamorphoses, his education does not prevent him from making many foolish decisions and choices" (p. 218). Although he appears to be "credulous," "foolish," "too easily swayed by momentary sensual pleasure," etc. (p. 219), he is capable of producing "a persuasive and highly invective forensic oration of Ciceronian character when required to at a mock trial in Book 3 (3.43-7.3)" (p. 219).
125 Courtney (2001) in comparing the novels of Petronius and Achilleus Tatios claims that a main difference in the protagonists of those novels lies in "the interval between the events and their recounting" which is not substantial in the case of Kleitophon; in Petronius, however, "it occasionally becomes clear that Encolpius is looking back at the events with a certain detachment and even amusement, though at the time he presents himself as thinking of them in a semi-tragic light." In this way "the irony of the narrator, who as such is sophisticated and competent, converges with that of the author" (p. 37).
of the author rather than as a means to create a parody of the genre. Reardon is against viewing Achilleus Tatios’ novel either as a parody or as a comic novel altogether, but rather he sees it as “an amused comment on its own genre”\(^\text{127}\) and as “a genuine if offbeat specimen of its genre.”\(^\text{128}\) He therefore considers that the “isolated and special episodes”\(^\text{129}\) of Leukippe’s sacrifice in 3, 15 with the corresponding soliloquy of Kleitophon in 3, 16 along with Leukippe’s decapitation and Kleitophon’s short corresponding speech in 5, 7 are deliberately created and expect the audience “to enjoy the kitsch, to relish the frisson such an incident would induce”,\(^\text{130}\) also he supports the idea that Kleitophon’s ill-conceived rhetorical outbursts are evidence of deliberate and “highly sophisticated sensationalism” which should not be taken at their face value.\(^\text{131}\) This view is further corroborated by the acute observation that in these episodes “the author has chosen to revert to an uncomfortably severe form of ego-narrative that he has in principle abandoned.”\(^\text{132}\)

In the other two novels, those of Chariton and Heliodoros, rhetoric is employed by the authors mainly to characterise their heroes. This should be interpreted with caution. First, rhetoric by definition is bound to distort pictures; it has cleverly been defined as “the science of occasion,” namely “how to say just the right thing at just the right moment.”\(^\text{133}\) Not every single element of the speech should be taken as a means of characterisation, but we should take into account the “rhetoric of the situation”\(^\text{134}\) and the function of each employment of rhetoric. If seen in this light, the use of rhetoric on each occasion is better understood and explained. In her introduction to the Alkestis, for example, Dale states that in these situations the question is not “What would X, being such a man, be likely to say in such a situation?” but “suppose a man involved in such a situation, how should he best acquit himself? How gain his point? Move his hearers? Prove his thesis? Convey information lucidly and vividly?”\(^\text{135}\)

\(^{129}\) *Ibid.* p. 84.
\(^{131}\) *Ibid.* p. 84.
\(^{132}\) *Ibid.* p. 84.
\(^{133}\) MacQueen (1990) pp. 111-112.
\(^{134}\) Dale (1954) Euripides *Alcestis* p. xxv of the introduction. I owe this reference to Prof. C. Carey, to whom I am grateful.
understand why the characters speak in a certain way in certain circumstances is a better way of approaching them. This is, Dale claims, "the dominating consideration," namely "what points could be made here." The dramatist is "as it were a kind of λογογράφος who promises to do his best for each of his clients in turn as the situations change and succeed one another." This in no way means that we should discard rhetorical speeches as indications of character. It means, however, that the speaker's specific situation should also be taken into account.

What Euripides is doing in the Alkestis is true for the novelists as well. Their characters, like those of tragedy, react to particular situations determined by what Dale called the "rhetoric of the situation." The novel unfolds scene by scene and not as one picture from the beginning to the end. It is principally the plot-line that unifies the whole thing.

In Theagenes and Charikleia, rhetoric is used mainly by educated speakers, usually coming from the higher classes, characters such as Thyamis, Arsake, Hydaspes, and principally Charikleia. The rhetorical techniques they use are very advanced indeed. Like most figures in Heliodoros' novel, his two protagonists are characterised mainly through their speeches and through their reactions to speeches; Charikleia's resourcefulness, calm and self-control even in extremely desperate situations become apparent in the way she speaks; her rhetorical skills, in contrast to those of Theagenes, are consistent with her dominant protagonist role in the novel as opposed to the role played by Theagenes.

Charikleia's rhetorical speeches play a great role in the presentation of her character. She proves to be extremely versatile in any awkward position and able to escape danger through the use of rhetoric (see, for example, her response to Thyamis' wedding proposal in 1, 21). The reader has been indirectly warned about this ability of Charikleia. Her step-father, Charikles, in despair because of his unsuccessful attempts to convince his daughter to start thinking about

---

136 Ibid. p. xxviii.
137 Ibid. p. xxviii.
138 Ibid. p. xxv.
139 Ibid. pp. xxvii-xix.
140 See, for example, p. 138ff., p. 143ff., p. 145ff., p. 154ff., p. 157, etc.
marriage confesses defeat. Because of this he asks Kalasiris to intervene and help. His daughter's good education has made her invincible in speech:

\[ \text{Τινάκινυσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ γαλεπώτατον τοῖς ἑμοῖς, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, κατ' ἑμοῦ κέχοιται πτεροὶς καὶ τὴν ἐκ λόγων πολυπειρίαν, ἣν ποικίλην ἐδιδαξάμην ποὺς κατασκευήν τοῦ τὸν ἄριστον ἠρρόθαι βίον, ἢπανατείνεται ἑκθειάζουσα μὲν παρθενίαν... (2, 33, 5).} \]

This very instructive comment by Charikleia's step-father is confirmed by her actual speeches in various situations; it comes to a climax in the scene at Hydaspes' court, where she manages to save herself and Theagenes from certain death, which not only reunifies her with her real parents but also changes the whole religious-ideological beliefs of Ethiopia concerning human sacrifice.\(^{142}\)

Apart from the main heroes, there is much scope for characterisation of secondary characters through their use of rhetoric, as in the case of Knemon's parents, and of Kybele (p. 214ff.). As for the first, we see an effective speaker seeking justice and punishment of his son while his wife is using rhetoric for her self-interested purposes (p. 127ff.).

As for Kybele, we are in front of an interesting character-type, the favourite, capable, and conniving servant through whom the heroes come into indirect contact with somebody in a superior position who, apart from power, has an interest in them.\(^{143}\) Kybele is the old steward next to Arsake (see 7, 2, 1 for her characterisation), for whom Arsake shows extreme trust and respect.\(^{144}\) Kybele is then presented as a highly experienced, manipulative character who is "skilful at achieving criminal goals."\(^{145}\) Her use of rhetorical techniques is appropriate; in her hands, rhetoric becomes a dangerous manipulative device.

In both Chariton and Heliodoros rhetoric is used to present educated characters\(^ {146}\) as, for instance, Dionysios or Chaireas in the former, Charikleia in

\(^{141}\) See Pernot (1992); Morgan in Schmeling (1996) p. 452 and Wiersma (1990) p. 21; see also later on, p. 213ff.

\(^{142}\) A further discussion on Charikleia can be found in Pernot (1992) pp. 43-51.

\(^{143}\) This is also true of Chariton's Plangon who appears to use the language of deceit to a great extent in order to persuade Kallirhoe to marry Dionysios which would please her master (p. 203).

\(^{144}\) See how she talks to her in seeking help: ὃ μητέρων (7, 10, 3); μαμέλικαν (7, 10, 4); Κυβέλιον ρατατοῦν (7, 10, 6).


\(^{146}\) For Chaireas' characterisation as a noble character, a "hero in the sophistic-rhetorical tradition of the romance see Helms (p. 28f.); similarly, for Kallirhoe's characterisation as a noble,
the latter, etc. Chariton gives a straightforward characterisation of Dionysios (5, 5, 1):

"δι' ἰονύσιος, οἷα δὴ πρόόμος ἁνὴρ καὶ πεπαιδευμένος. λόγους τῇ γυναικῇ προσήγεγεν ὡς ἐν τοιούτως πιθανωτάτως. ἐλαφρῶς τε καὶ πράσῳ ἐκαστα διηγούμενος."\(^{147}\)

The fact that he speaks convincingly reveals his rhetorical abilities acquired through his paideia. Later on, in the court scene, Dionysios presents an excellently-prepared speech (p. 51ff.) for which, the narrator informs us, he woke up early in the morning "to rehearse."\(^{148}\) Related to this is the interesting fact that Dionysios is not only impressed by Kallirhoe's beauty but also, as he confesses, by her "gift of persuasive speech."\(^{149}\)

The use of rhetorical dexterity shows the negative power of rhetoric when used for calculated purposes, as in the case of the servants who use rhetoric. They present an apparent discrepancy which exists in all (three) novels, which is explicable in the case of Achilleus Tatios as we saw earlier (p. 29ff.) but not in the case of the other two novelists. The supposedly uneducated servants (and others such as robbers) are often presented as showing craftiness through the use of rhetoric.

In Chariton's novel we have at least two cases where rhetoric could at first sight be seen as inappropriate to the characters; these are Theron (1, 7; 1, 10; 1, 11, etc.) and the robbers' council, and Plangon (2, 10). In 1, 10 the speakers' use of intelligent and cultured lady see *ibid.* p. 45f.; for Dionysios' characterisation as a noble and educated man see *ibid.* pp. 66-68; also for Plangon's characterisation as a cunning and intelligent character see *ibid.* p. 94f. Helms' book on characterisation in Chariton is the only monograph, to the best of our knowledge, on this topic. In his work he discusses characterisation in terms of three Aristotelian categories; these are "moral choice," "consistency," and "realism" (see *ibid.* p. 22; also p. 147) and so excludes rhetorical characterisation (in this case *ethopoia*) on the basis that it "does not contain any character delineation but rather a verbose display of pathos" (p. 25). As a result, this thesis overlooks the character-revealing use of rhetoric which, if nothing else, indicates educated, cultured characters. However, in places (as, for example, on p. 70) the author claims that Chariton is fond of speeches (soliloquies or dialogue) "for no other reason than to make the portrayal more lively, more picturesque, more human" (see also p. 106, 127, and 148) and concedes that in Chariton "rhetoric is not used for its own sake but is functional in making the portrayal more human, more lifelike" (p. 148) therefore indirectly admitting some bearing of rhetoric on characterisation.

\(^{147}\) Earlier Dionysios had been introduced as a man "πλούσιος καὶ γένει καὶ παιδεία τῶν ἄλλων ἰδίων ὑπερέχοντα" (1, 12, 6); again in 2, 1, 5 he is called: "ἀνήρ γὰρ βασιλικὸς, διαφέρων ἀξίωματι καὶ παιδείᾳ τῆς δόλης ἰονύσις."\(^{148}\) Translation by Reardon in Reardon (1989) p. 81; Chariton 5, 5, 6: "Ἄνα μελετήσῃ τὴν δύναμιν."
telika kephalaia\textsuperscript{150} fails to persuade Theron to follow either speaker's suggestion, but the employment of rhetoric is an indication of how a case can be equally argued from both sides.

In Plangon's case we see the manipulative servant at work. This scene (2, 10) needs two equally resourceful characters, Plangon and Kallirhoe (p. 203ff.). Without an equally capable character we would not be able to witness the discussion of the two opposing views of a serious issue and the deliberations on the best possible solution, and the reader would not be able to get closely involved in Kallirhoe's dilemma. The issue is highly appropriate for controversia and suasoria, where often speakers are in front of similar situations.\textsuperscript{151} The circumstances call for a capable person to rise to the occasion; here Plangon is shown doing that. On this occasion, rhetoric functions rather as a basic tool in the construction of a dramatic scene. Speakers apply rhetorical techniques such as the use of ethos\textsuperscript{152} in order to make a convincing speech. Ethos is deliberately depicted in a certain way in order to serve the speaker's specific objectives. Is this characterisation consistent or incongruous with the picture that the author gives of his characters? Does the specific rhetorical device of ethos inform our reading of the novel's characters in any way? This depends on the circumstances.

For example, the villain Thersandros becomes a much more convincing figure after the courtroom trial where his opponents expose the dark sides of his character with informative details and arguments,\textsuperscript{153} and also when we see him exploit rhetoric in order to make his fabrications sound plausible.\textsuperscript{154} In this case, ethos is used as a means of advancing our perception of a character. Thersandros' deceptive speeches highlight the depravity of his character and deepen our understanding of his viciousness.

His advocate turns out to be a worthless bubbler, who despite the employment of sophistry and his apparent confidence proves to be inadequate in supporting his

\textsuperscript{149} Translation by Goold (1995) Chariton p. 111; Chariton 2, 6, 1: "πρόσκενον δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ ἦ τῶν λόγων πειθώ." See also Wiersma (1990) p. 119f. for the characterisation of Kallirhoe as "the stronger personality of the two leading characters"; see also Egger (1994) p. 36ff.
\textsuperscript{150} See pp. 201-202.
\textsuperscript{151} Almost all controversiae and suasoriae in Seneca deal with such impossible situations; see, for example, Contr. 1, Suas 3, etc.
\textsuperscript{153} See, for example, p. 83ff. and p. 276.
\textsuperscript{154} See Thersandos' speeches in Achilleus Taticos 7, 11 and 8; see p. 76ff.
client. Arrogant (starting his speech with an overambitious statement, see 8, 10, 2) and without a sense of the courtroom’s reality, is he not the type of orator who has been so much criticised as useless in courts due to his education inappropriate for the real courtroom circumstances? Is he not the type of “private room orator,” a private declaimer and not a real orator, who is often mocked in the handbooks as being ineffective in real courts? The case of Kleitophon, who because of his suffering pleads for the death penalty for himself by accepting full responsibility for Leukippe’s death, is another interesting one. It is the reaction of a man in despair but also of a man who seeks justice and revenge for his beloved’s murder. We are shown two pictures of a character: one given before the speech, where Kleitophon reveals his plans to his friend Kleinias (and thus to the reader), and one – a distorted one – which arises from his speech; the reader, though, has been warned against this early enough. By juxtaposing those two pictures the reader becomes involved in the irony of the scene where speaker and reader know more than the intended audience – the jury. Kleitophon’s speech to the judges is a particularly sophisticated example of pseudo-characterisation, which works on two levels: to the judges, he presents himself as a villain and murderer, yet by his very self-denunciation he arouses the reader’s sympathy for the predicament he is in. Chariton, by contrast, uses speeches and ethopoiai in a more straightforward way in order to characterise his protagonists. Although Kallirhoe is involved in deceptions (lying to Dionysis; failing to mention the existence of her son to the real father Chaireas), in her speeches we hear her real self. This is especially true of her epideictic speeches where we are allowed access to the inner self, her justifications, her feelings and her thoughts. Furthermore, Kallirhoe, as indeed Chaireas, the heroes of Achilleus Tatios and Heliodoros, “frequently retrace” and lament their fate. As Billault rightly observes in Kallirhoe’s case, “whenever

155 See Seneca, Contr. III pref. 12-14; here Cassius Severus claims that people trained in declamation often appear useless in real courts; see also Contr. 9 pref. 4-5, Bonner (1949) pp. 71-83 and Bonner (1977) p. 324.
156 Achilleus Tatios 7, 6, 3-4.
157 As indeed other noble characters such as Dionysios in Chariton (3, 10, 1; 4, 7, 6-8; 7, 1, 3-4; see Helms (1966) pp. 79-80) or Charikleia in Heliodoros (see, for example, p. 213f.); in this way these characters become more believable and closer “to ordinary people”; see Billault in Schmeling ed. (1996) p. 125.
she complains, she sums up her whole destiny as a long string of unfortunate events. Thus she is constructing and claiming an identity that results from her misadventures."\(^{159}\) This "mode of self-portrayal"\(^{160}\) is apparent in every epideictic speech of the characters.

Taking as starting point an ingenious association between the three branches of rhetoric (advisory, judicial, and celebratory) and the three parts of the soul (rational, emotional, and appetitive) made by "several rhetorical prolegomena,"\(^ {161}\) Hock concludes that the characters of the novels "are not only rhetorically adept but human in terms of their rhetorical culture: ready and able to speak eloquently in whatever situation may arise."\(^ {162}\) "It is only through skill," Hock claims, "at composing and expressing all three kinds of speeches that a person can give full expression to his soul and hence can be human in the fullest sense of the word."\(^ {163}\) This is what the authors try to do with their characters throughout the length of their novels, in which we witness them going through numerous changes of circumstances to which they respond as versatile human beings.

**Conclusions on rhetoric and character.**

In the three novels, the characters' use of rhetoric is expressive of their human nature, which is multidimensional and able to respond to different circumstances. However, characterisation in forensic speeches falls into a special category and should be treated with caution because they may be determined by the particular circumstances of the speaker's situation.\(^ {164}\)

The novelists differ in their use of rhetoric for characterisation purposes:

1. In Achilleus Tatios rhetoric is used pervasively by the narrator-protagonist who is thus characterised as a *pepaideumenos-scholasticus*. All other characters also show remarkable rhetorical abilities. Their speeches have been affected by the narrator-protagonist's filter who tends to be attracted by


\(^{160}\) Ibid.


\(^{162}\) Ibid. p. 465.

\(^{163}\) Ibid.
rhetorical speeches and to respond to rhetorical situations by creating professional rhetorical set-pieces. The world is seen and presented through the eyes of the *scholasticus* narrator-protagonist.

2. Chariton and Heliodoros employ rhetoric more straightforwardly as a means of characterisation. Their protagonists are portrayed as characters chiefly by the way they speak and by the rhetorical devices they use, such as *ethopoia*. In this respect, the novelists use the same methods, in principle at least, which Homer and the tragedians had used to portray their heroes' characters.

---

PART I

Recoverable forensic rhetorical features in the novels of Chariton, Achilleus Tatos, Heliodoros, and the fragments: their relation to rhetorical theory of Roman times.
CHAPTER 1: CHARITON
1. The rhetorical dimensions of the courtroom speeches in the novel of Chariton and their relation to the ones present in Achilleus Tatios’ main courtroom scene.

There are a number of courtroom speeches in Chariton’s novel which are extremely interesting for their use of highly technical rhetorical strategies. What follows is an attempt to present some evidence which shows that Chariton, although widely regarded as a novelist of the “pre-sophistic era,” uses rhetorical techniques which are normally expected and, in fact, are extensively used in the novels of later authors like Achilleus Tatios or Longos.

Book 1: The first trial-scene.

In book 1 the trial scene is created after Chaireas seemingly kills Kallirhoe in an incident which took place after he had thought that she had betrayed him. This trial scene presents striking similarities with the one presented in Achilleus Tatios’ novel.

The process towards the trial is typical; one day after the crime the magistrates assemble a jury to try the murderer. After his violent aggression against Kallirhoe in 1, 4, Chaireas proceeds to an investigation of the facts. He spends all night interrogating Kallirhoe’s servants until he learns the truth. Interrogation by torture is also what is suggested by Thersandros in the trial of Melite. He proposes to the judges that they find out the truth from the slaves who will have to give evidence under torture; if they do not confirm the adultery then Melite will go free (A.T. 8, 8, 13; see also 7, 11, 5-6). The victim is the fiancée of the hero and the trial is set to judge the hero’s actions.

“τότε ἔλεος αὐτὸν εἰσῆλθε τῆς ἀποθανούσης καὶ ἀποκτεῖναι μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἐπεθύμει, Πολύχαρμος δὲ ἐκώλυε, φίλος ἐξαἰρέτος” (1, 5, 2).

The same reaction is observed also in Achilleus Tatios’ hero, Kleitophon, who wishes to die when he learns that Leukippe is dead. There is again a special friend, Sopatros, who discourages Kleitophon from making a false confession that he entirely accepts the accusation and, therefore, he should receive capital punishment. In both cases the friends encourage the desperate lovers to opt for
life for the sake of their beloved; Polycharmos after the trial argues that Chaireas should stay alive to observe the burial procedures of Kallirhoe (1, 6). Kleinias on the other side discourages Kleitophon from his self-destructive decision by saying he should not die with the shame that he was the one who killed Leukippe.

The accused is the first one who is quick to accuse himself and to request capital punishment. Here things are reversed compared with the normal legal procedure. Chaireas is the first hero in the history of the novel who makes such a kind of self-accusation, proposing for himself the death penalty. Hermokrates, on the other side, who, as the father of the victim, should be in the prosecutor’s position, is actually helping Chaireas to escape punishment. His speech (1, 5, 6-7) has rather the form of a formal statement than that of a forensic speech. The speaker gives reasons why the jurors should not try the case and suggests what they should do.

Chaireas’ speech is simpler than that of Kleitophon. It has a very basic structure and certainly does not follow the formal plan of a complete speech; it contains a logical sequence and it has merely a persuasive purpose. The speaker avoids the “introduction” and the “statement of facts” and goes straight to his proposition which is “δημοσίᾳ με καταλεύσατε” (1, 5, 4). He uses reasoning, although his thinking is quite exaggerated in places because of his emotional state.

Hermokrates’ speech, which follows immediately, has a similar structure. He also goes straight to his point, avoiding the “introduction” and “statement of facts.” His central point is “ἐπίσταμαι τὸ συμβαν ἀκούσιον” (1, 5, 6). He does not accept intentional responsibility on behalf of Chaireas, he recognises that he has been tricked, and he proposes that this trial should be aborted. Therefore, it is obvious that Hermokrates’ speech is not a direct response to Chaireas’ speech since it ignores all his arguments; rather it is a response to the whole situation.

---

1 Chariton 1, 5, 4: “ἐπίσταμαι τὸ συμβαν ἀκούσιον”
2 For the division of a speech and its parts, see p. 50f.
3 Schwartz (1998) p. 36, note 22, based on Seneca’s Controversiae points out that a “good defence” would have been one using the “quality of the action” (p. 36f.) and this may be reflected in the narrator’s comment preceding the speech: “οὔθεν εἰς τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν δικαίων, οὔ τὴν διαβολήν, οὔ τὴν ἔρευναν, οὔ τὸ ἀκούσιον” (1, 5, 4). Of course, this may be regarded as coincidental, based on an actual summary of the events, but it is where an orator perhaps would have resorted in such a case.
Schwartz suggests that "since this speech is embedded in a larger narrative, the reader is permitted to draw conclusions from material which, strictly speaking, is presented outside of the speech." This shows how flexible Chariton can be with his speeches, while in other cases, such as in the later courtroom scene, both Dionysios' and Mithridates' speeches are very formal (5, 6 and 5, 7).

The second trial-scene

The second trial-scene takes place in book 3. After Theron is found by Chaireas, he is interrogated; he has to explain about Kallirhoe's personal belongings which were found with him. His explanation is in the form of a deceptive speech (3, 3, 17-18). He presents a plausible and cunning scenario in a remarkably compact style. His speech is succinct but at the same time the hearer is bombarded with a highly informative narration.

This second trial is much more formal. Chariton describes in detail the crowd, the assembly, and each speaker's appearance and speech (3, 4). Chaireas makes the first speech (3, 4, 5-6). His emotions are obvious to the audience as with Kleinias in Achilleus Tatos (7, 7, 6). The speech has two parts: an emotional "introduction" (3, 4, 5) and an informative "statement of facts" (3, 4, 6).

Theron's speech (3, 4, 8-10) contains an utterly plausible story persuasive enough to convince anybody because it fits to every detail of what happened. His speech consists of a "statement of facts" and a "conclusion" in a form of dissuasion. However, very soon he is accidentally recognised by some people in the crowd. His second speech (3, 4, 13-14) is much more straightforward and sincere.

It is worth taking into consideration that all the speeches reported are included in the body of a story and, therefore, should follow its rules and conform to its purposes. For this reason the speeches are very often extremely compressed.

5 See p. 51ff.
Books 5 and 6: the third trial-scene.

The last and most important courtroom scene is found in book 5. This trial is extensively reported. We have four independent speeches in this trial, the last two of which are quite important examples of forensic art.

The trial continues in book 6 after a delay similar to the one that takes place in Achilleus Tatos (from book 7 to book 8). The reasons for such a delay correspond to those in the trial presented in Achilleus Tatos, namely the sexual interest of the judge of the court towards the heroine of the novel. Furthermore, the second part of this trial shifts its focus to a slightly similar dispute but with rather different sides involved, giving the feeling of a reversal. While in the first part we have Dionysios against Mithridates, in the second part we have Chaireas against Dionysios. The same happens in the second part of the trial in Achilleus Tatos; in its first part we have Thersandros against Kleitophon and Melite, while in the second part the case is reversed and we have Kleitophon and the priest against Thersandros.

There are a number of other similarities in events and in language which should be pointed out: for example, the King is the judge in Chariton and a person from the royal house in Achilleus Tatos, although in the latter “the president of the judges” consults with a group of “assessors chosen from the elders of the town;” also in the process of the trial we have a figure who intervenes in the trial out of turn; in Chariton’s trial it is Mithridates (5, 4, 9) and in Achilleus Tatos’ it is Sopatros (8, 10, 11). Furthermore, from the aspect of similarities in language we can observe the following striking examples:

**Chariton:**

1. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤκεν ἡ κυρία τῶν ἡμερῶν (5, 4, 5).
2. Παρασκευὴν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν ἐγίνετο ἐπὶ τὴν δύσην παρ’ ἐκατέρων (5, 4, 1).

**Achilleus Tatos:**

1. Ἡκούσῃς δὲ τῆς κυρίας ὁ Θερσάνδρος (8, 8, 1).
2. Παρασκευὴ δὲ πολλῇ ἐν τοῦ Θερσάνδρου κατ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ πλῆθος ἡπάτῳ (7, 7, 1).

---

6 Translation by Gaselee (1917) *Achilleus Tatos* p. 379; the president of the court is “τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους” (*Achilleus Tatos* 7, 12, 1).
The degree of correspondence between Chariton's and Achilleus Tatos' trial scenes makes one feel that there is some kind of influence from the first author on the second. Although Achilleus Tatos applies more sophisticated and elaborate techniques in his speeches (discussed in p. 66ff.), there is good evidence that Chariton has been one of his models in creating these episodes. Furthermore, Chariton's third trial scene contains speeches which can compete with the later author's forensic speeches of the "sophistic era." The parallelism is so close that sometimes we have to do with "mirroring scenes." The question that arises here is what does an ambitious author, such as Achilleus Tatos, find in an "unsophisticated" and seemingly unambitious novelist, as Chariton has often been described? Are there any aspects in Chariton's novel that Achilleus Tatos found enticing but which we - the modern readers - have failed to notice? What are the qualities that Achilleus Tatos finds in Chaireas and Kallirhoe?

\[\text{\footnotesize See p. 20f. and p. 24f.}\]
2. Chariton's courtroom scenes and their relationship to the oratorical theory presented by the author of the *Ad Herennium*.

The speeches discussed in the previous chapter presuppose some kind of rhetorical training, the form of which we intend to investigate in this chapter. According to the author of the *Ad Herennium* "the task of the public speaker is to discuss capably those matters which law and custom have fixed for the uses of citizenship, and to secure as far as possible the agreement of his hearers." The judicial cause "is based on legal controversy, and comprises criminal prosecution or civil suit, and defence" (I. ii. 2); under this definition we may classify the special trial-scenes in the novel. The only difference in this case is that we have to do with imaginary trials. The cases contain always the ingredients which are regarded as necessary according to the aforementioned description.

How does the author of the novel present his speakers? Is it all about a simple courtroom confrontation between two sides or is it a special event in the novel worth reporting extensively? The main trial-scene determines the heroes' destiny and the development of the story in Achilleus Tatos, Chariton, and Heliodoros. It becomes the central point around which tension and interest culminate. The litigants are normally well-prepared, surprisingly competent speakers with well-defined plans and rhetorical tricks up their sleeves. The speeches they produce are quite remarkable and their familiarity with the legal system and the courtroom procedures is striking. Consequently, the heroes of the novel who participate in a trial are seen as efficient speakers.

The rhetorical dimension of the courtroom speeches can be more easily illustrated if we read them with the assistance of theoretical handbooks dominant in that era.

There is wide agreement among the ancient authors about the tasks of a speaker and the parts of a speech. One of the most important tasks is "invention" which is used in all six parts of a discourse: the introduction (*exordium*), the statement of facts (*narratio*), the division (*divisio*), the proof (*confirmatio*), the refutation (*confutatio*), and the conclusion (*conclusio*). This construction of a speech is

---

8 *Ad Herennium* I. ii. 2, translation by H. Caplan (1954) which I use throughout.
dominant in almost all handbooks of rhetorical theory of later antiquity that survive today. They contain the same or a similar scheme of division of a speech. Many authors go one step further by suggesting how such a construction should be accomplished, what each individual part should contain, what should be avoided in each part, and what the role and function of each one of them is. It is clear that the scheme is extremely logical and as effective today as it always has been.

Let us see if Chariton was familiar with it and, if so, to what extent. Two of the most important courtroom speeches will become the centre of our attention. The one is Dionysios' speech in book 5, 6, 1-10 and the other Mithridates' response in book 5, 7, 1-7. It is the second day of the trial and they essentially make their first formal speeches which deal directly with the case. Both speeches are clearly referred to (in the story) as very carefully prepared, and this is indeed reflected in both speeches. We will discuss here three basic parts in these speeches: the introduction, the narration or statement of facts, and the proof and refutation which are inseparable in this case.

Exordium: the introduction.

With reference to the initial part of the speech called *exordium* we notice that the two speakers use it for similar purposes but in different ways. Dionysios, who is the first speaker-accuser, assumes the role of the grateful citizen who is not overlooked by his governor/King when a statesman assaults him. He emphasises that the King is seen as the protector/guardian of marriage; we will see that all this, apart from its strong “captatio benevolentiae” effect, is within the *Ad Herennium*’s description of the essence and role of an “introduction.” Mithridates' introduction is a plea to the King/judge which attempts to achieve a similar effect; the speaker aims at the King’s favour, his humanity and justice which, the speaker claims, will give an opportunity to him to present his case. The issue of “never judge before you listen to both sides” is clearly recalled here,

---

9 See, for example, *Ad. Her.* I. ii. 4.
using the widely known basic Greek principle of administering justice.\(^{10}\) Furthermore, Mithridates draws attention to the issue that Dionysios is of foreign nationality and, therefore, the king should trust more his subject’s claims than the prosecutor’s calumny.

The case is clear: Dionysios accuses Mithridates of attempting to seduce his wife; therefore, the central point is attempted adultery. Now according to the *Ad Herennium* “in order to be able to make a more appropriate Introduction, we must consider what kind of cause it is” (I. iii. 5). There are four kinds of causes: honourable (*honestum*),\(^{11}\) discreditable (*turpe*),\(^{12}\) doubtful (*dubium*),\(^{13}\) and petty (*humile*).\(^{14}\) If we follow *Ad Herennium’s* classification, we see that this is what the author of *Ad Herennium* calls *honestum* (the “honourable kind”); it is used when we defend “what seems to deserve defence by all men, or attack what all men seem in duty bound to attack.”\(^{15}\)

**Dionysios’ prooimion** (the direct opening) and Mithridates’ *ephodos* (the subtle approach).

In this trial Dionysios defends his marriage and the chastity of his wife and that is why his cause belongs to the honourable kind. Let us now see if Dionysios’ introduction follows the recommendations on making an introduction for the specific case of *honestum*, as set out in *Ad Herennium*. According to it, in such cases the speaker can either use the direct kind of opening (*prooimion*) or not (I. iv. 6). Among his suggestions on how to go about it, he mentions that the speaker “must show why the cause is honourable,” or “briefly announce what matters we are going to discuss” (I. iv. 6).

In his introduction Dionysios tries to emphasise how important the matter is. He introduces the general situation of the case. A private citizen has been under attack by a man of authority; the accusation is attempted adultery. This is

\(^{10}\) See, for example, Aristophanes’ *Wasps*, 725-727: “πολλήν ἄν ἀμφοτέρον μᾶθον ἄκοιχος ὡς ᾧ ἄν δικάσασαι.”

\(^{11}\) When we defend something which deserves defence by all men or when we attack what all men seem in duty bound to attack e.g. prosecute a parricide (see Caplan (1954) p. 11).

\(^{12}\) When we attack something honourable and when we defend something discreditable (*ibid*).

\(^{13}\) When it is partly honourable and partly discreditable (*ibid*).

\(^{14}\) When the matter we bring in is unimportant (*ibid*).

\(^{15}\) The example given in the *Ad Her.* is “prosecute a parricide” (I. iii. 5).
roughly what he is going to discuss in his speech. What is clearly implied here is the fact that the case is of an honourable nature. Mithridates attempted an assault against Dionysios’ marriage and Kallirhoe’s chastity. Both issues (adultery and equality before the law) are matters which belong to the honourable case as defined by the *Ad Herennium* (I. iii. 5).

While Dionysios uses the direct kind of opening to achieve his aims, Mithridates is compelled by the situation to follow a different route which is again consistent with the alternative kind of introduction described as the “Subtle Approach” in *Ad Herennium* (I. vi. 9ff.). According to that, in three situations we must opt for the “Subtle Approach”: 1. When the cause is discreditable, 2. When the hearer has been won over by the opposite speaker, and 3. When the hearer has become tired by the previous speeches (I. vi. 9).

It is clearly the second condition that applies (here) in Mithridates’ case since Dionysios’ speech had a strong impact. This is not only what one should expect when looking at the quality and strength of Dionysios’ speech but is also made clear by the author. After the end of Dionysios’ speech: “ταύτα εἰπὼν ὁ Διονύσιος παρώδυε τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ εὐθὺς εἶχε τὴν ψῆφον. θυμωθείς δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς Μιθριδάτην πυρὸν καὶ σκυθρωπὸν ἁπέβλεψεν” (5, 6, 11). It is, therefore, clear that Mithridates is at a disadvantage after Dionysios’ speech; consequently, his speech, especially the beginning (introduction), should be of the right kind so that he will be able to reverse the previous impression.

Mithridates picks up his opponents’ last point, namely that he is an adulterer and a liar, and tries to refute this statement. He starts his speech with a plea to the king-judge not to believe his opponent’s claims and allow slanderers to win him over. This is included in the proposals which the author of the *Ad Herennium* makes on how to create an introduction of the subtle kind when we are obliged to use *ephodos* because of case 2 (when the hearer has been won over by our opponent16). One of his suggestions on how to make an introduction of the subtle approach is to “begin with a statement made by the opponent, and particularly with that he has made last” (I. vi. 10), which happens in Mithridates’ introduction.

---

16 See *Ad Herennium*, I. vi. 9.
The aim of both types of introduction (direct-subtle) is to render the audience attentive, receptive and well-disposed (docilem, benivolum, adtentum auditorem habere volumus - προσεκτικός, εύμαθης, εὔνους). In both speeches in question each of the three aims is achieved with specific means which are also described in the *Ad Herennium*: “I shall disclose how each state can be brought about” is his promise which is fulfilled in book 1 (I. iv. 7).

If we want to achieve these three qualities in our speech we should make sure that they are present throughout all the speech (I. vii. 11). However, for obvious reasons “it must in the main be won by the Introduction to the cause.” These are the main theoretical points the author of *Ad Herennium* makes about the introduction in general (I. iv. 6 - I. vii. 11).

Now let us see to what extent the points which are made in *Ad Herennium* about the three aims of the introduction apply to the introductions of our speakers; the main question here is how the speakers try to secure these three purposes of their speeches, focusing (only) on their introductions.

Dionysios tries to make his audience receptive by presenting in his introduction the main points of his case. It is what the *Ad Herennium* advises to “briefly summarise the cause and make them (the hearers) attentive” (I. iv. 7). By briefly going to the heart of his cause in his introduction, Dionysios manages to hit this aim; the need for equity, justice and protection of marriage are all mentioned in his short introduction encapsulating the essence of his speech.

In a similar way (but more indirectly) Mithridates introduces his main point, namely that he is a victim of lies and slanders (ψευδείς διαβολάς, 5, 7, 1), summarising in this way the main defence line of his speech.

Next is the matter of attentiveness. We can achieve this by promising to discuss among others matters which, the author of *Ad Herennium* says, “appertain to the commonwealth, or to the hearers themselves…” (I. iv. 7). This recommendation is taken into account by Dionysios when he raises the issue of equity before law among all people whether they are private citizens or people of high office, and also when he draws attention to the main point of his

---

18 See also “we shall have attentive hearers by promising to discuss important, new, and unusual matters…” I. iv. 7.
case which is assault against marriage and immorality, two serious offences against the people of the community.

On this matter Mithridates follows a similar strategy. He raises the issue of equal opportunity to speak; also he refers to the danger of somebody being the victim of slanders, and he reminds the audience that the community in which they live is not Greek and so the Greek man's claims should not be considered reliable. This last detail, when seen from the King's point of view (Artaxerxes), is bound to have a strong manipulative effect on him and the way he will try this case; it is also closely connected to the third aim of the introduction.

This is the winning of the audience's favour. It can be achieved by four methods, claims the author of Ad Herennium: "by discussing our own person, the person of our adversaries, that of our hearers, and the facts themselves" (I. iv. 8).

All these methods are used in this court-scene. Dionysios is more interested in his hearer and judge; his remarks upon the King's respect for marriage, the weak citizen and the wife's chastity attract the hearer's favour. In between the discussion of the hearer's own personality the speaker also interposes remarks on himself and his opponent: "οὐ γὰρ περιείδες ἄνδρα ἵσθην ἐπιβουλευθῆντα ὑπὸ ἡγεμόνος, ἀλλὰ ἑκάλεσάς, ἵνα ἐπ' ἐμοῦ μὲν ἑκδικήσεις τὴν ἀσέλγειαν καὶ ὀβολυ. . ."¹⁹

Mithridates, on the other side, follows a slightly different route. While he also stresses the hearer's characteristics, he equally brings into discussion his opponent's behaviour. The King is called "just and compassionate"; as such he should protect him from his slanderous attack. By assuming the role of the victim, he tries to render the King-Judge well-disposed.

Further on the issue of "character" in a speech, the author of the Ad Herennium claims that "from the discussion of the person of our adversaries we shall secure good-will by bringing them into hatred, unpopularity, or contempt" (I. iv. 8). We can achieve that by revealing some "imprudent, malicious or shameful act of theirs" (I. iv. 8). This is attempted by Dionysios in his introduction. The author of the Ad Herennium suggests that we can "make our adversaries unpopular by setting forth their . . . wealth, lack of self-restraint, high birth," etc. and "making
clear that they rely more upon these supports than upon the truth” (I. iv. 8). Dionysios hints at the last point when he makes an emphatic comparison between himself, a private citizen, as opposed to Mithridates, the powerful ἥγεμων.

Also “from the discussion of the person of our hearers, goodwill is secured if we set forth the courage, wisdom, humanity, and nobility of past judgements they have rendered, and if we reveal what esteem they enjoy” (I. v. 8). Both Dionysios and Mithridates use this method in order to achieve the King’s favour; Dionysios does this by mentioning that the King respects the common citizens, marriage and chastity and has the courage to summon a trial in order to examine a governor’s behaviour against a civilian. Mithridates, on the other hand, more openly describes the King as humane (φιλάνθρωπος) and just (δικαιος).

All these elements show that there are certain rhetorical concepts which are applied in the introductions of the two speakers and most of their principles can be traced in the rhetorical handbook Ad Herennium.

Statement of Facts.

Let us now see if similar rhetorical principles exist in the next part of a formal speech, the narratio (statement of facts).

Dionysios’ narratio is clearly separated from the other parts of his speech and is well-defined. His opening sentence makes clear what he intends to do: “ὁ δὲ ἐμὸς λόγος σαφῆς ἐστι καὶ σύντομος” (5, 6, 5). The end of his narratio is also explicitly indicated by him: “τὸ μὲν διήγημα εὑρηκα τοῦ πράγματος, περὶ σοῦ δικαίεις” (5, 6, 9).

The speaker is extremely conscious of what he is doing and is aware of the technical terminology. “Τὸ διήγημα τοῦ πράγματος” corresponds exactly to the part of the speech called narratio-διήγημας, namely the statement of facts.20

---

19 Chariton 5, 6, 1: “You have not allowed a private citizen to be ruined by a governor’s intrigue but have summoned him here, so that you will punish him for his immoral and vicious behaviour towards me” (Goold transl. (1995) p. 257).
20 See Ad Herennium’s definition of narratio “Narration is an exposition of events which have or might have occurred,” Ad Herennium I. iii. 4; also Cicero De Inv. I. xix. 27.
There are two types of narration concerning courtroom speeches, the author of the *Ad Herennium* says (I. viii. 12). Dionysios follows the first one: this is the exposition of the facts and their presentation to our advantage. According to the *Ad Herennium* "a statement of facts should have three qualities: brevity, clarity, and plausibility," i.e. συντομία, σαφήνεια, πιθανότητα. It is to these qualities that Dionysios' initial sentence (in his narratio) is referred. His claim that his narratio will be clear and brief (σαφής καὶ σύντομος) is another indication that he is consciously following rhetorical principles. We shall now examine whether these three qualities exist in Dionysios' narration and if he follows recommendations like the ones found in the *Ad Herennium*. As far as brevity is concerned, there are a number of recommendations made in the *Ad Herennium* (I. ix. 14) that help the speaker to achieve it. We should start the narration from where we need to (not going too far into the past) and finish it at the point we need to (not going further); we should not include many details and digressions and we should avoid repetition; finally, we should present the facts in such a way that other information can be simultaneously conveyed, without having to actually say it. This last suggestion is used in Dionysios' speech: Dionysios says that having realised the chastity and fidelity of Kallirhoe, the accuser decided to forge a letter and send it to her (5, 6, 7). With this Dionysios wants mainly to report what Mithridates has done with the letter but simultaneously he conveys the important information that his wife is above suspicion in this case.

This is, in essence, the way to brevity described by the author of the *Ad Herennium* (I. ix. 14). If we take a close look at the narratio of Dionysios we will discover that it complies with all these suggestions. The speaker manages to contain a long story into a paragraph by relating only the events which are closely related to the case, avoiding unnecessary details and repetition. As far as the last suggestion is concerned, namely conveying information without actually speaking it, it is also used in the speech (5, 6, 7): with his remark about the

---

21 The second type is when we try to win belief or incriminate our adversaries for setting the stage for something (διαβολή, παραδίγματι, etc.).
letter, Dionysios reports what Mithridates has done with it and implies that his wife is above suspicion.

The second feature that a statement of facts should have is clarity. It will be clear (I. ix. 15) if it is brief, if it follows the order in which the events have occurred, if the speaker focuses only on the facts in question and does not include other details (not excluding anything pertinent at the same time) and if he pays attention to his language. These characteristics can also be detected in the narration of Dionysios.

In order to be plausible the narration should fulfil the requirements of the usual, the expected, and the natural, as the author of the *Ad Herennium* suggests; time, persons, motives, advantages of the scene, etc. should all be consistent with what one should expect to happen in real life. These precautions must be observed even if the matter is true, "for often the truth cannot gain credence otherwise" (I. ix. 16). Dionysios' statement of facts does not fail to meet the aforementioned requirements. We know that his claim is sincere. He does not go too far in the past; he states that for his wife this is a second marriage which happened after the death of her first husband and he briefly follows his story up to the point of his report to the King. No unnecessary information is included in his narration and the events presented are coherent from the aspect of time, place and motives. The narratio is and sounds true because it does not contain any inherent discrepancy and goes behind the scenes giving reasons for individual action and explaining the motivation and the thinking behind it.

In Mithridates' speech we notice that the speaker moves directly from his introduction (5, 7, 1) to the next part of the speech skipping the narratio. Schmeling (1974) regards the part of the speech in which Mithridates brings "countercharges of adultery against Dionysius" (seemingly 5, 3-5, 7). This is inaccurate since the whole part from 5, 3 to 5, 7 is devoted to proving his case and not narrating the "facts." Schwartz (1998) justifies that by using Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (1417a). She claims that "for the defendant, the narration is a waste of time which is better spent otherwise." Although the *Ad Herennium* does not explicitly mention anything similar for the narratio, the choice of an alternative

---

arrangement regarding the parts of a speech (even the omission of one) if the
speaker finds it necessary is not excluded (see Ad Her. III. ix. 17 – x. 17). Cicero
in the *De inventione* is more explicit on this issue. In I. xxi. 30 it is stated that a
narrative can be skipped over when it is regarded as “a hindrance or of no
advantage” and this is “when a presentation of events alone and by themselves
gives great offence” in which case “it will be necessary to distribute the
narrative piecemeal throughout the speech and to add an explanation directly
after each section so that the remedy may heal the wound and the defence may
immediately lessen the animosity.” Furthermore, “a narrative is of no advantage
when the facts have been explained by the opponents and it is of no importance
to us to tell the story again” or “when the audience has grasped the facts so
thoroughly that it is of no advantage to instruct them in a different fashion.”

Here in Chariton, the facts are already known to the reader, especially the fact
that Chaireas is alive; both speeches are used by the novelist for ostentatious
purposes, for the suspense of the scene, and for the characterisation of the
formidable abilities of the speakers. Restating the facts would mean that the
audience (the king) would hear them twice and the readers three times. The facts
have been explained, the audience has grasped them and it is of no advantage to
Mithridates to recast them in a different way since he knows he has hard
evidence to present anyway. The fact that he avoids a straightforward narrative
but disperses elements of his narrative in various places may indicate that he
tries to avoid the embarrassment of presenting awkward information involving
an improper relationship. He rather prefers to introduce the opponent’s claims
and refute them immediately. In 5, 7, 3, for example, he claims: “Διονύσιος γὰρ
οὐχ ὑπὲρ γυναικὸς ἐγκαλεῖ κατὰ νόμους αὐτῷ γαμηθείσης, ἦλλα πολυσθένην
ἡγόμασε αὐτὴν”; “ἀλλὰ” φησιν “ἐλευθέραν ὅσαν ἐφημήν” (5, 7, 4);
“Μιλισία οἴμερον ἡ Συρακοσία δοξάτω (5, 7, 5). All this material could be
used in the narrative-part stating the facts, but it seems more effective here that
it should be mentioned and refuted piece by piece.

---

27 See also “Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐ γενομένην, ἀλλ' ὡς μελλοῦσαν μοιχείαν ἐγκαλεῖ . . .” (5, 7, 5);
“ναὶ” φησιν. ἀλλὰ Χαρίδεας μὲν τέθηνας, σὺ δὲ ὅνομα τοῦ νεκροῦ τὴν γυναῖκά μου
διέφθειρε” (5, 7, 6).
The reasons mentioned in the *De Inventione* for not including a narrative in a speech are valid here and the explanation why there is no *narratio* in this speech is clearer in Cicero than in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.

**Divisio**

The next part of a speech is the so-called *divisio*. In this part the speaker mainly presents the points on which he is in agreement with his opponent, and the ones he does not accept; he also introduces briefly the points he is going to make. In Dionysios' speech there is a short part after his narration which can be regarded as a *divisio*, but it is in such an embryonic state that it is incorporated in his "proof and refutation" part that functions as an introduction to it. His initial statement in any case leaves no doubt that he wants to progress immediately to the proof: "αὐτὸ δὲ ἀποδείξεις ἀπροκτονή" (5, 6, 9).

Having no reason to use *narratio*, Mithridates goes straight to the *divisio*. After his introduction in which he tries to prepare his audience he advances to put things in their right order. He, therefore, states what he is willing to accept as plausible and what he will challenge. His defence policy is to accept that he is in a difficult position since he admits that in these circumstances one could have done something like that. However, he clearly states that he would never do it.

**Proof and Refutation - Πίστις καὶ Ἀνασκευή.**

"The entire hope of victory and the entire method of persuasion rest on proof and refutation, for when we have submitted our arguments and destroyed those of the opposition, we have, of course, completely fulfilled the speaker's function" (I. x. 18). This is how much importance the author of the *Ad Herennium* gives to the part "*confirmatio*" and "*confutatio*" (πίστις καὶ ἀνασκευή).

The question of the "Issue" becomes here more necessary than in any other part of a speech. We can pursue a winning forensic line only if we know the type of the "issue" we are dealing with. There are several views on this matter, since a

---

28 *See distributio* in I. x. 17: "the Distribution has two parts: the Enumeration and the Exposition."
couple of handbooks have survived. All of them agree on the importance of the
definition of the “issue” but they usually take different views on how many types
of issues there are and who determines them.  
According to the author of the Ad Herennium, “the issue is determined by the
joining of the primary plea of the defence with the charge of the plaintiff” (I. x.
18). The kinds of issues, according to the Ad Herennium are in general three
(with many sub-types): conjectural, legal, and judicial (I. xi. 18).
In this trial’s case the issue is determined in Mithridates’ speech. His defence
policy is quite clever. He attempts to expose every vulnerable side of his
opponent’s case. For this reason, he develops his view that there is no case for a
trial. Kallirhoe should be recognised as Dionysios’ slave, since he bought her, and
not as his wife. As the adultery-law does not apply to slaves, there is no case.
This is the issue of definition: “a cause rests on definition when the name by
which an act should be called is in controversy” (I. xii. 21).
However, this position of Mithridates could imply that he is in some way
involved in improper behaviour. His case can also be proven by using another
type of “issue” and by following a more straightforward defence line which will
help him clear his name.
In this second part of his proof and refutation he states that he will accept that
Kallirhoe is Dionysios’ wife. However, he does that because he is soon going to
deny the accusation: “ούτε Διονυσίου ώς ἄνδρα οὔτε ώς κύριον ἡδύκησα” (5, 7,
5). As a result, he determines the case as an issue of conjecture.  
His proof that
he did not violate the adultery law is that Dionysios speaks of an “intention to
adultery in the future” and he does not report the deed. In his refutation-part he
demolishes Dionysios’ arguments that he personally sent a letter to Kallirhoe, for
the letter has Chaireas’ name as sender and not his.

29 The most detailed handbook on this matter is Hermogenes’ On Issues, which we discuss in
relation to Achilles Tatius’ courtroom speeches (on p. 110ff.; see also Heath (1995) p. 18ff. and
30 "coniecturalis": “When the controversy concerns a question of fact” (I. xi. 18); Caplan (1954) p.
35.
31 “legitima”: “When some controversy turns upon the letter of a text or arises from an
implication therein” (I. xiv. 24); Caplan ibid.
32 “iuridicalis”: “When there is agreement on the act, but the right or wrong of the act is in
question” (I. xiv. 24); Caplan (1954) p. 43.
33 See Ad Her. I. xi. 18: “coniecturalis est cum de facto controversia est . . .” (we have conjecture
when the controversy is about the fact).
The author of the *Ad Herennium* gives advice on what to use and what to avoid in each particular case of an issue (II. ii. 2ff.). In the case of the conjectural issue the prosecutor should present “material inciting suspicion of the defendant” (II. ii. 3) and expose his motives. The defendant should present a “simple and clear account” (II. ii. 3) alleviating suspicion as much as possible. In Dionysios’ speech the defendant is presented as assaulting the values of hospitality and friendship, and not being prudent and respectable, as a man of his office ought to be. He has been lewd and he has abused his authority. His motive for all this was his passion towards Kallirhoe. This is actually included in the *Ad Herennium*’s discussion of how to handle the conjectural issue; the author explains that one can prove that the crime was profitable to the defendant using “probability”: “through probability (εἰκὸς) one proves that the crime was profitable to the defendant”34 (II. ii. 3). Dionysios here uses the subhead of “motive” and tries to show that his opponents wished “to satisfy some passion - love or a like overpowering desire” (II. ii. 3), a case specifically named in the *Ad Herennium*. Likewise, the defendant rebuts the charge by denying “that there was a motive” or he will try to “vigorously belittle its importance,” says the author of the *Ad Herennium* (II. iii. 4); and this is actually used by Mithridates. The defendant’s main line should “contain a simple and clear account, and should also weaken suspicion” (II. ii. 3). This is exactly the defence policy that Mithridates pursues in his speech. First, he recognises that Kallirhoe is actually very beautiful and this could be presented as a motive raising suspicion against him. However, he immediately refutes Dionysios’ claims by destroying the motive which the accuser presented. Having been trusted with such power and fortune by the King he had no motive to appear as a dissolute man; his power is exactly the disincentive for such a behaviour, for nobody would risk all this “for the sake of a moment’s base pleasure.”35 This way of defending ourselves when our opponent uses “Motive” is also described under the sub-head of “Motive” (causa II. ii. 3 - iii. 4) by the author of the *Ad Herennium*. Another means of handling conjecture is by using the “defendant’s manner of life”; this is described in *Ad Herennium* as a sub-head under “Probability” (II. iii.

---

34 The author gives two subheads: Motive and Manner of Life (II. ii. 3).
5). It is mainly presented as an assistance to the accuser to prove his point but it can be equally used by the defendant.

The accuser, in our trial, makes no direct use of this sub-head (he has already used “motive”) but he alludes to it indirectly by saying that the defendant’s deed shows a man whose moral standards are very low. He also makes use of an instruction given in the *Ad Herennium* about people who are regarded to be above suspicion. In this case of someone who “enjoys a high reputation for purity and integrity,” the author of the *Ad Herennium* says, the prosecutor should claim “that deeds, and not reputation, ought to be considered” (II. iii. 5). In Dionysios’ speech a similar assertion is clearly implied.

This sub-head is more useful to the defendant in this trial-scene. Mithridates actually gives great emphasis on his manner of life. “I have lived all my life in decency and this is the first charge I ever received,” he claims in his speech (5, 7, 2). There is no connection with similar behaviour in the past; his manner of life just does not go together with the accuser’s claims about him.

Mithridates also makes use of what is described in the *Ad Herennium* under the head of “Comparison”; this is the case when the prosecutor shows that the act could benefit only the defendant and nobody else (II. iv. 6). This is what Dionysios claims; Mithridates appreciates the power of that argument and makes it clear at the beginning of his speech by saying that Kallirhoe’s beauty is not much help to his case. Soon after this claim Mithridates takes a different view. The attempted act does not involve himself and certainly would not benefit him since he was not the one who sent the letter to Kallirhoe; the sender was Chaireas.

By stressing Mithridates’ state of authority and power Dionysios tries to make use of another means in conjectural cases: the one called “Sign” (*Signum*) in the *Ad Herennium* (II. iv. 6 – II. iv. 7). By that, he explains, one “shows that the accused sought an opportunity favourable to success.” He mainly makes use of the subdivisions called “Occasion,” and “Hope of Success” (II. iv. 7). Was the

---

35 Chariton 5, 7, 3: “τις οὖν ἔστιν ἄνοιγτος, ἕνα ξελητα τὰ τηλικαστα ἄγαθὰ μᾶς ἢδονής ἐνεκεν ἀπολέσαι καὶ ταύτης αὐχοῦσις”

36 See what the priest says about Thersandros in Achilleus Taticos’ trial scene (8, 9); see also Carey (1997) pp. 17-18 on such “revelations” in classical authors aiming to affect the judges’ emotions.
time, the place and the occasion favourable for the action? Do all these coincide? (etc.). The fact that Mithridates is a man of a significant power is indisputable by both sides. Knowing that he has no way of winning Dionysios' wife through the use of money, he decides to use a trick. The occasion could not have been better; however, the occasion and his personal state do more harm than good in his case; and those are the details that convinced Dionysios in the first place.

The last means of persuasion “when suspicion has been established” is confirmatory proof - *approbatio* (II. vi. 9). Dionysios' speech has had a big impact on his audience and more importantly on the King-judge (5, 6, 11). Suspicion has accumulated over Mithridates and he must do something about it. In a conjectural cause the defendant is described as having a clearly predetermined way to reverse the climate: “he tries to win pity, and charges the prosecutor with slander” (II. vi. 9). This is what he is doing right from the beginning of his speech.

**Conclusion - Epilogos**

Conclusions according to the *Ad Herennium* are tripartite, consisting of the “Summing up,” the “Amplification,” and the “Appeal to pity” (II. xxx. 47).

Dionysios' conclusion contains a degree of amplification. There are ten *formulae* from which one can make an advantageous amplification, says the author of the *Ad Herennium* (II. xxx. 47). The seventh formula which is given here seems to match with Dionysios' epilogue; one can “show that it is a foul crime, cruel, sacrilegious, and tyrannical” (II. xxx. 49); this case is in total agreement with Cicero's *De Inventione* (I. liii. 102); there, it is also listed as seventh but it is at the same time further illustrated: “the seventh topic is used when we express our indignation, saying that a foul, cruel, nefarious and tyrannical deed has been done by force and violence or by the influence of riches, and that such an act is utterly at variance with law and equity.”

Dionysios concludes his speech with a strong point: he takes the letter, his main evidence, and reads the part which says that Chaireas is alive and ends stating

---

37 Similarly, the priest in his speech in Kleitophon's trial relies a lot on the topic of the “previous life” (A.T. 8, 9).
that this alone proves that the accused is a shameless adulterer who resurrects the dead to achieve his aim. His indignation is clear: the devious means used by the defendant and his foul intention to seduce Kallirhoe show a man who is a liar and a shameless adulterer (5, 6, 10).

His epilogue is also in agreement with the *Ad Herennium*, namely, that “since what has been said last is easily committed to memory, it is useful, when ceasing to speak, to leave some very strong argument fresh in the hearer's mind” (III. x. 18). It is evident how much impact Dionysios’ last argument has had on his hearers (5, 6, 11).

All the points we have just discussed in this chapter indicate that Chariton's forensic speeches and sophisticated rhetorical theory are not unrelated. The evidence shows that the author was familiar with elaborate rhetorical theories similar to those which formed the basis for the movement of the second sophistic. It is clear that the author follows a consistent theoretical-rhetorical system.39

---

38 Cicero *De inv.* I. liii. 102; I use H. Hubbell's (1949) translation.
39 Most of the second part of book II of the *Ad Herennium* (II. xviii - xxix) deals with faults that should be avoided when using arguments, reasons and embellishment in our speech. It is interesting that the faults pointed out in this manual can nowhere be traced in the forensic speeches of Chariton's courtroom scene.
1. The courtroom speeches in the novel of Achilleus Tatos.

The courtroom speeches as a central part of *Leukippe and Kleitophon*.

Before we discuss the courtroom speeches in the seventh and eighth books of Achilleus Tatos' novel, it is useful to summarise the facts (starting from book 5) which lead to the courtroom scene.

Kleitophon, although strongly hesitant, decides to follow Melite to her house in Ephesos accepting her proposal that they should live together. Earlier, she tried to convince him that Leukippe was dead and that the best option for him at that moment would be to go to Ephesos with her. However, soon Thersandros appears unexpectedly, and having heard the rumours about his wife being alive, guesses straightaway the reasons for Kleitophon's presence at his house. His reaction is violent; his first words, when he meets Kleitophon, are indicative of what his role is going to be in the novel. He is quick to accuse Kleitophon of adultery (ὁ μοιχὸς οὔτος; 5, 23, 5). Actually, at this stage Kleitophon's relationship with Melite cannot be characterised as adulterous.

The second stage of this preparatory scene leading to the trial is Melite's reaction; she decides to help Kleitophon to escape from the room where he had been held by Thersandros, provided he yields to her wishes. However, very soon Kleitophon by an unfortunate coincidence is arrested again and led to the prison

---

1 The details related to Kleitophon's trial are found in the last four books of the novel as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book 5:</th>
<th>Book 6:</th>
<th>Book 7:</th>
<th>Book 8:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 3, 1</td>
<td>6, 3, 4-6</td>
<td>7, 1, 1</td>
<td>8, 1, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 1</td>
<td>6, 5, 1</td>
<td>7, 6, 1-4</td>
<td>8, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 8, 1</td>
<td>6, 5, 3</td>
<td>7, 7, 2-6</td>
<td>8, 3, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 11, 5</td>
<td>6, 5, 4</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>8, 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 12, 2</td>
<td>6, 8, 4</td>
<td>7, 9, 1-14</td>
<td>8, 6, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 14, 2</td>
<td>6, 9, 1</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
<td>8, 7, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 15, 3</td>
<td>6, 10, 1</td>
<td>7, 11, 1-8</td>
<td>8, 8, 1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 16, 1</td>
<td>6, 11, 1</td>
<td>7, 15, 3-4</td>
<td>8, 9, 1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 20, 2</td>
<td>6, 28, 1</td>
<td>7, 16, 1</td>
<td>8, 10, 1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 21, 3</td>
<td>6, 28</td>
<td>8, 11, 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 22, 5</td>
<td>8, 13, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 23, 3</td>
<td>8, 14, 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 23, 5</td>
<td>8, 15, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 26, 2</td>
<td>8, 19, 1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 26, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 27, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where he is (for the first time) officially accused of adultery (ἐγκλήμα μοιχείας ἐπιφέρων 6, 5, 4).

However, Kleitophon is not afraid of this development because he hopes that he will find justice in the court since he has not committed adultery but simply agreed to marry publicly Melite (ἐθάρρων τῷ λόγῳ περιέσεθαι μὴ μοιχὸς εἶναι, γῆμαι δὲ ἐμφανῶς 6, 5, 4). Meanwhile, Kleitophon hears from a stranger in the prison that Melite paid two people to kill Leukippe (an intrigue set up by Thersandros). In this hopeless situation Kleitophon changes his plan. He reveals to his friends his decision to deliver in the court a defence speech of such a content that it would cause both the death penalty to him and appropriate punishment to Melite. When the day of the trial comes Kleitophon puts his plan into play.

It is clear, therefore, that the author has conceived the idea of the trial at least from book 5. The scene proves to be a very well planned part of the whole novel. The earliest reference to it is in book 5, 23, 5 where Thersandros speaks openly about adultery. From this point onwards the idea of the courtroom trial is constantly in the mind of the readers, thus making the courtroom scene the central point of the whole second half of the novel. The complications that will appear in the court are basically the elements that help the novelist to develop a story full of suspense and create a stirring part in his novel. Consequently, the trial-scene and the issues related to it provide us with material the study of which would reveal a useful way of understanding the last four books of the novel.

In the following discussion we ask what kind of information is included in these speeches and how each speaker presents it. We deal mainly with the nature of the material presented, the arrangement of arguments, and the speaker's intentions. All these are discussed in reference mainly to the rhetorical handbook of Quintilian, where appropriate. We are going to examine the speeches' rhetorical construction, expose the speakers' way of thinking and investigate the nature of the material that the speakers use.
The trial of Kleitophon and Melite: its representation in the novel.

In Kleitophon's trial the reader is presented with seven courtroom speeches, the majority of which recall real forensic speeches and follow their typical form. We are going to discuss here the following speeches found in books 7 and 8:

**Book 7:**
- 7, 2-6: Kleitophon's "confession."
- 9, 1-14: Kleinias' defence speech.
- 11, 1-8: Thersandros' accusation against Melite and Kleitophon.

**Book 8:**
- 8, 1-14: Thersandros' accusation against Kleitophon and the priest.
- 9, 1-14: The priest's defence speech.
- 10, 1-12: Sopatros' accusation speech (Θεοσάνδρου συνήγογος).
- 11, 1-2: Thersandros' proposal for a settlement.

**First part of the trial.**

7. 7, 2-6: Kleitophon's "confession."

Shortly before Kleitophon's confession we are informed that both Thersandros and Melite have carefully prepared for this trial; Thersandros is said to have no less than ten rhetors for assistance (7, 7, 1).

The reader is not introduced to the court from the very beginning; the author does not give a report on what has been said by the speakers at the beginning of the trial; he presents the trial as being underway, starting with Kleitophon's direct speech. However, the reader is given enough information to gather what has been said up to this moment.

**Structure:**
- 2: proœmium. Kleitophon claims that all the previous speakers have lied and that he is going to tell the whole truth.
- 3-5: narration: the accused presents the facts in a chronological order; his relationship with Leukippe is followed by an affair with Melite when the
former is believed to have died. When he and Melite arrived in Ephesos they found Leukippe to be Sosthenes' slave. Melite planned Leukippe's death and Kleitophon agreed with her and paid an unknown person to kill the girl.

- 6 (ώς γὰρ ἐμαθὼν . . . πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην): propositio, namely the speaker's proposal. Kleitophon has regretted murdering Leukippe and should receive the death penalty.

- 6 (οὗ γὰρ φέρω . . .): conclusion: in a brief conclusion he refers both to his criminal act and his present situation.

The speech is clear, simple and brief. The speaker relates a straightforward and plausible story easily followed by his audience. Kleitophon tries to corroborate his claims in order to make the weak points of his story look persuasive. The most interesting example of this is his claim that he agreed with Melite to kill Leukippe when the former revealed to him her malicious plans. He inserts a rhetorical question (τί γὰρ οὗ δεῖ τάληθη λέγειν; 7, 7, 5) in his attempt to convince his audience that at this moment he is telling the truth as he promised at the beginning (ἐγὼ δὲ πᾶσαν ὑμῖν ἐφώ τὴν ἀλήθειαν 7, 7, 2). The rhetorical question assists him in his attempt to show the motive of the murder and make his deceptive speech look more plausible; the motive, he claims, is Melite's promise to make him master of her fortune. He even gives details of how he ordered an unknown person to carry out the plan but he fails to give the name of this man; this is one of the most unconvincing moments of his speech. Nevertheless, the fact that he tries to support his statements by any means of argumentation, when possible, adds to the persuasiveness of his speech. Although, in general terms, this speech is not the most interesting sample of a rhetorical speech, it follows basic rhetorical patterns in terms of its structure, the way it is presented, and the use of rhetorical devices. The speaker tries to win the confidence of his audience by assuring them that he will be honest. This introduction helps the speaker to attract the public's interest and render his audience attentive. Besides, the use of rhetorical means in places where a logical explanation is not convincing enough helps the speaker to look persuasive.

2 See, for example, p. 95f., p. 100, p. 108, and p. 116f.
As already mentioned, all persons involved in this trial have carefully prepared for it. This is also true in Kleitophon's case; the accused has chosen to defend himself without help of any rhetors; he has also decided on the objectives of his speech. The author reveals this information just before the beginning of the trial. In 7, 6, 3 Kleitophon, unconvinced by Kleinias' consolation, exposes his plan to his friend. The underlying principle in this speech is, as he openly says, "οὐδὲν αἰσχρόν, ὃ λυπεῖ τὸν ἔχορόν" (7, 6, 4) and his speech keeps in line with this intention. As a result, in this trial scene there is a peculiar inversion of the usual trial procedures. Not only does the defendant speak for the prosecution but also the defence's (self-appointed) synegoros seeks to refute his principal.

This kind of self-accusation (prosangelia), which exists in other novels as well, helps the author give a closer description of the quality of the main hero's character and the despair he is in. The hero's decision elicits the reader's sympathy and places Kleitophon at the centre of interest. The author also underlines that love between the two protagonists is so deep that they cannot live without each other; this emphasises one of the main ingredients of the novel: love and its powers. Moreover, the main hero is in great danger and this adds to the suspense of the novel.

Kleitophon's speech is a so-called "confession." His only aim is to present his claims with persuasive language. In a way, it is a simple narration. As a confession to the crime the speech does not follow a strictly typical structure.

7, 9, 1-14: Kleinias as a witness for the defence.

With Kleinias' speech we have a clear example of forensic speech. This speech contains a number of rhetorical elements. Both its structure and its means of persuasion follow a plan similar to that which a real defence speech would have. It is clear from Kleinias' very first words that he is going to demonstrate his rhetorical ability. He assumes a modest role when he makes his request to be heard by the judges (7, 9, 1). Furthermore, he uses the strong argument of...

---

3 See 7, 7, 1: "Παρασκευὴ δὲ πολλῆ ἡ τοῦ Θερούνδρου κατ᾽ ἔμοι ... καὶ τῆς Μελίτης σπουδῆ πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν παρεσκεύασατο."

4 I owe this observation to Prof. Carey; see also p. 73f.
reminding them that this trial is serious and they have to decide about the life of a man.

When he starts his speech he makes the climate very emotional by reactions, such as crying, which calls for maximum attention and even attracts sympathy for the speaker and, consequently, for the accused, whom he defends.

Structure:
The structure of the speech follows the speaker’s plan, which is to convey a specific amount of information in the most persuasive way.

• 7, 9, 2: proœmium. In this introduction the speaker urges the judges not to rush into a condemnation because the accused has lied in order to receive the death penalty.

• 7, 9, 3-4: a ôe qru%qoe ôià ppaxécov ègcü . . . xol (pŒouç e/ovra Xyioraç narratia confirmation of an amount of information given by Kleitophon in his earlier speech; suspicion about the role of Sosthenes in Leukippe’s fate. In general, in this part Kleinias refers to the points made by Kleitophon with which he agrees. 6

• 7, 9, 4b-8: ouxoç ouv dvngqoQai . . . pq pdxqv ajtoOdvn; proof: the speaker is talking about the motives, etc. Kleinias attempts to analyse what he has claimed earlier in his introduction: “κατέψευσεα γάρ ἐαυτῷ τὴν τῶν ἀδικοῦντων αἴτιαν, ἵνα πάθη τὴν τῶν δυστυχούντων τιμωρίαν” (7, 9, 2).

• 7, 9, 9-13: διὰ τί ὁμ Μελίτης κατηγόρησεν . . . ἐπὶ τοῦς ἄροις ἔξεσμψεν: second part of his proof section: the role of Melite in the case and the consequences of her actions.

• 14: conclusion. The speaker gives a summary of the ideas expressed in his speech and recommends that the judges investigate the evidence thoroughly before they reach a decision.

The highly emotional mode of the speech does not prevent Kleinias from using logical arguments and making an even transition from one idea to another. Not only his appearance (δακρών γεμισθείς, 7, 9, 2) but also his arguments

---

5 See Chaireas in the beginning of Chariton’s novel (1, 4); however, Chaireas here makes a sincere self-accusation without any hidden deceitful plans.
underline the emotional dimension of the case. He explains that the accused
person wants his own death and in his despair has falsely admitted a murder he
never committed. Kleinias applies several devices in order to make his speech
sound persuasive. Even at the very beginning of his speech Kleinias emphasises
the fact that this trial is very important because it has to take a serious decision.
Therefore, the court should hear this witness. His first words recalls a classical
rhetor who advises the public or the people of a committee: “Ανδρες . . . , Ἐφέσιοι, μὴ προσετῶς . . . 7, 9).

One of his main aims is to attract sympathy and favourable attention. He comes
straightaway to his aim, which is to convince the judges not to condemn
Kleitophon. His principal request is encapsulated in the phrase “μὴ προσετῶς
καταγγέλτε τὸν νανοτον”; if the judges take a quick decision to condemn it will be a
result of a fast and unwise action (προσέτεται). Moreover, such a decision will
not mean punishment for Kleitophon but reward, since he really wants to die.

His speech is carefully organised to prevent possible confusion. What he
introduces in the beginning (introduction) is later picked up and analysed in the
main part; this consistency makes the speech easy to follow. The speaker
separates clearly his ideas and gives a lucid explanation to every issue he speaks
about. At the beginning of his narration he gives the promise that he will be
brief: “ἄλα δὲ ἡτύχησαν διὰ βοαχέων ἐρώτ.” (7, 9, 3).

In the proœmium the speaker introduces the main aspects of the matter he is
going to discuss in his speech; first, he appeals for a careful decision; second, he
explains the reasons why Kleitophon wishes a death penalty for himself; also he
reveals the fact that Kleitophon was not sincere in his confession about
Leukippe’s murder.

Another aim of Kleinias’ speech is to reveal the poor morality of Thersandros
and the fact that Thersandros and his servant, Sosthenes, would have had
motives to kill Leukippe; the latter was in love with her and, when Leukippe
refused to respond to his advances, Sosthenes tortured her. Besides, such
behaviour is not unfamiliar for Sosthenes since almost all his friends are
criminals. With these allegations Kleinias succeeds in rendering Kleitophon’s

6 Thus, apart from narratio this part functions as divisio as well; see Ad Her. I. x. 17.
opponents suspects of apparently committing either murder or kidnapping (7, 9, 4); their notorious characters point to that direction. However, this argument, though plausible superficially, is in sharp contradiction with Kleinias’ subsequent argumentation that Kleitophon must be able to give specific details about who committed the murder and where the victim is, if he is truly the perpetrator of the crime. At this stage (7, 9, 6-7) Kleinias makes the strong point that without killer and victim there is no murder and, therefore, no trial case. This argument can be easily applied to Thersandros’ and Sosthenes’ case as well. Kleinias’ version of the facts seems sensible. By presenting the accusers as unreliable persons, closely associated with criminals, he indirectly accuses them of criminal action. This is the first aim of his speech.

His second aim is to argue that Kleitophon has made a false confession. He claims that Kleitophon wishes honestly to die because of his grief at the loss of this woman, something that is so apparent in his confession. Moreover, as the speaker said earlier, Kleitophon is in despair and it is natural (φόβει) for a desperate person to seek an end to his calamities. Additionally, he points out the paradox of this particular case where Kleitophon, the alleged murderer of Leukippe, wants so desperately to die because he managed to kill his victim. If Kleitophon were the murderer he would not wish to die, because he achieved his aim. The reasoning of Kleitophon’s confession is, Kleinias says, easily appreciated if one calls to mind that Kleitophon believes that Leukippe has been killed and thus he does not want to be alive without her. Although Kleinias mixes facts with suspicions in his narration, he tries to make them look real, through argumentative language and reasoning. Almost all of his statements are accompanied by a plausible explanation. With a clear narration and short sentences he manages to draw a sketch of the situation and thus he keeps his initial promise to the judges that he will speak briefly.

Until now Kleinias has given some reasonable explanation of Kleitophon’s reactions but no proof of what he claims. All he has managed to do is to give to the court insinuations about objective factual statements. Although he is telling the truth, the court is not in a position to verify what Kleinias suspects without

7 A classical opening of the narratio part of a speech, see, for example, Dem. 24.6; see also Gabaudan (1987) p. 223.
any kind of evidence. This is the reason why Kleinias employs rhetorical means, both in the way of thinking and in the way of presenting his views.

Another issue which Kleinias tries to illustrate is the role of Melite in the case, and her relationship with Kleitophon. If we accept that the motive for Kleitophon to kill Leukippe was his love for Melite, then Kleitophon would not involve Melite in his confession and, furthermore, he would not wish to die for Leukippe whom he is supposed to hate (in case we accept that he killed her). Both facts should normally lead him to the opposite reaction.

However, the fact is that Kleitophon believes that Melite is involved in the crime; that is now what remains to be explained. According to Kleinias, Melite wanted to marry Kleitophon, while he definitely did not want this marriage; when this prospect of marriage became even more unlikely for Melite, after she learned that Leukippe was alive, Melite sent Leukippe to the fields. This reaction of Melite and a strange coincidence in the prison made Kleitophon suspect that she is the person who wanted Leukippe to be murdered. In particular, the piece of information given by an unknown fellow-prisoner that someone called Melite murdered Leukippe made him absolutely sure about the perpetrator of the murder. Because Melite acted out of jealousy, Kleitophon may have regarded himself (indirectly) responsible for her death.

Kleinias’ speech deals with almost all the details of this trial case. In his attempt to prove Kleitophon’s innocence, he has tackled several aspects of the issue. Surprisingly, towards the end of his speech the speaker ironically assumes the role of the ignorant witness and accepts that he does not know whether what he has stated earlier is absolutely right; however, according to his view, the judges are in a position to find out the truth, since they have all the persons involved. With this suggestion Kleinias appears absolutely confident that the evidence is going to corroborate his views and reveal the truth. What he has said can be easily confirmed by a first hand examination of all the witnesses and facts. By making this request at the end of his speech Kleinias follows the safe way of assuring the judges; “μαθεῖν δὲ ὑμῖν ἐξεσταῖ” (7, 9, 14) is not so much a reminder of the judges’ duties as it is a statement of self-confidence. The speaker

---

8 See p. 185.
presents the facts as he believes they happened and then urges the judges to check them.

Kleinias' speech is widely regarded as sensible and plausible by the audience (τοῖς μὲν πολλοῖς ἐδόκει πιθανός ὁ λόγος; 7, 10, 1) and it has succeeded in turning the trial to a new direction. Melite agrees to help with the investigation of the crime and invites Thersandros to co-operate. Moreover, she declares that Sosthenes is the main suspect of the murder. Thersandros' position has become more uncomfortable after Kleinias' speech and now he needs to deal not only with Melite, as he originally intended, but also with what has been said by Kleinias.

7. 11: Thersandros' first speech.

Structure:
Thersandros, avoiding a long introduction, soon comes to the central point of his speech. From the very beginning he attempts an attack on Kleinias. The plan of the speech is scheduled according to five points the speaker wants to raise: first, to render Kleinias an unreliable witness; second, to accuse his opponents of murdering his servant, Sosthenes, and present a “machination” which Kleitophon and Melite organised against him; third, to assure the judges that there is no doubt that Kleitophon is guilty and only Melite's case needs further investigation; fourth, to confute Kleitophon's claim that a prisoner informed him about Leukippe's murder. Finally, to urge them to finish this trial with a conviction against Kleitophon, since he has confessed his crime.

Accordingly, the speech could be divided as follows:

- 7, 11, 1 - διαχρόνως introduction: Thersandros' general reaction to Kleinias' speech. Thersandros claims that the previous speaker (Kleinias) has been extremely capable in presenting fiction as truth.
- 7, 11, 1 (ὅν νομίζω - ἐληλεγμένον): proof: the motives behind Kleinias' speech.
- 7, 11, 2-3 (δοκῶ δὲ . . . Σωσθένης ταύτα εἴπών): what happened to Sosthenes and why.
- 7, 11, 3 - 7 (τούντεθεν δὲ ὁ λόγος μοι πρὸς Μελίτην καὶ Κλειτοφώντα - ἐρωτοκέναι): introduction to the second part of his speech; Kleitophon and
Melite have harmed him by killing his servant. Thersandros admits that Melite's case needs further investigation.

- 7, 11, 7 - 8 (ἐλήφησε δὲ καὶ . . . - ἐγνώρισεν); the incident of Kleitophon with the strange prisoner.

- 7, 11, 8: ὅ ταὐτεσθαι φανάρων . . . end: conclusion. A connection with the beginning and the addition of a new element: divine providence has urged Kleitophon to confess. The judges should stop hearing all the excuses the opponents put forward and accept Kleitophon's confession.

Thersandros' speech is full of speculations. He bases his arguments only on the fact that Kleitophon has confessed his deeds. According to his opinion a confession is safer evidence than an arrest in the very act. Apart from that, his whole accusation depends on suspicions and unreliable conclusions. His main accusations are introduced with verbs such as νομίζω (1) and δοξῶ (twice in 2), a fact which reveals the subjective nature of his claims. His suspicions are so unreliable that there is no other way of presenting them than using words/language of uncertainty or probability such as the words ἔφα (6), ὡς εἰκὸς (7); the phrase ἐφ' ὅν εὐδηλον τὸ πρόγμα reveals his attempt to hide the fact that what is said is not all too obvious. He comes to arbitrary conclusions by guessing what the truth might be. Thus, his thinking is quite unconvincing; as mentioned afterwards (7, 12, 1) Kleitophon was condemned because he had actually confessed his crime.

According to Thersandros, everything in this case is easy to explain: Kleitophon is guilty since he has confessed his deed; Kleinias is not a reliable witness because he may have been personally involved in the murder. Sosthenes has disappeared and the accused persons have possibly murdered him in order to make a trap for Thersandros. Furthermore, in Thersandros' opinion, it is easy to predict Sosthenes' statement, if he was present as witness, about Melite and Kleitophon's deeds against his "servant," Leukippe, and the reasons behind Kleinias' strange story of Kleitophon's meeting with the unknown prisoner. In this way Thersandros makes use of testimony without presenting any hard evidence to the court.

Thersandros tries to emphasise that Kleinias' persuasive ability is used as a means of deception. He claims that the speaker is a liar and a skilful "babbler"
and criticises the judges for allowing him to say all this and delaying their conviction.

In his attempt to refute what Kleinias has argued he chooses to attack the character and the abilities of this person. He argues that Kleinias is a "wizard of words" and a "plausible actor who cries plausibly." Accordingly, he claims that Kleinias' version of the story is deceitful but appears credible because it is artificially presented to look so. Moreover, he tries to involve the witness into the crime by expressing suspicion about him. He even accuses his opponents of a second murder, namely the killing of Sosthenes. To make this view strong enough he exploits all the coincidences he can; he even makes up a whole story of a supposed "machinery" which, he claims, his opponents brought into action in order for them to incriminate him. According to him his opponents wanted to prove that Sosthenes is Leukippe's murderer who acted on Thersandros' order; by using this "plot" Thersandros manages to present all the incriminating evidence against him as a supposedly well organised machination.

In the exposition of the details of the case Thersandros claims that he personally had no incentive to kill Leukippe; on the contrary, such an action contradicts his own interests because if his "servant" was alive, she would be able to work for him for a long time. Therefore, Melite's decision to send Leukippe to the fields is obviously so suspicious that it can indicate that she is involved in this case. Moreover, the incident with Kleitophon and the prisoner indicates yet again that the murderer of Leukippe was not unknown to Kleitophon; he rather seems to be one of his partners in the crime, since he has not reported anything to the magistrates.

Thersandros' speech concludes with precisely the same ideas with which it started: the judges must stop hearing "useless babbling" and should face the truth which comes out directly from Kleitophon's confession (τὸ αὐτὸν ἐαυτοῦ κατειπεῖν). In addition he uses the idea, which is indirectly introduced by his advocates in the previous chapter, that Kleitophon's confession was made with god's providence; with this allusion he tries to strengthen his view that

---

9 Winkler's translation in Reardon (1989) p. 266.
10 See "καταλίθησεν"; "καθεξήθης δὲ γόπτος ἄκουοντες"; "οὐ παύεσθαι φληγνάρων ἄνεχόμενοι κενόν." in 7, 11.
11 Notice that the same expression is used in both paragraph 1 and 8.
Kleitophon's confession is true because it was caused by divine providence; consequently, he puts the judges into a difficult position and allows no other way for them than to condemn Kleitophon.

Thersandros' devices of thought are an interesting example of the sophistry that is used in court cases. He uses every possible detail of the case to his own advantage. The reader is in front of a devious and capable speaker who distorts the truth.

Second part of the trial.\(^{12}\)

8. 8. 1-14: Thersandros' second speech.

Structure.

- 8, 8, 1-2: prooemium. In his prooemium Thersandros assumes the role of the embarrassed speaker who is so puzzled by the seriousness of the offences that he does not know where to start from.
- 8, 8, 3: a list of the offences committed; moral order has been so badly disturbed that lawlessness, adultery, sacrilege and murder are all involved in this case.
- 8, 8, 4-6 (κατάδικος ἔστιν ὑπερήμερος): Thersandros underlines the fact that Kleitophon enjoys a life of a freeman although he has been condemned to death by this court.
- 8, 8, 6 - 12 (Τί λέγεις . . . καὶ δικαστηρίων - τῇ καταδίκῃ): this is a broader part, the main aim being to attack the priest's actions and, consequently, to request his punishment. It can be divided in three separate parts:

\(^{12}\) The outcome of the first trial was the conviction of Kleitophon on the one side, and, on the other, the request of a second trial in order for the judges to be able to examine Melite's role in the whole case. This second trial is essentially a second phase of the same trial. Between the first and the second trial some development has taken place which is going to influence the nature of the case. Immediately after the decision of the court the priest of Artemis decided to commence a sacrifice; a procedure which demanded nothing else happening as long as it was lasting. This development means that Kleitophon's punishment should not be carried out for some time. In the meantime, Leukippe escapes and seeks refuge in the temple of Artemis. Kleitophon manages to escape from the prison in his attempt to meet Leukippe in the temple and the priest in charge protects the couple. Furious after hearing the news, Thersandros accuses the priest of violating the law because the latter has given refuge to a criminal; in addition, the priest has no right to keep Thersandros'
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i. 8, 8, 6 - 8 (τί λέγεις . . . - σεαντόν ἰγοῦ): the priest has no right to overrule the law and the judges.

ii. 8, 8, 8 - 12 (Μετὰ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος . . . - μόλις ἐν χαμαιτυπεῖῳ γίνεται): with his behaviour the priest has placed himself even above Artemis and has committed sacrilegious acts.

iii. 8, 8, 12 Εἰς μὲν δὴ μοι λόγος . . . τῇ καταδίκῃ: formal statement of the accusation against the priest and convict.

- 8, 8, 12 - 13 (Δεύτερος δὲ ἔστι μοι - 13): Melite's case (μοιχείας ἄγων, 8, 8, 12) is going to be made clear if the maids are examined. If they claim that the convict has stayed together with Melite for a long time as a husband then she must assign her fortune to Thersandros; in the opposite case she will be free from any accusation; however, Kleitophon must die whether he will be proved an adulterer or not.

- 8, 8, 14: Thersandros is going to speak about his servant, Leukippe, after the condemnation of the persons involved in this case.

In the new trial Thersandros is obliged to take into account the new development which took place in the meantime before the second trial. This development has changed the object of the new trial which was initially intended to be a further investigation into Melite's case. Now Thersandros has to speak about the delay of Kleitophon's punishment, the priest's intervention and the fate (future) of Leukippe who, he claims, is his servant.

The speaker follows the well-tried technique\(^\text{13}\) in which the rhetor pretends that he does not know where to start from, because of the extent of the law-breaking and the complication of the case. He assumes the dramatic role of the "embarrassed speaker";\(^\text{14}\) by showing embarrassment about the situation he manages to attract understanding of the judges; only with a benevolent audience can he put his deceitful plan into action. This is why he tries to present himself as a victim.

---

\(^\text{13}\) See p. 175f.

\(^\text{14}\) This has been identified by Schwartz (1998) p. 207 (and note 159) as aporia and associated with Demosthenes 18.129: "οὐκ ἄποροι δ' ὁτι χρή περὶ σοῦ καὶ τῶν σῶν εἶπεν, ἄποροι τοῦ πρώτου μνησθῶ."
Nevertheless, very soon he specifies the terrible outrages which the accused have committed. In a very long period (8, 8, 3) Thersandros, without referring to specific names, identifies the crimes in question; the crime is a combination of murder, adultery, failure to impose the law and sacrilege. The accusation is carefully expressed so that it points to specific persons without mentioning their names. The perpetrators of these insults are mentioned with the general noun oí μοιχοί. Moreover, he shows that law and order have been terribly violated in the present situation. When society is in such a dangerous condition, measures must be taken for the protection of the citizens. Judges and audience are also members of this society and they are directly affected by such a situation and, therefore, they should sympathise with Thersandros. He pretends that he is incapable of doing anything that would stop the people who openly commit these offences; he feels helpless (τι δράσει τις έτι . . .;) and indirectly appeals to the emotions of his audience. This clever and careful preparation of his audience will help him to make his points sound stronger later.

According to the law which the judges are supposed to protect and impose, the convict should have been executed by now. However, reality shows that the law has not been strictly enforced in this case and the judges have not been taken seriously by the people involved, he claims. This argument tries to set Kleitophon in conflict with law and the judges on a personal level. This is a matter of principle and the judges should ensure that the law is strong enough to protect “innocent” citizens, like the speaker himself (!).

Thersandros advances to an open attempt to show that the priest’s action is opposed to the judges’ decisions. He accuses the priest of trying to subvert the judicial power and of acting as a tyrant. Adopting a reasonable tone, he demands to know where the priest found the right to act as a superior judge.

15By this word Thersandros implies Kleitophon and Melite, by the phrase τοις ἀλλοτρίωνοις οἰκίσκες he implies Leukippe, by the phrase εἰς φωνάς he implies Kleitophon; the phrase μουχρής τῆς ἀλλοτρίως γυναίκας (namely Melite) refers to Kleitophon; εἰς πολεμικάκιον refers to the priest, while εἰς πόρναι refers to Leukippe. Schwartz (1998) notes that the last reference “in this escalating sequence occupies an emphatic position” with the aim to insinuate “that Leucippe is a prostitute and that she is guilty of religious pollution” (p. 208). The plurals generalise and so aggrandise by turning a specific instance into a trend: I owe this last observation to Prof. Carey.

16 The use of the argument “that the defendant’s crime has injured the entire state” is explained by Schwartz (1998) both as a way of attracting sympathy and as “an absolutely necessary
Additionally, with his behaviour the priest has tried to surpass even the gods who never did anything similar to this in the past. The priest has allowed "murderers" and "adulterers" to live in the temple of the goddess. In this way the priest's character is called into question. Furthermore the accuser explicitly expresses his suspicion over the priest's relationship with Leukippe and Kleitophon. Thersandros' attempt to discredit the priest tries to take advantage of any possible detail. He may sound hypercritical and exaggerating but even so he serves his aim to show the psychological situation of a man who has been unfairly dealt with by criminals and indirectly by the failure to impose the law. As a result, Thersandros demands the execution of Kleitophon and the punishment of the priest. This is the main aim of his speech.

The speaker's attack is focused on his two targets: Kleitophon and his protector, the priest. Almost seventy five per cent of the speech is spent on this issue, only a couple of periods on Melite's case and one period only on Leukippe. This is particularly odd if we think that the second trial was called in order to investigate Melite's case. The part that concerns Melite deals only with technical matters (how the issue with her should be solved in the future) and contains little persuasive language. Thersandros has thrown all the weight of his speech on ensuring the conviction of Kleitophon.

8, 9, 1-14: the priest's speech.

Structure.
8, 9, 1: Παρὰ τὴν θεόν... οὗ καθαρόν: introduction. Content-wise it covers the first half of the speech, namely the exposition of Thersandros' character.
8, 9, 2-5: a description of Thersandros' life: considering the accuser's life from childhood until now, one can conclude that he is a hypocrite and an immoral person.
8, 9, 6: introduction to the confutation.
8, 9, 7: confutation of the accuser's arguments:
 i) (8, 9, 7): ἔλυσας... τὸν θανάτου κατεγνωσμένον.

argument in a graphe, a public procedure" (p. 205); Schwartz claims that the second trial is a graphe if it is to be discussed "in terms of classical Athenian procedure" (p. 205).
ii) (8, 9, 9): οὐδενὸς γὰρ οὔδεις ἔστιν ἄνευ κρίσεως δυνατώτερος.

iii) (8, 9, 11): κατάδικοιν ἔλυσας θανάτω παραδοθέντα.

8, 9, 13–14 (… ἐκήληγεν): recapitulation of Thersandros’ offences.

8, 9, 14: τὰ μὲν ἐμά… παραδόδωμι: conclusion.

Thersandros spent so much time on attacking the priest of Artemis that it is fair for the priest to have the chance to speak. The priest is introduced by the narrator as a good rhetor (ἣν δὲ εἰπεῖν οὐχ ἄδυνατος) with a particular preference for the Aristophanic comic style (8, 9, 1). The priest manages indeed to give a proper reply to Thersandros. He even tries to ridicule him and the whole situation by discreetly alluding to funny and often obscene scenes; as a result, he will be strictly criticised by his opponents later (8, 10, 1 and 4). The decision to start with a reference to the goddess (Artemis) is not accidental. After all he, not Thersandros, is the most appropriate person to speak on her behalf. With an epigrammatic phrase he goes straight to his main subject. Thersandros is not at all a devout person and this is why he has insulted the goddess with his speech; this is the central idea which the priest is going to develop in detail in his speech and it is introduced straightaway from the beginning.

The priest chooses to present an outline of Thersandros’ prior life and behaviour; this will expose his character’s qualities and will be very useful for a broad estimation of Thersandros’ personality (ethos). Thersandros spent his life showing indecent behaviour; as a result, he is a constant danger to all decent people of the society. The priest does not need to defend himself and the way he spends his life because all this is apparent to everybody. What he must do, however, is speak for the specific accusations against him after his involvement in this case.

Almost half of the speech is spent on the issue of Thersandros’ character; something similar in Thersandros’ speech about the priest’s character. In fact,

---

17 See further in Vilborg’s (1962) commentary, pp. 132-134.
18 See also pp. 189-191 and p. 276.
19 Schwartz (1998) underlines the striking verbal similarities of the priest’s speech: “Ἄλλ’ εἰ μὲν ἄλλη ποιν βεβίωκος ἔτυχον, καὶ μὴ παρ’ ὑμέν…” (Achilleus Tatiōs 8, 9, 6); and “τῶν τούτων βλασφημῶν” (8, 9, 6) with Demosthenes 18.10: “περὶ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἴδιων δεδομόσθενος βεβλασφήμικε περὶ ἰδεῶς” and “οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοθ᾽ ποιν βεβίωκα κὰ παρ’ ὑμέν.”
Thersandros has dealt in more detail with the priest than with the persons involved in this trial.\textsuperscript{20}

Real argumentative language exists in the second part of this speech (8, 9, 6ff.). There the speaker demonstrates rhetorical ability and persuasive power. He discusses each part of the accusation in a very systematic way. The main accusation he deals with is that the priest has released Kleitophon, who has been condemned to death, and, therefore, he acted like a tyrant. This is refuted by the claim that the priest himself did not release somebody who deserves the death penalty because Kleitophon has not committed any crime. In fact, Thersandros is the one who committed an offence by imprisoning an innocent man without any legitimate verdict from a court. The priest's claim that Artemis has saved the young couple is particularly appropriate to the priest's capacity and corresponds to the allusion to the god made by Thersandros in the end of his speech (8, 8, 10).

The priest has replied to the part of the accusation that concerns him. His principal aim is to defend himself against the unfair accusations in Thersandros' speech: even so he inevitably touches issues that have to do with the actual case and contributes to the argumentation in favour of Kleitophon. This is achieved firstly by exposing Thersandros' character (he is a man with very low moral standards (8, 9, 1), he does not even respect his priesthood (8, 9, 5), and he is a hypocrite (8, 9, 2-3). Secondly, by explaining that Kleitophon has been treated unfairly by Thersandros who is a συνοφάντης (8, 9, 14); thirdly, by pointing out that Leukippe is alive and, therefore, there is no crime.

The speeches in this second part of the trial scene have so many parallels with Aischines 1 that one could claim that it has actually been modelled on it. First of all, as Schwartz (1998) has noted (\textit{ibid.} p. 80, note 15), it belongs to a trial that is virtually a graphe. Second, the style and the ethos of the priest's speech is similar to that of Aischines 1 (\textit{ibid.} p. 188f.; see also our p. 174). Later, Sopatros is

\textsuperscript{20} Both the priest and Thersandros insist very much on speaking about their opponents' character (see pp. 177-183). The importance of the issue of ethos as a persuasive means has been illustrated by May (1988) in her study on the use of ethos in Cicero.
presented as making the same gesture (8, 10, 2) as Demosthenes mentioned by Aischines in his attempt to mock him (p. 173).

8. 10. 1-12: Sopatros’ speech.

Sopatros makes a passionate speech in which he pursues two chief aims: first, to refute the priest’s claims about Thersandros (by explaining that the priest is immoral and Thersandros is an honourable man); second, to deal with the issue of adultery which is the only accusation that remains.

Structure.

- 10, 1 - 2 (ἀπολύσασθαι τῆς αἰτίας): introduction. The speaker gives reasoning about why he should speak at that moment.
- 10, 2 - 4 (πῶς αὐτῶν): refutation: what Thersandros has said about the priest is true while the priest’s accusations are all pure slander; the priest has said the same things about Thersandros’ ethos as Thersandros claimed for the priest’s ethos.
- 10, 4 - 6 (νυν τιμήν ταύτην ἔχειν): a harsh attack on the priest’s character who, according to Sopatros, shows this protective behaviour to the accused persons because of his questionable relation to the two youngsters.
- 10, 7 - 9: a reply to the priest’s comment about Thersandros’ life: Thersandros’ character and his life have been impeccable until now.
- 10, 10: the extent of the adultery and the seriousness of the insult.
- 10, 11: a sophistic argument to strengthen the view that Kleitophon is guilty.

The speech is interrupted by the priest and, consequently, terminated.

In his introduction Sopatros explains the reason why he should speak before Kleitophon’s advocate and promises that he will very soon prove that the prisoner is guilty not of one but of two murders.

Sopatros’ speech is complementary to that of Thersandros and offers a more penetrating view of some aspects of the case. In the part in which the priest’s speech is discussed there is a continuous attempt to deflect the priest’s

---

21 See also the discussion of the use of humour and sexual innuendoes in both these speeches on pp. 188-191.
accusations against himself; the priest, according to his opponents, is of questionable morality; he is rather suspect of involvement in obscene behaviour. Sopatros claims that what the priest has said is a comedy and he criticises the style and the (mainly sexually) suggestive language of the latter’s speech; Thersandros, according to the speaker, is telling the truth when he claims that the priest has released a prisoner, has accepted a prostitute at the temple, and has condoned an adulterer.

Despite the promising introduction the rhetor fails to bring any serious arguments into the court; the only thing he manages to express is vague suspicions without giving any specific details. This reaction reveals lack of arguments which oblige him to continue on the same practice of expressing insinuations and implications about the priest’s character (ethos).

His next point concerning the priest’s behaviour belongs to the same context. In order to build his argument he expresses his puzzlement (ὑπερθεαμάκα, 8, 10, 4) why the priest reacts with so much concern for the “adulterers.” His final aim is to suggest that the priest has some motive to do this: the nice appearance of the two youngsters is implied as the priest’s motive in the context of his obscene character. The fact that they slept and drank together in the temple is an indication for the rhetor that these persons are involved in an immoral relationship. This is used in an attempt to deflect the impression that the priest made in his speech.

Melite’s ethos and deeds is another issue with which the speaker is concerned. He claims that in “the last act of her performance she has thrown off her veil of respectability and wallowed in her shameless behaviour” we can see that “it is likely that she has been sinning with other men for a long time past” and she has managed to hide it from her husband (εἰκώς γὰρ αὐτὴν καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους τινὰς ἠμαρτηκέναι τὸν πρόσθεν χρόνον, λανθάνειν δὲ ἐπὶ ἐκείνους χρηστὸν ἄνδρα; 8, 10, 8). When Thersandros left for a long trip, she found a new opportunity for adultery (καὶ όν τοῦτον νενόμιξεν μοιχεῖας 8, 10, 9); she found a lover, a corrupted young man, namely Kleitophon, and she surpassed any limit

---

22 The expression of (wonder and) astonishment through the word “θαυμάζεται” has strong classical antecedents; see Isokrates, Panegyrikos 4.1; Philip 5.1; Archidamos 6.1; see Lausberg (1998) par. 270.

23 Winkler in Reardon (1989) p. 278; Achilleus Tatos 8, 10, 8.
of immoral behaviour; she felt no shame in presenting her lover to the people of Ephesos.

Melite's objection to that would be that she acted so because she thought that her husband was dead. However, with an interesting piece of complicated sophistry he comes to the conclusion that, since Thersandros is alive, adultery actually has taken place, irrespectively of what Melite thought, and Kleitophon is indisputably an adulterer.

The speaker has put all the weight into his attempt to expose the priest's character, to criticise Melite and Kleitophon's deeds and to present Thersandros' moral virtues. Therefore, the main issue for him is the ethical aspect of the persons involved - not the examination of the real facts - and the presentation of arguments in one or another direction. The rhetor does not seem to accomplish his first promise to prove that Kleitophon is twice guilty; this leads Thersandros to intervene and interrupt the rhetor. If we judge from what he has said up to the point he was interrupted, the speaker did not show any indication that he intends to use objective argumentative language.

The speaker commits two fundamental mistakes. First, he promises things he is not going to deliver. As a result, he raises the expectations of his hearers and the outcome looks much more disappointing. Secondly, and more significantly, he is letting himself be carried away with the ethos-topic analysed by the priest earlier and so he gets himself in an adverse area. The result is a total deviation from the main issue.

The speech adds to the drama of the scene, especially the speaker's threat to overturn the priest's claims but also has other narratological functions, as has been rightly pointed out by Schwartz: it advances "the impossibility of resolving the issues in a forensic setting – namely, Melite's fidelity and Leukippe's chastity - and in turn precipitates the final trials by ordeal." We could add that this speech is instrumental in order for the whole trial case to collapse. Moreover, Schwartz points out that the speech "heightens the dramatic sense of the formidable opposition the heroes face in this trial," but this is only

25 Ibid.
true for the beginning of the speech with the intervention of this confident and promising speaker and not for the end.

8.11.1-2: Thersandros' last courtroom speech.

Thersandros, having possibly realised that his advocate has run out of serious arguments, decides to put an end to this trial. In so doing he has the advantage of arranging the settlement on his terms. This speech is not a complete forensic speech; it simply contains Thersandros' proposals for a final settlement.

Structure.

- 11, 1: introductory statement.
- 11, 2: his proposal for a settlement.

Thersandros proposes to finish this trial provided that Melite and Leukippe accept to undergo two supernatural challenges (two important elements for the lysis of the novel). It is notable that Kleitophon's case is not mentioned at all since the speaker regards Kleitophon's case as having finished.

---

26 Proklesis is a legal challenge; “certain categories of evidence (notably statements given on oath or under torture) could only be admitted in an Athenian court with the consent of both sides” (Todd (1993) pp. 393-394); “women, however, who could not be witnesses, could in principle swear an evidentiary oath, provided this was done with the agreement of both litigants” (ibid p. 387); see also Volkmann (1963) p. 178.
2. The relationship of the courtroom speeches with formal rhetorical theory.

A good forensic speech is usually related to a sophisticated rhetorical theory with which every rhetor should be familiar. This is particularly true in the time of the second sophistic in which oratory has become a standard form of education. Quintilian's work *Institutio oratoria* (95 A.D.) is a good source of the existing theories known at the end of the first century and the beginning of the second. By that time rhetorical theories have acquired a fixed form and different schools follow an almost deceptively individual system. The differences between the teachers of rhetoric are mainly superficial and exist mainly in terminology, classification and other minor details.

According to these rhetorical theories "every cause in which one side attacks and the other defends consists either of one or more controversial questions" and therefore a forensic case can be "simple" or "complex" (Quint. III, X, 1). It is possible that other cases exist such as the "comparative" and the "mutual accusation" (ἀντικατηγορία) (Quint. III, X, 3-4).

The question which is tried at this court is a definitive question, namely an issue (a question) which deals with specific facts, persons, time, etc. (ὑπόθεσις, causa; Quint. III, V, 5ff.). The main question is whether Melite and Kleitophon have committed adultery and murder. This issue is not simple because it contains several subordinate questions; it is initially a complex question which is transformed into a mutual accusation especially in the dispute over the matter of the murder of Leukippe.

Every case (cause) "has a certain essential basis on which it rests" (Quint. III, VI, 1). This "basis" is the "kind of question which arises from the first conflict" (Quint. III, VI, 5). Hence the conflict of the type "fecisti" - "non feci" leads to the question "an fecerit," while the question "hoc fecisti" - "non hoc feci" leads to the question "quid fecerit." Accordingly, we have two questions, the first of which is of a conjectural nature (*quaestio conjecturalis*) and the second of a definitive (*finitivi status*). Furthermore, questions of the type "etiamsi feci, recte feci" constitute the basis of quality (Quint. III, VI, 10). According to Quintilian "a

---

27 Butler, H. (1921); I use Butler's translation of Quintilian throughout.

28 Status, constitutio, quaestio, caput, kepalaion genikotaton, stasis (see Quint. III, VI, 2) are some alternative names of what is translated by Butler (1921) *Quintilian* as "basis" or "ground."
basis can originate in denial" (III, VI, 10); therefore, it is the side who denies a case that determines the basis. Although there are several questions in almost every case, “it is often the most trivial which occupies the first place” (Quint. III, VI, 7-8). There may exist also questions with more than one basis (Quint. III, VI, 9).

In Melite’s and Kleitophon’s trial detection of this technical information becomes even more complicated than the theory itself because Kleitophon decides to change his position at the last minute and accepts the accusation; hence he agrees with the accusers and, therefore, there is initially no question and no case. However, his friend Kleinias assumes the role of the defendant very soon. The main accusation is that Kleitophon has committed adultery. As shown in later statements, there are also some side issues which are raised by the accuser, such as the murdering of Leukippe and the nature of Melite’s offence; the former belongs to the type of conjecture: whether Leukippe was murdered by Kleitophon or not; the latter belongs to the type of quality: whether Melite’s deed is an adultery or a justifiable action since she considered her husband dead; therefore, she assumes that she did it but there was nothing wrong with it at that time.^^

As far as the main question is concerned, namely whether Kleitophon is an adulterer or not, it should be noted that it is still the defence which determines the basis. The defence denies the main accusations as well as the secondary ones and, therefore, it creates the basis of conjecture, where the one side assumes that adultery and murder has taken place and the other side completely denies it.

There are four different methods which one can follow in every case (Quint. III, VI, 83). As far as the defendant is concerned, these are as follows: the strongest method is “to deny the charge,” the second best is “to reply that the particular

---

29 Compare Quint. III, VI, 10.
30 Number and names of basis: Quintilian, although he accepts that there is a great disagreement on this issue and discusses it in detail (III, VI, 22-42f.), seems to follow Cicero’s suggestion (Orator, XIV, 45) that “everything that can form the subject of dispute of discussion is covered by the three questions,” namely Sitne? Quid sit? and Quale sit? (Quint. III, VI, 44 and VI, 80) which correspond to three bases: conjectural, definitive, and qualitative. The importance of these categories is essential because, as Quintilian says, “neque enim ula iuris discrepatio nisi finitio, quitàtate, conectura potest explicari” (III, VI, 82).
31 Compare with a similar case in Quint. III, VI, 17.
act with which you are charged was never committed," "the third and most honourable is to maintain that the act was justifiable," and the "last and only hope" is to "evade the charge with the aid of some point of law, making it appear that the action has been brought against us illegally" (question of competence; Quint. III, VI, 83).

From these four "lines of defence" the first two are clearly applied in Achilleus Tatos' trial scenes. First of all, Kleinias tries to deny any charge brought against Kleitophon: he argues that Kleitophon has not committed a murder but confessed it only because of some specific reasons which he explains extensively. However, though he implies it, he never claims that adultery has not taken place. He passes this matter over in silence, as a teacher of rhetoric would advise him to do, and only tries to make it look a petty and extremely doubtful issue.

This is again a kind of rhetorical device where "in complicated causes" "two or three bases may be found"; this happens because in such cases "many different lines of defence are brought to meet a single charge" when there are "secondary questions related to the main issue of the trial." In this case Quintilian proposes that the orator may choose the best basis "to permit [him] to develop a maximum of force" (Quint. III, VI, 91-92).

Coming to Thersandros' speech which follows that of Kleinias, we should again consult Quintilian concerning the four ways the accuser should employ in order to make his point persuasive; thus, he must "prove that something was done, that a particular act was done, that it was wrongly done, and that he brings his charge according to law" (III, VI, 85).

These conditions are met in the accuser's speech. It should be borne in mind that in a supposed real court Thersandros would have made another speech in the very beginning where he would have delivered a formal accusation. However, because the presentation of the trial-speeches starts in mediis rebus we do not have this first speech of Thersandros. Still, one can detect these lines in the other speeches of accusation. Thersandros never loses an opportunity to declare that

32 "Πώς οὖν Μελίτης φόνον κατηγορεῖ, ἢ ἡμια;" (7, 9, 7) and "Διὰ τι οὖν Μελίτης κατηγόρησεν, . . ." (7, 9, 9).

33 Quintilian says that whatever you cannot prove, it is better not to mention at all; he also advises that if you cannot avoid mentioning it you must try hard to make it look unimportant; see V, XIII, 9-10; also, V, XII, 2; V, XII, 6; V, XII, 8, etc.
Kleitophon is an adulterer and a murderer and he does whatever he can in order to prove that such crimes have been committed by the accused.

Another rhetorical practice which Thersandros employs is to blame the persons involved in this trial and to accuse them of either participating in the offences or having a corrupt character. Quintilian's view that "the award of praise or blame to a witness may carry weight in the courts" (III, VII, 2) is here put into practice. Thus, Kleinias is accused of taking part in the crimes committed by Kleitophon and this is the reason why he defended his friend so passionately, while the priest later becomes the victim of Sopatros, Thersandros' synegoros, who tries to ridicule him and to expose the corrupt character of the witness. However, similar practice has been applied earlier in the confrontation between Thersandros and the priest.\(^4\)

However, in the confrontation between the priest and Thersandros' advocate (Sopatros), the latter gives the impression that he is abusive and slanderous. This practice is especially questionable and a professional orator would have not recommended it.\(^5\) Kleinias, however, seems to be familiar with this and avoids giving this impression, namely that he makes false statements in order to slander Melite. He clearly states that what he says is the truth and that he has no intention to harm anybody unfairly.\(^6\)

The speakers participating in a trial should not give the impression that they are excellent advocates but that they are reliable persons; in order to achieve this they should convince the public that they have been involved in the case because of "a sense of duty to a friend, etc." (Quint. IV, I, 7). This is particularly similar to what happens with Kleinias' case. The speaker, though a real friend of Kleitophon beforehand, manages to pass the message that he is talking for the good of his friend who is so terribly hit by unfortunate circumstances. This is also true in the case of the priest who tries to give the impression that he is a reliable person because as a priest he has the moral duty to defend individuals who have been treated unfairly.

\(^{4}\) Thersandros claims in his speech (8, 8, 6-12) that the priest's behaviour in protecting the adulterers was not appropriate for the servant of Artemis and the priest tries to prove his case by presenting Thersandros as an absolutely corrupted character.

\(^{5}\) Quint. IV, I, 10.

\(^{6}\) A.T. 7, 9, 9: "καὶ πρὸς θείων μὴ με νομίσητε διαβάλλειν θέλοντα τὴν γυναῖκα ποιήσασθαι τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ πᾶν ἐγένετο."
Furthermore, Thersandros tries to damage Kleinias’ reliability through rendering him suspect to the judge through exaggerating his rhetorical and acting abilities. This device is also mentioned by Quintilian when he advises that the rhetor can speak of his opponents’ advocate “in honorific terms, pretending to fear his eloquence and influence, etc.” (IV, I, 11).

The character of the persons involved can also play a significant role in the trial. The presentation of their weakness, their merits and their personal adverse circumstances can attract appreciation or arouse pity in the judges, “for pity alone may move even a strict judge” (IV, I, 14). This is true especially in the defence strategy of Kleinias. One of the speaker’s main attempts is to show that the accused has suffered enough without deserving it and that this fact should arouse the pity of the judges.

Thersandros’ speech, on the other hand, tries to undermine this practice by maintaining that Kleinias has exaggerated the facts. Simultaneously, Thersandros himself exaggerates the situation by making long statements, full of terrible crimes which, he claims, have been committed by the opposite side. 37 This policy of exaggeration 38 as regards our opponents is also recommended by Quintilian (IV, I, 15).

37 See his prooemium in his second speech (8, 8, 1f.).
38 This technique is called amplification (ἀυξάνειν) and is used in all branches of rhetoric and we will find it used extensively in the chapters on epideictic oratory (see, for example, p. 230, note 22, p. 237, p. 248f., p. 250f., etc.).
3. Divisions of rhetorical speeches and their specific role.

In his discussion about the necessary parts of a speech\(^{39}\) Aristotle assumes that there are two parts in a speech: the statement (πρόθεσις) and the proof (πίσις). The only additional parts which Aristotle was prepared to accept were the prooemium and the epilogue. Later, until the time of the second sophistic, there is relative agreement among the contemporary specialists about the parts of a speech. Thus, according to the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a reliable authority on the subject, there is the following six-part division of a speech: \(^{40}\)

- introduction (*exordium*)
- statement of facts (*narratio*)
- division (*divisio*)
- proof (*confirmatio*)
- refutation (*confutatio*)
- conclusion (*conclusio, peroratio*)

In the light of this division which was popular in the environment in which the novelists wrote their works, we are going to discuss separately each part of the structure of the forensic speeches in the courtroom scenes of the novel of Achilleus Tatio.

**Prooemium**: the introduction in the courtroom speeches.

The introduction of a formal speech in a novel depends directly on both the contents of the speech and the context in which it is placed. Therefore, it is much more susceptible to adaptation to its environment (context) than any other part of a speech in the novel. This happens because the speech should be smoothly introduced and connected with the rest of the narrative so that it may not look like an irrelevant part of it. Therefore, the introduction of a speech is also a connective part between the speech (direct speech) and the narrative that immediately precedes it. Inevitably, this practice makes the speeches in question different from real forensic ones delivered in a courtroom.

---


\(^{40}\) *Ad Her.* I. iii. 4, Cicero *De Inv.* (I. xiv. 19) and Quint. *Inst. or.* (III, IX, 1) give similar schemes.
By *prooemium* we mean that part of the speech which is addressed to the judges and is placed just before the orator starts dealing with the main points of the case. The speaker should never assume that the judge is already familiar with the case (Quint. IV, I, 3). In the *prooemium* we can present some of the main points of our case but not the whole case. The ultimate purpose of the *exordium*, apart from introducing the main topic, is to excite certain feelings in the judges and to show that any success of our adversary will cause “outrageous insolence” and will lead us to a pitiful condition (Quint. IV, I, 28-29).

The *prooemium* should aim at the attraction of people’s attentiveness and sympathy. The orator should “prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech” (IV, I, 5). After all, an introduction creates the first impression on the audience and should be very carefully and skilfully constructed.

The speaker should use all his powers to bring the audience round to his way of thinking. This can be achieved in three ways:\(^{41}\): “making the audience well-disposed” (*benevolum*), “attentive” (*attentum*), and “ready to receive instruction” (*docilem*).

There are special tricks which can create each of these feelings; for example, Quintilian mentions that “for acquiring good-will” one can use “rhetorical expressions of wishing, detestation, entreaty, or anxiety” (IV, I, 33). The latter is employed both by Kleiniás (mainly in his moving *exordium*) and by Thersandros. For attraction of attention of the audience, Quintilian advises us that we should “create the impression that we shall not keep them long and intend to stick closely to the point” (IV, I, 34). This is used by Kleiniás at the beginning of his *narratio* where he states that he is going to describe the situation in brief.\(^{43}\)

Kleitophon tries to use all these means in his speech in order to win his audience. With his *prooemium* he makes clear that he is going to relate the story as it has (was supposed to have) happened in reality; this statement aims to make his audience both attentive and ready to hear what the speaker is going to tell;

---

\(^{41}\) See also the discussion of Chariton’s two main courtroom speeches in chapter 1, esp. pp. 51-56.

\(^{42}\) Quint. III, IV, 2: “tria sunt item quae praestare debeat orator, ut doceat, moveat, delectet”; see also *Ad Her.* IV, i, 5.

\(^{43}\) A.T. 7, 9, 3: “ὢ δὲ ἡτύχοντες διὰ μακράν ἔρως."
moreover, his assurance that he will tell the truth may aim at the benevolence of the audience. Kleinias, on the other hand, insists more on how to make his audience benevolent by appealing to their emotions. Thersandros' second speech manages to employ all three means of winning over the audience. He assumes the character of a person who is in despair because he cannot find justice: benevolence of the audience is his first priority, while attentiveness and readiness for instruction are also targeted at the same time.

There are two kinds of *exordium*, the direct (*principium*) and the indirect (*insinuatio*): in the direct *exordium* the speaker tries with plain language to make the audience receptive and attentive. In the indirect *exordium* the speaker "by dissimulation and indirection unobtrusively steals into the mind of the auditor." In Kleitophon's and Melite's trial both types of introduction exist. In his first speech Kleitophon makes use of the direct kind of *exordium* (*principium*) and tries with simple language to win the audience's confidence. His introduction is very short; one period only. Nobody tells you the truth, he claims; "I am going to tell it all." The speaker assures the audience that he is going to say something that has not been stated until now; this is a typical method of attracting attention. Clarity and certainty are vital characteristics of this *prooemium* which can win the audience's good will. The fact that Kleitophon's *prooemium* (and the whole speech) is intentionally simple for rhetorical reasons can also be paralleled by what a professional rhetor has written: in his fourth book (IV, I, 55) Quintilian praises simplicity and maintains that it could prove very useful: "indeed a certain simplicity in the thoughts, style, voice and look of the speaker will often produce so pleasing an effect in the *exordium* that even in a case where there is no room for doubt the confidence of the speaker should not reveal itself too openly."

Another noticeable direct *prooemium* is the one used by Thersandros in his first speech (7, 11, 1). Thersandros here follows a similar way; "the accused spoke too

---

44 Quint. IV, I, 42ff.; *Ad Her.* I, iv. 6; see also p. 52f.  
47 Quint. IV, I, 55.
much and tried to falsify the truth; however, I am surprised by your willingness
to listen to him"; this is a way of telling that something odd has happened and of
trying to cause the same feeling to the audience. The effect is to cause
embarrassment to the audience for their decision to hear Kleitophon presenting
his views and to convince them that Kleinias has lied by exaggerating his
statement and his abilities.
Kleinias' introduction is also interesting for its attempt to use different ways of
persuasion. It starts with an indirect way of presenting his view, namely that he,
too, should speak since they are deciding about the life of a human being. Then
acting is put forward and Kleinias starts his speech with his eyes filled with
tears. He then comes directly to his main point which is to request from the
judges not to rush to a conviction. In this introduction Kleinias makes use of
advantages from direct and indirect *exordium.* He derives from *principium* the
direct and plain language of presenting his case and from *insinuatio* the oblique
means and the dissimulation one needs to win his audience's *benevolentia.*
Clearly indirect *proemium* is the one that Thersandros makes in his speech in
the second part of the trial (8, 8, 1f.). This introduction is one of the most
complete that can be found among all the courtroom speeches in the novel. The
speaker expresses his bewilderment because he does not know where to start his
speech (*ἀποφάσις*). The illegalities are very grave and he cannot deal with all of
them. Because he is so upset at the injustice he has experienced, he fears that he
will miss some of his points. In this introduction the speaker tries to create
feelings of indignation in the audience for the injustice alleged against the
accused. Also he tries to gain their sympathy which can be attracted by a person
who has been so unfairly treated. With this devious way the speaker prepares his
audience to hear a long speech full of details; they should pay attention to his
speech and try to help in order to set things right. Moreover, by showing that he
is "weak," unprepared and has "not the powerful talents" of his opponents he can
"derive some silent support" from the audience.\(^{48}\)
The remaining three speeches employ direct *exordia* but each of them has its
special characteristics. The priest's introduction is very short. He comes directly
to his point, which is to demonstrate that Thersandros is immoral and

\(^{48}\) Compare Quintilian's comments in IV, I, 8.
slanderous. With a general statement which refers broadly to Thersandros he makes this point clear: it is an act of a blasphemous man to insult Artemis' servants. This statement will become clear in the other parts of his speech. At this stage the priest's view is intentionally stated at the very beginning. The priest's *exordium* seems to belong to the category which is mentioned by Quintilian as one of the most attractive: this *exordium* "draws its material from the speech of our opponent" (IV, I, 54); this shows that the *prooemium* has not been prepared beforehand and that it has been "improvised on the spot to meet the needs of the case" (IV, I, 54). This is what the priest is doing in his *prooemium*, his points are based on what Thersandros has claimed just before in his speech.

An example of a short speech with no introduction is that of Thersandros' last speech. The speaker interrupts Sopatros and simply puts forward his request. With a very short introductory statement he comes directly to his proposal: "ἀλλ' οὖ... λόγων δεί" (8, 11, 1). Now Thersandros does not care very much for his persuasiveness and having become more compromising, he is not very keen on using rhetorical technicalities. He rather advances immediately to his proposals. In a remarkably short statement the only thing he does is to use plain and easily comprehensible language in order to avoid complexities in the trial. The speech is not a formal courtroom speech.

Special mention should be made of Sopatros' introduction. He is the only specially trained person to be presented speaking in this trial (8, 10, 1). He should be very well aware of what he is meant to be doing in his speech. In his *prooemium*, which is an indirect one, he decides to introduce his case obliquely. He justifies why he should deliver a speech at that point and it looks certain of going to demonstrate that Kleitophon is guilty of two crimes. According to Quintilian "the circumstances which call for insinuation arise also in cases where the pleading of our opponent has made a powerful impression on the minds of the judges," as, for example, in Achilleus Tatos, we can reverse the situation "by promising to produce our own proofs and by eluding the arguments of our opponents" (Quint. IV, I, 48). That is exactly what Sopatros is trying to do in his *prooemium* when, full of confidence, he says in 2: "ἐσταν οὖν ἀποδείξω δυσὶ θανάτως ἔνοχον ὅτα, τότε ἄν εἶ ἡ καὶ σοὶ καιρὸς ἀπολύσασθαι..."
Tας αἰτίας" (A.T. 8, 10, 2). His introduction is a vivid representation of an apostrophe not to the judges, which would be absolutely natural, but to Nikostratos, the defence rhetor (8, 10, 1).

In Quintilian special mention is made of the figure of apostrophe when it is used to address persons other than the judges; he maintains that rhetoricians suggest that it should be totally avoided in the exordium, and this is because in this specific part people should address themselves only to the judges whose favour they wish to win (VI, I, 63). There is, however, scope for an exception to this rule when "some striking expression of thought is necessary in the exordium which can be given greater point and vehemence if addressed to some person other than the judge" (IV, I, 63-64). This is precisely applied to this exordium where the speaker wants to give the impression that he is confident that the arguments of the other side are so weak that it is very easy to confute them. The confidence of the speaker and the seemingly unhurried and effortless delivery of his speech attract the audience's attention and invites them to give a favourable hearing to what he is going to say. His main aim in his introduction is to win their confidence and to show his ability to prove his case.50

The use of narratio

In the part of narratio, which normally follows prooemium and precedes the proof (Quint. IV, II, 24), the speaker makes a statement of the facts, explaining the situation. This relation has almost nothing to do with an objective presentation of what happened and, consequently, the speaker presents the case to the best of his advantage. However, the narration must look probable and should be as persuasive as possible. Situations or facts which do not add to his direction are usually passed over in silence. "As a general principle," Quintilian claims in the discussion on how to confront a case starting from the exordium, "I should advise the avoidance of points which tell against us and concentrate on those which are likely to be of service" (IV, I, 44). If we cannot deny a fact, we

49 For the use of apostrophe in courtroom speeches see p. 184ff.
50 We will see that Sophros fails to realise this objective, and we understand that this risky rhetorical apostrophe in his prooemium has not produced the desired effect.
51 Quint. IV, II, 1: "res, de qua pronuntiaturus est [sc. orator], indicetur."
can show that it has been exaggerated by our opponents; if we have a weak case and the presentation of the character of our client cannot be a particularly strong point, we must try to find "something that will damage our opponent" (IV, I, 44ff.).

The part of narratio is not always necessary and often speakers omit it. However, when used, its importance as a basis for the next part (generally the argumentation) is great. In Achilleus Tatos' courtroom scenes Kleitophon and Kleinias use this part to illustrate their case. As one of the first speakers (speaking for his side), Kleitophon makes the narration an important part of his speech. Kleinias immediately after it gives his narration, trying to present the truth which was not told by Kleitophon.

Therefore, as a general principle, this part of the speech is useful particularly with the first speakers in a trial. Besides, the narratio is occasionally a long one dealing, for instance, with the past life of the accused, the circumstances which brought an innocent man to such a state, etc. (IV, II, 12). We can find such an example in Kleinias' speech where he gives a flashback of the facts and tries to explain how the accused got himself involved into this trouble. Likewise, the priest uses a similar technique in order to reveal Thersandros' past life and how he has progressed to the point of insulting even clergymen and slandering innocent people. In the priest's speech, narration is made in a peculiarly comic style, alluding to obscenities in an Aristophanic way, as the author himself informs us.\(^\text{52}\) This is a practice which, although not in complete accordance with the personal style of a traditional priest, is in accord with Quintilian's suggestion that sometimes the speaker could find ways to entertain the audience "with a show of wit," humour or whichever other means (digression, fictitious statements, etc.) will make our speech pleasant (IV, II, 19).

The purpose of the narratio is not only to instruct the judges but to persuade them (IV, II, 21). Furthermore, the narratio should be constructed in such a way that it not merely refutes the charge but "turns the tables on our opponents" (IV, II, 26); the speaker tries to incriminate the other side in whichever way possible. Kleinias employs such a practice first when he speaks of Leukippe's murder alleging that Thersandros' friends may have been involved in this.

\(^{52}\) A.T. 8, 9, 1; see also p. 188ff.
The virtues of the *narratio* are basically three: it should be lucid (*lucidam*), brief (*brevem*) and plausible (*verissimilem*). With these qualities we can achieve our aim which is to make the judge “understand, remember and believe what we say” (IV, II, 33). Therefore, a successful *narratio* is a matter of technique, namely to be able to present things as plausible; orators base their art on the fact that “there are many things which are true, but scarcely credible, just as there are many things which are plausible though false” (Quint. IV, II, 34).

Achilleus Tatios makes full use of this principle in the courtroom speeches where, having let his audience know the facts beforehand, he proceeds to present the speakers telling lies and trying to convince their audience. Even at the end of the trial we are not told whether the judges have realised the truth of the facts. The speaker should always “avoid obscurity” and say nothing but only “what is likely to win belief” (Quint. IV, II, 35). This is a principle which Kleitophon fails to follow in his speech. A close look at his speech would reveal how important this piece of advice is. It is Kleitophon's failure to reveal the name of Leukippe's assassin that helps Kleinias to raise suspicion about the truth of Kleitophon's confession. This is because a false statement of facts should follow some basic rules in order to sound plausible: it should be “within the bounds of possibility”; secondly, “it should be consistent with persons, dates and places involved”; and thirdly, it should present “a character and sequence that are not beyond belief” (IV, II, 89). Furthermore, it “should be supported by some argument that forms part of the actual case” (IV, II 89), when possible, and “above all we must see that we do not contradict ourselves” (IV, II, 90). Kleitophon fails to meet these conditions because the information included cannot be regarded as particularly probable and this is what Kleinias exploits in order to refute Kleitophon's claims. Nevertheless, the speaker does his best to make his story sound as credible as possible, basically by trying to assign reasons and motives to his actions (Quint. IV, II, 52ff.).
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53 Quint. IV, II, 31.
54 See, for example, the reaction of the different sides involved in the court after Kleitophon's "confession" in 7, 8 where people tend to believe him, and in fact later the decision of the judges to convict him is based on the fact that Kleitophon has confessed his crime (7, 12, 1) and not on the fact that in 7, 9 Kleinias made a very convincing speech (see “ταῦτα εἰπόντος τοῦ Κλεινίου, τοῖς μὲν πολλοῖς ἐδόκει πιθανός ὁ λόγος” 7, 10, 1).
In the presentation of the narratio the speaker will “win a certain amount of favour or pity by look, voice and attitude” (IV, II, 77). This principle is used by Kleinias at the beginning of his speech; his pitiful mood dominates the style of his presentation. In a similar way Kleitophon tries to move his audience by his frank confession.

Kleitophon’s narration of “facts” uses every detail he needs to strengthen his point. It is very clear and brief; the narration is simple and the facts are adequately connected to each other.

Kleinias’ narration is closely connected with Kleitophon’s because it acts as a rectifying supplement to what the latter has said: he confirms or contradicts the accused’s narration; when necessary he adds some new information. His whole narration is also brief, clear, and persuasive. He is actually the only person who completely tells the truth.

The priest’s narration takes a different approach. It is considerably longer compared with that of the other two speakers. Though long, it is easy to follow. The facts are presented in a chronological order and the account is quite vivid. In his narration the priest attempts to present the character of the accuser as terribly immoral.

**Proof and Refutation: Subjective representation of the truth.**

Quintilian, among other rhetoricians since Aristotle, divided evidence into two general categories: ἀτεχνοὶ or plain (inartificial) proofs (such as decisions of previous courts, rumours, documents, witnesses, etc.) and ἐντεχνοὶ or artificial proof, namely the one which is created by the synthetical ability of the orator (Quint. V, I, 1-3). It is artificial proof which attracts more interest because it involves greater rhetorical abilities. This kind of proof “consists either of indications (signa), arguments (argumenta) or examples (exempla)” (V, IX, 1).

Concerning arguments (ἐνθυμήματα, ἐπιχειρήματα, and ἀποδείξεις; see V, X, 1ff.) Quintilian gives a list of “places” where they can be found. These “argumentorum loci,” as he calls them (V, X, 20), are “the secret places where arguments reside, and from which they must be drawn forth” (V, X, 20). An argument is “a process of
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reasoning which provides proof and enables one thing to be inferred from another and confirms facts which are uncertain by inference to facts which are certain" (V, X, 11); and thus it is necessary that there should be something in the case that does not require proof ("necesse est esse aliquid in causa, quod probatione non egeat," V, X, 11). This is called by Quintilian a certainty (certum, V, X 12) and as such can be regarded firstly "things which we perceive by the senses," secondly, "things about which there is general agreement," and, thirdly, "things which are established by law or have passed into current usage;" finally, "things which are admitted by either party."

In his consideration of the places of arguments, Quintilian makes an initial general distinction: "all arguments fall into two classes, those concerned with things and those concerned with persons" (V, X, 23). As far as persons are concerned, Quintilian notes among many others that "natural disposition" can provide the basis from which arguments can be drawn, "for avarice, anger, pity, cruelty, severity and the like may often be adduced to prove the credibility or the reverse of a given act" (V, X, 27). Kleinias uses this in his attempt to disprove Kleitophon's claims that he killed Leukippe whom he loved and that he wants to die because of despair.

Concerning arguments that can be drawn from a person's "bodily constitution" (e.g. beauty) can be an area from which arguments may be drawn (V, X, 26). "Condition" is another important area; so whether a person is "a magistrate or a private individual, etc." (V, X, 26) can make a difference and thus can be used for an argument; "natural disposition" is also a factor that may be used when trying to prove our point; "avarice, anger, pity, cruelty, severity," etc. are mentioned by Quintilian as useful means of proving "the credibility or the reverse of a given act" (V, X, 27). Also "occupation" (V, X, 27), "past life and previous utterances" (V, X, 28), etc.

Concerning things from which arguments can be drawn Quintilian underlines the importance of the questions Why, where, when, how, or "by what means the action is performed" (V, X, 32). Therefore, "motive for any action" is an area from which a speaker can draw persuasive material either to defend or to convict an accused person (V, X, 36). Also "questions of definition are important"; for example, is Kleitophon an adulterer or a murderer? (8, 8, 13). Also "place" (V, X, 37) is an area
on which somebody can base his arguments. One of the examples given by Quintilian is “you have stolen private money, but since you stole it from a temple, it is not theft but sacrilege” (V, X, 39). Similarly, Thersandros (8, 8, 11) and Sopatros (8, 10, 5-6) allege that the priest has committed sacrilegious acts with the two youngsters in Artemis’ temple.

Quintilian classifies “εἰκότα” under the signs (V, IX, 8): “these may not be sufficient in themselves to remove doubt, but may yet be of the greatest value when taken in conjunction with other indications.” Also “ομετίον” or indicium (an indication) or vestigium (a trace) are indications that “enable us to infer that something else has happened” (V, IX, 9), such as Thersandros’ accusation that because the young couple spent the night in Artemis’ temple they were involved in indecent activities (8, 8, 10-11) with the priest. Sopatros takes this further claiming that the young age and the appearance of the couple indicate that the priest was charmed (8, 10, 5-6). This corresponds to Quintilian’s suggestion that “a bloodstain on clothes” can be presented as evidence (V, IX, 9-10) that someone is a murderer if it is used along with other indications such as that he was an enemy of the victim, he threatened him in the past or “was in some place with him” (Quint. V, IX, 10). This is how you can transform “what was previously only a suspicion” into “a certainty” (V, IX, 14).

**Persuasive material used in this trial.**

The persuasive material used in the speeches in the context of this trial is drawn from the following areas:

1. the motives of the persons involved;
2. objective facts and logic;
3. likelihood and insinuation;
4. emotional situations;
5. ethos.

In the first category belong some quite persuasive claims; in Kleitopphon’s speech, for example, Melite is presented as having planned Leukippe’s murder, because she is worried that Kleitopphon might go back to Leukippe (7, 7, 4); Kleitopphon himself decides to help her because he has the motive of gaining Melite’s fortune. In
Sopatros' speech the priest helped the two youngsters, Leukippe and Kleitophon, because of personal interest of a sexual nature (8, 10, 5). The subjective presentation of facts and the suggestion of (probable) motives behind them is used here in place of proof.

In this category the speaker reveals or invents motives in the supposed actions of his opponents. In this way he does not need to use several kinds of persuasive techniques; the situation speaks by itself.

"Objective facts" are more frequently used in presenting "evidence." The speaker presents a series of facts in order to show how the situation has developed. Sometimes he uses these claims in order to come to conclusions; it goes without saying that it is common practice that these "objective" facts are either made up or isolated in such a way that they support the speaker's views.

Kleinias' speech is the only one in which there is sustained use of arguments. The speaker bases his arguments on "certainties" (Quint. V, X, 12-14) in order to prove the disputed questions: for example, on the accepted fact that Kleitophon was in love with a girl who subsequently disappeared and because he believes that the girl has been killed he himself wants to die (7, 9, 2-4) and has confessed that. But it would be a contradiction, if he was the murderer, to kill the person he loves. Furthermore, if he loves Melite he cannot at the same time accuse her of murder (7, 9, 7).

Most persuasive material belongs to the third category, the insinuations. In Kleinias' speech Sosthenes is indirectly accused of being involved in the crime because he was in love with Leukippe and also has friends of low morality (burglars). Thersandros later maintains that Kleinias defends the accused because he is possibly himself involved in the crime. Additionally, he says that he believes that the other side has probably committed one more crime, namely the murder of Sosthenes, because, as he claims, he has not seen him for some time. Arguments drawn from bodily constitution are used by Sopatros in order to prove that the priest, having been attracted by the beauty of the two youngsters, committed a sacrilege in Artemis' temple.56

The speakers also make points based on emotions. This can be used either by the prosecutor or the defendant. In Achilleus Tatos, for example, there are claims such

as those which Kleitophon uses at the end of his speech, namely that he confessed his crime because of emotions of regret and love. In Kleinias’ speech there is the idea that the judges should take pity on this poor man (Kleitophon) because he does not deserve to be punished. Emotions such as anger, cruelty and severity are attributed to Thersandros by the priest in order to show the nature of his reactions (Quint. V, X, 27). Thersandros’ past life and character (ibid. V, XII, 13) are also discussed by the priest in order to prove his motivation. Character and behaviour are also used by Sopatros to help him prove his claims concerning both the priest and Kleitophon (8, 10, 9).

An idiosyncratic type of persuasive material is produced with reference to character (ethos). The speaker can prove his case by showing either that he is an honest and reliable person or that his opponent is a slanderer, a person of a corrupt character or a hypocrite.

The priest’s speech is a characteristic example full of allegations based on ethos. The speaker tries to depict Thersandros’ behaviour and motivation in order to show that he is an unscrupulous person. This helps him argue that Thersandros is a liar and therefore the judges should not take into account what he says. On the other hand, the priest himself reminds the jury that he is a person honoured within the priesthood and that he has never shown improper behaviour.

Sopatros makes a similar attempt to make allegations using material from the character of the persons involved. He tries to prove that the priest's character is not above suspicion and that Thersandros has led an utterly dignified life. This indicates whom the judges should believe and whom not.

Timing of the crime, says Quintilian, is important because “questions of law turn on time, while it also determines the quality of actions and is of great importance in questions of fact” (V, X, 43-44). This is put into practice by Sopatros in an argument of his speech. In his proleptic argument he tries to refute Melite's potential argument that when she was with Kleitophon she thought that Thersandros was dead (8, 10, 11-12); this is an argument based on the question of timing (8, 10, 11-12) because, according to law, when one of a married couple dies the marriage is regarded as dissolved. Sopatros also uses the device called by
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57 See earlier p. 84 and note 20 herewith.
Quintilian *adfirmatio* (asseveration) as a way of proving his point that her adultery was manifest all the way from Egypt to Ionia: “ὁ μοιχείας γῆ καὶ θαλάσση μεμειοσμένης ὁ μοιχείας ἀπ’ Ἀιγύπτου μέχρις Ἰωνίας ἐκτεταμένης” (8, 10, 10).

Quintilian in V, XIII, 34-35 mentions a number of “errors” that are made when “careless speakers” (V, XIII, 35) argue their cases which is relevant to the present discussion: “I refer to mistakes such as advancing a disputable argument as indisputable, a controversial point as admitted” (V, XIII, 34). Thersandros’ second speech is full of disputable arguments and rhetorical tricks. According to Quintilian, careless speakers “will exaggerate a charge which has still got to be proved, will argue about an act when the question is who committed it, will attempt impossibilities, drop an argument as if it were complete, whereas it is scarcely begun, speak of the individual in preference to the case,” etc.; and also “lose sight of the main issue of the case” (X, XIII, 35). Thersandros here ignores that adultery and murder have not yet been proved; having run out of arguments he ignores the fact that his main task is to prove his case; similarly, Sopatros, though making a number of claims, fails to prove them later. Therefore, Thersandros’ second speech looks quite weak since controversial points are admitted (murder, adultery), weak arguments are used, he exaggerates a charge (murder) though it should first be proved, he argues about murder without any solid evidence and, mainly, he loses sight of the main issue which is the question about Melite’s case; instead, he deals mainly with the priest and with other general accusations.

Thersandros uses the “type of charge which is known as obscure, where it is alleged that an act was committed in secret without witnesses or any evidence to prove it” (Quint. V, XIII, 16). He does that when he says that the two servants left Leukippe in the fields and came back while a gang of murderers afterwards killed her, so nobody actually saw the deed: “κατέληπον δὲ αὐτήν ἐνθα ἦν ὁ τῶν ληστῶν λόχος λαυθάνων, ὥστε ἐνεχώρει μὴ ἐκείνας τὸ γενόμενον ἑωρακέναι” (7, 11, 7).

Other aspects of Sopatros’ speech are also interesting. The way he attacks the priest is also recommended by Quintilian; he attacks not only his manner of
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59 *Prolepsis* is a rhetorical device by which the orator discusses the objections of his opponents before they make them.
speaking, namely the gross (in places) and comic allusions but also his character by showing suspicion about his integrity (V, XIII, 39). Moreover, his confident manner is an advantage in his speech because in Quintilian's view again such a manner "does not permit us to feel the least doubt and has all the force of genuine proof" (V, XIII, 52). However, his initial presentation by the narrator as an overconfident speaker (8, 10, 2) recalling the description of Demosthenes by Aischines (see p. 174) in combination with his failure to fulfil his initial promise (8, 10, 2) may have caused suspicion to the sophisticated readers and this may have made them see Sopatros in an ironic way.

Peroration.

Peroration is the final part of a forensic speech. As Quintilian says, it has two types: "it may deal either with facts or with the emotional aspect of the case" (VI, I, 1). As a general rule it should be short. Kleitophon, for example, uses the second type in order to finish his speech; his conclusion is an emotional appeal to the judges to condemn him to the death penalty. Thersandros in his first speech, however, tries another way: apart from some suggestions to the judges not to listen to the empty words of his opponents he makes an invocation to the gods, a practice recommended by Quintilian, because it "gives the impression that the speaker is conscious of the justice of his cause" (VI, I, 34). In concluding, this part of the speech leaves the final impression and it should be carefully constructed, but it can occasionally be omitted, as happens, for example, in Thersandros' second speech.

In general terms, it is notable that in Achilleus Tatios there is not such a strong adherence to the handbooks' advice regarding the division of parts of a speech, while Chariton follows strictly the rhetorical structure of exordium, narratio, probatio, and conclusio.\(^{60}\) However, behind these courtroom speeches there is hidden a considerable amount of rhetorical material, some of which we attempted to illustrate here. The degree of care in rhetorical planning is so extensive that it

---

\(^{59}\) See, for instance, V, XII, 12 and elsewhere.

will not have escaped even the most uninitiated contemporary reader. A look at these types of speeches reveals that, apart from the apparent rhetorical tricks, there is a whole world of rhetorical information waiting to be recovered. A fruitful way to expose it is through the use of ancient rhetorical manuals, which at first sight may not seem so straightforwardly appropriate for the analysis of a novel.

On the method and the mechanics in ancient oratory.

When the ancients speak about rhetoric and how somebody could construct a persuasive speech at a court, they have a definite concept. This evolved through the centuries and was perfected on a theoretical level during the second century AD. When the student of oratory was assigned a specific subject, he had to follow a certain path: invention, arrangement, diction, memory, and delivery. He would not be able to mix these stages since each of these constitutes a step which is a result of the previous one; for instance, what you are supposed to memorise (memory) must exist beforehand (diction).

On the other hand, the system/scheme functions to a certain extent automatically and unintentionally; thus, you cannot deliver a speech (delivery) which you have not first memorised (memory). The system appears to be only theoretical and not necessary for the speaker to know, because it seems that he will follow it to a certain extent whether he knows it or not. This is, however, not the case. The speaker must understand in depth what he is doing if he is to speak with some kind of success. This is especially true of the parts of invention, arrangement, and diction. Only when he is aware of the stages of the creation of a speech is he able to exploit the potential for speaking persuasively. Therefore, a trained rhetor will not resort to writing immediately after accepting his case. First, he will have to think about his defence line, the issue of the matter, then, he will decide about his arguments and their right place in the speech and, finally, he will start writing down his first draft. That is why he should know about this theoretical scheme; in this way he will secure a better result.

Generally speaking, in the process of creating a speech an ancient orator was dealing with two broad areas: first the invention, namely the pre-thinking stage of the different aspects of the matter and second the diction, namely the actual writing of the speech. The theorists of rhetoric were concerned about both, as
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62 *Ad Her.* I. ii. 3; Quint. III, III, 1; Kennedy (1994) pp. 4-6.
Hermogenes, for example, who wrote both on issues (Περὶ στάσεων) and on the types of style (Περὶ ἡμῶν).

Here we are concerned only with invention and mainly with the *stasis*-theory, which was perfected in the second century AD.

**The issue theory.**

In what follows we attempt to establish possible relationships between *stasis*-theory and the courtroom speeches in the novel of Achilleus Tatos. The extent of this relationship between those two superficially unrelated genres can prove not only that Achilleus Tatos was familiar with advanced rhetorical education which every educated man had in that time, but also that the author had come in contact with sophisticated theories, such as the issue-theory, which concern rhetoric in the abstract and in practice. This is not included in the basic principles of rhetoric and is mainly an occupation of the advanced students of rhetoric.

The issue-theory has a long history behind it. Its roots can be traced to the Hellenistic period; some indications show that already in the fourth century some forms of issues existed, mainly in a legal environment. In the 2nd century BC Hermagoras gave a great turning point to the development of the *stasis*-theory and created an almost complete system of the issues, which was to remain, with minor changes, a standard manual in the following centuries. Cicero and Quintilian wrote about it extensively (the latter in more detail), although both present a rather basic theoretical construction. In the second century Minukianos contributed considerably to the theory as one can infer from the indirect comments on his views by his commentators. Hermogenes, however, was the one who would contribute the most towards a more sophisticated and complete theoretical system and towards its influence to the orators of the following centuries (until the Renaissance).
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64 Kennedy (1999) p. 121.
To simplify and present the issue-theory in a short paragraph is very difficult. For practical reasons we should present some of its basic principles. According to a very apposite definition, issue-theory "was a set of rules intended to help the orator to think out and select the most telling and appropriate ways of treating his case."

As will be apparent from the discussion of stasis-theory in the novel of Achilleus Tatios, a forensic orator sometimes makes use of more than one issue in each case. As Kennedy rightly points out, "Hermogenes does not consider their combination, but in a court of law defence was usually offered on more than one ground and the prosecution was forced to answer each. Later Greek rhetoricians sometimes lectured on speeches of the Attic orators and discussed the combinations of stasis found there." This is what happens in the courtroom speeches of Leukippe and Kleitophon; indeed, the author gives complete freedom to his characters to use as many issues as they need and exploit any possible detail.

The types of staseis in the courtroom speeches in Achilleus Tatios.

The significance of dividing the issues and proving one's point in a dispute is, according to Hermogenes, immense. It is, of course, in the orator's interest to find a way to effectively pursue his aim which is to convince the judges. This is at the centre of the Hermogonean theoretical system in his On Issues. That is why it is worth looking at Achilleus Tatios' courtroom speeches in terms of Hermogenes' contemporary rhetorical concepts, which reflect current theory which had been developed (at least in the East) for centuries before both Hermogenes and Achilleus Tatios.

The representation of the trial starts from the defendant's first speech. Kleitophon speaks for himself and, in sharp contrast to his opponents, he has not sought legal assistance from the experts.
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65 A comprehensive discussion of Hermogenes' stasis-theory can be found in Kennedy (1994) p. 209ff.
67 Kennedy (1994) p. 211.
68 Hermogenes (Rabe 28. 7-8): "Μέγιστον εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ τὸ περὶ διαμέτρεσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποδείξεως."
From the aspect of invention his "confession" should not have any kind of concern for persuasion. It is easier to believe somebody who confesses to his crimes. Yet, there is a preconceived structure in this speech at the level of invention. Kleitophon's aim, the death penalty for himself, must be carefully pursued. That is why he wants to sound perfectly convincing even in his confession. The speech is not actually made for the defence, as the speaker does exactly what the prosecution would dream of.

Kleitophon's unexpected confession (7, 8) puzzles the other sides which are involved in the case, as this speech is mostly helpful to the prosecution. Melite however is in real trouble because she is accused of direct involvement in the murder of Leukippe. This causes embarrassment to her rhetors and herself and upsets their already predetermined defence line. The new data oblige Melite's rhetors to reconsider their stasis policy and decide about their new speech for the defence (καὶ ἀπορεῖν ὅτως χρήσαντο λόγῳ πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν, 7, 8, 2).

With Kleinias' speech (7, 9) we are in the area of the real defence of the accused. The question of defence line and stasis can be investigated with fewer difficulties than in the previous speech (Kleitophon's confession). Kleinias' passionate and deceptively improvised speech has a quite carefully premeditated defence strategy behind it. Kleinias starts by presenting the stasis, the angle from which he is going to present the matter. The speaker maintains that the accused has not committed the crime and, therefore, assumes the stasis of stochasmos (conjecture). If he proves that no crime has been committed by Kleitophon, the whole trial case will collapse and the accused will automatically prove his innocence. In order to accomplish the issue of conjecture (στάσις τοῦ στοχασμοῦ) the defendant should explore the question "did it really happen?", more specifically "did Kleitophon commit the crime of which he is accused?"

After Kleitophon's confession, however, such a stasis is not very easy to sustain. That is why Kleinias has to explain many difficult details of the case which oblige him to oppose not so much the prosecutor's side of the story but the person he is trying to defend. In essence, he tries to undermine Kleitophon's strategy.
Kleinias' systematic way of proving his case is quite similar to the Hermogenean theoretical principles analysed extensively in his On Issues. The relevant passage in which Hermogenes speaks about *stochasmos*, is the most extensive part of his subject.⁶⁹

This trial’s central issue belongs to the general category which Hermogenes calls a “political question.”⁷⁰ This is “a rational dispute on a particular matter, based on the established laws or customs of any given people, concerned with what is considered just, honourable, advantageous, or all or some of these things together.”⁷¹ In the novel of Achilleus Tatos there is a dispute between (at least) two sides which leads to a trial. Some kind of legal abnormality has taken place and Kleitophon is involved in accusations of adultery and (later) murder.

In this kind of political dispute (Ἀμφοβήτητι), according to Hermogenes again, both persons (πρόσωπα) and acts (πράγματα) are involved. The examination of these two factors based on the system he analyses helps the orator find the various headings of the issues.⁷² In the Hermogenean system⁷³ Kleitophon can be fitted perfectly in the persons “which can provide a basis for argument” by the prosecution. Kleitophon is characterised by “prejudicial terms” as an adulterer. Generally, Kleitophon is given several characterisations by the prosecution with the aim of creating new arguments each time.

One of the acts on which the prosecution can base an argument is “acts for which someone is charged as himself the agent.”⁷⁴ Kleitophon is accused of committing both adultery and murder while Melite is accused of committing only the first. Clearly, adultery is the original and main accusation dealt with in this trial and Kleitophon is the main accused.

In the whole process of the accusation Melite’s participation is not sufficiently emphasised. Contrary to what one would expect, Melite is treated more as a
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⁶⁹ Hermogenes, On Issues, in the chapter on conjecture, pp. 43-59 (Rabe).
⁷¹ Heath (1995) ch. 29, p. 28; Hermogenes, p. 29 (Rabe).
⁷² ibid. "ἠν δὲ ἀμφοβήτητιν ταῦτα ἀνάγκη περὶ τε πρόσωπα γίνεσθαι καὶ πράγματα ἄν πλείστη δήποτε διαφορά, ἡν τοῖς ἔγγυθοις ὑδίων ἢ δὲ τὸς διαμέρεσις συνιδέων τὰς εἰς τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν ζητημάτων καὶ δόσα διὸς διαμείεται δύναται.’’
⁷⁴ Heath (1995), p. 29; see Hermogenes, p. 30 (Rabe): "καὶ ἱσχυροτάτην μὲν ἔδεστον ἐπιδεχέται ταύτα, ὡς ὅλης τις αὐτός ὡς πολύτις κρίνεται.’’
person who is charged with the crime as a consequence of Kleitophon’s action; this kind of argumentation is discussed by Hermogenes in his description of acts which provide basis for arguments.\textsuperscript{75} Schwartz presumes\textsuperscript{76} quite plausibly that “Melite’s defence had already been presented before Clitophon spoke” (7, 7, 1), and the advocates’ puzzlement refers to the new charge of murder. Beyond that, we believe, there is a plausible explanation for Melite’s role being downplayed in this case. According to Hermogenes, in cases like this there is sufficient ground for “exception” “because one should not be brought to trial for another’s acts.”\textsuperscript{77} By involving Melite, Kleitophon tries to secure her condemnation as an adulteress (his initial plan as revealed in 7, 6, 3-4).

The “intermediate case,” discussed by Hermogenes in the section of acts which can form a basis for argument,\textsuperscript{78} applies to the incident with Leukippe: Kleitophon wants to get rid of Leukippe since he has found a new lover. Leukippe has disappeared. Kleitophon is charged with murdering Leukippe. The case is an exact parallel to the example given by Hermogenes: “the father of a dissolute son goes missing; the son is charged with homicide.”\textsuperscript{79} In Hermogenes’ view the prosecution can make a case although no act seems to exist (in which case there should not normally be a case since both person and act are prerequisites for such a thing). According to Hermogenes this case is based on an intermediate act; “the father’s disappearance has no direct reference to the son but does provide arguments against him in the light of his known bad character.”\textsuperscript{80} Therefore, it does not belong to the “incomplete case” and the case is going to be disputed in terms of character and χρώμα (gloss), namely the transposition of cause,\textsuperscript{81} that is that there is some kind of explanation for what has happened.

\textsuperscript{75} See Heath (1995) p. 29 case ii in the acts section, namely “δευτέρων δὲ, ὅταν ἐπέροι προέχοντος ἰδίως εἰς αὐτῶν ἀναφέρονται τὸ κρανόμενον”; Hermogenes, p. 30 (Rabe).
\textsuperscript{77} Hermogenes, On Issues A A , 6-9; translation Heath (1995) p. 36.
\textsuperscript{79} Heath (1995) p. 29; Hermogenes, p. 31 (Rabe): ἀπέσκει δὲ οὐδὲν τοῦ ζητήματος τοῦτον καὶ ὁ ἀπώταις ὅ ἐπὶ τὸ πατρὶ ἀρανεῖ γενομένον φόνου φεύγων.”
\textsuperscript{80} Heath (1995) commentary on 31. 6-11 (p. 66).
\textsuperscript{81} More detailed discussion on this matter and on gloss (μετάθεσις τῆς αἰτίας) can be found in Heath’s commentary on 31. 6-11, pp. 65-66 and 49. 7-50.19, pp. 87-89.
In our case Kleitophon (and Melite) have a motive for killing Leukippe; in addition, the prosecution tries to prove that Kleitophon has a bad character and is therefore capable of committing such a crime.

That is precisely what Thersandros does in his speech in 7, 11. He underlines the fact that Kleitophon has confessed his crime, he presents Kleitophon's motive for the crime and he maintains that he attempted and managed to trap him with the aid of a diabolic intrigue (7, 11, 2). In his second speech (8, 8) Thersandros asserts that since Kleitophon has already committed the crime of adultery he would have no ethical obstacles to kill Leukippe and, therefore, he should be considered as the prime suspect. Thersandros uses the same principles in his attack against the priest; he claims that the priest had a sexual motive (which is later supported in more detail by Sopatros).

The issues judged in the trial belong to two categories. The alleged murder of Leukippe, which arises in the second trial, corresponds exactly with what Hermogenes notes in 36.8-12. The question of Leukippe's death is unclear and the issue is conjecture (στοχασμός). As he says, "conjecture is a proof of the existence of an act that is unclear from a sign that is clear" (36.10-11). Based on Leukippe's disappearance and Kleitophon's confession the court tries to find out who is the real perpetrator of the criminal act.

The defence line is quite complicated since Kleitophon appears in the court with a confession to the crime in which he also incriminates Melite; his friend Kleinias speaks in defence of him and tries to put the blame for Kleitophon's misfortunes on Melite. Melite, on the other hand, is in the same position as the accused but has to keep her distance from Kleitophon's false accusations and to follow her own defence line. The attempts of the litigants to promote their interests lead them to different defence policies, some of which are successful and some are not.

In Kleitophon's speech the defendant accepts that murdering Leukippe was a wrong deed and, therefore, we are in the area of counterposition (ἀντίθεσις).  

---

82 Hermogenes, 36. 8-12 (Rabe): "ἐπισκοπεῖν δὲ τὸ κρινόμενον, εἰ ἀφανὲς ἡ πράξεως ἡ φανερῶς. κἂν ἡ ἀφανὲς ἡ στοχασμός ἡ πράξεως. ἠδὲ ἡ πράξεως πράξας ἔλεγχος υποτυπώσεις ἀπὸ τοῦ πράξας σημείου. ἦ ἀπὸ τῆς θερ. πρὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ὑποτύπωσις."

However, though accepting some responsibility of the act, Kleitophon transfers a significant part of it to Melite, i.e. to a third party, and the issue is therefore transference (μετάστασις) according to the Hermogenean system.

Concerning the priest’s speech there is one more dimension to be added: it is the application of the issue of definition in the accusation that he offered refuge to, indeed protected, two immoral criminals (8, 10, 3). Apart from the attack against Thersandros’ character, the priest tries to establish that Thersandros was not entitled to act like a judge in the first place when he imprisoned Kleitophon and decided by himself that the accused was guilty. The priest denies that what he did was wrong and therefore the issue is counter plea (ἀντίληψις).

Sopatros’ case:

After his attack on the priest, Sopatros speaks about the impeccable character of Thersandros and tries to establish the accusation of adultery against Melite and Kleitophon with the assistance of the issue of definition (ὁρικὴ στάσις). According to Hermogenes “the issue of definition is an enquiry into the description of an act that is partially performed and partially deficient with regard to the completeness of its description.” In Sopatros’ view the question is whether what Melite has done can be described as adultery: since everybody accepts that Thersandros is alive, Melite has committed adultery with Kleitophon. Although she claims she thought that Thersandros was dead, she

---

84 Ibid. p. 33; Hermogenes 39. 6-9 (Rabe): “Ἀν δὲ εἰς ἄτερον τι μεθυστὰ, πάλιν διαφημένον ἢ γάρ εἰς ὑπεύθυνον τι δυνάμενον γενέσθαι πράγμα ἢ πρόσωπον μεθύσθη, τὸ ἔγκλημα ὁμολογῶν τι πεποιημέναι ὡς ἀδύκτημα καὶ ποιεῖ μετάστασιν.”

85 Counterposition (ἀντίληψις): Counterposition is the issue which arises when the defendant accepts that his act was wrong. There is a distinction here: if the defendant accepts full responsibility of his act then he makes counter statement (ἀντίληψις); if he transfers part of it to a third party (capable of being held to account) he makes transference (μετάστασις). In the case of Kleitophon, the speaker in his confession accepts clearly that the act in question was wrong, that he is certainly responsible but he also underlines the significance of Melite’s part in the murder; and, finally, he presents the events that have happened (presentation); see further in Hermogenes 38.16-39.19 (Rabe) and Heath (1995) p. 33f.

86 Heath (1995) p. 33; Hermogenes, 38. 8-13 (Rabe): “Ἄν μέντοι πεπραγμένον ἢ περὶ οὗ ἢ κρίσις ἢδη, κοινὸν μὲν ὅνωμα τούτῳ δικαίωσις, . . . πάλιν δ’ αὐτοὶ καὶ τοῦτο διαφημένον δίχα ἢ γὰρ ἐρέεπ τι πεποιημέναι ὡς ἀδύκτημα ὁ φεύγων καὶ κατὰ τί κεκαλυμμένον ἢ οὗ κακῶν μὲν μηδομᾶς φάσαις κεκωλυθεῖσα τὸ πεπραγμένον, ἀντίληψιν ποιεῖ.”

87 Heath (1995) p. 32; Hermogenes, 37. 5-7 (Rabe): “Εστι γὰρ στάσις ὁρικὴ ὀνόματος ζήτησις περὶ πράγματος, οὗ τὸ μὲν πέπραξεται, τὸ δὲ λείπει πρὸς αὐτοτελείαν τοῦ ὀνόματος.”
unconsciously accepts that what she has done is indeed adultery because Thersandros is alive.

The issue of conjecture (Περὶ στοχασμοῦ).

The issue of conjecture raises the question of fact: normally the defendant denies the accusation. The question is whether something happened and the answer is negative; when there is a disagreement between the disputants on "whether an action was performed at all" then stochasmos is applicable (στάσις τοῦ στοχασμοῦ).  

What Hermogenes does in his treatise - and this is very important - is not only to categorise different types of issues, which of course would have a limited influence on practical application, but also to analyse how each one can be divided into various parts and pursued systematically and effectively.

According to Hermogenes, there are ten subdivisions in stochasmos: exception; demand for evidence; motive; capacity; sequence of events; counterplea; objection; transposition of cause; persuasive defence; common quality. Exception can arise (among others) from deficiency.  

The argument of Leukippe's death is based precisely on these principles. Kleenias is the first to use this kind of argument in 7, 9, 6-7: there is no victim and no perpetrator, he claims; therefore, he denies the accusation on behalf (and for the sake) of Kleitophon. Later, when Leukippe appears on the scene, the priest makes a similar point and tries to achieve an automatic acquittal for Kleitophon: since we have found the supposed "victim," no crime has happened and consequently Kleitophon is innocent (8, 9, 11-12). Thersandros in his second speech makes a similar false accusation against Kleitophon. He maintains that the accused had a motive to kill Sosthenes and since Sosthenes has gone missing for some time, Kleitophon should be considered as a prime suspect.

---

88 Kennedy (1983) pp. 82-83. Further on stochasmos see Hermogenes 43. 16 – 59. 9 (Rabe) and Kennedy (1983) 73-86, esp. 82-85.

89 Heath (1995) p. 36; Hermogenes, p. 43. 17-21 (Rabe). Especially for common quality Hermogenes claims that it is appropriate in second speeches and epilogues; also "defendants too summarize the points in a similar way, but make a different use of them, appealing for pity and stirring up emotions"; "the so-called heads of purpose are common to both sides here, i.e. legality, justice, advantage, feasibility, honour"; see later pp. 123-124.
Demand for evidence (ἐλέγχων ἀπαίτησις).

Speaking about the general “technical principle regarding witnesses,” Hermogenes suggests that you “either attack them on the grounds that they give evidence out of partiality or enmity, or because of personal relationships, or for private gain…”

The latter is applied by Thersandros and Sopatros in their attack against the priest. In their prosecution in the second trial they maintain that the priest supports the young couple because he has a personal interest in them. Kleiniyas is also attacked by Thersandros who claims that Kleiniyas is untrustworthy since he is personally involved in the crime.

The point is extensively dealt with by the speakers in Tatios’ courtroom speeches. Here, too, one can find practices which are reminiscent of Hermogenes’ instructions in the relevant chapters (Hermogenes, 45 – 46.7).

When there are witnesses (μάρτυρες) in a case the defendant will not demand them; instead, the defendant will attack them based on any kind of weakness, e.g. if they are servants they will be attacked with the claim that they naturally hate their masters or that they are not at all trustworthy, etc.; moreover, the defendant will present his own witnesses who would support his point of view. If there are no witnesses then the defendant will demand them by asking every kind of details (who, what, where, how, when, why). Of course, the opposite side will insist on presenting facts and not paying special attention to witnesses who as human beings are not always reliable.

Kleitophon is the first to touch the question of witnesses. Expecting in all probability to face the demand for witnesses from the people involved in the trial, he mentions from the very beginning that the perpetrator has disappeared since he executed Leukippe (7, 7, 5).

Immediately after it, Kleiniyas in his attempt to refute Kleitophon’s self-accusation challenges him to present evidence: if you are the instigator you

---

90 Hermogenes, 44. 1-4 (Rabe).
91 Hermogenes, 45-46. 7 (Rabe).
92 Heath (1995) p. 37; Hermogenes, 45. 16-19 (Rabe): “τούτι γάρ ους καθόλου περί μαρτυρίαν ἐξει τεχνικόν θεώρημα, ἢ διαβάλλειν αὐτοῖς, ὀποὶ πρὸς χάριν ἢ δ’ ἐξίσου ἢ διὰ τινα ἀξιαίητην αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίοις ἢ διὰ κρίσεως τι οἰκείου, ...”
93 Hermogenes, 45. 1-46.7 (Rabe).
should be able to present the perpetrator and the victim. Kleinias uses a similar argument based on demand for evidence to illustrate his view better. At the end of his speech (7, 9, 14) he reminds the judges that they have several witnesses and therefore they can make up their mind by judging their testimony. According to Thersandros (7, 11, 1) there is no need for evidence concerning who has committed the crime in Leukippe’s murder: the fact that Kleitophon has confessed is the strongest evidence. Concerning adultery, Thersandros claims that he had Sosthenes as his witness (who was the first to let him know about Melite’s behaviour) but now he has gone missing.

As we have seen, Hermogenes covers the case when no witnesses exist: if there are no witnesses “the defendant emphasises the absence of witnesses by considering every aspect of the alleged act to which testimony might be required and is not available.”

On the other hand, Thersandros demands evidence for Kleinias’ claim that Kleitophon heard from a co-prisoner that Melite had ordered a man to murder Leukippe. In his second speech Thersandros again demands evidence for Melite’s case and maintains that he will accept the result that will come to light from the witnesses’ testimony. Again here we see Thersandros manipulating the principles of demand for evidence according to his personal interests.

Motive and capacity (ἡ βουλὴς καὶ η ἀνάμισ).

According to Hermogenes, “in all conjectures one should consider all the persons about whom a judgement can be formed.” It is true that motive and capacity (βουλὴς καὶ ἀνάμισ) can form an important basis for argument in any kind of speech and especially in forensic speeches, as it does in the courtroom scenes in Leukippe and Kleitophon.

Right from the very beginning of the trial the factor of motive is used. Kleitophon presents a clear motive for Melite’s decision to murder Leukippe; she was afraid that Kleitophon would go back to her (7, 7, 4). This decision was

---

94 Heath’s commentary (p. 83) on Hermogenes, 45. 20 - 46. 3 (Rabe).
95 Heath (1995) p. 37; Hermogenes, 47. 5-6 (Rabe).
convenient for Kleitophon too, since Melite had promised that she would give him all her fortune.

Kleinias is one of the speakers who make full use of it. In defence of Kleitophon he presents the accused as one of the unfortunate people (τῶν ἀτυχοῦντων 7, 9, 2) who has falsely confessed a crime he never did; and that is all because he wants to die and so put an end to his calamities, because he thinks that Leukippe has been murdered (7, 9, 4). Kleinias comments on Kleitophon's argument that he had a motive to kill Leukippe because he was then in love with Melite (7, 9, 7), by pointing out that it is inconsistent with Kleitophon's attempt to incriminate Melite for the murdering of Leukippe: if he was in love with that woman, he claims, he would have tried to protect her from any accusations. Thus, Kleitophon had really no motive to kill Leukippe but he had a motive to have Melite involved into Leukippe's murdering. Kleitophon believed that Melite murdered Leukippe out of jealousy and that she should therefore pay for that. In sum, Kleitophon is presented as an unfortunate man who has been involved in a terrible tragedy and as a result of his despair, reacted in a self-destructive manner.

Thersandros (in 7, 11, 1) explains Kleinias' defence of Kleitophon as a result of Kleinias' personal interest in exonerating Kleitophon, because of personal involvement in the murder. By presenting a motive for Kleinias' attitude, Thersandros attempts to render him unreliable.

Sopatros' speech, too, makes some use of motive and capacity. Sopatros tries to show that the priest's character is inappropriate for a person with this kind of function in the society. According to him, the priest has spoken in an insolent way incompatible with his official title (8, 10, 4). Apart from this, the priest, he claims, had a motive of sexual nature to protect the two youngsters in the temple (8, 10, 5-6). Melite on the other side found it easy to commit adultery while Thersandros was absent. It is not only her that had an inclination to adultery but also Kleitophon was mostly appropriate for this since, as Sopatros claims, he is a lecherous man (8, 10, 9).

The priest places more emphasis on the nature of Thersandros' character. He makes an in depth analysis of Thersandros' past life in order to prove with
evidence (incidents) that this man has never shown a moral attitude and therefore the judges should not believe his hypocritical claims.

Sequence of events (τὰ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς ὑπὲρ τέλους).

What Hermogenes says about sequence of events (in conjectures) is not clearly in agreement with what happens in Leukippe and Kleitophori's trial scene. According to Hermogenes, sequence of events "generally belongs to the prosecutor"⁹⁶ and "it is not possible for the sequence of events to belong to the defendant alone."⁹⁷ However, although there are parts of Thersandros' speech where one can detect a form of sequence of events (as in 8, 8, 3-4 or Sopatros in 8, 10, 7-9), it is mainly the defence that makes full use of it. Both Kleitophon in his confession (7, 7, 3-6) and Kleinias in his speech for the defence (7, 9, 3-4 and 9-12) take advantage of this simple but very convincing way of presenting their case.

Objection (μετάληψις): According to Hermogenes "objection is always opposed to counterplea (ἀντιληψις), not just in conjecture but wherever it is found. If one of the opposed parties uses either one of these (I mean, counterplea and objection), the other will certainly use the other."⁹⁸

This description of the objection-counterplea technique used in trials is found in Leukippe and Kleitophori's courtroom scene, more precisely, in the involvement of the priest. After the end of the first part of the trial the priest gives shelter to the young couple who sought refuge in Artemis' temple. This infuriates the prosecution which rushes to ask for a new trial. In this trial Thersandros accuses the priest, using objection, i.e. maintaining that the priest's action was illegal. This is called by Hermogenes objection by refutation (μετάληψις κατὰ ἐνστασιν).⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 37; Hermogenes, 47. 8-9 (Rabe).
⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 38; Hermogenes, 48. 1-2 (Rabe).
⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 38; Hermogenes, 48. 10-14 (Rabe).
⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 38; Hermogenes, 48. 15 (Rabe).
Counterplea: ἀντιληψις.

"If one is brought to trial on the basis of one's own acts, counterplea will certainly be relevant but if on the basis of the other people's acts, it will not. It runs along the lines: "This is permissible, and not forbidden."\(^{100}\)

After the first trial the priest gives refuge to the young couple. For this action he is severely criticised by the prosecution. In his defence the priest uses counterplea. He defends strongly the legitimacy of this action maintaining that he has not acted against any law and that Kleitophon has proven his innocence after the appearance of Leukippe. On the contrary, Thersandros is the one who acted illegally when he arrested and imprisoned Kleitophon without having any authority of that kind.

Counterplea (as a main head):\(^{101}\)

Ἀντιληψις as a main head of an issue is defined by Hermogenes as follows: if the person "denies altogether that the act was forbidden, the issue is counterplea."\(^{102}\)

As mentioned earlier, part of the priest's speech belongs to that category. The priest becomes the target of a severe attack by the prosecution; he is accused of helping criminals and participating in blasphemous actions. In his defence the priest uses mainly the issue of counterplea by showing that Kleitophon is an innocent man, which becomes clear after the appearance of Leukippe. Therefore, the priest claims, he did not do anything wrong (counterplea), while Thersandros was not entitled to arrest Kleitophon in the first place. He claims that Thersandros (and not the priest himself) is the one who committed a number of illegal acts.

Common quality (κοινή ποιότης).

"Common quality are epilogues and second speeches ( . . ). Prosecutors, after their proofs, run through the charge in the manner of a common topic ( . . ) and

\(^{100}\) Ibid. p. 38; Hermogenes, 48. 3-6 (Rabe).

\(^{101}\) See "ἀντιληψις" in Hermogenes, 65. 10-71 (Rabe).
summarise each of the relevant points as Demosthenes does, ( . . . ); defendants too summarise the points in a similar way, but make a different use of them, appealing for pity and stirring up emotion ( . . . ). The so-called heads of purpose (tô teîkâ xerfálâma) are common to both sides here, i.e. legality (tô nóûmiou), justice (tô dîkâian), advantage (tô suîphérōn), feasibility (tô dûnātov), honour (tô ejnôdojov).”

Both Kleitophon (7, 7, 6) and (more) Kleinias make use of the aforementioned suggestions. Kleinias (7, 9, 14) gives a short summary of the points he made earlier in his speech, and appeals to feelings. Sopatros’ epilogue (8, 10, 12) summarises all the main points he discussed from the beginning of the speech.

**Definition: δοοει.**

Sopatros uses definition as a basis for argument. Already from the beginning of his speech (8, 10, 2) he prepares his audience to hear his proof that Kleitophon is twice guilty. It is the process of definition with which he is going to prove his point.

The definition according to Hermogenes begins with the presentation (προσβολή) of the events from the beginning to the end: Sopatros uses this stage (presentation) in 8, 10, 7-9. Especially in 8, 10, 9 the speaker “distinguishes the act, and arises from the things passed over in the sequence of events;” the crime is adultery: Melite “καίρων τοῦτων ἐνόμισεν ἐξουσιον μοιχείας” (8, 10, 9).

The importance of Melite’s adultery is great because she committed it repeatedly and with no shame she let all the people know about it (8, 10, 10). Her objection would be that she thought that Thersandros was dead and so she was not committing adultery (that is related also to intention). However, now we all know that Thersandros was alive and therefore (at that time) Melite committed the crime.

---


103 From Heath’s (1995) translation of Hermogenes p. 40; see Hermogenes 52. 6-21 (Rabe); all the parenthetic words are mine.

104 Hermogenes, 59. 16-18 (Rabe): “ἡ προσβολή ἐστιν αὐτὰ τὰ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἄρχης ἄροι τέλους ὁ δρός χωρίζει τὸ πράγμα καὶ γίνεται ἐκ τῶν παρεμένων τοῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἄριττος τέλους.”

We have seen how the analysis of these forensic speeches with the assistance of Hermogenes' treatise *On Issues* can expose rhetorical practices which each speaker puts into action. These speeches are complicated and multidimensional. The author has put a great effort in them and his tactics are derived from mainstream rhetorical theory.

\[^{106}\] *Ibid.* p. 44; Hermogenes, 60 (Rabe).
CHAPTER 3: HELIODOROS
1. Rhetoric in Heliodoros’ Aithiopika.

In the Aithiopika there are a considerable number of occasions where persuasive or rhetorical use of language comes into action. Some of the speeches show a remarkable manipulation of devices drawn from the art of rhetoric.

There is more than one occasion in the novel where a courtroom scene is staged where several speeches of accusation or defence are made.

In book 1, after the death of his wife, Aristippos marries another woman, Demainete, who seems to be a very good stepmother to Aristippos’ son, Knemon. However, the reader knows that she does not mean well. Soon after she fails to satisfy her passion for Knemon, she plots a whole series of traps in order to punish him. In the end, she manages to cause him serious trouble but not until there is a trial.

The trial case unfolds from chapter 13 onwards. The theme is not unique to Heliodoros’ novel (see Phaidra in Eur. Hippolytos). Having failed to seduce her stepson, Demainete convinces her husband that he kicked her in the belly at the time when she had just realised that she was pregnant (a motif that is similar to Kallirhoe’s case in Chariton; 1, 4, 12).

The case is presented at a very early stage. The very first accusation is made in private by Demainete to Aristippos in chapter 10. The accusation is actually a short speech supported by false claims.

**Demainete’s first accusation speech (1. 10. 4).**

Demainete’s accusation is twofold; the one side is that Knemon kicked her knowing that she was pregnant and the other is that Knemon was disrespectful towards his father. It is indirectly implied that Knemon’s rage was the motive for the former; the young man was outraged when he heard that his stepmother was pregnant. Her alleged piece of advice to him occasioned his rage and gave him the pretext to attack her.

Demainete’s accusation is carefully constructed and designed not only on the level of ideas but also on the level of expression. Her very first ironic words have to do with the means of persuasion used frequently by rhetoricians called
“persuasion through character.”¹ The words are very carefully chosen to show how corrupted a character Knemon is; for example, “ὁ θεαμαστὸς νεανίς” is used for this end ironically; he is presented as devious with the information that he went home after waiting for his father to leave. This claim makes the accusation more serious since it shows that the attack was premeditated.

At the same time Demainete appears a righteous-caring mother (as indeed she does in the courtroom during and after her husband’s accusation speech) who has no feelings against her stepson while the latter is full of hatred against her. This is also recommended by Quintilian: “it is also important to avoid giving the impression that we are abusive, malignant, proud or slanderous toward any individual or body of men.”²

Demainete presents herself as a loving and caring mother who loves her husband’s son even more than her husband does. She tries to offer him advice in his own interest. She covers his misdeeds and does not report them to his father so that she will not be misunderstood as a bad stepmother. She is so sensitive that she takes great care to avoid embarrassing her stepson in public and is also ashamed to repeat his insulting words in front of her husband. After all this, she does not deserve to be in the condition she is in after the violent action of her stepson.

On the other side, Demainete claims, Knemon’s life was consumed between prostitutes and drinking. His hatred against his father and herself became obvious both by his insulting language and his violent action.

Without having any kind of proof for her allegations, Demainete carefully makes her case based purely on character. This is one of the most representative examples of how far “character” can go as a means of persuasion. The case is presented as a matter of extreme opposites. Her allegations are more easily accepted if we consider Demainete’s previous conduct. Indeed, she can present herself as an example of a good wife.

Her allegations are made even more credible and her good character becomes more “obvious” in this speech by the fact that she nowhere accuses Knemon

¹ See, for example, May (1988) p. 11f., 46f., 79f., 167f. (and passim) and the chapter on character as a means of persuasion in classical oratory and in the novel (p. 175ff.); see also Carey (1994) p. 34ff.
² Quint. IV, I, 10.
straightforwardly or asks for his punishment; rather she presents her accusations in an indirect way in her attempt to explain to her husband why she is still in bed, not feeling well and avoiding at first to answer his question (1, 10, 3).

It is also remarkable that all these accusations have been inserted into one period only and the density of her speech shows how much premeditation Demainete had gone through before she was able to make this speech. Demainete’s speech managed to leave Aristippos in no doubt that Knemon was guilty. Having convinced Aristippos early enough that she was well disposed and actually liked her stepson, Demainete now has the best basis for convincing him that a person who meant only well for his son would not do anything to harm him. That Aristippos was absolutely convinced about his son’s wrongdoing is evident straightaway from his immediate reaction: ταύτα ώς ἡκουσεν, οὐχ ἔπειν, οὐχ ἡρώτησεν, οὐχ ἀπολογίαν προσθήκεν, ἀλλὰ πιστεύων . . . (1, 11, 1).

The accusation, though accepted without any question in the first place, is completed shortly after; having been misled by Demainete’s servant, Knemon believes that Demainete is unfaithful to her husband and breaks into her room with a sword in order to catch her in the very act. Instead, he finds his father by her side and this can be taken as the most convincing evidence that Knemon is dangerous both to his stepmother and his father.

Demainete’s accusation is now strengthened by unquestionable facts which make her allegations much more plausible: she claims that she had realised earlier that Knemon had designs on his life. Here Demainete makes a direct appeal to emotions. She tries to excite “hatred by the disgraceful nature of his conduct,” a practice which is also discussed in Quintilian (VI, I, 14). Furthermore, Quintilian adds that the “atrocity may be enhanced by considerations of the nature of the act, the position of its author or the victim, the purpose, time, place and manner of the act” (VI, I, 15). This plan is clearly implemented here.

^ A standard motif found also in adultery cases in declamation; see Seneca, Contr. 1,4; 9,1; see further Bonner (1949) pp. 119-122; also Schwartz (1998) p. 251. Professor C. Carey suggested to me that “the trap set for Knemon involves a sequence of events which may be based on Lysias 1”; I believe this is quite plausible. Schwartz (1998) suggests that Lysias’ On the murder of Eratosthenes has influenced the rhetorical exercises of the controversiae (ibid p. 251).
Now the case is complete and ready for a proper trial-scene. Knemon is arrested (1, 12) and brought to trial (1, 13).

Aristippos’ speech (1, 13, 1-2).

Aristippos’ position is different from that of Demainete in one important aspect; he is absolutely convinced by what he saw that his son is guilty; Aristippos, therefore, believes in every word he is uttering while Demainete knows the truth and pretends to be the victim. When Aristippos presents his case he uses techniques more appropriate to a professional orator.

He takes great care to look miserable and pitiful: he appears to the assembly with his head soiled (καὶ τὴς κεφαλῆς κόνιν καταχειμένος 13, 1) trying to show right from the beginning in what a predicament he is and arouse his listeners’ emotions. Quintilian, for example, sets rules on what to say in the proemium (IV, I) and how to deliver it (XI, III); the first opinion the audience forms is very important for the whole case. What Aristippos tries to do right from the very beginning is to attract his audience’s pity. His case is suitable for this kind of treatment, something which can also be found in Aristotle’s Rhetoric. In his discussion on what can cause pity Aristotle claims that a pitiable situation can be caused when some evil comes “from a source that ought to have supplied something good.”

Then Aristotle mentions that pity is more effectively aroused when people make use of “gestures, cries and display of feelings” and acting in general. He makes this point clearer when he mentions that even the presentation of the clothes of those who have suffered and any other similar things can attract pity because they make suffering more realistic. Finally, it is “most pitiable,” Aristotle says,

---


5 Kennedy, ibid., p. 154; Arist. II.viii.14 (1386a 28-33): ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔγχρης φανόμενα τὰ πάθη ἑλεινά ἐστὶν, . . . ἀνάγκη τούς συναπεγκασμένους συμματί καὶ φωναῖς καὶ ἑσθήτῳ καὶ διὸς τῇ [ἐν δ] ὑποθέσει ἑλεινωτέρους εἶναι.

6 Arist. Rhet. II.viii.16 (1386b 2-6).
“for good people to be in such extremities, since one who is unworthy [is suffering] and the suffering is evident before our eyes.”

This is precisely what Aristippos is doing in presenting his case. It is possibly the best treatment a rhetor can give to this particular case. Aristippos starts his speech with a negative statement showing his disappointment at his son; he never expected to have this kind of treatment. He rather thought that he would have a helping hand in his old age. He is a person who does not deserve what is happening to him.

He then relates what he has done as a good father. He never failed to give him anything a young man would need at every stage of his life and he devoted all his life to him. In response his ungrateful son forgot all that. Instead, he used abusive language, violence and even attempted parricide.

Aristippos tries to show that he is a law-abiding man and decides to leave the matter to the court, although by law he had the right to kill his son there and then. In this way Aristippos is presented as a democratic citizen and righteous man. Aristippos builds a lot of his arguments on the presentation of his good character.

After Aristippos’ speech Knemon is not allowed to defend himself but is only asked questions similar to the ones an orator asks when preparing his speech. These questions have the aim to define the nature of the case. The people asking these questions try to establish the basis of the case according to stasis theory; however, Knemon is only asked if he has committed the assault (if he went with a sword against his father). The positive reply, which Knemon gives, makes the case straightforward and incriminates him immediately. The accused is not given the chance to explain and since he is not able to deny any part of the case he is not able to provide a certain angle of the issue which would lead to the relevant stasis; this would be the issue of definition. The accused accepts the action but wants to explain what it was. Since a stasis of a case is determined by some sort of denial we do not have an issue here, which is why Knemon cannot put forward and prove his case. If he had the chance to go through the next step

---

7 Kennedy, *ibid*, p. 155; Arist. II.viii.16 (1386b 6-8): “καὶ μάλιστα τὸ σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐν τοῖς τουώτοις καιροῖς ἄνταξις ἔλεεινών, καὶ ὡς ἀναξίων ἄντος καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς φαινομένου τοῦ πάθους” (text Kassell 1976).

131
of questioning, namely why he did it he would be able to prove his innocence through the issue of quality.

Let us now compare what Aristippos has done in his case with what Quintilian would do in case he had to complain that “his client has been beaten” (VI, I, 16ff.). These are some of the principles that Quintilian recommended in order to excite the feelings of the judges (VI, I, 14ff.) which, when compared, show a striking resemblance to what Aristippos is doing in his speech:

- “we must first speak of the act itself; we shall then proceed to point out that the victim was an old man, a child . . .” (VI, I, 16).
- “we shall also point out that the assailant was a worthless and a contemptible fellow, or (to take the opposite case) was in a position of excessive power or was the last man who should have given the blow” (VI, I, 16).
- “or that the act was committed at a time when such crimes were punished with special severity in the courts . . .” (VI, I, 16).
- “or finally we may hint that he wished to inflict more serious injury than he succeeded in inflicting” (VI, I, 17).
- “but it is the manner of the act that contributes most to the impression of its atrocity, if, for example, the blow was violent or insulting” (VI, I, 17).

Aristippos follows these principles so closely that his speech looks like a textbook case. It is also worth noting that the theme of the speech apart from its popularity in literature was a standard case in controversia, a great number of which concerns fathers and sons in dispute with each other for various accusations.8

Aristippos takes particular care in the delivery of the speech. To this aim he gets continuous assistance from his wife. They both appear to weep, they cry, they try to pre-empt the judges’ decision by mentioning that Knemon is going to die at an early age but lawfully and Demainete tries to endorse her husband’s claims. In fact, what Demainete says is not a formal speech but it helps her husband to make his case look more persuasive. At the end of the speech there is a detailed

---

8 See, for instance, Seneca, Contr. 2.3 (rape); Contr. 3.2; 7.3 (parricide - attempted); and stepsons falling in love with stepmothers: Contr. 6.7; and other similar father-son disputes (e.g. Contr. 7.1); see also many cases in the “Major Declamations” of (pseudo) Quintilian where often sons are described as breaking in their fathers’ bedroom in the middle of the night with deadly intentions e.g. Declamation I, etc.
commentary on the delivery and some of the speakers’ techniques. It is worth
taking a closer look:

Aristippos’ staged delivery is complemented by his appearance and his crying,
while this passage also shows how Demainete assisted him. What she does is
carefully planned and follows specified rhetorical principles for use by orators.
First of all the aim of her verbal reactions is quite different from what it seems
to be. She pretends to pity her stepson for his predicament but at the same time
she provides material which supports the accusation, a practice found also in
logos eschematismenos.9 Second, she assumes the role of a mourner and
strikingly enough follows principles from the funeral oration. The verb
ἐπεκώχυε is evoking the picture of a mourner.10 Moreover, the exclamations
(τὸν ἄθλιον, etc.) are a commonplace in funeral orations, and the picture of the
person accusing some evil deity are all borrowed from funeral oration.11 All
these show the speaker’s preparation. There is nowhere any indication that
Knemon’s parents were highly trained orators but there is plenty of evidence
which shows that they are of a noble family;12 Aristippos is “an Athenian by
descent, a member of the upper council (i.e. the council of the Areopagus),
and an Athenian representative to the Amphictyonic Council at Delphi”;13 also “he
is prominent enough to dine regularly in the Prytaneion,” he “has property in the
country in addition to his city house” (1, 12, 1), and Demainete has a female
slave who knows also how to play the harp.14 All this suggests that this family
belongs to the upper classes which implies that they were well educated, or at the
very least it does not rule out that they are capable speakers.

9 For this rhetorical technique see p. 145ff.
10 See p. 238.
13 Heliodoros 1, 9, 1; 2, 26, 3; see Schwartz (1998) p. 240.
Other samples of rhetoric in speeches.

Thyamis' speech (1, 19).

Rhetoric was divided into three kinds as early as Aristotle. The first is deliberative which is concerned with the future; the second is forensic which is concerned with the past and the third is epideictic which is more or less concerned with the present and has to do with things such as the beautiful etc.

It would be surprising if one could not find in the novel some rhetorical speeches, other than forensic. In book 1, Thyamis, after a perplexing dream urging him to take Charikleia as his share from the robbery, decides to summon his companions and makes a remarkable speech. Instead of demanding Charikleia for himself straightforwardly without any explanation, as a leader would do, he tries to convince them that he deserves to take Charikleia for himself. It sounds odd right from the beginning that he takes such great care to prove himself so democratic that he - the chief robber - goes through a summons, assembles his companions in a kind of parliament, and delivers a carefully prepared speech, whereas he could - it is obvious that he had the power - take her without too much effort. After hearing about the call for a meeting, Theagenes and Charikleia are clearly afraid that something bad or violent is going to happen, so they plead with Knemon to help them if such a case arises. Knemon quietens their fears by saying that Thyamis is not completely barbaric in his ways (οὐ παντάπασιν βαρβαρον εἶναι τὰ ἡθη τὸν λόγοτοχον ἐγγυώμενος, ἀλλά ... 1, 19, 2) but he is from a good family and his character has a good side. It is evident, therefore, that Thyamis had the power to impose his decision and did not need a lengthy speech to convince his companions.

The speech is rather a convention which the author creates in order to give scope for a good piece of rhetoric. Although this novel is quite distant from the acme of the second sophistic, it is notable that rhetoric still has an important influence on it.

It is implied that Thyamis delivered his speech in Egyptian since he could not speak Greek fluently, and that Knemon acts as an interpreter. In what follows,

---

15 Arist. *Rhet*. I.iii.3 (1358b 6-8).
16 See 1, 19, 3: "καὶ τὴν νῆσον ἐκκλησίαν ἀποφήγω."
Thyamis proves that apart from being a good robber he can be a good speaker. This is how he presents his case: he first goes through his past conduct, his origins and principles in leadership (1, 19, 3-5). Then he advances to his request (1, 19, 6-7). After this he gives the reasons why he is asking Charikleia as a present and not something else (1, 20, 1-21, 1). Finally, he asks for Charikleia's consent (1, 20, 1-2).

His speech follows principles more suitable to deliberative than any other kind of oratory. As we see, for instance, in the definition of the Ad Herennium (I. ii. 2) "the deliberative consists in the discussion of policy and embraces persuasion and dissuasion" while "the judicial is based on legal controversy, and comprises criminal prosecution or civil suit, and defence" (I. ii. 2). As we will see later, this speech is about a certain future action and is well suited to the category of deliberative speech. Both the general principles and the content of the speech place it in this general category.

The rhetorical tactics followed here seem to be according to the suggestion in the Ad Herennium: security (tuta) and honour (honesta) (III. ii. 3). One of the divisions of the honourable (honesta res) is the Right (rectum) and the Praiseworthy (laudabile) (III. ii. 3). The former has further subdivisions and is generally defined as "that which is done in accord with Virtue and Duty" (III. ii. 3).

These are all issues with which Thyamis is concerned in his speech. In his introduction his main aim is to establish that he has kept a very good relationship with his comrades and that he was always more than just in his dealings with them. To prove this he reminds them quickly of his past. This illustrates better his character and his motives. If he had not been treated unfairly by his brother, he would now have succeeded his father in the office of high priest in Egypt. As a man of noble origin, he does not have the same

---

\footnote{See also p. 219, note 53.}

\footnote{"Deliberatium est in consulatione, quod habet in se suasionem et dissuasionem."}

\footnote{"Iudicale est quod positum est in controversy, et quod habet accusationem aut petitionem cum defensione."}

\footnote{See the definition of the Ad Herennium "Deliberative speeches are either of the kind in which the question concerns a choice between two courses of action, or of the kind in which a choice among several is concerned" (Ad Herennium, III. ii. 2); and Caplan's Loeb translation (1954) pp. 172-173 note b: "whereas in both deliberative and judicial causes the speaker seeks to persuade his hearers to a course of action, in epideictic his primary purpose is by means of his art to impress his ideas upon them, without action as a goal."}
incentives as the other robbers, namely to gain easily as much wealth as possible; his motives are of a different nature: he joined the robbers because he wanted to regain his position in the priesthood. Therefore there is in no way a conflict of interest between himself and his comrades. They are ultimately after different things. That is why he is not interested in getting a larger share of the money, as a leader should do. He, therefore, explains that he took always great care to be a fair and good leader. He treated prisoners in a good way as well and this is a clear indication that he follows a set of principles unusual for a robber. All that proves how fair he was with everybody and how much he was concerned for the general good. He goes through the “Honourable”\textsuperscript{21} which is divided into the “Right” and the “Praiseworthy.” Furthermore, the “Right” is defined as “that which is done in accord with Virtue and Duty.”\textsuperscript{22} This is what Thyamis has always done; this is what he intends to do in the future. Moreover, under the Right there are a couple of subheads: wisdom, justice, courage, and temperance. More specifically, “justice is equity, giving to each thing what it is entitled to in proportion to its worth.” “Temperance is self-control that moderates our desires.”\textsuperscript{23}

One of the features which the speaker uses a lot is justice as recommended by the \textit{Ad Herennium} (III. iii. 4): we will use “the topics of Justice if we say that we ought to pity innocent persons and suppliants;” that is what Thyamis says that he has done in his life up to that moment; also “if we show that it is proper to repay the well-deserving with gratitude”; that is how Thyamis tries to present himself. He is a caring and successful leader, so people should grant him his little request in gratitude to what he has done.

We also use the topics of justice “if we say that the laws and customs of the state ought especially to be preserved” (III. iii. 4); similarly, in Thyamis’ case it is clearly implied that according to custom he should take the present without even asking and he is therefore entitled to it. The topics of justice are also used “if we contend that alliances and friendships should scrupulously be honoured” (III. iii. 4); it is clearly stated that Thyamis would expect his friends to be unhappy with

\textsuperscript{21} Ad \textit{Her.} III. ii. 3.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, III. ii. 3: “Honesta res dividitur in rectum et laudabile. Rectum est quod cum virtute et officio fit. Id dividitur in prudentiam, iustitiam, fortitudinem, modestiam.”

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, III. ii. 3.
him taking Charikleia without asking: "it would be silly to take the prisoner by force and thus stand revealed as acting against the will of my friends." Of course this argument can also be reversed. In case he does not get his present he would be an unhappy friend.

The topics of justice are also used “if we say that in all cases a principle of dealing alike with all should be established” (III. iii. 4). Usually when dividing Thyamis takes an equal share (although he could claim more as a leader). This is what he intends to do now. Besides, he is not “asking this as a free favour.” He is going to repay them by not taking any of the rest of the share.

If we need to use these kinds of virtues then they should be underlined and enlarged. That is what Thyamis does especially in the first part of the speech where he emphasises the honourable through justice and wisdom.

It is clear throughout the speech that Thyamis is trying to prove that he is doing the right thing when he asks for the girl as a present. Also they are going to benefit from the larger share of the remainder of the goods. Thyamis wants the girl for no other reason than the “continuation of his line.”

In the next part of his speech (20-21, 1) Thyamis presents the reasons for asking for this particular girl in a remarkable climax:

Πρώτον μὲν εὐγενής εἶναι μοι δοξεῖ (20, 2);
Έπειτα τὴν ψυχὴν ἁγαθὴν τε καὶ σώφρονα στοχάζομαι (20, 2);
"Ο δὲ μέγιστὸν ἔστι τῶν εἰρημένων, ἱέρεια θεῶν τινος εἶναι μοι φαίνεται (20, 2).

After managing to get his comrades’ consent to his request, Thyamis proceeds to find out Charikleia’s views, remarking at the same time that he could enforce his decision if he wanted to, but he is wise enough not to impose a marriage on the girl without her consent.

---

24 Hel. 1, 19; transl. by Morgan in Reardon ed. (1989).
26 Ad Her. III, iii, 6.
27 “Wisdom is intelligence capable, by a certain judicious method, of distinguishing good and bad; likewise the knowledge of an art is called Wisdom; and again, a well-furnished memory, or experience in diverse matters, is termed Wisdom” Ad Her. III. ii. 3.
28 Hel. 1, 19; transl. by Morgan in Reardon ed. (1989).
Charicleia’s speech (1. 21-22).

Charicleia’s response is also a noteworthy example of rhetoric. Charicleia is asked to speak because Thyamis wants to know whether she agrees with his plans or not; she also has to introduce herself and Theagenes and explain where they come from. Charicleia does not fail to respond to all the points made by Thyamis. Her speech follows this plan: introduction, statement of facts, response to the request, personal plea for a delay in the marriage.

Before responding Charicleia takes some time to gather her thoughts. This is not an insignificant piece of information. It is a common practice to take staged postures; there is a special recommendation about it in the rhetorical handbooks. Quintilian, for example, advises that “the method of arousing the emotions depends on our power to represent or imitate the passions. Therefore when the judge in private, or the usher in public cases, calls upon us to speak, we must rise with deliberation” (XI, III, 156); elsewhere, again, Quintilian advises that “we must not break forth at once into speech, but should allow ourselves a few moments for reflection. For the display of such care on the part of one who is about to speak attracts the audience and gives the judge time to settle down” (XI, III, 157). Now if we compare this with the passage that follows we will find much correspondence:

Ὁ δὲ πολλῶν τινα χρόνον τῇ γῇ τὸ βλέμμα προσερέσθασα καὶ τιμὴν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπισεύωσα λόγον τινα καὶ ἐννοίας άθροισεν ἑώρηκα καὶ ἀδύν ἂν πρὸς τὸν Ἐυμήν ἀντωπήσασα καὶ πλέον ἃ πρότερον αὐτὸν τῷ κάλλει καταστράφασα (καὶ γὰρ περοίνικτο τὴν παρείαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνθυμιμάτων πλέον ἃ σύνηθες καὶ τὸ βλέμμα κεκινητο πρὸς τὸ γογγύτερον) ... (1, 21, 3).

Apart from the conspicuous gathering of thought shown just before the beginning of her speech which is recommended by Quintilian, we also find other elements in this description which serve as additional commentary for her speech. The passage shows Charicleia’s extra-careful attention as to the position of her head (τὴν κεφαλὴν) and her eyes (τὸ βλέμμα). It is striking but seems not coincidental that this area is also discussed in detail in Quintilian.29 According to him the head is of great importance in delivery since it serves “not merely to

29 See XI, III, 68-71, for the head; XI, III, 72-79, for the eyes and glance.
produce a graceful effect, but to illustrate our meaning as well.\textsuperscript{30} Quintilian goes to great lengths in examining different head positions and their meanings, for example, "a droop suggests humility" ("deiecto humilitas" XI, III, 69). There is, therefore, a great number of emotions one can show by the movements of the head "consent, refusal and affirmation, modesty, hesitation, wonder, indignation."\textsuperscript{31}

Is not this Charikleia's intention here? Her eyes are fixed on the ground, she moves her head to show that she is gathering her thoughts and just before speaking she fixes her glance straight at her listener's face.

The most influential means in expressing emotions is the eyes,\textsuperscript{32} "for it is by this that we express supplication, threats, flattery, sorrow, joy, pride or submission."\textsuperscript{33} The importance of the glance is further emphasised by Quintilian: "it is on this that our audience hang, on this that they rivet their attention and their gaze, even before we begin to speak. It is this that inspires the hearer with affection or dislike, this conveys a world of meaning and is often more eloquent than all our words."\textsuperscript{34}

There seem to be far too many coincidences in what Quintilian\textsuperscript{35} recommends and what the narrator in Heliodoros' novel says for Charikleia's head and eye movement in her response to Thyamis. In her speech she tries to show modesty, submission (she had no alternative anyway), and generally she tries to win time. Her speech is full of conniving but plausible ideas all of which serve her final aim: to defer her "marriage" to the new suitor.

In her introduction (21, 3 - 22, 2) she states that normally she ought to be silent in front of a meeting among men; with this first thought she tries to show that she is prudent and that she respects tradition and custom; she tries to win her hearer's sympathy and to make her listeners attentive according to the

\textsuperscript{30} See XI, III, 68: "precipuum vero in actione sicut in corpore ipso caput est cum ad illum, de quo dixi, decorem, tum etiam ad significationem."
\textsuperscript{31} See Quint. XI, III, 71 (transl. here by Butler).
\textsuperscript{32} "Dominatus autem maxime vultus" Quint. XI, III, 72.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid. XI, III, 72.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} Apart from the use of sophisticated rhetorical tricks which can be traced back to formal rhetorical handbooks, Charikleia, after the end of her speech, follows one more of the rhetorical techniques, suggested by Quintilian: the use of tears. Quintilian claims that "nature has given them tears to serve as interpreters of our feeling, tears that will break forth for sorrow or stream
established rhetorical rules for the introduction of the speech.\textsuperscript{36} Then she justifies her decision to speak and in so doing she acknowledges that the robbers show her kindness/benevolence and emphasises that they want to use persuasion not force and that the matter in question concerns only her. Above all she wants to show that she is modest and that she accepts and respects Thyamis as her master.

This introduction may have reminded the ancient reader of Lysias' \textit{Against Diogeiton}\.\textsuperscript{37} There the speaker describes the mother of the orphan children as having been obliged to speak in the presence of men due to the seriousness of her misfortune, even though she is not used to it (Lysias, 32,11). Additionally, in the introduction of Lysias' speech (32,2) we also find the idea of Diogeiton preferring the law-suit even though he was given the choice of arbitration, which can be seen as a choice between “persuasion” and “force.”

Next (22, 2 – 22, 5) Charikleia states that she comes from a noble family, that she was serving as a priestess and that Charikleia and Theagenes were unlucky enough to be driven by adverse winds to a foreign place where they became victims of the sailors of the ship. All this is plausible - but not true - and shows them as people who did not deserve such kind of treatment by fortune. All this adds to the sympathy effect.

The end of her story takes her to the current situation where she states that she considers herself fortunate to be in their hands and, most importantly for her, to be chosen as the leader's wife. Ironic though it sounds to the reader, this information deflects the discussion of the case and gives Charikleia the chance to win time, by preparing the ground for her to express her request. Apart from receiving Thyamis' proposal as an honour, Charikleia wins his good will by flattering him with the comments about his origins and reminding him of the prospect of becoming a priest. As a man from a religious family, Thyamis is bound to grant her request. Her proposition to go to Memphis and get married after Thyamis assumes his role as a high priest will help her win even more time or even avoid the marriage altogether.

\textsuperscript{36} See pp. 54-55.
\textsuperscript{37} I owe this observation to Professor Carey.
Charikleia's speech is so carefully created and delivered that she leaves no opportunity to Thyamis but to accept her proposal. Her emotional appeal together with the reasonable argumentation gives her what she wants.\textsuperscript{38}

The importance that the author gave to this speech is related to the general design of his story. Charikleia's speech contains a devious plan which helps the development of the plot. The assembly immediately grants her request and urges Thyamis to accept it. Thyamis has no option but to accept Charikleia's plea. He decides to head for Memphis as soon as possible; he is closer to his final aim than he has ever been before.

Even Theagenes is convinced by Charikleia's speech and is very disappointed indeed. This leads the couple to an interesting conversation over the speech delivered by Charikleia. To Theagenes' expression of regret the young girl replies:

\textit{Εὐφήμησον...πηδε... ἐκ λόγων ἐπικαίρων καὶ πρὸς τὶ κυρεύουσα εἰσημένων ἂγε δὲ ὑποψίας} (1, 25, 3).

Later Theagenes asks for more information about her speech:

\textit{Τί οὖν ἐβούλετο σοι τὸ τῆς καλῆς δημηγορίας ἔχετας} (1, 25, 5).

Both phrases constitute internal evidence that the author is consciously making rhetorical speeches whose power he uses to produce more adventures; here Charikleia's convincing speech manages to avert danger for the immediate future; it also tests and strengthens the couple's relationship further by causing some kind of crisis because of Theagenes' misunderstanding. Obviously, rhetoric is presented as having great power to manipulate the audience, an idea that did not fade two centuries after the peak of the second sophistic movement.

Charikleia makes two further good speeches (1, 25 and 1, 26) to inform Theagenes about her thoughts and her plans. Her final thought in her second speech is that a lie can be a good thing if it helps the speaker and does not harm the hearer (1, 26, 6). The narrator indicates that Charikleia has made all her suggestions in her speeches because she wanted to achieve the best result for Theagenes and herself (πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον 1, 27, 1). This is the framework within which the orator works.

\textsuperscript{38} The comments and reactions of Charikleia's audience following her speech give some additional information about the general planning and objectives of the speech and the impact it
In book 2 there is another occasion for a trial scene. The information which we receive, however, is given indirectly through Knemon’s narration. It concerns the fate of Knemon’s father. After a tip-off from Arsinoe, Thisbe’s competitor, Demainete’s relatives call for a trial because they claim that Demainete died without a trial and falsely accused of adultery. They paid a lot of money to get the best public speakers: καὶ τοὺς δεινοτάτους τῶν ὀφτώρων πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς χρήμασιν ἀναβιβασόμενοι (2, 9, 2). Because of the sound arguments used by the accusers and the lack of evidence in defence of Knemon’s father the man is exiled and his property is confiscated.

Book 10.

In the last book of the novel we are in front of a trial scene which is the key to the conclusion of the novel. The young couple have been arrested by the Ethiopians during their attack against the Egyptians and they are about to be sacrificed according to Ethiopian law. The gymnosophists who are present at the time do not approve in principle of such bloody sacrifice and decide to withdraw. As they are ready to withdraw Charikleia intervenes and brings forth a suit against Hydaspes. With this (10, 10, 1-2) Charikleia initiates the whole trial procedure.

In her plea addressed to the leader of the gymnosophists, Sisimithres, Charikleia states that she will bring forward a suit against the king since they “alone have judicial authority” above the country’s leader in this case, which is a matter of life and death. She promises to show that it is impossible and improper (οὔτε δικαίως οὔτε δίκαιον 10, 10, 2) for such a sacrifice to take place.

---

39 Professor Carey suggests that “this is an erotesis, which in classical Attic oratory would form a part of a speech.” See also Carawan (1983) pp. 209-226; the gymnosophists call it πρόκλησις in 10, 10, 2: “ἄκοντες τῆς προκλήσεως καὶ ἄρα πρόκληται ἢ ἐξήλθαν.”

40 Transl. by Morgan in Reardon ed. (1989) p. 565; Hel. 10, 10, 1: “δικίᾳ γάρ μοι καὶ κράσις πρόκληται πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεύοντας, ἡμᾶς δὲ μόνον καὶ τοὺς τοσοῦτος δικάζειν πυθάγομαι.”

41 See the similar statement in Kleinius’ speech in Achilles Tatios 7, 9, 2 (made also in the introduction); Schwartz (1998) p. 324, note 122.
The result of this speech is the gymnosophists' acceptance of Charicleia's plea. The king, however, rejects the possibility of a trial because he claims that there is no ground for a suit and no basis for a case. Furthermore, it is improper for a king to have to defend himself because a captive woman accuses him. Sisimithres, the leader of the gymnosophists, who in this case represents the judicial power, states that "at law there is but one king: he who has the strongest case."42 This is what we are going to witness in the following chapters. The king supports the idea that the law concerns only the natives of Ethiopia, not foreigners.

Charicleia's speech (10, 11, 3 – 10, 12, 1; 10, 12, 3-4).

The speech consists of an introduction, an attempt to prove her case, and a conclusion. In the introduction, Charicleia invokes the gods to help her with her case and assures her listeners that she is going to tell the truth. In the second part, she tries to overturn the whole case through a process similar to that used in *stasis* theory.43 This has to do with the letter and the actual intention of the law. Her question is simple: whom does the law refer to? Natives or foreigners? It is obvious that the king would refer to the natives. Charicleia claims that she is native and actually his daughter; therefore, there is no case. The last has yet to be proven but the basic line of defence has been successfully established.

In his speech Hydaspes dismisses everything Charicleia had told as lies and asks for protection.

The second part of Charicleia's speech (10, 12, 3-4) is a reaction to Hydaspes' speech and provides further support to her claims. Her first thought is that in the court the judges have the power, not the king; besides, in this case the king cannot take part in the formation of the final verdict because he is a party in the case.

The proof of the case comes from the interpretation of the law. The law refers to the sacrifice of foreigners not the King's own child. Then Charicleia moves on to provide her evidence. Just before that she underlines the importance of her proof:

42 Transl. by Morgan in Reardon ed. (1989) p. 565; Hel. 10, 10, 3: "άλλ' εἶς ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεύων ἐν ταῖς κρίσεσιν, ὁ τοῖς εὐλογοτέροις κρατῶν."
“Πάσα δίκη καὶ κρίσις, ὡ βασιλεὺ, δύο τὰς μεγίστας ἀποδείξεις οἶδε, τὰς τε ἐγγράφους πίστεις καὶ τὰς ἓκ μαρτύρων βεβαιώσεις.” The shy girl we met in book 1 who hesitated to speak in front of men appears to be very well aware of the legal procedures and what is effective in a court case. With this thought she provides her proof and her witness, both of which constitute very strong evidence. All her speeches show her as a capable speaker, complementing her characterisation as a dynamic female figure in the novel.

Again in this chapter we see that the author follows technical rhetorical procedures found extensively analysed in rhetorical handbooks of Roman times. It is clear, therefore, from this discussion that Heliodoros had access to rhetorical material similar to that found in the manuals that we have examined. In the next chapter we will see that Heliodoros is much more specialised in rhetorical theory than he actually shows or wants to show.

43 Hermogenes, On Issues 82.4ff. (Rabe).
44 Hel. 10, 12, 4.
45 See pp. 36-37.

In Dionysios' of Halikarnassos "τέχνη ὑποτύπωσις" there are two treatises (VIII and IX) which deal with a common subject: the "ἐσχηματισμένος λόγος." In these two treatises, (wrongly) attributed to him, the author describes what he calls ἐσχηματισμένος λόγος, namely speeches in which the orator says one thing but by saying this he gives arguments for something else, even its opposite. This device is described at length and many examples from classical texts are provided. Hydaspes' speech in Heliodoros 10, 16, 4-10 is a good example of this method.

Hydaspes, convinced at last that Charikleia is his daughter, does not want to sacrifice her. That is why he makes this deceitful speech. Almost any reason he uses to back up his apparent commitment to kill his daughter at the altar can be used as an argument for the opposite view.

Both treatises of Dionysios distinguish and analyse different types of schemata and give examples taken from classical authors. The word "σχήμα" has a very specific meaning here; it means the rhetorical strategy used in speeches in which the speaker seems to be trying to support one view but in a deeper sense he provides material for a different one, even the opposite. The idea is similar to that found in Quintilian's book 9 - a good supplementary source on this matter - where the author speaks about figures and refers to "cases when the speaker pretends to say something other than that which he actually does say"; "verum id ipsum anguste Zoilus terminavit, qui id solum putaverit schema, quo aliud simulatur dici quam dicitur, quod sane vulgo quoque sic accipi scio" (IX. I. 14).

---

1 Usener – Radermacher (1997) pp. 295-374. The treatises have survived as part of the "τέχνη ὑποτύπωσις" of Dionysios of Halikarnassos. It is widely accepted that the two treatises found among the works of Dionysios of Halikarnassos do not actually belong to him but rather to some other later author(s) (probably of the 2nd, 3rd or even 4th cent. AD; see Russell-Wilson eds. (1981) Menandrer Rhetor, introduction, pp. 34-40).

2 When I first made this observation I found it very strange that it has eluded the attention of previous scholars for so long. Subsequently, I noticed that Schwartz (1998) has also noted that the speech is a figured one (p. 334).

3 Quint. transl. by Butler (1921) (which I follow throughout) vol. III, p. 355; Quint. IX, I, 14.

4 Zoilos' definition is contained in the discussion of figures by Phoibammon (Rh. Gr. III 44, 1ff. Spengel): "ὁριζότατα δὲ Ζώλος στόχος, σχήμα ἐστὶν ἐπερον μὲν προοπτοιείσθαι, ἐπερον δὲ λέγειν"; Schöpsdau (1975) n. 7 pp. 85-86.

In these speeches there is "hidden meaning which is left to the hearer to discover."\textsuperscript{6}

This technique is used, according to Quintilian, when there are certain circumstances, as for instance when it is "unsafe," or when it is "unseemly to speak openly," etc.\textsuperscript{7} The same idea is found in Dionysios of Halikarnassos' treatise B; the scheme is used when there is a great risk or danger: "καὶ τηρητέον, ὅπως ἐν κινδύνῳ οἱ σχηματισμοὶ εὑρίσκονται."\textsuperscript{8}

As the authors of the two treatises "Περὶ ἐσχηματισμένων" A and B (from here on called A and B) are more concerned with the use and methods of such \textit{schemata}, they fail to give a general definition of the term which, however, becomes obvious in the discussion of different types of figures (there are three main and three additional types). The use of \textit{scheme} is a much more widely spread technique known to ancient rhetoricians than one would have thought.

Sopatros is also familiar with the \textit{ἐσχηματισμένον} \ζήτημα when he refers to the father who "asks for the life of a cowardly son" and the son then pleads with the jury to give him "leave to die"\textsuperscript{9} since the father is alleged to have an affair with his son's daughter the case is \textit{eschetaismenon} (says Sopatros) and the actual aim of the son is to denounce his father.\textsuperscript{10}

A and B are the only treatises which deal with this topic in an extensive way. In these we find the kind of \textit{schema} useful for the analysis of Hydaspes' speech. This is the third type of \textit{schema} which is defined in A as "τρίτον σχημα ἔστι τὸ οἷς λέγει τὰ ἐναντία προσχίνη τα πραγματευόμενον,"\textsuperscript{11} and in B "τὰ ἐναντία προτείνειν τὰ ἐναντία διοικεῖται."\textsuperscript{12} According to A "οὕτος ὁ λόγος τὸ τελεστατὸν σχήμα ἐστὶ."\textsuperscript{13} The \textit{schema} is illustrated in both treatises with the same example which is the speech of Agamemnon in \textit{Iliad} B, when Agamemnon,

\begin{itemize}
\item Quint. IX, II, 65: "latens et auditori quasi inveniendum."
\item Quint. IX, II, 66.
\item D. Hal. 328, p. 327, lines 20-21 Usener-Radermacher.
\item \textsuperscript{9} See Kleitophon in Achilles Tatos 7, 7 where his speech's aim is to secure death for himself and revenge for Leukippe's alleged murder which was supposedly ordered by Melite; also Chaireas in Chariton 1, 5 who pleads to receive death penalty (here the speech is not deceitful).
\item Russell (1983) p. 36. Compare the parallel case of Demainete where the motive of her viciousness is her unrealised love towards her stepson. In this case she pretends to be sorry for what her stepson has done to her and his father and in speaking about how sorry she is about his predicament she amplifies the accusation in her attempt to secure his conviction; see p. 133.
\item D. Hal (A) 282, p. 296, lines 3-5 Usener-Radermacher.
\item D. Hal(B) 323, p. 324, lines 5-6 Usener-Radermacher.
\item D. Hal (A) 304, p. 311, lines 15-16 Usener-Radermacher.
\end{itemize}
actually wanting the Greeks to stay and go all the way with their plans, makes a speech in which he proposes to go back to their beloved country deserting the war. In reality, his speech is giving arguments against it when we know that to turn back to their glorious country would be a cowardly and shameful thing to do.\footnote{D. Hal. (A) 316, p. 319, 22 – 320, p. 322, 5 and (B) 328, p. 327, 19ff. Usener-Radermacher; see also (A) 282, p. 296, lines 14-20 Usener-Radermacher.} This technique is also discussed in Hermogenes\footnote{Hermogenes, “περὶ μεθὸδου δεινοτήτως,” (Rabe): “Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἐναντία λέγοντα κατορθοῦν ἐναντία” 437.7-438.12.} in the chapter with the title “Μέθοδος τοῦ τὰ ἐναντία λέγοντα οἷς βουλεύσθαι γενέσθαι, κατορθοῦν, ὃ βούλεται...” It is also underlined in most handbooks dealing with this schema that the speaker should hide his technique because there is a danger, if discovered, that his opponents might pretend that they are convinced and, consequently, they will accept his proposals: “δεῖ οὖν ἡμᾶς διδάξαι, πῶς μὲν λέγει εὐθὺλωτα καὶ στρεφόμενα, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, πῶς ἔλαβεν τούτο ποιών ἐπεὶ συμβῆσεται, ἂν κατάφωρος ἡ τέχνη γένηται, καὶ τὸν ἀκούοντα ἀντιτεχνάζειν καὶ ἀντισχηματίζειν, προσποιούμενον πείθεσθαι καὶ συγχωρεῖν.”\footnote{D. Hal. (B) 331, p. 329, lines 19-24.} Further to this, in A there is a demonstration of “τοῦ λανθάνειν ἡ τέχνη.”\footnote{Ibid (A) 320, p. 322, lines 6-13.} According to this Agamemnon turns against the god and shows disrespect in order to make people aware of his emotional state. Agamemnon is behaving under the influence of pathos, so the hearer thinks that all the things he says are a direct outcome of his emotional state. This is a common idea both in A and B; when using this kind of schema we must cover our art with some kind of emotional state (πάθος) and so show that what we say is a result of this.\footnote{Ibid (B) 332, p. 330, lines 16-18: “πάθους προβολὴ πρὸ τοῦ λόγου, ἵνα δοξὴ ὑπὸ λόγους φέρεσθαι αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, μὴ ἐξ ἐπιθυμητὸς διοικεῖται”; and (B) 333, p. 330, lines 23-24: “πάθους οὖν προβολὴ κλοπὴ γίνεται διοικητῶς τεχνῆς.”} The method for this schema, according to A, is simple: we present our case as a weak one and our opponent's as a strong one (τὰς προτάσεις τὰς οἰκεῖας ἀσθενεῖς εἶναι δεῖ, τὰς δὲ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου ἰσχυρὰς”),\footnote{Ibid (A) 283f., p. 297, lines 9-10.} or use arguments similar to those of our opponents ("τοιαῦτα λέγειν δεῖ, οἷς καί ὁ ἀντιλέγων χρησεται").\footnote{Ibid. lines 15-16.} The kinds of arguments used in this schema should be easily

\footnote{Hermogenes, “ἱερὸν ἠλευθὸν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἄνθρωπον, ἢ ὁδὸν ὑπὸ λόγως ἐφεξῆς. αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος, μὴ ἐξ ἐπιθυμητὸς διοικεῖται”; and (B) 333, p. 330, lines 23-24: “πάθους οὖν προβολὴ κλοπὴ γίνεται διοικητῶς τεχνῆς.”}
refuted or easily reversed ("οὔτω μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐνδόσσιμα καὶ εὐδιάλυτα προτείνει, καὶ στρεφόμενα καὶ ἐναντία λέγει"). Additionally, in treatise B we are advised that we should present the bad as good: "ὅταν τις ὄν λέγῃ τὰ ἐναντία βούληται, ἀνάγκη αὕτῳ τὴν κακίαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων ἄρετὴν ἐνταῦθα ποιήσασθαι;" in this way we will be more convincing for the opposite of our apparent view. Hermogenes (see p. 147, note 15) follows the same principles when he discusses the use of this particular schema. He also uses the same example (Agamemnon's speech in the Iliad) and makes suggestions with striking resemblance especially to the B in Dionysios of Halikarnassos.

We have gone through all the relevant points which can be shown to be closely applicable to Hydaspes' speech in Heliodoros' book 10. All these elements fit perfectly in the speech in question to the extent that it can be regarded as a model example of logos eschematismenos (type 3).

One of the basic ingredients for such a speech is "pathos." The persons who hear Agamemnon swearing at the god certainly think that he is intemperate and does not actually mean what he is saying since he speaks under the influence of pathos. In Hydaspes' case there is a certain element of genuine "pathos" after he realises that the girl in front of him is actually his daughter (10, 16): "ὁ δὲ Ὑδάστης ἠλέει μὲν τὴν γυναῖκα ὀδυρομένην ὅρων καὶ εἰς συμπάθειαν ἐκάμπτετο τὴν διανοίαν, ... πρὸς τάς ὁδίνας τῶν δαχρῶν ἀπομαχόμενος καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν πατημώ τὸ πάθη... καὶ παθήρ οὐχ εἶναι μόνον ἐπειδήτο ἄλλα καὶ πάσχειν ὀσα παθήρ ἠλέγχετο." The people are also deeply moved from this event: "τὸν τε δὴμον κατοπτεύον ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰσων παθῶν κεχινημένον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιίαν τῆς τύχης ὑψεῖ ἡδονής τε ἢμα καὶ ἐλέου δαχρύνοντας..." The author gives us a full description of the emotional state of the people involved in this trial and at the same time leaves no doubt that the speaker (Hydaspes) is in an extreme emotional state. This, in combination with the facts, has affected his people, leaving us assured that one of the prerequisites for a
The other condition for eschematismenos logos, is found in Quintilian, the only one speaking extensively on the conditions in which the speaker should use schema: “if it is unseemly to speak openly” (“si non decet” IX, II, 66); it is the most suitable condition to our case. The first explanation given by Quintilian has a narrow sense; it means respect (reverentia IX, II, 76) for some people that makes us use this kind of figurative speech. In a wider sense, however, the condition is explained by Quintilian as applicable to more general cases (IX, II, 79): "itaque non solum, si persona obstaret rectae orationi, (. . .) decurrebant ad schemata, sed faciebant illis locum etiam, ubi inutiles ac nefariae essent, . . .” Therefore, it is not only in cases where respect prevents direct speaking but also in other circumstances, such as cases “where they were useless or morally inadmissible” (Quint. IX, II, 79). This is an easy device, principally because “the hearer takes pleasure in detecting the speaker’s concealed meaning” (IX, II, 78). In our case the speaker should not be deflected from his main duty which is to follow the traditional religious customs of his country. As the king of the country he must safeguard these procedures. Therefore, he must put his personal matters aside and get on with his duties. The only way out of this predicament is the successful use of eschematismenos logos; and this is exactly what he does.

The king has committed himself in front of his people to sacrifice his daughter. He has to go through with his decision according to the law. In his address to his people, he makes clear that he intends to go all the way with the sacrifice, but he does everything possible to make them stop him. Superficially, Hydaspes makes a speech to defend his decision to carry on with the scheduled sacrifice. Essentially, his speech is an emotional appeal to his people not to allow him to sacrifice his daughter.

He starts with the reference to the gods “who have shown” him “to be a father” (οἱ θεοί πατέρα με, . . ., ἀνέδειξαν 10, 16, 4). This is his very first thought. Now why would gods give him the chance to realise that he has a natural successor if he has to kill her immediately after it? Carrying out the sacrifice would not actually be in line with the gods’ will. He rather argues that he is going to

25 See ibid. (A) 320, p. 322, 7: “τοῦ λαυδάνειν ἢ τέχνη” namely “ʰ τοῦ πάθους προσθήκη,”
complete the sacrifice because of his devotion to his people and his land (ἐγὼ δὲ 
tοσσάτην ὑπεξολήν ποιοῦμαι τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς τε καὶ τὴν ἐνεγκούσαν εὐνοίας (10, 
16, 4). He is going to do all it takes for their sake; therefore, if they do not want 
this sacrifice - according to his first statement the gods do not - then he should 
call it off. He indirectly states, however, that he will neglect his own interest (the 
continuation of his line) and the emotional ties of a father to his daughter; 
arguments that are only useful to show his reluctance to kill his daughter. 
Therefore, the people are put above all this and so they have the power to change 
it. He does not fail to mention that the people are deeply moved by his 
predicament: "ὅρω μὲν γὰρ ὑμᾶς δακρύσας καὶ ἀνθρώπινον τι πάθος 
ἀναδειγμένους καὶ ἔλεοῦντας μὲν τὴν ἀωρίαν τῆς κόρης ἔλεοῦντας δὲ καὶ 
tὴν ἐμοὶ μάτιν προσδοκηθεῖσαν τοῦ γένους διαδοχῆν" (10, 16, 5): "Even you 
feel emotional about the waste of a young life and the disappointment of my 
vain hopes. However, we need to follow the law of our fathers and proceed with 
this sacrifice." He also notices that they, too, might not want it: "καὶ ὑμῶν ἰδιος 
μὴ βουλομένων" (16, 5). He then attempts to show indirectly that there is a way 
out of this, since the whole case is based on absurd grounds. The gods who gave 
him back his daughter are used in the present case as the reason for which he has 
to lose his daughter. The whole absurdity of the case is even better illustrated by 
the fact that the gods have taken his daughter to the end of the earth and have 
returned her to her family safe and unharmed only to be sacrificed and be 
returned to gods by her own father! This can even be a sacrilegious mistake. He 
is not sure whether the gods would want that; it is something that "I leave you to 
ponder" ("ὁμιν καταλέιπω σκόπεῖν" 10, 16, 6). In fact every eschermatismenos 
logos needs the active reaction of the audience because the effect depends on the 
reception of such a speech. If it is successful, the audience will have gathered 
enough material to come to the opposite conclusion. Otherwise, they might agree 
with the speaker, which in this kind of "game" is a real danger, pointed out also 
in the handbooks on schema.26 

Further on he states that he will not do what a father would normally do in such 
a case,27 namely to kneel before them and beg them to except his daughter from

26 Ibid (B) 331, p. 329, lines 21-25. 
27 Hel. 10, 16, 7: "ὅ καὶ ἀλλ᾽ ἐλάχιστον πατρὶ συγγνωστὸν ἰδιος."
the sacrifice. This might be taken as “I would rather not need to” rather than “I will never do that.”

He also adds that he would follow the orders of nature (φύσις) but he will have to stick with “νόμος” (16, 7), implying that φύσις is there; we cannot change it, while νόμος is something we make and, consequently, we can change. He even gives the main argument as to why this νόμος can be changed: I will not make excuses, he says, that the god could be served in other ways as well (ὡς ἔξοδοι καὶ ἐτέρῳ τρόπῳ θεραπεύειν τῷ θεῖῳ 16, 7). This is an absolutely logical argument and we should bear in mind that Sisimithres and the gymnosophists are in the audience: earlier the leader of the gymnosophists was ready to leave before the beginning of the sacrifice because as far as the gymnosophists are concerned sacrificing human beings was not proper (10, 9, 6).

Another aspect of his arguments is the emphasis on emotions. We are all extremely distressed and more so is “poor Persinna” “whom a single hour has made a mother for the first time and then childless.”28 He turns to his daughter and in a lamenting mode,29 he exposes all her rare virtues which are suitable for a princess. In a very emotional address he asks her to follow him to her sacrifice as if going to her marriage. The emotional tone is very strong at the end of the speech; it is probably one of the most moving parts of the novel. The king wants his speech to have the maximum impact.

It is apparent that the speaker is systematically using a rhetorical device; he produces arguments for the opposite side. Hydaspes’ strategy is exactly what is prescribed in the treatises. In B, for instance, where we find an example of declamation which belongs to the category “permission to die”:30 ὅταν γὰρ τις προσέλθῃ τῇ βουλῇ ἄξιῶν ἀποθανεῖν, οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν βουλεῖται, ἄλλα τὰ ἐναντία βουλεῖται ὁν λέγει. (Καὶ οἱ τὰ δῶρα <τὰ> παρὰ φίλων ἀπωθοῦμενοι, βουλόμενοι δέξασθαι, λέγουσι μὲν τὰ ἐναντία, πράττοντες δὲ τὰ ἐναντία.)31

28 Hel. 16, 8; transl. by Morgan in Reardon ed. (1989) p. 571.
29 The speech contains a significant number of lamenting motifs which we will find also in other lamenting speeches in a later chapter. For example, the standard motif of death instead of wedding, or the series of exclamations for the wasteful loss, the address for the person lost, etc.; see the chapter on funeral oration: p. 254ff. and p. 256, etc.
30 Ibid (B) 331, p. 329, lines 15-17.
31 Ibid (B) 331, p. 329, lines 15-19.
Therefore, the treatise continues: "δει ὧν ἡμᾶς διδάξαι, πῶς μὲν λέγει 
εὐδιάλυτα καὶ στρεφόμενα, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, πῶς ἔλαθεν τοῦτο ποιῶν." 32 All the
speaker is doing is making points which are εὐδιάλυτα καὶ στρεφόμενα; indeed,
all his arguments, even the least important ones, can either be refuted or be
turned to serve the opposite cause. This speech follows closely all the basic
principles of the "eschematismenos logos."

Immediately after the speech the narrator reveals that Hydaspes did not want
this speech to be "successful" (in a straightforward way): καὶ τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν τῶν
ἔνθροιμένων τῇ δημηγορίᾳ λόγων ἀπευθύμενος (10, 17, 1).
The reaction of the people is overwhelming: they have no doubt that the girl
should be excluded from this sacrifice "Σφίζε τὴν κόρην" ἀναβοῶντες, "σφίζε τὸ
βασιλείου αἵμα, σφίζε τὴν ὕπο θεῶν σωθείσαν ἔχομεν τὴν χάριν πεπλήρωται
ἡμῖν τὸ νόμιμον. . . . Πλέον παρανομήσωμεν ἀνθιστάμενοι τοῖς ἐκείνων
βουλήμασιν μηδεὶς ἀναιρεῖτο τὴν ὕπτ' ἐκείνων περισσωθείσαν" (10, 17, 1). The
audience picks up Hydaspes' main arguments and uses them to plead for not
sacrificing Charikleia!

Hydaspes' speech is taken as a straight one and this is the only way a figured
speech can work. If people understood it as a figured speech then it would
appear as a deceitful speech and would not have the desired effect. The speaker's
arguments must be taken as straightforward but they should be chosen and used
in such a way that they lead to a different outcome. The audience's guided
conclusion is that it was the gods who saved the girl and thus people should not
upset their intention. According to the audience it would be better to oppose the
traditional law than to oppose the god's will (10, 17, 2).

Hydaspes is now defeated; but in his defeat he is really the winner (see 10, 17, 3).
Exactly as Hermogenes would want him to be in such a case: "ἐν γὰρ τῷ
τοιούτῳ σχήματι τῶν λόγων τὸ μὲν νικῆσαι λέγοντα ἡττηθήναι ἐστι, τὸ δὲ
ἡττηθήναι λέγοντα, νικῆσαι ἐστι. γέγονε γὰρ ὃ δὲ βουλόμεθα" 33 are Hermogenes' 
last thoughts on this type of schema.

33 Hermogenes, "περὶ μεθόδου διενότητος," 438.9-12 Rabe.
The underlying question in this case is also found in advanced rhetorical exercises such as thesis, controversia and suasoria. This type of declamation, popular in the Roman era, often contains an issue which includes a kind of dilemma. The idea seems to have fascinated the ancients; that is why such exercises were abundant in ancient rhetorical schools: as Bonner (1949) has put it, "the more critical the dilemma, the better the chance of a good debate." The deeper issue at question here is the following dilemma: should a man who is head of a state follow the traditions and the laws of the country or should he put above all this his personal interest in certain circumstances. If, more specifically, by following the customs of his country, which he is supposed to be the first to safeguard, its leader destroys his only chance of blood succession, what should he do? Another controversial topic is the complex situation in which a man is going to sacrifice his daughter to the gods who have returned her to him after long adventures.

Questions such as Hydaspes' dilemma were attractive possibly because of the "intellectual strain" they put on people's minds. They were popular because it is interesting to see how the rhetor is going to extricate himself from this complicated situation through speech, especially in a society where rhetorical training is a basic element of the educational system. Trying to answer a question for which there is no right answer on a theoretical level is a challenge. One side or the other must be compromised. The question of what is right and what is wrong is not the objective of rhetoric. In rhetoric the main question is how one can convince others that any side chosen is right or wrong.

---

34 Thesis is a preliminary exercise; the student should express his views on a general question, for example: "should one marry?"; "in a thesis much may be said on both sides" (Clark (1957) p. 180); see Theon, Prog. 12 (120.12 - 128.21 Spengel), Hermogenes, Prog. 11 (24.1 - 26.9 Rabe), Aphthonios, Prog. 13 (41.12 - 46.18 Rabe), and Nikolaos, Prog. (71.1 - 76.23 Felten).

35 See p. 193, notes 1 and 2; also 194f. and 213ff.

36 Bonner (1949) p. 9; see also p. 6ff. where there is a discussion of several other "dilemmas" which became subject of rhetorical speeches.

In their introduction to the chapter on the “Educational training” the editors of the book *Readings from Classical Rhetoric*¹ point out that rhetorical exercises not only helped people speak persuasively in front of an audience but also taught them “the fundamentals of literary composition.”² Their view that “in much of the Greek and Roman literature of the Christian era one finds structural units that resemble the rhetorical exercises set forth in the *progymnasmata*³ is particularly true in the case of the ancient novel. As they have rightly noted in the case of the novel, there should be “awareness of such *progymnasmatic* techniques on the part of the modern student.”⁴ There are, indeed, *progymnasmatic* features and (often) real echoes of declamation themes which have been adapted and incorporated in the novels. The most suitable audience to appreciate this would be the ancient “readers” who were familiar with them through their education.⁵ The modern reader, however, often fails to do so and this leads to incomplete interpretations and very often to unsatisfactorily answered questions.

In Heliodoros’ book eight we find the scene of the debate between Thyamis and Arsake (3 - 5, 4). When Thyamis - Kalasiris’ son - had overseen his father’s funeral and all the other necessary procedures, he was free again according to “the rule of his office”⁶ to come into contact with other people. As soon as he found out that the young people were in the palace, he went to Arsake to ask her to let the two strangers go with him. The whole scene of asking the youngsters back contains legal terminology and rhetorical techniques and betrays a good rhetorical background.

Thyamis’ first speech (8, 3, 5) is given briefly in an indirect way and can be partially reconstructed by Arsake’s reply (8, 3, 6). Simply put, he demands the return of the two youngsters, according to his father’s will who had asked him to

---

³ *Ibid.* p. 251  
take care of the two young people as much as he could. He does not fail to express appreciation and gratitude for the fact that Arsake has been so kind at a time when he could not accommodate his friends. In the end, however, he makes clear that he has the right to demand the return of his guests: “δικαιών δὲ ἀνακομίζεσθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ παρακαταθήκην” (8, 3, 5).

The idea of the son who loses his “inheritance” to another person and then claims it back is a frequent theme used in rhetorical schools. In a similar way, Thyamis has been unjustly treated by his brother who took his priestly office; trouble between brothers is a theme frequently found in rhetorical exercises.*

In reply Arsake uses suitable legalistic language: “θαμμαξὼ σοι χρηστὰ μὲν ἡμῖν καὶ φιλάνθρωπα προσμαρτυροῦντος ἀπανθρωπίαν δὲ ἀκραίς καταγινώσκοντος . . .” (8, 3, 6). She mentions that it is strange that Thyamis implies that she cannot or does not want to provide “τὰ πρέποντα” for the strangers.

Thyamis’ second speech tries to dissolve this misunderstanding; on the contrary, Thyamis claims, Arsake would be able to give the strangers more than she should if they wanted to stay with her (εἰ καὶ μένειν βουλομένους ἢ; 8, 3, 7). Thyamis’ first important point is that he received as a part of the “inheritance” from his father the order that he should help the youngsters return to their country (ἐμὲ κληρονόμον ὁ πατὴρ καταλέλοιπε; 8, 3, 7). His last point is that he has a number of rights over his guests apart from friendship that Arsake cannot claim she has (δέντων μοι καὶ ἄλλων φιλίας πρὸς τοὺς ξένους δικαιωμάτων; 8, 3, 7).

Arsake picks up Thyamis’ points easily and knows how to use matching legalistic language. She reacts in the same way as an advocate would do: you did very well to leave out your first argument which has to do with “τὰ πρέποντα” for the strangers, she claims. Now having been defeated in your first part, you are turning your argumentation to your formal legal rights, she seems to claim: “τὸ δικαίων προβαλλόμενος” (8, 3, 8). That is all very good but it favours my side more than yours. I should be using this argument because I have in the

7 See 8, 3, 5: “ὁ πατὴρ Καλάσιος τελευτῶν ἐπέσχετε παντοῖος προνοεῖν καὶ ἀπερισταῖν τῶν ξένων.”
8 See, for example, Sen. Contr. 7.1 which contains striking thematic resemblance in parts with the case of Thyamis, thus being a good indication that the Thyamis-figure stems from some rhetorical source. In this controversia, after a serious family crisis one of the two sons “drifted into the hands of pirates, and became a pirate chief.”
meantime become their owner, and ownership (τὸ δεσποτεύειν) is stronger than simple care (προνοεῖν). And then she reminds him of the law of war (πολέμου νόμῳ) according to which “in war the prisoners become slaves.” This is a technique well known technique to rhetoricians: when there is no other way of refuting your opponent’s arguments – here based on τὸ δίκαιον - you present the situation as being an exception to the case made by the opponent and you defuse his claims (μετάληψις).

Instead of conceding defeat, Thyamis takes Arsake’s claims into more technicalities. He claims that the law is acceptable but there is a question of interpretation of this law. There is no war now; we actually live in peace. Therefore, you must set them free. Besides, to make people slaves is something a tyrant would do while the opposite is the act of a king. The difference of peace and war does not exist only in name but in the way we use them in reality. If you base your interpretation of δίκαιον on that, you will be closer to truth (τὸ μὲν δίκαιον τούτοις θεμελένη βέλτιον ἀν φανεῖς ὀριζομένη: 8, 4, 2).

As far as the other two important headings in a rhetorical speech are concerned - namely τὸ πρέπον and τὸ συμφέρον – “we need not debate; there is no way that you can show that you may be acting rightly or in your own interest by showing excessive protection for the young strangers.” By this he implies that Arsake may have a motive behind her claim which Thyamis indirectly acknowledges that he is aware of.

The most interesting part of the debate is the last one when Arsake is defeated in her arguments and loses her temper. This happens when she realises that there is no way she can win her case by answering Thyamis’ rhetoric. She rather chooses to go on the offensive. First, she accuses Thyamis of participating in the killing of Mitranes (ἀντικατηγόρα) and claims that one day her husband will make him pay for this (δίκην εἰσπράξεται; 8, 5, 2). Then she reveals her decision to keep the strangers as her slaves and after a while to send them to her brother, the Great King, according to Persian law (κατὰ νόμον τὸν Περσικόν; 8, 5, 2); her

---

9 Hermogenes, *On issues*, 48.10-49.6 (Rabe).
10 ἀντικατηγόρα, i.e. “head in which it is maintained that a given act is legitimate in itself”; it is refuted by its opposite μετάληψις i.e. we accept “the legitimacy of an act in itself” but we dispute “its legitimacy in the given circumstances”; see Heath (1995) pp. 251 and 257.
concluding thought is: "πρὸς ταῦτα ὀπτόρευε καὶ δίκαια καὶ πρόστοντα καὶ συμφέροντα μάτην ὀμισχόμενος ..." (8, 5, 3).

In this way she reveals that she is well aware that Thyamis is using rhetorical technicalities on a high level. Thyamis' first (indirect) speech (8, 3, 5) is actually based on the heading "τὸ δίκαιον." Arsake's reply (8, 3, 6) is based on the heading "τὸ πρόστον." In Thyamis' second speech (8, 3, 7) it is made clear that he does not contest in terms of "τὸ πρόστον" but in terms of "τὸ δίκαιον." Next Arsake (8, 3, 8) claims openly that she has the legal right to keep the strangers and thus she introduces the heading "τὸ νόμιμον." Then in 8, 4, 1-2 Thyamis refutes the heading "τὸ νόμιμον" according to certain established rhetorical rules found in handbooks (see below). In the end, Arsake (5, 2-3) reveals the whole plan and claims that rhetoric is not valid when there is no democratic rule.

The debate reveals that both speakers have had a very good rhetorical background. They go to such technicalities to prove their case; the whole debate seems more of an academic confrontation between experienced orators than a private discussion, because it is directed by a certain number of topics well known through a number of rhetorical treatises. These are called "τελικὰ κεφάλαια"; it is "a system of arguments," which is used to prove one's case; they are general categories which somebody can apply in accordance to his/her specific case. In them the speaker can find material to generate a body of arguments. Having in mind his/her final aim, e.g. "τὸ δίκαιον," the speaker tries to use every possible argument to achieve the effect of the heading in question. They are mainly used in deliberative speeches but they can also be used in judicial speeches or other debates. Thyamis and Arsake are presented as capable speakers, who both put their case forward in a convincing way and appreciate the basis of the arguments of their opponent.

The number of τελικὰ κεφάλαια varies from rhetorician to rhetorician: they vary from four to seven or even more. However, one can say that νόμιμον, δίκαιον, συμφέρον, δυνατὸν and πρόστον are included in more or less every common system of arguments. In 8, 4, 1-2 Thyamis refutes the heading "τὸ νόμιμον" using a system of arguments known through a number of rhetorical treatises. These are called "τελικὰ κεφάλαια"; it is "a system of arguments," which is used to prove one's case; they are general categories which somebody can apply in accordance to his/her specific case. In them the speaker can find material to generate a body of arguments. Having in mind his/her final aim, e.g. "τὸ δίκαιον," the speaker tries to use every possible argument to achieve the effect of the heading in question. They are mainly used in deliberative speeches but they can also be used in judicial speeches or other debates. Thyamis and Arsake are presented as capable speakers, who both put their case forward in a convincing way and appreciate the basis of the arguments of their opponent.

The number of τελικὰ κεφάλαια varies from rhetorician to rhetorician: they vary from four to seven or even more. However, one can say that νόμιμον, δίκαιον, συμφέρον, δυνατὸν and πρόστον are included in more or less every

---

12 See also p. 36f.
discussion of τελικὰ κεφάλαια.\textsuperscript{14} Usually in γένος δικανικῶν, the aim (τέλος) is δίκαιον and ἀδίκον, in γένος συμβουλευτικῶν it is συμφέρον and βλαβερόν, and in ἐπιδεικτικῶν it is τὸ καλὸν and τὸ αἰσχρὸν.\textsuperscript{15} This is how a rhetor works on his case. First he has to distinguish the question at issue (στάσις); after this he has to find which “headings” (κεφάλαια) belong to this case (issue) and choose which of them are the most appropriate for it; τελικὰ κεφάλαια are a section in the headings department.

The treatise of Apsines,\textsuperscript{16} written in the first half of the third century, gives five or six such headings:

Esti de taìta (sc. tà τελικὰ κεφ.), νόμιμον, δίκαιον, συμφέρον, ἐνδοξόν, δυνατὸν, εἰ βούλει σαφῆς πρὸς τούτοις.\textsuperscript{17}

On νόμιμον he goes through a number of cases in which one could use this heading and also how one can attack a law:

ei de tôn nómiou mē diábetaiōn, φαίνησθαι δ’ oútō δυνατόν εἶναι αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ παρόντι χρήσασθαι ἢ ἐκ διανοίας αὐτόν ἔξετάσαις, ὅτι σύν ἐπὶ τούτοις γέγραπται, ἢ κατ’ ἀντιπαράστασιν κεφαλαίου.\textsuperscript{18}

What else does Thyamis do when Arsake claims that according to war law prisoners become slaves in wartime? Thyamis does not attack the law but he argues that the law cannot be applied in this particular case (8, 4, 1-2).

The debate between Arsake and Thyamis is very interesting from the rhetorical point of view. First of all, it echoes declamation themes.\textsuperscript{19} The son who has to sort out his inheritance after his father dies finds it hard to recover what belongs to him; it is a debate between a priest in office and political authority; who is entitled to host the two youngsters? The person who undertook to help them return home or the representative of the authority who seemingly applies the law (although we know that she has other motives)?

Although we are concerned with private speeches, the case is laid within the boundaries of a judicial and a deliberative speech. However, the way it is

\textsuperscript{14} See Prisc. Praex 6 and 11 (in Keil H. (1961) Grammatici Latinī (vol. 3) Hildesheim; Hermogenes Prog. 11, Prog. 6; Aps. Rhet. 11, Aphth. Prog. 13; and 7; Nik. Prog. 7, etc.
\textsuperscript{16} Dilts-Kennedy eds. (1997); Spengel-Roemer eds. (1885) 217-339.
\textsuperscript{17} *Ibid.* p. 184, ch. 9, 1; Spengel-Roemer eds. (1885) I, p. 291, 9-10.
\textsuperscript{18} Aps. in Dilts-Kennedy eds. (1997) p. 186 parag. 9; Spengel-Roemer eds. (1885) I p. 293. 5-9.
\textsuperscript{19} See p. 155, note 8.
presented recalls a debate of a judicial nature where both speakers show deep knowledge of the rhetorical techniques of τελικά κεφάλαια. The whole debate shows an artful implementation of this system of argumentation. The actual terms are there; the speakers and the educated audience are aware of what is going on. Both speakers are extremely confident and successful in decoding the technical terminology and know exactly how to react and reverse them appropriately in each case. They seem to have worked extensively on the rhetorical training of invention and they do not lack any of the abilities in the rhetorical art.

This particular extract provides evidence of how well the author knows the art of rhetoric, what impact this has had on his work, and how rhetorical technicalities have permeated the novel in general.
CHAPTER 4: THE FRAGMENTS
The fragments\(^1\) of the Greek novel: a brief overview of their rhetorical dimension.

A considerable number of fragments of several lost novels came down to us, mainly written on papyri. By studying several samples of novels representing a broad chronological spectrum we can come to conclusions which are based on a wider range of evidence.

In respect of our exploration, namely the question of the extent of the impact of rhetoric on the novel and its sources, it is useful to evaluate all these scraps of lost novels from a rhetorical point of view. We are going to explore any possible connection between the fragments and rhetoric; whether, for example, there are any rhetorical scenes, such as debates inviting rhetorical treatment as we find in the complete novels (such as the debate at the end of the second book in Achilleus Tatios), use of rhetorical techniques, rhetorical structuring of speeches, etc. Was rhetoric extensively used by most, if not all, ancient novelists or was it only a peculiarity to certain individual authors? Is there a sub-category of novels with extensively applied rhetoric or is rhetoric a main characteristic of the genre that links together all the novels?

The evidence that we have today clearly shows that rhetoric is extensively present in many of the surviving fragments. An interesting fact associated with this is that very often scholars have real difficulties in telling apart a rhetorical fragment that belongs to a novel from another that belongs to a real speech. The number of the fragments that were regarded as novels in the first place and then turned out to be pieces of orations must have embarrassed -we suppose- quite a number of scholars both in our days and in the past. Here are some examples.\(^2\) P. Hamb. 134 was suspected, among others, to be a fragment of a romance but was later found to be a rhetorical exercise.\(^3\) Another fragment published by M. Norsa\(^4\) in 1920 was regarded by Lavagnini as a piece of a lost novel; it is now regarded as a rhetorical exercise. P. Oxy. 6.868 was thought to belong to a novel;

---

1 Unless otherwise specified, for the text and line numbers of the fragments quoted in this chapter see Stephens - Winkler eds. (1995).
2 For these fragments, see ibid p. 469 ff. “Appendix A. Also known as Romance.”
3 Ibid p. 469.
now it is considered that it could equally well belong to history or oratory. P. Mich. Inv. 3793 was regarded as romance; now it is suggested that it “is more likely to be mime or a fable or even a declamatory exercise.” P. Harris 23 can also belong to a history or rhetorical exercise although it was assigned to romance in the first place, and the same is true of P. Harris 18. In fact, one can argue extensively about some of the fragments as to whether they belong to one genre or another. Nevertheless, the dispute between rhetoric and the novel over which fragment belongs to which genre cannot be easily settled unless we have some further evidence; our investigation of certain fragments of ancient Greek novels is thought to help in this direction; it is hoped that such a treatment may help establish firmer criteria upon which we can base our final opinion of the uncertain fragments. At the moment it should be kept in mind that rhetoric and novel are easily confused due to the rhetorical nature of the latter.

The editors of the book Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments, have rightly noticed about Iamblichos’ Babyloniaka, for instance, that “the longer fragments display the habits of Greek rhetorical training, and would not disgrace more classical writers.” In their introduction they express surprise at the extensive application of rules of ancient rhetoric and “highly artificial conventions” in the fragments of the novels. The fragments which are most suitable to investigation for the form and the degree of the rhetorical factor are the following:

**NINOS**

Columns A. I - IV:

In the speech to his aunt Ninos shows remarkable rhetorical ability. The speech can be divided to separate units as follows:

---

8 *Ibid.* p. 188.
10 "The long speech of Ninos to his aunt Derkeia (A.II-IV) is an elaborate display of rhetorical style and compositional finesse" (*Ibid.*, p. 23).
11 As indeed many heroes of other novels; see p. 29ff. and esp. p. 35ff.
1) The speaker’s previous conduct; the speaker states his view “εὖορχήσας . . . ἀνεψάς” (A.I 37- A.II 4) and supports it in what follows (5-17). He claims that he has kept his oath and that he can prove (τεκμηριώσομαι) that he has kept his chastity despite numerous temptations.

2) His second argument is developed in lines 17-35. He admits that he is defeated by Aphrodite and his maturing age, providing examples from other similar cases as supporting evidence for his claims.

3) A.II 36 - A.III 10: his third point is a commonplace in rhetoric; he develops the physis - nomos argument where physis is right while nomos can be changed or ignored: “ἡ φύσις τῶν τοιούτων συνόδων κάλλιστος ἐστι νόμος.”

4) A.III 11 - 26: the argument from “Τύχη”; we do not know what “Τύχη” has in store for us. If we wait any longer I might not be alive since as a soldier I am dealing with dangerous situations. He does not neglect referring to his bravery.

5) A.III 26-36: Repeated rhetorical appeals which function as recapitulation of the previous arguments.

6) A.III 36-A.IV 13: The reasons why Ninos is not inhibited by shame when speaking of these matters to his aunt and his reassurance that only good can come out of this.

The speech has a good internal coherence but does not seem to follow the traditional rhetorical divisions in great detail, possibly because of its private nature. Otherwise, it is well organised and delivered. The arguments are carefully selected and supported. There is a great degree of rhetorical awareness in the creation of this speech. As Stephens-Winkler have rightly noticed, “the speech (as well as that at B.I 12 ff.) contains many rhetorical questions and third-person imperatives.” Also in A.III 3-IV. 5 there is an interesting repetition

---

12 See also Hydaspes’ speech (Heliodoros 10, 16, 7) on p. 151, where we find the same argument.
of ἀναιδῆς (3 times) which is the accusation which Ninos tries to refute. There is use of *anaphora* in Ninos’ urges in lines 26-28 (σπευσάτω).

In sharp contrast to this speaker, who is presented employing rhetoric, comes the maiden’s description; the girl is presented as not particularly eloquent; she has lived most of her life in the women’s room and so she is not familiar with suitable speeches (ἐντρέπεται λόγους column A.IV). Therefore, we have here an inexperienced speaker who fails to make a speech in the end; on the other side, there is Thambe who seems to be a more skilled speaker; this is her speech addressed to the young girl (column A.V):

"Ἄπαντος," ἔφη, "μοι λόγου κάλλιον ἡ σωπή διαλέγεται, μή τι μέμφη τὸν ἐμὸν νῦόν; οὐδὲν μὲν γὰρ τετόληκεν οὐδὲ θραύσας ἤμιν ἀπὸ τῶν κατορθωμάτων καὶ τροπαίων ἐπανελθὼν οίκα πολεμιστῆς πεπαρώνηκεν εἰς σέ. τάχα δὲ κοῦκ ἄν ἔσιωπας τοιοῦτον γενομένου. ἄλλα βραδὺς ὁ νόμος τοῖς ἐφωρίοις γάμων. σπεύδει δὲ γαμεῖν ὁ ἐμὸς νῦός. οὐδὲ, διὰ τούτ’ έι κλαίεις, βιοσθήναι σε δεῖ."  

The discussion is continued with further speeches which unfortunately are lost. Derkeia speaks to her sister and tries to settle the problem. The part which survives can only let us guess at the possible rhetorical quality of the speech which follows, if we suppose that the speech was in a similar style. The beginning is an indication that it is.

Immediately after Ninos’ speech we have the opportunity to acquire some information about eloquence in the female world (A.IV 20ff.). The girl cannot show any kind of ability in public speech: 

"τῇ κόρῃ δ’ ἐν ὀμοίοις πάθεσιν οὐχ ὀμοία παροφορία τῶν λόγων ἦν πρὸς τὴν Θάμβην (A.IV 20-23). As elaborated shortly after, it is not only the subject of the speech (τὸ πάθος) that prevents the girl from speaking but also her way of life typical of the girls of her age (A.IV 23-26). The author makes a strong scene in presenting the girl’s emotional reactions. With the juxtaposition of the female and male world and the emphasis on the girl’s emotions, the author indirectly emphasises the girl’s chastity. She is
not used to too much social contact, which at the time was regarded as a virtue for girls and the heroines of novels.\(^\text{14}\)

In the very little that survives from the Ninos romance, we are lucky enough to find considerable rhetorical elements. Firstly, we have speeches that follow certain rhetorical principles.\(^\text{15}\) Secondly, the central question in discussion is “should a young man marry a very young - even for that time - girl?” which more precisely is “should the 17 year old Ninos get married to his 13 year old cousin?” The issue is related to declamation themes which we come across very often in rhetorical education.\(^\text{16}\) Thirdly, the amount of rhetoric is quite high even in these early samples of novel; slightly more than 34% of what survives is speeches and in two cases we have got only the beginning of a speech (A.I, B.III). Although a sample of a very early novel, \textit{Ninos} shows a strong inclination to oratory.

\textbf{METIOCHOS AND PARTHENOPE}\(^\text{17}\) is another novel which gives us evidence of some kind of extensive speeches. First, at the beginning of the fragment (col. I, line 2) the king speaks to Metiochos: “τίς εἶπεν, “ὁ [φιλός, δύνατ' ἐν περὶ τούτου δικάσων;”\(^\text{18}\) if this is correct then we are faced with another declamation theme or an issue associated possibly with Metiochos’ previous life.

\(^{14}\) The skilful description of the girl’s awkwardness characterises her as an inexperienced speaker. The narrator says that the girl could not find the right words to express herself and would stop before starting (28-29 ff.) and her emotional state is manifested in her face (καὶ ἤσθεραίνοντο μὲν αἱ παρευα πρὸς τὴν αἱδώ τῶν λόγων, 35-37), etc. The whole picture of the girl’s behaviour is opposed to that of Ninos. The overwhelming emotional state is further enhanced by the embarrassing subject but when this is taken out and the analogies kept, then the description could fit the psychological state of any speaker/orator in his “debut.” This is another indication that the author has a very clear idea - from first hand experience? - of the psychology of the inexperienced speaker.

\(^{15}\) The introduction is drawn from the character of the speaker. Ninos tries to explain what the \textit{Ad Herennium} recommends in detail: “from the discussion of our own person we shall secure goodwill by praising our services without arrogance and revealing also our past conduct toward the republic, or toward our parents, friends, of the audience, . . . [\textit{Ab nostra persona benevolentiam contra hemus si nostrum officium sine adrogantia laudabimus, atque in rem publicam quales fuerimus, aut in parentes, aut in amicos, aut in eos qui audiunt aperiemus}] \textit{Ad Her.} I. v. 8. Furthermore, the speech contains rhetorical questions, the topoi of \textit{nomos} and \textit{physis}, \textit{tyche}, carefully developed arguments, the use of historical-mythological example, repetitions and appeals, etc.

\(^{16}\) See Bonner (1949) p. 8f.

\(^{17}\) For the text and line number see Stephens – Winkler eds. (1995).

Second, in column II Metiochos makes a speech on the nature of Eros\textsuperscript{19} which can be compared with speeches of similar content in Achilles Tatios, for instance 1, 10 (see also 1, 16-18).

In lines 37-38, Metiochos' first remarks, given in an indirect way by the narrator, contain a characteristic rhetorical trick: "\textit{ύποτιμησάμενος τὸ ἔχειν λόγον εἰκότα (Maehl.) ἢ μάθησιν πρέπουσαν τῇ τοιούτῃ διαλέξει (Merk.).}" It fits exactly the advice given in rhetorical handbooks that one should hide one's art to be more successful.\textsuperscript{20} When seen in retrospect this is clearly distinguishable; the speech that follows requires and presents both plausible arguments and specialised knowledge of the topic. His definition of love at the end is competent enough to render his initial statement invalid. But when it is presented it is so remote (in terms of time) that the audience does not notice it.

The speech is very well organised and structured in a professional way. It consists of an introduction (introductory sentence: "βουμολόχοι μὲν," εἶπεν, "ἀ[παντες] (ἀποφθέγματα) παυδείας ἀνθιστανταῖς ἀφοτε[ρομα]ντος μουθ[ο]γαίος ἐπαρχολοθοθούντος"); a statement of facts: "ὡς ἐστὶν [ό ἴδιος . . . τυρώσθει]; the proof: "γελως δὲ ἔν εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτον πρώτον μὲν[ . . . οὖν θε[ο]φορήτοις];" and finally, the conclusion with his definition of Eros.

Unfortunately, Parthenope's reply has not survived, but as far as we can estimate from the beginning it might have been of the same quality as the immediately preceding speech. The little that has survived, however, suggests that the whole question is a declamation theme. It is clearly recognised as such by the narrator who calls it "ζήτησε." Now "ζήτησα" or "ζήτησες" is the term used by rhetoricians to refer to declamation, while "λόγος" (see line 63) is a single speech, a declamation. If the Metiochos-novel is one of the earliest examples of novel we have today, then we are certainly speaking about one of the first declamatory speeches found in the genre. This means that declamation or rhetoric in general is present in this genre right from the very first stages in its development.

\textsuperscript{19} See the lines 39-62: "βουμολόχοι μὲν . . . ὑπὸ συναφείας αὐξήμενον."
The whole scene is presented in a form of symposium (?) where the king, Anaximenes the philosopher, Metiochos and Parthenope take part. It is clear then that ἐν τῷ φιλοσόφῳ ζήτησις has more to do with eloquence than with a philosophical question. The whole ζήτησις is a declamation theme, a debate where the most eloquent speaker wins.

In the 11th century Persian poem based on this novel, Parthenope was raised “as if she were a son; trained in warfare and in eloquence.” In the same poem Wamiq (the Persian version of Metiochos) is invited by Polykrates to a party where the king intends to test Wamiq’s ability in speech; that’s why he organises a “debate” with love as a subject. Although there are some differences in the speeches on Eros - Metiochos takes an untraditional view while Wamiq supports the “old Eros” view, which Stephens-Winkler assume that “in Persian cultural terms” it would be the traditional view - there are analogies in general structure and details which make the Persian poem a good source of information for the lost Greek novel.

Parthenope is not less eloquent than Charikleia in Heliodoros, who saves her and Theagenes’ life at the end of the novel, nor less capable than other heroines of the ancient novels. Metiochos has presented the rational side of love. He has scorned the “romantic” image which is dominant in poetry and, of course, other novels. His innovative view is more difficult to accept, because the old idea is still active. That is why he tries to ridicule the traditional view. On the other side, Parthenope supports the conventional view; she simply rehearses the old arguments which support the concept of the “winged god.” On this basis we can assume that her speech would be conventional in terms of content; now whether the style followed this line is not so certain. In her introduction she seems very confident; one does not get the sense that she talks in front of an audience for the

20 See Ad Her. IV. vii. 10 and Caplan (1954) pp. 250-251, note a, where there is a detailed list of other references on the same issue.
22 Ibid. p. 76.
23 Ibid. pp. 74-76.
first time. Her introduction corresponds to Metiochos' introduction.²⁴ We might perhaps expect a contrast in style to go along with the opposition in content. Further evidence from the later source - the 11th century Persian verse romance - allows us to believe that "Parthenope speaks here as one already skilled in traditional male public discourse, not as a shy and tongue-tied miss normally confined to the women's quarters."²⁵

IAMBlichos

As mentioned earlier,²⁶ Iamblichos' novel is extremely interesting in terms of its rhetorical dimension. Photios' report attests at least one trial scene. It is the part when Euphrates is taken for Rhodanes and is arrested. He then undergoes a thorough interrogation and trial.²⁷ The most interesting piece, however, is fragment 35 which is about a man who accuses his slave of adultery with his wife. The speech is delivered before a judge who is a king; according to Stephens-Winkler the judge could be Garmos or Bokchoris (an Egyptian king).²⁸

Fragment 35:²⁹

Δεσπότης δούλου κατηγορεῖ ἐπὶ μοιχεία τῆς οἰκείας γαμετῆς ἐξηγησαμένης, ώς ὄναρ τούτω ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερῷ ἐμιγη.

This speech is delivered before the king who is acting as a judge. The whole speech is based on paradox and antithesis, common topics in the rhetorical speeches. It starts with a negative statement "ὅτι μὲν οὐδεὶς ἄν ἔκὼν ἐπὶ τοιαύτην δίκην ἔλθοι . . . οὐκ ἔστιν δότις οὐκ ἄν συνομολογηθεί μοι" which makes a strong impression as in Lysias "ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου" (24.1): "οὐ πολλοῦ

²⁴ Compare "βομμολόχοι μὲν," εἴπεν, "ο[παντες] δο[σι] τῆς ἀληθοῦς παρείας ἀμήντου ἀρχηγοτάτου μνημολογήσω ἐπακολουθοῦσα" (Metiochos) with "κενός ὁ τοῦ ἔκειν λήρος καὶ οὐ δοκεῖ μοι ὅτι ἤμιν ἐπὶ παρείας θύραν" (Parthenope).
²⁶ See p. 162.
²⁸ Ibid. p. 228.
²⁹ For the text, see ibid. p. 230f.
δέω χάριν ἔχειν, ὦ βουλή, τῷ κατηγόρῳ, ὅτι μοι παρέσχεύσας τὸν ἀγώνα τοὺτονί..."30

The whole speech can be divided as follows:
1-8: "Ὅτι... νικήσας": introduction; his unwillingness to come to trial is won over by distressing truth; the contradictory nature of the case: both winner and loser lose. He is in an impossible situation.
8-17: the accusation: adultery; particulars: committed with his slave.
17-21: the prosecutor’s appeal.
21-43: the husband praises the adulterer. This part is more epideictic than forensic and is reminiscent of the enkomion of Helen.
43-49: the evidence: his suspicions on different occasions.
50-52: (contains a lacuna) ways of possible immediate punishment.
53-57: the dream itself is the strongest argument that she is adulterous.
57-63: apostrophes: the peak of the antithetical structure.

The speech is an artistic example of rhetoric. It is a model speech of antithesis. The topic recalls similar occasions for declamation themes. It is not a simple case of adultery. The speaker must convince the judge/his audience that his wife has committed adultery in her dream! The paradoxical nature of the case is more suitable for a school exercise than a real life situation. Similar impossible cases were often given to students of oratory in order to see how they would defend their case. Stephens and Winkler try to explain the connection between trials and dreams in realistic terms, giving an example from Tacitus Ann. 11.4 where two soldiers get the death penalty because one of them had seen a bad omen for Claudius in a dream. This is possibly true, if we take into account the mental state of the emperor! The case is rather similar to the example given by Sopatros31 where a man sees in his dream the secrets of a mystery and then is tried for impiety. This is more like the case here; a simple investigation through the limited number of declamation themes extant today can reveal similar

---

30 See also other similarly impressive beginnings in Lysias 3.1; 12.1; 20.1; 23.1; 31.1; 32.1, etc.
impossible cases which were presented for educational purposes or for their inherent intellectual challenge and entertaining qualities.

**Fragment 61** is an undisputedly Lamblichan piece of the novel. It contains a long speech made by Saronis after she witnesses that her Rhodanes kisses the farmer’s daughter. Saronis in her speech (1-7) claims that Rhodanes does not love her any more. After that she runs into the house to kill the young girl but Soraichos tries to dissuade her with his speech which contains argumentative and emotional language. Soraichos’ speech is an advisory speech to Saronis (deliberative).

The fragment contains a jealousy scene expected on such occasions (as in other novels, see Chariton: Chaireas (p. 45f.); Achilles Tatios (5, 18ff.): Leukippe, when she hears about Kleitophon and Melite’s “marriage”; Theagenes in Heliodoros, when he hears Charikleia’s speech to Thyamis (1, 21 - 22; p. 138ff., esp. p. 141) in which she agrees to marry him, etc.).

From the few extended speeches which survive we realise that the author is quite experienced in rhetoric and familiar with declamation themes. Based on this evidence the *scholion* in Photios that “he worked hard practising Greek too, so as to be an accomplished rhetor” is credible.

**Antheia**

In the fragment “Antheia” there is an indication of a trial procedure which has taken place somewhere earlier in the story. In the small fragment which survives today there is a speaker who claims that an ἀπολογία has been made for many murders (col. I, lines 15-16; Stephens-Winkler p. 280). Whether we should take it as a formal defence speech over a certain accusation is not certain. However, it

---

32 See, for example, Seneca, *Contr.* VII, 8; VIII, 6; IX, 1, etc.
34 Stephens-Winkler *ibid.* p. 235.
36 Fragment 101 (*ibid.* p. 243f.) is a very interesting piece of rhetoric which contains a formal speech made by mercenaries in a court before the Amphiktyonic Council, but it does not belong to Lamblichos’ novel: “Μισθοφόροι τῶν πολεμίων ἐπήγαγον, καὶ ἀπαιτοῦσι τῶν μισθῶν παρ’ Ἀμφικτύων δικαζόμενοι.” See also Borgogno (1973) pp. 127-128; I owe this reference to Dr. J. Morgan.
is a piece of information which we should keep in mind when estimating the scope for rhetoric in the novel. The author does not seem to avoid direct speech, anyway; instead, based on the fragments we have today we can say that the novel might have contained a lot of direct speech.

*Daulis* is another fragment whose author is extremely aware of rhetorical schemata; in the fragment which we have we can find figures such as hyperbaton, anaphora, rhetorical questions, wordplay and chiastic arrangement.\(^\text{37}\)

In the fragment *Tinoupheis* we have information about a prophet who is condemned for adultery; there is information about the law which refers to adulterers; the case can be compared with Thersandros’ accusation against the priest and his relationship with Leukippe. There is also an allegation that the priest has been involved in similar actions; the law which applies to these cases is also mentioned.\(^\text{38}\)

In conclusion, there is a certain amount of evidence that rhetoric is quite extensively applied in a number of the fragments which have been discovered. It appears, therefore, that rhetoric played an important role in the novel from a very early stage, even before the appearance of the second sophistic movement. The evidence from the surviving novels, however, is not consistently uniform. Although it provides indications that rhetoric may have been an integral part of some of the novels which are represented in the fragments, the possibility still exists that there may have been significant differences within the tradition throughout the existence of the genre. Furthermore, we should keep in mind that a novel that might have contained significant rhetorical features may not show them in the short surviving fragments and, of course, this is true of the opposite. At any rate, rhetoric is present in early examples of novels.


\(^{38}\) The small fragment (P. ANT. 18; *ibid* p. 462) called “initiation” seems to be a piece from a direct speech directed to some Triptolemos and scholars are also here confronted with the very often occurring dilemma as to whether it is a fragment of romance or a piece of rhetorical exercise.
Evidence of classical oratory and rhetorical features of Roman times in the novel.

Up to now we have explored the relationships of forensic speeches in Chariton, Achilleus Tatios, and Heliodoros with rhetorical theory. As we have seen, there is a certain policy the authors follow in their courtroom speeches, which can be traced to the rhetorical manuals. The question that arises now is whether the novelists were familiar and used material coming directly from classical Greek orators. As our reference point for this issue we take the extensive courtroom speeches of Achilleus Tatios.

This chapter investigates to what degree principles of classical oratory are diffused in the courtroom speeches of Achilleus Tatios' novel. Our knowledge about possible interconnections between these two areas is restricted here to the small sample of forensic oratory which we possess from Achilleus Tatios' novel and also the speeches of classical rhetores which have come down to us. Demosthenes, Lysias and Isokrates are among the most promising orators whose models and ideas seem to exist, in different degrees, in the novel of Achilleus Tatios.

Oddly, it is the earliest orator whose basic rhetorical technique our author seems to echo. Antiphon's speeches concern homicides; especially his tetralogies present a striking similarity in their inner rhetorical technique. Antiphon, as indeed Achilleus Tatios, is conspicuous in using the inner elements of a case in order to prove his point. His principal technique is not to use the facts but to find the inherent details of the case and to build up his arguments. It is probabilities that he is looking for in a trial case and not facts and witnesses. The arguments in the courtroom speeches of Achilleus Tatios' novel are mainly modelled on this kind of sophistry. Almost all speakers and especially Kleinias and Thersandros follow this technique.

Demosthenes is another orator who seems very promising in the discussion of the relationship between Achilleus Tatios and classical rhetoric. Sopatros, the professional rhetor who defends Thersandros, is strongly reminiscent of, if not actually modelled on, the figure of Demosthenes. He is extremely self-confident,
he speaks with great assurance and he is quite assertive. He states from the very beginning with absolute confidence that he is going to establish not only one accusation against Kleitophon but two: "ὅταν οὖν ἀποδείξεω δυσὶ θανάτοις ἔνοχον ὅντα, ..." (8, 10, 2). The same style of speaking we find in Demosthenes. In his Against Onetor, for example, he uses the same language: "ἀποδείξεω γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον τὴν προϊκ' οὐ δεδωκότα, ... ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῖς ἑμοῖς ἐπιβουλεύοντα" (30.4). Besides, there is a special detail in his description that betrays his model. After his introduction the quite experienced looking rhetor is described as making the following gestures: "Ταύτα εἰπὼν καὶ τερατευόμενος καὶ τρύψας τὸ πρόσωπον ... ἔφη" (8, 10, 2). Likewise, Demosthenes is described quite dramatically (but rather sarcastically) by Aischines in his speech On the Embassy: "ἐφ’ ἄπασι δ’ ἡμῖν ἀνώταται τελευταῖος Δημοσθένης, καὶ τερατευόμενος, ὅσπερ εἴωθε, τῷ σχήματι καὶ τρύψας τὴν κεφαλήν ... ἔφη" (2.49). Moreover, Aischines and Lysias are relevant to the investigation of their influence on Achilleus Tatos.

The influence of classical oratory in the introductions of the courtroom speeches in Achilleus Tatos' novel.

The extent of the influence of classical rhetoric in the introductions of the courtroom speeches is quite remarkable. This does not happen - strictly speaking - only in introductory parts of the speeches but also in the introduction to a new issue within the speech. The main common ideas which are shared between real speeches of the classical era and the ones in Achilleus Tatos are the following: i) I will speak briefly, ii) I will tell everything from the beginning, iii) I am sure I will forget certain things, etc.

The idea of the first statement (i) works quite well in those circumstances where judges and audience may be subjected to hearing long speech full of unnecessary details. Therefore, the assurance that this will not happen is a relief and helps attract the audience's interest. In Achilleus Tatos' novel, Kleinias uses this idea

---

1 See Vilborg (1962) pp. 134-135. In his section on "the faults in the use of the hands" (XI, III, 117ff.) Quintilian suggests that such movements indicate nervousness (IX, III, 121) and dismisses the "striking of the forehead" as a "purely theatrical trick" (XI, III, 123; transl. by Butler); see also Schwartz (1998) p. 220.
in his introduction: "ἀ δὲ ἡτύχησε διὰ βραχχών ἔρω" (7, 9, 3). In Demosthenes' Against Stephanos I the speaker makes a similar statement: "ἐξ ἀρχῆς δ' ὡς ἄν οἷς τ' ὁ διὰ βραχυτάτων εἰπεῖν πειράσομαι τὰ πεπραγμένα μοι πρὸς Φορμύωνα" (45.2). In Against Olympiodoros (48.4) he gives the same promise: "ἐστι δὲ βραχὺς ὁ λόγος." Lysias in his speech Against Eratosthenes explains that although the case is very complicated he is going to make as short a speech as possible: "ὁμοιὸς δὲ πειράσασι οὕμας ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὡς ἄν δύνωμαι δι' ἐλαχίστων διδάξαι" (12.3). In another case Lysias promises that he will speak briefly: "ποιήσωμι δὲ τὴν ἀπολογίαν ὡς ἄν δύνωμαι διὰ βραχυτάτων" (Lysias, In defence of Mantitheos; 16.9). Brevity therefore is an idea shared by speakers in Achilleus Tatios and classical orators.²

Stating that you pursue clarity (case ii) in your speech in a trial is quite helpful for the judges who try to understand what has really happened in the case. This is another useful trick in the introduction which is used by many speakers. Kleitophon is one who uses it in his confession to the court; he promises that he is going to say the whole truth: "ἐγὼ δὲ πᾶσαν υμῶν ἔρω τὴν ἀλήθειαν" (7, 7, 3). Lysias in his speech "ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἐρατοσθένους φόνου" makes the same statement: "ἐγὼ τοῖν δὲ ἀρχὰς ὑμῶν ἀπαντα ἐπιδείξω τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πράγματα, οὐδὲν παραλείπων, ἀλλὰ λέγων τάληθ'" (1.5).³

The third case is the one when the speaker gives the impression that he may fail to cover everything he should say about the case, either because he is not a good speaker or because there are so many things which should be mentioned that he may forget (or intentionally avoid) some of them. In his second speech Thersandros makes a similar statement. More specifically, he claims that there are so many offences the adverse party has committed that some of them may escape him (φοβοῦμαι μὴ ἀτελῆς μοι ὁ λόγος γένηται, τῆς τῶν ἄλλων μνήμης τὴν γλῶσσαν ἔργ' ἔκαστον ἐλκούσης; 8, 8, 2). In the same introduction Thersandros asserts that he does not know from where to start his speech and what to say first and what second because the offences are numerous and all

---

² Gabaudan (1987) also deals with this theme in classical oratory and there are some other examples on p. 220ff.
³ Likewise, Antiphon (1. 13) makes a similar statement just before the narrative: "περὶ δὲ τῶν γενομένων πειράσομαι υμῶν διηγήσασθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν."
equally serious. The same idea can be found in many classical speeches as, for example, in Lysias’ Against Eratosthenes. The speech’s very first lines are:

“οὐκ ἄρξσοαι μοι δοκεῖ ἄπορον εἶναι, ὃ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, τῆς κατηγορίας, ἀλλὰ παύσασθαι λέγοντι τοιαύτα αὐτοῖς τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τοσαῦτα τὸ πλῆθος εἰργάστατ, ὥστε μήτε ἂν ψευδόμενον δεινότερα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων κατηγορήσαι, μήτε τάληθη βουλόμενον εἰπεῖν ἄπαντα δύνασθαι” (12.1). Moreover, in Lysias 28.1: “τὰ μὲν κατηγορημένα σὺτώς ἐστὶ πολλὰ καὶ δεινά, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥστε οὐκ ἂν μοι δοκεῖ δύνασθαι Ἐργοκλῆς ύπερ ἕνδε ἐκάστοι τῶν πεπραγμένων αὐτῷ πολλάκις ἀποθανῶν δοῦναι δίκην ἄξιαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πλήθει.”

Thersandros is in a similar puzzle caused by the seriousness and the variety of the offences. He asserts that he does not know where to start: “οὐκ οἶδα τίνος ἄρξομαι λόγου καὶ πόθεν, οὔτε τίνων κατηγορήσω πρῶτον καὶ τίνων δεύτερον” (8, 8, 1). In the same way Gorgias expresses puzzlement as to where to start his speech: “Περί τούτων δὲ πόθεν ἄρξομαι; τί δὲ πρῶτον εἴπω;” In a later stage of his speech De Corona Demosthenes makes a similar statement: “Οὐκ ἄπορος δ’ ὅτι χρῆ περὶ σοῦ καὶ τῶν σῶν εἴπειν, ἄπορος τοῦ πρῶτον μνησθῶ” (18.129). This rhetorical device, therefore, is well known to the orators and in fact it is one of their favourites.

One can find it in different parts of a speech apart from the introduction as, for example, in the epilogue; in Lysias’ Against Alkibiades I, there is an interesting statement: “Εγὼ μὲν οὖν ὡς ἐδυνάμην ἄριστα κατηγορήσαμαι, ἐπιστάμασο δ’ ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι τῶν ἀκρομωμένων θαυμάζουσιν, ὡς ποθ’ οὕτως ἄκριβως ἐδυνήθην ἐξευείην τά τούτων ἀμαρτήματα, οὕτως δέ μου καταγελᾶ, ὅτι οὔτε πολλοστόν μέρος ἔτηκα τῶν τούτων ὑπαρχόντων κακῶν” (14.46). Likewise, in Isokrates’ Evagoras the speaker states that he is not afraid of exaggerating the deeds of Evagoras but he is rather afraid of not rendering them rightly (9.48). Aischines in his distinctive way asks the judges to enquire if they feel that he has missed out something and expresses puzzlement as to where he should start (ἀπορῶ δ’ ὅποθεν χρῆ πρῶτον ἄρξομαι).6

4 Gorgias, Palam., 4.
5 See p. 80, note 14.
6 A similar puzzlement is found in the introduction of the speech; see Aischines, On the Embassy 2.7: “ἀπορῶ δ’ ὅποθεν χρῆ πρῶτον ἄρξομαι.”
Sometimes the speaker, wishing to overstate his self-confidence, makes it clear that he will not only prove his main point but also something more. Sopatros makes such an assertion at the beginning of his speech: “οταν οὖν ἀποδείξω δυοὶ θεαντοίς ἐνοχὸν δνικ.” (8, 10, 2). Demosthenes in his speech *Against Onetor* claims that he will prove not only that Onetor has never given money to Demosthenes but also that he has been treating him unfairly for a long time “ἀποδείξῳ χὰρ αὐτὸν οὐ μόνον . . . ἄλλα καὶ” (30.4). Isokrates makes a similar statement: “ἀποδείξῳ δὲ Καλλίμαχον οὐ μόνον παρὰ τὰς συνθῆκας δικαζόμενον, ἄλλα καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ψευδόμενον, καὶ προσέτι . . .”7

This is, therefore, another common element shared by Achilleus Tatios and classical orators.

**Character and its role in the process of persuasion.**

In many speeches of classical orators the speakers are preoccupied with the matter of character and morality. They often try to prove the truthfulness of their side by presenting the immaculate character of the person they defend (and vice versa). On the other hand, a speaker may try to prove his points by “revealing” the real character of the adverse party and showing that his opponent is a man of poor morality, a totally unreliable person. This is common practice in the trial with which we are dealing, as it is indeed with trials from classical antiquity. The speaker is not only interested in the facts of his case but tries to make an attack on the whole life of his opponent. This trick is useful, as bad rumours about a person are more easily accepted than good ones.

There are many ways in which a character of a person can be presented in a trial; there are at least four:

i) you can give specific examples of one’s actions in order to illuminate your point;

ii) you can attack a person with specific accusations about the quality of his character;

iii) you can go back to his previous life and reveal some kind of insolent behaviour which people do not seem to remember or even know;

---

7 Isokrates, *Against Kallimachos*, 18. 4.
iv) when all these fail or you do not want to waste too much time trying uncertain methods, you can use a more powerful resource: accusation of sexual perversion, using illuminating examples if possible.

As we saw earlier, in Tatos' trial scene some of the above techniques are used by various speakers. It is interesting to notice that the fewer arguments or pieces of evidence one has, the more one turns to such areas to prove a point; this policy can also be used by a speaker with quite strong arguments in order to make sure that he will convince even the most awkward judge.

The use of character exposition in the process of proving a point is used more intensively in the second part of the trial (book 8). Here are some examples; when Thersandros realises that Kleitophon and Leukippe are protected by a local priest, he applies for a new trial where he complains that the law has not been imposed; even the convicted Kleitophon is still free and enjoys every right an innocent citizen can have. He blames the priest for this violation of the law, because, as he argues, instead of staying away from criminals the priest is protecting them. This is an act that shows the priest's real character and his attitude towards law and order; he disdains them. However, the same accusation is made against Thersandros by the priest; he wonders where Thersandros found the right to imprison Kleitophon in his house in the first place; there is no law which says that private individuals have the right to judge and punish people for their deeds. The same kind of argumentation is also used by Sopatros, one of the professional rhetors hired by Thersandros. In his single speech he tries to convince the judges not to believe what the priest has said earlier because, he claims, he is not respectable person; it is not suitable for a priest to speak in the way he did, namely making gross allegations and comic statements about Thersandros' sexual life.

In real forensic speeches of classical antiquity this is a favourite kind of allegation made by the speaker as a substitute for evidence. Demosthenes is one of the orators who use it quite often. In his speech Against Stephanos Phormion is the victim of a strong attack on his character, his ingratitude and his

---

8 See p. 83f., p. 92, and p. 106.
9 Demosthenes. 45.71ff., esp. 45.79f.
immorality. Again in *Against Olympiodorus* the speaker presents Olympiodorus as ἀδικος (48.56), ἀπληστος καὶ αἰσχροκερδῆς (48.67).

In his speech *Against Aphobos* Demosthenes claims, similarly to Thersandros, that the law has not been imposed. Although Aphobos has been condemned to pay him a certain amount of money in damages, he received nothing until that day; instead Aphobos continued to dissipate his belongings and after destroying his house he went to Megara. These actions indicate clearly his real character and the respect he pays to the court. Therefore, it is only just for him to be loathed by the judges for his deeds (oriously poll ἔν δικαιοτερον διὰ ταῦτα τὰ ἔργα τούτων μισῆσαι, *Ag. Aph. III*, 29.3). By exposing these details of his opponent’s deeds the speaker can win over the judges and convince them that they should dispense justice. In the closely related speech *Against Onetor* Demosthenes claims that Onetor is of a far worse character than his brother-in-law judging by what he has done to him; he is telling lies in order to avoid the decision of the court and he even expelled Demosthenes from the farm-house which Onetor now possesses illegally. Therefore, the judges will find out that Onetor is a very unjust person (ἔν γε τῶν πρῶτος ἐμὲ πεπαγμένων γνώσθαι, δι’ καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον ἐλάνθαι αὐτὸν κάκιστος ὄν καὶ ἀδικώτατος ἀπάντων *Ag. On. I*, 30.4). In another speech of Demosthenes we hear a certain speaker defending his friend Phormion; his stepson has brought him to the court accusing him of exploiting his real father’s fortune. Thus the speaker reminds him that he has no right to say anything against his father-in-law since he has done nothing illegal; on the contrary, he has administered his property in the best possible way. The son reacted in this way because of his “insatiate greed” and his character (ἄλλα ὀλ硬化 τῆς σῆς ἀπληστίας καὶ τοῦ οὖ τρόπου τῆς ἄν δύναις ἐφικέσθαι; *For Phormion* 36. 44-45). He later explains that what this man is doing is causing people to think disgraceful things about his family and the city which granted them citizenship (36. 46-47). Demosthenes uses the same method of argumentation, this time positively, to prove his friend’s good character (36. 55ff.): he mentions the services that his friend has offered to his country and that he has harmed nobody until that day; his deeds indicate that he has proven to be a man of an immaculate character and for this reason the judges should believe his side. In *De Corona* Demosthenes claims that his opponent (Aischines) has accused other
people of every offence he has committed in his life (18.261); later, he
classifies Aischines as a cruel and malignant person who accuses him of
every misfortune he has had in his life (Αἰσχύνης τούς τοσούτους ὑπερβέβηκεν
ἀταντας ἀνθρώπους ὡμότητι καὶ συνοφάντια . . . 18.275). This man brought
Demosthenes to the courts only because of personal malice, jealousy and
meanness against him (ἰδίας ἔξοδας καὶ φθόνον καὶ μικροψυχίας ἔστι σημείον,
οὐδενὸς χρηστοῦ (18.279).

All these examples imply that a person acts against another because of personal
faults of his character. Some are accused of scorning the law, others that they
failed to act according to law and to decisions of previous courts, others are
motivated by personal enmity and wish for revenge, others show violent
behaviour and others show ingratitude to their parents. By giving examples of
your opponent's malignant behaviour you can easily render him vulnerable to
your accusations. That is why the persons involved in the trial case of Achilleus
Tatios' novel try so often to use this way of argumentation. Thersandros
complains that both Kleitophon and the priest utterly scorn the law. The latter
accusation is equally made by the priest against Thersandros, while Thersandros'
rhetor tries to focus more on the priest's "immoral" character.

Looking back at somebody's life is another easy way of focusing on theirs
mistakes and faulty behaviour which can produce quite a bad impression of their
personality; this is especially true in the case of allegations which cannot be
easily proved. With some degree of exaggeration he may be branded as totally
untrustworthy. This is used in quite serious cases as in the accusations of
Aischines against Demosthenes in On the Embassy. Aischines in defence tries to
depict Demosthenes' character with the worst colours presenting briefly his past
life:

"ἐν παιδί μὲν γὰρ ὄν ἐκλήθη δι’ αἰσχροφυγίαν τινὰ καὶ κακαδίαν Βάταλος, ἐκ
παιδῶν δὲ ἀπαλλαττόμενος καὶ δεκαταλάντος δίκαιος ἐκάστω τῶν ἐπιτρόπων
λαγχάνων, Ἀργάς, ἀνὴρ δὲ γενόμενος προσεύληπε τὴν τῶν πονηρῶν κοινῆν
ἐπωνυμίαν, συνοφάντης" (On the Emb. 2.99). A similar but more extended case
is used in Demosthenes' De Corona: the speaker turns against Aischines and
speaks about his previous life from the time he was very young until that day. He
claims that he did not want to mention such things but since the adverse party (Aischines) has insulted and slandered him he is obliged to respond (ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῆς τουτοῦ τοῦ χαλεποῦ βλασφημίας καὶ συνοφραντίας εἰς τουτὸν τὸ ὕπο εἰμπέπτειν ἀναγκάζομαι, 18.256); in this way, he can compare his life with his opponent’s. He has lead a respectful life according to the ideals of his homeland while Aischines was poor and was raised like a slave (οἰκεῖου τάξιν, οὖν ἔλευθερον παιδὸς ἔχων 18.258); he then starts referring to details of Aischines’ private life from an early age; this presentation passes through specific chronological stages: when Aischines was a child (Σὺ δ’ ὁ σειμνὸς ἄνηγ... πᾶς μὲν ὄν 18.258), when he became an adult (ἄνηγ δὲ γενόμενος 259), then when he registered in the citizen’s list (ἐπειδὴ δ’ εἰς τοὺς δημοτας ἐνεγράφης 18.261), etc. An almost identical pattern is followed by the priest in Achilleus Tatos’ novel. When the priest gives a short flashback of Thersandros’ life he follows similar stages: his young age (καὶ τοί τε νέος ὄν 8, 9, 2), his later independent young age (καταληπτῶν γὰρ τὴν πατρῴαν οἰκίαν 8, 9, 3), and his adulthood (ἐπὶ δὲ εἰς ἄνδρας ἦκε 8, 9, 5).

Sopatros speaks about the positive aspects of Thersandros’ life. Following the same chronological pattern he claims that his client is a decent and lawful man. It seems likely that this pattern is modelled on an established motif used by classical orators in their carefully constructed speeches. In the defence of Mantitheos, the speaker himself uses a lot of examples to corroborate his view that he is innocent and has acted lawfully in his life; he asserts that he never followed the other youngsters in their disreputable entertainment, he was never involved in trials, he cares about poor people and he was always in the first rank in battles. All these claims are presented as evidence which the judges should consider before they reach a decision.

Previous life and actions of a person can yield interesting aspects of one’s character, both positively and negatively. In Lysias’ speech Against Simon the speaker gives examples of the past life of the accuser in order to defend himself. In 3.44-45 the speaker mentions Simon’s misdeeds in his military life in his attempt to use it as evidence of his audacity: “τεχνήσιον ἔσεσθαι τῆς τούτου θρασύτητος καὶ τόλμης” (3.45). The accuser Simon is presented as a violent and

10 Lysias, In Def. of Mant. 16.
insolent man while the speaker is a peaceful and lawful man; he reminds the judges that it is the accuser who exercised violence against him and intruded into his house and dragged him from the street: “έκείνο ένθυμεσθε: Οὔτοι εἰσιν οἱ βία εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν οἰκίαν εἰσιόντες, οὔτοι οἱ διώκοντες, οὔτοι οἱ βία ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ συναρπάζοντες ἡμᾶς.”

In his speech Against Alkibiades Lysias tries to relate the immoral life and character of the accused speaking about loose behaviour, conspiracy, abuses, indifference to other people’s life, and outrageous behaviour (14.25-29); these are all enough reasons to condemn the accused. Similarly the priest speaks of the loose character of Thersandros and tries to persuade the judges that they know enough about his character to judge by themselves.

The last and perhaps most effective resource for a speaker who wants to achieve the condemnation of the adverse party is the almost standard accusation of sexual perversion. It is a matter that comes into play on different occasions in the courtroom scenes in Achilleus Tatos’ novel. Thersandros unwisely enough uses it against Kleitophon and the priest. The priest accuses Thersandros of improper sexual life and so on. It is an area that the classical orators have exploited quite extensively as well. On a similar occasion Aischines attacks Timarchos’ private life; as he very vividly says, the moment that the name Timarchos is spoken everybody asks if it is the notorious prostitute. In another instance Aischines makes it clear again: “So that you have made (he says to Timarchos) many a house a brothel by the facility with which you have plied your profession. Ask not, then, where it was that you practised it, but make this your defence, that you have never done the thing.” On many occasions Aischines speaks about Timarchos’ sexual perversion - he may have had good reasons; he claims that although Timarchos has the body of a man he has been committing the sins of a woman (Ag. Timarchos 1.185); in another case he makes a pun with the sexual behaviour of Timarchos and his friend Hapesandros:

11 Lysias, Ag. Simon 3. 46.
12 For a good example of what was expected to be said about a man’s character see what Aischines proposes to Timarchos to say in 1.121-122.
13 Aischines, Ag. Timarchos 1.130.
14 Aischines, Ag. Timarchos 1.124; transl. C. Adams (1919) Loeb.
In his attempt to ensure Timarchos' condemnation he asks the judges: "Θαυμάζω δ' ὑμῶν, ὃ ἀνδρὲς Ἀθηναῖοι, κάκεινο, εἰ τοὺς μὲν πορνοβοσκοὺς μισεῖτε, τοὺς δ' ἐκόντας πεπορνομένους ἀφήσετε." For the classical orators, attacking their opponents' sexual behaviour was an effective strategy in the trials.

---

16 Lysias, *Ag. Agoratos* 13.68
18 Aischines, *Ag. Timarchos* 1.188.
The rhetorical use of *apostrophe* in courtroom speeches.

The rhetorical schema of *apostrophe* gives a theatrical dimension to the whole process of the trial. It helps the speaker to present his points more vividly and gives him an advantage over his opponent as he is not allowed to reply directly. Furthermore, *apostrophe* to the judges makes things more straightforward for them as they are directly asked to think or do something about the case. It is one of the more frequent devices which the classical orators use and it is, thus, no wonder that Achilles Tatios' forensic speeches contain it so often.

*Apoptrophe* to the judges is made by Kleinias "σχοπείτε δὲ" (7, 9, 5); "μὴ πρὸς θεῶν, μὴ πιστεύσητε, μηδὲ ἀποστείνητε . . ." (7, 9, 6); "ἔγῳ καὶ τούτῳ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔρω . . ." (7, 9, 9); "πρὶν δὲ μάθητε τούτων ἔκαστον, οὔτε . . ." (7, 9, 14).

*Apoptrophe* to the adverse party can be found on several occasions as, for example, in Thersandros' first speech: "Τί μου τὴν δούλην πεποίηκατε;" (7, 9, 4); in Thersandros' second speech "Τί λέγεις, ὃ σεμνότατε καὶ κοσμιώτατε ἱερεῦ;" (8, 8, 6); "Τί ἐστηκας, ἱερεῦ, σὺν ἡμῖν ὡς τῶν πολλῶν εἴς;" (8, 8, 7) and so on.

In classical oratory *apostrophe* of the adverse party occurs quite often. In his speech Against Leochares Demosthenes turns to his opponent with these words: "καὶ διὰ μὲν σέ, ὦ Λεώστρατε, ὦ οἶκος ἐξηρήμωται" (Ag. Leoch. 27; Dem. 44.27). In Against Eratosthenes the speaker addresses his question to the accused: "ἀπήγαγες Πολέμιαρχον ἢ οὔ;" (Ag. Erat.; Lysias, 12.25). In Aischines' speech Against Timarchos the device of *apostrophe* comes up very frequently.

*Apostrophe* to the judges is also quite frequent. The speaker usually makes an appeal or simply wants to attract attention. Kleinias often appeals to the judges not to condemn Kleitophon but to check the evidence first. Thersandros asks them to impose the law and condemn the accused, etc. Lysias in Against Agoratos addresses the judges from the beginning and asks them to punish Agoratos (13.1). Isokrates in his *Aiginetikos* turns to the judges who, he asks, should think carefully about the case and remember what has been said at the beginning of his speech before they take a decision about the case (19.50-51). In a similar way to that used by Kleinias in his introduction, there is an appeal by Aischines in his Against Ktesiphon. This is the similar structure: "μὴ πρὸς Δίδ
καὶ θεῶν, ἰκετεύω ύμᾶς, ὡς ἀνδρὲς Αθηναῖοι, μή τρόπαιον ἴστατε . . ., μηδ’ αἰρεῖτε . . ., μηδ’ ὑπομιμήσετε . . .” (156).

The plea to the judges for a just hearing to both sides is made by Kleinias in his epilogue. The same is well attested in classical oratory as well. Demosthenes, for example, in Against Olympiodorus asks the judges to do the same thing: “δέομαι σὺν υμῶν, ὡς ἀνδρὲς δικασταί, ἀκούσαντας ἀμφοτέρων . . .” (48.3). Likewise, Kleinias in his epilogue reminds the judges that it is up to them to find the truth since they have got all the elements necessary to do so: “Εἴ δὲ ταῦτα γέγονεν οὕτως, ἐγὼ μὲν σὺν οἴδα, μαθεῖν δὲ υμῖν ἔξεσται. Ἐχέτε τὸν δεδημένον εἰσὶν αἱ θεράπαιναν ἔστιν ὁ Σωθένης” (7, 9, 14). This is reminiscent of the same idea expressed by Lysias in the epilogue of his speech Against Eratosthenes: “παύσομαι κατηγορῶν ἄκηκοστε, ἑρόκαστε, πεπόνθατε, ἐχέτε δικάξετε” (12.100). Lysias in another speech and also in the epilogue makes a similar appeal: “φανερῶς ἔχετε αὐτὸν ἀσεβοῦντα εἰδεῖ, ἡκούσατε τὰ τούτου ἀμαρτήματα” (Against Andokides, 6.55). Therefore, the idea is not original in Achilleus Tatios but is either an intentional allusion or an indirect influence on the novelist, who most probably had some knowledge of Lysias’ speeches.

The use of apostrophe is particularly extensive in the priest’s speech (8, 9). A series of apostrophes dominate the second half of his speech (8, 9, 7-14); this is the part that refers to his accusations (8, 9, 6: “φέρει εἴπω πρὸς ύμᾶς περὶ ὧν ἐγκέκλημαι”). This becomes very clear right from the beginning of this part. It starts with a “reverse apostrophe”:20 Ἐλυσσαῖς, φησί, “τὸν θανάτου κατεγνωσμένον” (8, 9, 7). Elsewhere the priest uses the “reverse apostrophe” to refute a point by first stating it and then rejecting it (9, 8, 11; 9, 8, 12; likewise, Sopatros in 8, 10, 12). In Demosthenes’ First Olynthiakos the speaker first uses reverse apostrophe (“τι οὖν;” ἃν τὶς εἴποι, “σὺ γράφεις ταῦτ’ εἶναι στριστομικά;” 1.19) and then emphatically rejects its contents by providing explanations (1.19-1.20).

The same technique is employed in the priest’s speech. In the second part of his speech there is sustained apostrophising to the opponent: “κατὰ ποίους νόμους, εἰπὲ, τούτον τὸν ἔξοντοι νεπαίσκον κατέκλεισας πρῶτον εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον; τίς προέδρουν κατέγνω; ποίον δικαστήριον ἐκέλευσε δεθήναι τὸν ἀνθρωπον;” (also

20 That is when “the speaker himself is apostrophised”; see Usher (1999) p. 222.
in 8, 9, 11; 8, 9, 12; 8, 9, 13; 8, 9, 14). The priest thus tries to embarrass and expose Thersandros by asking him difficult questions and often by telling him what the answer to these questions would be. A similar technique of “sharp interrogation” has been observed in Isaicos.\(^{21}\) This, of course, corresponds to similar direct questions asked earlier by Thersandros (8, 8, 6; 8, 8, 7).

Similarly, Demosthenes in Against Aphobos II (28.7-10) uses “lively apostrophic questioning of the opponents” which “exposes their irrationalities and the irregularity of their behaviour”,\(^{22}\) for example, “πότερον ἐμοί; ἢ τῇ πόλει;” (28.7); “δεξαίητε γὰρ ταύτην τὴν οὐσίαν, τῆς ἦν καὶ ποῦ παρέδοτε μοι καὶ τίνος ἐναντίον” (28.7), etc. Likewise, in Against Onetor we find this technique in the employment of an argument (31. 6-8);\(^{23}\) in On the Crown Demosthenes uses apostrophe to Aischines 18.51-52: “καὶ νῦν εἶπέ ποι λέγων “ὁ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου ξενίαν ὑνειδίζων ἐμοὶ.” ἔγω σοι ξενίαν Ἀλεξάνδρου; πόθεν λαβόντι, ἢ πῶς ἰξιώθεντι;”

The most interesting cases of the use of apostrophe in classical orators are the ones which resemble the priest’s tactic against Thersandros: he uses apostrophes here to the opponent and there to the judges: “κλείσαν μον τὰ δικαστήρια . . .” (8, 9, 9); “ἐπανάστηθι Θερσάνδρω, πρόσεδορε, . . .” (8, 9, 9, etc.). This is also found in Demosthenes 56.37-47 (Against Dionysodorus): “ἡ δὲ συναγωγὴ τί λέγει; οὐ μὲν Δ’ οὐ ταῦθ’ ἀ οὐ λέγεις, ὡ διονυσίωδωρε . . .” (56.38). In this way the speaker manages to go over the main points of his case.\(^{24}\) And, finally, in Dinarchos 1.4f. there is “an unprecedented resort to apostrophe of the defendant” which “is maintained with further apostrophes, a constant switching from jury to defendant.”\(^{25}\) Therefore, the apostrophe is a well tried rhetorical technique often found in classical oratory, which seems to have had some influence on the speeches of the novel, especially on the priest’s speech. By using all possible kinds of apostrophe (reverse apostrophe, apostrophe to the opponent, to the judges) the priest manages to put across his points in a very straightforward way, to embarrass his opponent, to respond to his allegations and to pre-empt any

\(^{21}\) See Usher (1999) p. 137 on Isaicos 5.43; see, for example: “. . . καὶ ἐξαργυρωσάμενος πενίαν ὀδύρη, ποι ἀναλώσας” (5.43); “διὰ τί οὖν ἰξιώσας σοι τὸν δικαστὰς ἀποπηρώσαθα, ὡ δικαστῆρεν; πότερον . . .” (5.45), etc.


possible new ones. In fact, *apostrophe* becomes instrumental in the priest's attempt to refute any accusations against him and thus transform his speech for the defence into an aggressive speech full of accusations.

*Nomos, aidos* and *dike* in the persuasive procedure.

The notion of justice (디καιον) is quite strongly underlined by the speakers taking part in a trial; after all, it is justice that they demand. In Achilleus Tatos both sides appear to make claims in the name of justice. Kleitophon is called “δόσω καὶ εὐσεβής” (7, 9, 14). Thersandros in his second speech complains about the ἀνομία and ἀσέβεια and μιαφονία, accusations which are closely related to *dikaion*. More specifically, in Thersandros’ speech the idea of injustice and law violation is dominant and constitutes the main arguments of the speaker; this idea is emphasised from the very beginning where Thersandros claims that the case is full of injustices; moreover, in the epilogue Thersandros expresses the sophist argument that even if Kleitophon is punished by the death it will not be absolutely just because he has committed two offences which are worth the death penalty: “ὄσε ὀπτέρως ἀν οὕτος ἀποθάνῃ, ὡς μισχὴ ἡ ὡς φονεὺς, ἀμφοτέρους ἕνοχος ὡν, δίκην δεδωκός σοῦ δέδωκεν” (8, 8, 13). The priest also expresses the idea that Thersandros has committed an offence against justice by taking the law into his hands and imprisoning and punishing Kleitophon. The law should be above all: “οὐδὲν οὕτως αὐτόν, οὐ καὶ σοῦ καὶ πάντων κύριος, δησάτω” (8, 9, 8). Thersandros has not respected this but, on the contrary, has ridiculed the notion of justice: “οὐκ εἰσιν κολάζει καὶ δικάζει καὶ διῆθηναι κελεύει, καὶ ο ἡ δίκης καιρός ἐσπέρα ἔστι καλός γε καὶ ο νυκτερινὸς δικαστῆς” (8, 9, 11).

The idea of δίκαιον and δόσων is also dominant in classical orators. Demosthenes speaks a lot about justice. To prove his point he often claims that the man he is accusing is generally an unjust person: “οὔτε δίκαιον οὔθε δόσων τοῦτ’ ἔστιν” (Dem. Against Makartatos, 48.65); “ἐν δὲ παρανομώτατον καὶ μιαρώτατον


26 The reference to the role of the law here might have reminded the ancient reader of Lysias 1.26: “οὖν ἐγῶ σε ἀποκτενῶ, ἀλλ' ὁ τίς πόλεως νόμος.” I owe this observation to Professor C. Carey.
The idea of people disregarding the law is also present in this speech: "Οὕτως δ᾽ οὕτως ἡ ᾿Αγαθονύμωτερος ἢ βιαστερὸς;" (ibid. 43.78). The idea of people disregarding the law is also present in this speech: "Οὕτως δ᾽ οὕτως ἡ ᾿Αγαθονύμωτερος ἢ βιαστερὸς;" (ibid. 43.78). Lysias in his speech Against Simon makes much use of the idea of justice and lawfulness; the speaker defends himself against the accusation that he attempted to kill the accuser. In his introduction he appeals to the judges, saying that he hopes he will find justice from them (Against Simon, Lysias 3.2). The speaker explains how he first got involved in the incident by saying that it was his feeling that the law was violated by lawless people that motivated him to take part in the fighting (Lysias, 3.17-18). In another speech Lysias underlines again the idea of justice which the judges should serve; he claims that it is their duty to punish Agoratos (Against Agoratos, Lysias 13.1); further on he claims that his punishment is δίκαιον and δίκαιον (Lysias 13.3);27 Therefore, the idea that above any personal interest justice must always be administered is underlined by most classical orators and, of course, by the speakers in the trial of Achilleus Tatos’ novel.

Humour, sexual innuendoes and sarcasm: vulgar language in a formal speech.

In the courtroom speeches of the novel of Achilleus Tatos we find a series of direct or indirect insults made by the litigants to each other. Thersandros, in particular, makes use of violent language and does not refrain from using insults even against the priest. Of course, behind all this is the author’s intention to depict the villain’s character as dark as possible. It is funny enough, but behind many of the insults the readers discover mock seriousness or even a comic attitude of the speaker. It is quite strange, however, to find humour used in these serious cases. There are of course occasions where an orator makes use of humour, but this has very specific characteristics and takes place in very controlled circumstances.28 Thus he may use humour or sarcasm as in the case of

27 See also the speech On a wound by premeditation, Lysias 4.13, 4.17-18, 4.20, etc.
28 There is a rhetorical tradition going back to Gorgias (see Arist. Rhet. 1419b 4-5), and other references to humour and laughter exist in the rhetorical handbooks (such as Cicero, De Or. 2.216-289; Orator 87-90; Brutus 322) or Quintilian VI, III, 45 (brevity of wit), VI, III, 47 (scurrility to be avoided), VI, III, 82 (making a joke against oneself); in general there is not too much information that has survived about this matter in the handbooks comparing with other
the poor speaker in Lysias' speech *On the refusal of a pension to the invalid* (Lysias, 24). Even though people know that he is a disabled and very poor man, his opponent claims that he can afford to be with rich people, to have a horse and to be insolent towards his fellow citizens. It is so obvious that he is an honestly disabled person that nobody would believe the accuser's allegation, even if he ever tried to convince them that he could even apply for appointment for the office of the nine archons! This is one type of sarcasm one can find in rhetorical texts. Another type of wittiness is the one achieved by hyperbole. Aischines in *Against Ktesiphon* makes use of it: “Ταύτα δ’ εἰπὼν δίδωσιν ἀναγγέλλων φήμισι τῷ γραμματεῖ μακρότερον μὲν τῆς Πιλάδου, κενότερον δὲ τῶν λόγων οὐς εἶπον λέγειν” (Aischines 3.100). In another place the speaker addresses his opponent with the following: “ὦ πρὸς μὲν τὰ μεγάλα καὶ σπουδαῖα τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἀπάντησεν ἀνέκποντάτε, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τόλμαν θαυμασιῶτατε . . .” (3.152). Likewise, Sopatros makes use of exaggeration in a comic remark about the alleged adultery: “αὕτη δὲ οὐχ ὑπὸ σάλπιγγος μόνον, ἄλλα καὶ κῆρυκι μοιχεύεται” (8, 10, 10). In other places sarcasm becomes an insult as in *Against Ktesiphon* “ταύτα δὲ τί ἐστιν, ὦ κύναιδος, ἐπίματα ἤθαματα;” (Aischines, 3.167). Irony is also applied, as in Aischines *On the Embassy: “μόνος δ’ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ φαινεται κηδεμῶν τῆς πόλεως Δημοσθένης, οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι προδόται”* (Aischines, 2.8).

Strangely enough, the priest makes some grossly comic statements (A.T. 8, 9) in his speech against Thersandros. They are, however, so carefully expressed that they could be regarded as ambiguous, although it is sure they would not be missed by the contemporary audience. “Οὗτος δὲ οὐχ ἐνταύθα μόνον,” he says, “ἄλλα καὶ πανταχοῦ τὴν γλώτταν μεστήν ὑβρείας ἔχει. Καὶ τοῖς γε νέοις ὅν συνεγένετο πολλοῖς αἰδοίοις ἀνδράσι καὶ τὴν ὄραν ἀπασάν εἰς τοῦτο δεδαπανήκει: πάντα ὑποκύπτων καὶ ὑποκατακλινόμενος ἄει; ὅμηρῳ μὲν τὰ πολλά,” etc.;29 this kind of gross comment is attested in classical oratory. Sexual innuendoes are used, for instance, by the speaker in *Against Konon*, where his

rhetorical features. Clarke (1996) notes “Cicero was probably the first to incorporate a full treatment of it (i.e. humour) in a general treatise of rhetoric” (pp. 59-60). See also Carey (1990) p. 50, notes 17 and 18.

opponents are called "ιθυφάλλους" and "αὐτοληπτόθους"\(^{30}\) (Dem. 54.14; also 54.16), and later: "καὶ τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντες ἀ πολλῆν αἰσχύνην ἔχει καὶ λέγειν" (54.17).

Attacks on the sexual private life of a person can be found in Aischines, Against Timarchos (1.166ff.). In his attempt to render invalid the future argument of Demosthenes that Aischines has supported Alexander in the past he says (1.167-168):

ομολογούμενως γὰρ εἰς ἄνδρα, καίτερ οὐκ ὤν αὐτὸς ἄνήρ, τὰς βλασφημίας ποιήσαται, ὅταν δὲ ταῖς εἰς τὸν παίδα πεπραγματευμέναις μεταφοραῖς ὄνομάτων αἰσχρῶς ὑποψίαις παρεμβάλλη, καταγέλαστον τὴν πόλιν ποιεῖ. ὡς γὰρ τὸς ἐμᾶς εὐθύνας βλάπτον. . . . , φησί μὲ, ὅτι αὐτὸς πρῶτην ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου διεξῆ̂ ή, ὡς ἐν τῷ πότῳ ἡμῶν κιθαρίζοι καὶ λέγων ὑήσεις τινὰς καὶ ἀντικρούσεις πρὸς ἑτερον παίδα, καὶ περὶ τοῦτον . . . ἀπεφήνατο, οὖχ ὡς συμπρεσβευτήν, ἀλλ' ὡς συγγενῆ τοῖς εἰς τὸν παίδα σκώμμασιν ἄγανακτήσι.

This is similar to what the people involved in the main courtroom case in Achilleus Tatios do, namely attacking their opponents (πεπραγματευμέναις μεταφοραῖς ὄνομάτων αἰσχρῶς ὑποψίαις παρεμβάλλη); this type of savage personal attack sounds strange when it comes from a priest. Perhaps it can be seen as a direct influence of the character assassination of classical rhetoric\(^{31}\) and more specifically of references to the opponent's homosexuality and debauchery found in Aischines' Against Timarchos.

Usher (1999) in discussing Lysias 24 notes in relation to the presence of humour in Lysias that "Attic oratory, and especially early Attic oratory, is for the most part an earnest and serious genre";\(^{32}\) in view of the existence of humour here he characterises the whole speech as "the first surviving parody in the genre of

\(^{30}\) Kennedy C. R. (1902), The Orations of Demosthenes, London, vol. 5, p. 173, translates these two words as "Priapi and Sileni" (ibid. note 1 on p. 173); Sandys J. E. - Paley F. A. (1910) Demosthenes. Select Private Orations, part II, pp. 240-242 discuss the meaning of "ἁπτολήγος" and view it in the context of the youthful acts of low respectability, etc. (ibid. p. 241). But the obscure meaning of these words and their sexual connotations of the second are controversial; see further Carey C. - Reid R. A. (1985) pp. 86-87 where a non-obscene meaning for "ἁπτολήγος" is suggested.

\(^{31}\) Character assassination of this kind is often found in classical rhetoric, as in Demosthenes' Against Konon, see also Isaios 10.25: "ἄλλα γὰρ, ὠ ἄνδρες, οὐχ ἴκανον ἔσται Ἴναµῖντω τῶν Ἀριστοτέλειον οἴχων καταπεπαϊδευτηκέναι."

forensic oratory.” In Achilleus Tatos the narrator warns us before the speech that the priest spoke “πάντα ἀστείως καὶ κωμωδικῶς” (8, 9, 1). Here the priest tries to ridicule his opponent by presenting a serious situation as ridiculous. The humorous description of Thersandros’ past acts is befitting his opponent’s character. The double entendre used by the priest describes a seemingly serious person who is hypocritically involved in such lewd activities; in this part of the speech there is a persistently emphasised allegation that whatever Thersandros did was carefully hidden behind his serious and proper activities (8, 9, 2-4, esp. "ὀπεκράνατο" 8, 9, 2). The ridiculing function of the speech has a serious note behind it; it claims that serious improprieties have been consistently committed by Thersandros and that he managed to clothe them with the socially acceptable pretensions of education, culture, gymnastics, etc. The use of humour here therefore, especially the use of double entendre, serves to unmask Thersandros’ actions; in a way it verbally reverses what Thersandros did; the “immoral” which is hidden behind the “serious” is uncovered through the comic. In this way the priest manages to expose Thersandros’ unscrupulousness and achieves this without making direct allegations of an awkward and embarrassing nature.

It is evident from this survey that classical orators, especially those discussed here, had a direct impact on Achilleus Tatos and this most probably took place in the rhetorical schools of the time, where the classical orators were studied and regarded as the best models by the students of rhetoric.

2. The use of Advanced Rhetorical Exercises in the novels of Chariton, Achilleus Tatos, and Heliodoros.
Evidence of *Controversia*¹ and *Suasoria*² in the ancient Greek novel: the case of three novels.

Rhetorical schools in the first century A.D. had already behind them a long tradition of teaching declamation, mainly as part of the last stage of the course of rhetoric. The emphasis on this subject was far too much and the rhetorical schools became the target of criticism from various sides which castigated mainly the distance their teaching material had from real life and real courtroom cases.³ Some of the criticism, which occasionally is in the form of mockery, has survived until today.⁴ Even Quintilian who used this method at his school seems to admit this, as he notes characteristically that the people “who had “grown old in the schools” were living in a world of their own.”⁵

This prompted Quintilian to respond to public criticism (in his *Inst. Or.*) at the end of the first century A.D., making a new proposal towards an improvement in the education of a rhetor. This new proposal combines the old with the new. Apart from declamation on fictional or semi-fictional themes, the teacher of oratory should use teaching material coming from established, well-known oratorical works which survived in pairs, i.e. a speech of a *rhetor* for the prosecution and another for the defence. Speeches from famous high profile court-cases were especially regarded as particularly beneficial for the graduate of the school of rhetoric. This was meant to be studied in the last stage of the rhetorical course and also after leaving the school.⁶

Both the speeches for teaching purposes that survive and the fact that we have evidence of rejection of the “declamation method” of teaching rhetoric show that

---

¹ *Controversia* was an exercise in judicial oratory. The student (or orator) was given a number of laws (real or imaginary) and some imaginary “unusual circumstances” and then he had to speak either as a person directly involved or as an advocate for the prosecution or defence (Kennedy (1994) p. 169). The majority of Seneca’s *Controversiae* “are imaginary cases designed to test the speaker’s ingenuity” (ibid. p. 167).

² *Suasoria* was an exercise in deliberative oratory. The speaker “was asked to advise some mythological or historical figure what to do in a given situation” (Kennedy (1994) p. 84). At the centre of the *suasoria* was a dilemma confronting this figure (ibid. p. 168).

³ For a comprehensive discussion of this issue see Kaster (2001) p. 323ff.

⁴ See Seneca the Elder, *Controversia*, I, Praef. 6-10; Quintilian 2.10.1-15; Tacitus, Dialogue on Orators, I, 28-29, 31, 35; see also Bonner (1949) pp. 71-83 and Clarke (1953), ch. 8.


⁶ Bonner (1977) p. 324, Quintilian X, I, 22-23 and Theon 70, 7ff.
declamation had become a purpose in itself, instead of being a means towards an end.\footnote{Clarke (1971) p. 45.}

In fact, the tradition of speeches which provide arguments for the one side of a certain case and then arguments for the opposite side, is very old in the history of rhetoric. It goes back to Protagoras, to Antiphon, to δισοοι λόγοι of the classical era, where rhetoric actually has its roots, to Aristophanes (for example *Nepheleia: δίκαιος and δίκιος λόγος) and Euripides, both of whom reflect the rhetoric of the sophists, etc. This practice in rhetorical training was kept alive during the centuries; there is some evidence that in some instances the student of the rhetorical school would be asked to speak on both sides of a given case.\footnote{Quint. II, XVII, 30-36.}

Normally, however, the students were asked to choose which side they wanted to defend and then they had to declaim on this. It seems, however, plausible that the introduction of the study of speeches pro and contra a certain case taken from established orators, based on the old Greek idea that everything has two sides, must have given rise to the challenging exercise of making speeches for and against a subject. The ancient orators would go through a great number of possibly useful arguments in the preparatory stages of a speech – the invention part – and they would devote a great deal of effort to anticipate and demolish their opponents' arguments. Inevitably this occupation made them study arguments arising from different vantage points and use them in a positive or negative way according to the needs of the case.

This practice of studying opposing speeches which survived from classical Greek or Roman law-cases is evident in courtroom speeches in the novel, which is a quite straightforward case. But how do we explain then the opposing speeches on a given topic which is non-legal (or non quasi-legal) and thus cannot be proper *controversia*? A comparison of Chariton and Achilleus Tacios from this point of view can show how this development in teaching rhetoric has left its imprints on their novels.

The number of quasi-*controversia* speeches – with this we mean speeches of considerable length which share all elements with *controversia* apart from the basic legal dimension – is not large. In Chariton – an author who is particularly
fond of courtroom scenes - there is not enough emphasis on this type of speeches.\textsuperscript{10} We find, however, some speeches of heroes who are in front of a great dilemma; this kind of speeches is basically \textit{ethopoia}.\textsuperscript{11} The most characteristic case found is Kallirhoe's contemplating whether to keep her child and marry Dionysios or to have an abortion (2, 9). This includes two speeches; one for the salvation of the child and one for its abortion. This is a non-legal case, and an illustration of the benefits that an \textit{ethopoia} can produce. Besides, it is not about speaking about a past event which is what a \textit{controversia} is all about. The only places in which one can find influence of \textit{controversia} is in verbal exchanges where, however, the dramatic element is much more important than the rhetorical. In 5, 8, 5, for example, we are in front of a controversy (in the modern sense) where people exchange arguments, but no attempt for complete rhetorical speeches is made. Another author might have taken the opportunity to make a rhetorical contest where each side would present its arguments in a formal way. This author prefers to finish his courtroom scene in a rather theatrical way with the two contestants arguing informally.

In Achilleus Tatos' speeches \textit{controversiae} are much more abundant. We have, for instance, the intellectual game between Konops and Satyros (2, 20ff.) which starts with an elaboration of the meaning of the name of the first and ends with employment of speeches based on the \textit{progymnasma} "\textit{mythos},"\textsuperscript{12} all of which function here as speeches for or against a certain case.\textsuperscript{13} More importantly, we have the extensive scene at the end of the second book where in comparing homosexuality with heterosexuality men are talking for and against each case (2, 35ff). In the fifth book we have a whole scene devoted to whether Melite should

\textsuperscript{9} Kennedy (1963) p. 13ff.
\textsuperscript{10} Schmeling (1974) tries to link Chaireas' speech in 3, 6, 6 (which is a mourning speech delivered after he learnt that Kallirhoe married Dionysios) with \textit{controversia}, based mainly on the element of the "love triangle" (p. 108). We believe that the speech recalls rather an \textit{ethopoia} (\textit{prosopopoia} in Theon's terminology, see Theon, \textit{Prog.} 10 Spengel) of the form of "what one would say if one found that his lost wife had been married to another man."
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ethopoia} is "the presentation of moral character by a speaker through words and arguments" (Kennedy (1994) p. 206); also Hermogenes \textit{Prog.} 9; Aphthonios \textit{Prog.} 11; Lausberg (1998) par. 820-825.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Mythos} is the first of a number of preliminary exercises called \textit{progymnasmata}, i.e. "exercises which introduce the boys to the rudiments, at least, of all three kinds of rhetoric" (Clark (1957) p. 181). \textit{Mythos} is "the retelling of fables from Aesop" (\textit{ibid.} p. 182); see Theon \textit{Prog.} 3 (72.27 - 78.13 Spengel); Hermogenes \textit{Prog.} 1 (1.1 - 4.4 Rabe); Aphthonios \textit{Prog.} 1 (1.1 - 2.12 Rabe), and Nikolaos \textit{Prog.} (6.8 - 11.10).
\textsuperscript{13} See more on this speech in p. 265ff.
have an intimate relationship with Kleitophon with two speeches by Melite (5, 25-26). In book 6 (6, 21-22) we have a debate of Leukippe and Thersandros which contains two notable opposing speeches. These speeches are quasi-controversia; their topics derive from educational exercises, the progymnasma “mythos” in the first case, a type of thesis in the second, and from higher rhetorical education, namely declamation and study of speeches on both sides of a matter. They are somewhere between suasoria (since mainly they have to deal with things which have not happened yet, and they demand some kind of advice-giving) and controversia, since the speakers often have to take one side or another on a complicated or critical question. When seen in this light, all these scenes with the speeches for and against look rather artificial; apart from the dramatic effect these speeches have, they show the impact of rhetorical training and thinking on the novelist’s work.

Both the “competition of myths” and the debate on homosexual love contain speeches which make considerable use of comparison (synkrisis). The speeches could be taken as synkriseis and they may have been intended as such by the author. In fact, they are not. In the speeches found in these scenes we do not have people making speeches with the ultimate aim to compare two opposing ideas. In each speech, people take sides and each side advocates its own views; it promotes the one or the other idea. Although some comparison is inevitably involved, the speeches in their present form are intended as part of a debate on a subject rather than as simple synkriseis. They have a declamatory nature and they share characteristics with both suasoria and controversia. In fact, they constitute a “loosened” form of controversia, a by-product of melete (declamatio).

Therefore, the way rhetoric of this type infiltrates the novel is very oblique. The novelists adopt their rhetorical structural models in a free way. They combine material coming from exercises, they change their nature and ultimately transform a simple rhetorical exercise into a structural unit of the novel.15

---

14 For the definition of thesis see p. 153, note 34.
15 See a further discussion of this matter on p. 283ff.
Speeches belonging to the *controversia* and *suasoria* family in the novel: the basic criteria for the classification.

In deciding whether an isolated speech can be classified as a *suasoria* or a *controversia* we took into account - among other things - the temporal relation of the main question in connection with the action discussed. The principle has been established from a very early stage in the history of oratory.\(^{16}\) When people discuss something that happened in the past we have a debate (which can be forensic, private, or other). When people discuss what to do in the future we are in the area of deliberation where principles are less well-attested in comparison with (forensic) debates.

In the first instance we find ourselves in the area of *controversia*, whereas in the second we are in the area of *suasoria*. Both exercises played a great role in ancient higher education. We have also speeches which are less closely related with either exercise but seem to have been created in the shade of the appropriate exercise. These have not been excluded here on the basis of a strict definition of the speech-types since they stem from them, even if this is not immediately obvious. Since we are talking about influence of rhetoric on certain parts of the novel, we are concerned not only with real speeches but also with the adaptations of rhetorical speeches in the works of the three novelists. For example, if a speech, strictly speaking, is an *ethopoia* but it shares material, topics, arguments, etc. with a *suasoria*, for instance, then it is discussed here.

\(^{16}\) See Arist. *Rhet.* I.iii.4 (1358b).
"Advanced Rhetoric" in Chariton.

Differences in the treatment of different types of rhetorical speeches which we can note in the novels of the three authors in question are none the less found also here - in rhetoric taught at the highest and last stage of education.

When we talk about rhetoric at the latest educational stage, we refer mainly to the two standard types of rhetorical exercises which were initially supposed to prepare the student mainly for the courts but also for other kinds of public speaking: *suasoria* and *controversia*. It is true that in order to reach this stage the student needed to go through a lengthy educational system. Twice as much time as we spend today at university was usually spent in rhetorical training, the last stage of which was some kind of more independent work in learning how to cope with themes from *controversia* and *suasoria*.

Let us see whether advanced educational exercises have had any detectable influence on the speeches of the three novelists concerned. First, the case of Chariton's novel. The author takes the opportunity throughout his narrative to build scenes which are appropriate for either *controversia* or *suasoria* or speeches which can be seen as such even if strictly (or technically) speaking they are something else; for instance, in 1, 2 we see the different aristocratic suitors deliberating on what to do with their opponent who has been successful in getting the girl although he came from nowhere. In another instance (1, 7) we see Theron advising the "council of useless rogues" on how to go about the tomb-breaking. Next in 1, 10 these robbers become speakers who support two different opinions on what to do with the unexpected appearance of Kallirhoe which is considered as a bonus by one side but as a liability by the other. On another occasion (1, 11) the robbers hold a meeting in order to decide where to disembark after leaving Syracuse.

Both the case of the unsuccessful suitors and the case of the robbers are occasions for deliberative speeches, one comes from high class speakers and the other from low class uneducated yet rather fluent speakers, from whom the most impressive examples are the speeches of the manipulative Theron.

---

17 See p. 193, notes 1 and 2.
The most powerful case, however, of deliberative speeches is that of Kallirhoe in 2, 9 who is made to speak for and then against abortion in two consecutive speeches, in a similar change of tone as Melite does in Achilleus Tatos (in 5, 25-26) when trying to convince Kleitophon to accept her advances, in which in the first part she is very aggressive against him and next she talks in a completely reversed fashion, like students who had to tackle their themes in various ways (colores) or had to produce speeches for and against a certain position. In Chariton, there is another deliberative speech coming from Plangon (2, 10), the servant, and the final speech of Kallirhoe on this matter in 2, 11. Now, especially in this group of speeches, because of the peculiar nature of the case, we are more in the area of ethopoiia than anything else. The author chooses the ethopoiia to depict the main heroine's character, to produce dramatic tension and to involve the reader in the great tragic dilemma of this undeservedly suffering heroine.

Therefore, for practical purposes we discuss the following speeches:

I) The aristocrats' plot (1, 2).
II) The robbers' council (1, 10-11)
III) Plangon: the servant's advice (2, 10).
IV) Kallirhoe on abortion (2, 9).
V) Mithridates giving advice to Chaireas (4, 4, 2-5).
VI) The King deliberating on what to do (6, 1, 8) - ethopoiia.
VII) Chaireas in the deliberations after the defeat of the Egyptian King (8, 2, 10ff.): "should they stay or leave?"

In the first case the suitors of Kallirhoe, who had been antagonising each other until now, hold a meeting where they discuss what they should do, given that Chaireas has been Kallirhoe's choice. In this bouleutetom (1, 2, 1) we hear two deliberative speeches. In the first (1, 2, 2) the prince of Rhegium proposes that they should do something to destroy this marriage. His speech follows a careful structure. In his introduction (eî μέν τις ... οὖ φέρω τὴν ὄβρυν) he presents the idea that his resentment comes from the fact that they all were defeated by an "outsider," who has not even tried to win the bride (ό μηδὲν τοῦ γάμου πονήσας); with this argument again the speaker strikes a sensitive chord in

---

18 See 1, 2, 1: "συνήλθον εἰς βουλευτήριον κοινών."
trying to unite his hearers against the common enemy. The next part of his speech is an amplification of this argument which leads to his conclusion that they should take revenge and that the wedding should become the groom’s death (καὶ τὸν γὰμον θάνατον τῷ νυμφώ καταστήσωμεν), an extreme suggestion which, when turned on its head, is a standard idea of epideictic oratory (especially funeral oration).¹⁹

The next speaker is the ruler of Akragas who has a different opinion (ἀντείπει). He proposes the indirect approach, and puts forward a cunning plan which will take Chaireas out of the scene without them risking their relationship with Hermocrates.

The habit of deliberations which Theron calls forth on any occasion when there is a question arising seems a bit odd. The reader knows that Theron is a very selfish, unscrupulous, and manipulative character (1, 7). In sharp contrast to this, Theron follows democratic procedures. In the end, however, it is always his view that prevails.

On seeing the grand funeral and the jewellery involved in it, he expresses his views in an ethopoiia (1, 7, 1-2); and, in another ethopoiia, he tries to convince his companions and then he instructs them on how to go about it (1, 7, 4-6). The first case would be “what would a pirate say when discovering a rich person’s tomb” which is in similar lines to Hermogenes’ “τίνας ἄν εἴποι λόγους γεωργὸς πρῶτον ἰδῶν ναῦν.”²⁰ The second case is more interesting since the narrator himself characterises Theron’s assistants collectively as “οἰκεῖον στρατὸν τοιοῦτῳ στρατηγῷ” (1, 7, 3). In the speech that follows (1, 7, 4-6), Theron is presented as a general speaking to his soldiers before a war. His speech is a textbook ethopoia: “τίνας ἄν εἴποι λόγους . . . στρατηγὸς τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐπὶ τοὺς κινδύνους.”²¹

In both ethopoiai Theron uses deliberative speech: in the first (1, 7, 1-2) to convince himself that in these circumstances the tomb-breaking is advantageous for him (κέρδος, 1, 7, 1); in the second (1, 7, 4-6) the speaker again highlights that the action will be advantageous (κέρδος, 1, 7, 4; ὀφέλειαν, 1, 7, 5) and just

---

¹⁹ See p. 230ff.
²⁰ Hermogenes, Prog. 9 (21. 12-13 Rabe).
and "dikaios" are two of the headings that Theon suggests that we should use in deliberative ethopoia. Both speeches, especially the first, serve to describe to the reader Theron's character. He has been introduced as an unscrupulous character (1, 7, 1); now we see the way he thinks and speaks.

The next debate (1, 10) is also interesting. The question here is what to do with the girl they captured (eita boulhn proeithke peri auths 1, 10). The opinions differ. The first speaker calls his listeners sumpatevtais as if they were taking part in a (honourable) war and suggests a solution whose justification is based on some basic rhetorical principles. The speaker constantly projects the benefits which his proposal has for all people involved. It is, in other words, what the rhetorical handbooks call to oukiprov (advantageous). This is one of the final headings (telikà kefalai) - which we have seen elsewhere as well - that should be used in deliberative speeches (see for instance: xoroumêthas autow - dynameva anavdzontos . . . - filandprovian - evgenetais) and the final two rhetorical questions:

Pósos oxeide charhs emplhsmovn thn dolh Sinelias;
Pósas lhpomêthas dweias (1, 10, 3).

The speech ends with two other final headings by projecting the idea that what he proposes is dikaios and osios:

ámia de kai proos anverwponos dikiai kai proos theous osia tauta poysmovn (1, 10, 3).

The next speaker, who opposes this plan, refutes the arguments of the previous speech with two rhetorical questions (1, 10, 4). His view is totally against saving the girl. He claims that the girl will harm them in the end (allass dikhosei 1, 10, 5). The people to whom they will give her back will seek their punishment.

21 Theon, Prog. 10 (115. 14-16 Spengel).
22 Theon, Prog. 10 (116. 28ff. Spengel).
23 See p. 38.
24 See, especially, Heliodoros in the chapter on the debate of Thyamis and Arsake over who should host the young couple after Kalasiris' death (p. 154ff.).
25 For the concept of telika kephalaia see Apsines ch. 9, p. 184ff. in Dilts-Kennedy (1997). It is obvious here that the speaker is preoccupied with the headings of purpose. In Apsines' Rhetoric these are: vumios, dikiaio, sumfervon, evdos, dunatous. For sumfervon which is the underlying concept here, it is noted in Apsines (Dilts - Kennedy (1997) p. 190): to sumfervon kataskevazeetai atopo twn elhasteon osa evhymetai peidheia. teleia 8' apodeizeivs sumfervonos than, et' amfwn apodeizei, ti mên estai peidheia, ti 8' ei mē epakousiaen.
Therefore, this is presented as dangerous and not advantageous. He then examines another option which would be λυοντελέστερον (1, 10, 6); this is to sell the girl as a slave; but this would not pay off since people would not believe that a girl with her looks can be a slave. Therefore, by process of elimination the speaker concludes that they should get rid of the girl by killing her.

In the end both views are evaluated by criteria similar to the ones used by the speakers, namely the final headings (1, 10, 8). They are rejected by Theron who has already made up his mind before the debate:

σὺ μὲν γὰρ κίνδυνον ἐπάγεις,
σὺ δὲ κέρδος ἀπολλύεις (1, 10, 8).

He proposes to sell the girl and take the risk since this may be more profitable to them. We see, therefore, that the debate among the robbers in 1, 10 is a controversia in the sense that the speakers use opposing principles (or τελικὰ κεφάλαια), i.e. “advantage” (συμφέρον), “justice” (δίκαιον), and “respect for gods” (ὅσιον).

In the next instance the robbers deliberate on where to disembark after their flight from Syracuse. When one proposes the easiest solution which is the nearby Athens with the big market, Theron objects and makes a speech against Athens which shows some influence of a type of rhetorical exercise, most probably from psogos.

The most interesting of all cases is Kallirhoe's deliberation in 2, 9, 2-5, an excellent specimen of ethopoiia. However, apart from this generic type, the speech borrows material that is usually found in deliberative oration. Kallirhoe first expresses the view that she should opt for abortion (Καλλιρχῆ δὲ τὸ τέκνον ἔβούλετο φθείρωσι). Her basic argument is based on τὸ συμφέρον, what is beneficial for the child. This is one of the basic final headings (τελικὰ κεφάλαια) in a deliberative speech.

Next (2, 9, 3-5) Kallirhoe contemplates the opposite (dissuasion), starting with a rhetorical question and goes straight to the point: βουλεύῃ τεχνοκτονήσου; She

---

27 See p. 262f.
28 See p. 201, note 25.
uses an example from myth, concluding that she is worse than Medea (amplification: ἀγαμωτέρα δόξεις).

The next stage employs five rhetorical questions - the first three of which start in the same way - which become gradually longer:

τί δ' ἂν νίδος ἑ;  
tί δ' ἂν ὁμοίος τῷ πατρὶ;  
tί δ' ἂν εὐτυχέστερος ἐμοῦ;  
μήτηρ ἀποκτεῖνη τὸν ἰκάριον σωθέντα καὶ ληστῶν;  
pόσους ἁκούομεν θεῶν παιδᾶς καὶ βασιλέων ἐν δουλεία γεννηθέντας . . . καὶ Κύρον; (2, 9, 4-5).

With the last rhetorical question Kallirhoe comes back to examples from the mythological and historical past. She ends on an optimistic note.

By expanding on the tragic dilemma of the girl, Chariton finds the opportunity to show both sides of an issue, something that the orators were trained to do. It is a fine example of the different treatment of a given theme when seen from different angles. “Τὸ συμφέρον” is alluded to with the last statement of Kallirhoe, namely that in this way she will be “reinstated” by the child, but the main body of argumentation in this part of the speech is drawn from a different material (ἀνασκευή), whereas before (2, 9, 2-3) she had argued for the opposite (abortion), also referring to her child’s interests (οὐ συμφέρει σοι, παιδίον).

Similarly, Plangon in a cunning speech (2, 10) also uses the argument of “benefit”: κερδονείς γὰρ ὁδίνας ματαιάς καὶ νικοφόριαν ἄχριστον (2, 10, 2). Plangon’s final aim is to persuade Kallirhoe to marry Dionysios. She argues craftily that it is impossible for Kallirhoe to keep the child under the circumstances (ἀδύνατον: is her first word and incidentally one of the final headings). Her speech is very similar to an eschermatismenos logos where people argue for one case and in so doing provide arguments for the opposite side which is their ulterior aim.

29 Anaskoe is a progyannasmatic exercise in which students were asked to refute a certain thesis; see, for example, Hermogones Prog. 5 (11. 1-20 Rabe) or Aphthonios Prog. 5 (10.8 - 13.18 Rabe). In both authors “τὸ ἀσυμφόρον” is suggested as one of the headings that students could use in this exercise: Hermogenes Prog. 5 (11.10 and 11.18-19): ἐκ τοῦ ᾧσυμφόρου, ὅταν λέγωμεν, ὅτι οὕδε συμφέρει ταῦτα ἄκοψειν; see also Aphthonios Prog. 5 (10.17).

30 See p. 145ff.
The rhetorical habit of developing opposing sides of an issue is further advanced in the forensic speeches which can be associated with the extensive training of the orators in the exercise called *controversia*. The part of proper forensic speeches in courtroom scenes has been extensively analysed on p. 44ff.

In this area also belong speeches which are not clearly forensic since they are not part of a courtroom contest but come from debates which have mainly to do with an issue that has arisen in the past. One example is Dionysios' speech in 2, 4, 4 where he reprehends himself for being in love, followed by his confession that he is now irrevocably in love with Kallirhoe (2, 4, 6-9).

The first case is described by the narrator as "ἄγων λογισμοῦ καὶ πάθους." It is again an *ethopoia* but with a subtle forensic dimension. The first speech (2, 4, 4) is an accusation speech where Dionysios speaks mainly in place of a prosecutor representing actually the one side of the case, namely "λογισμός." In the second speech we see another "advisor" speaking, namely "πάθος" (2, 4, 6-9).

The prosecutor on this side uses rhetorical questions and comparison to show that what he is doing is not wise and to accuse him of improper behaviour, while the other speech uses the technique of amplification to show the extent of his emotional state.

The second case is the impact which the lawsuit of Dionysios has on the people after the sudden and unexpected appearance of Chaireas (6, 1, 1-5). The people are divided into two groups according to their gender and again subdivided into two further groups for each case according to their opinions. This handling of the speeches is reminiscent of the Antiphonean treatment of cases or, more appropriate here, *controversia*. Among the men, the one side supports Chaireas (6, 1, 2) and the other Dionysios (6, 1, 3). Now the men are seen arguing a complicated case with an underlying dilemma (similar to those found in *controversiae*) which is: "who is the rightful husband of the girl." The speeches are of course attributed collectively to each side and contain the principal arguments of each side.

The women's case, however, is quite different. They assume an advisory role: αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες οὐκ ἔρχοντος εὐθυς, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεβουλεύον ... (6, 1, 4).
Their speeches have nothing to do with the legal technicalities. They advise Kallirhoe on the basis of her συμφέρον only and give arguments to encourage her to choose the one or the other husband.

In this way we are given the basic arguments of the two opposing sides and we are virtually in front of a city which has been transformed into a huge courtroom or rather rhetorical workshop where people find the chance to discover and present arguments for their favourite side.

Chariton: Conclusion.

Apart from the courtroom speeches which are a direct by-product of forensic oratory (controversia), the deliberative speeches are also technical in places and based on rhetorical principles. Suasoria may have been a means in development of deliberative oratory but does not seem to have an enormous impact on the novel of Chariton, apart from the cases discussed above. It is also here that the controversia-type of treatment has an influence. The presentation of the two opposing sides in the form of a contest of speeches and the arguments which are mainly (but not only) borrowed from this branch of rhetoric are two of the main common characteristics. However, in almost all cases the material seems to be drawn mainly from the elementary progymnasmata exercises, such as the ethopoia, mythos, anaskeue, etc. rather than from rhetorical exercises of the highest level.
The impact of "advanced rhetorical exercises" on Achilleus Tatos.

Much more straightforward are things in Achilleus Tatos. In this novel one can isolate some very interesting speeches of considerable length in both the area of rhetorical competition (*controversia*) and in the area of advice-giving using persuasive and dissuasive techniques (*suasoria*).

There are two noteworthy occasions in Achilleus Tatos where advice-giving takes a principal role. One is a matter of personal interest and the other a common case of a faithful friend giving advice to the main hero. In all these cases Kleinias is the person who gives advice.

In 1, 8 Kleinias is given one of the most difficult tasks. His young lover, Charikles, is pressurised by his father to marry an ugly girl. The speaker knows early enough that Charikles is against traditional marriage. The youngster's short speech in breaking the news says it all. The case is presented as a double misfortune (ἵνα διηλφο συνοικω τῷ μακρῳ).

From now on we are in front of a misogynistic speech where the general question "should one marry," found so often in *theseis* exercises,\(^{31}\) becomes very specific since we are given persons and places and timing. The speech, therefore, becomes a *hypothesis* (*causa*) that is here a *suasoria*. The speaker in order to dissuade Charikles from making the tragic mistake of consenting to a marriage is taken through several types of arguments on why he should not.

The abrupt beginning (direct *prooemium*) shows how urgently the speaker feels the matter should be treated. Avoiding a more general approach, the speaker goes straight to the heart of the matter. His first word "γάμον" (1, 8, 1) is the subject of his speech.

The beginning of the speech consists of three rhetorical questions which one after the other develop the idea of a marriage as a god-sent destructive punishment often taken up by people. His first argument is based on Hesiod,\(^{32}\) the examples are taken from the past. Next he tries to draw a parallel between

---

\(^{31}\) See Theon 12, 121.9 (Spengel); Hermogenes, *Prog.* 11, 24.8 (Rabe); Aphthonios 13, 41.17 and 42.11-46.18 (Rabe); Nikolaos 71.20 (Felten); Kennedy (1983) translates Aphthonios' definition of *thesis* (Aphthonios 41. 14-15 Rabe) as "a logical examination of a subject under investigation" (p. 65); see also p. 153, note 34 of the present study.

\(^{32}\) See p. 208, note 34.
the wedding procedures and the extent of the "destruction." The wedding is like a preparation for war:

βομβος αυλων, δικλιδων κτυπος, πυρσων δαδουχια ... (1, 8, 3).

Then, in a long string of asyndeta he presents plenty of mythological examples. This ends in a well-balanced parison containing three conditional sentences:

\[ \text{αν το Χρυσηδος καλλος Αγαμεμνων ποθη, λομον τοις "Ελλησι ποιει:} \]
\[ \text{αν το Βροσηδος καλλος Αχιλλευς, πενθος αυτω προξενει;} \]
\[ \text{εαν έχη γυναικα Κανδαυλης καλην, φονευει Κανδαυλην η γυνη (1, 8, 5).} \]

With a plethora of examples – which are abundant in Greek tradition anyway - women are at the centre of a case where there is no escape. Whether they love their men or hate them, whether they are faithful or not, whether they have virtues or not, women are represented as diabolical creatures with only destructive effects for men. All this applies only to beautiful women (1, 8, 8) because beauty is some kind of consolation in all this misfortune. Now if we are talking about an ugly woman the case is a complete disaster.

By expanding so much in this area the speaker manages to tackle the whole question of marriage. The conclusion, however, is easily drawn and the speaker goes to more personal arguments in the next part which is his advice and plea (1, 8, 9ff.): Charikles should not succumb to such a slavery. Besides, marriage destroys youthfulness which the speaker claims is an additional drawback. The speaker finishes with a series of pleading phrases ("μη... μηπω... μηδε... μη... μηπω... μηδε" in 1, 8, 9) which culminates in a very clever metaphor:

\[ \muη παραδος εν δρομοφ συγκηπα ροδον ομορφης γεωργοφ (1, 8, 9). \]

The speech is a masterpiece of rhetorical display which would have been appreciated as such by the audience.\textsuperscript{33} The area had been particularly popular from a very early stage of ancient literature. Women have been presented in this way since the time of Hesiod; the material goes back to the beginning of Greek literature.\textsuperscript{34} Therefore, the speaker is not lacking material. The interesting thing is that this material is used in a rhetorical speech; the speaker visits different areas to draw his arguments to accumulate the amount of "evidence" which leaves his hearers unable to refute. The speech, therefore, is unusual not because

\textsuperscript{33} For the discussion of this issue see p. 293ff.

\textsuperscript{34}
of the innovative material it contains but because of the use of it; the speaker's main aim is the dissuasion of Charikles from getting married.

From a very early stage of the novel (only one chapter after he was introduced) Kleinias is presented as a very knowledgeable and capable speaker. He knows in detail his mythology, his literature and how to organise and present his material. He is also good at using emotional language, but his strong point is his ability to produce plausible and effective amplification.35

Another time that we find Kleinias offering advice is shortly after in completely different circumstances. Here, Kleinias is offering advice to his friend (1, 9; 1, 10). His first speech deals with Kleitophon's confession that he is deeply in love and his condition is worsened by the fact that the desired person lives in his own house, making his misery more unbearable. This point is meticulously refuted in a lengthy speech (1, 9, 2-7) with both a consolatory and an advisory nature. The speaker turns Kleitophon' premises from a negative to a positive argument in a clever way, showing that there are two sides to the matter. This serves the consolatory purposes of his speech. He should think it a great stroke of luck to be able to live under the same roof with the object of his love while others would consider themselves lucky to catch even a simple sight of their lovers. He then advances to explain what this pleasure of seeing the person you desire consists of and he gives him courage and advice on how to proceed with his advances. This last piece of advice makes Kleitophon seek a more detailed and practical guidance. In the first part of his reply Kleinias tries to show how easy the whole matter is by claiming that he does not need to be asking for advice because "αὐτοῦ διὸ ξαντὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σοφιστής" (1, 10, 1). The second part, however, gives practical advice and clear instructions (1, 10, 2ff.).

The cases examined above are some of the most characteristic deliberative cases in the novel. However, apart from being challenging exercises in deliberative oration there is no other special connection with the suasoria as such. Their subjects are not matters of life and death, as we usually find in suasoria, however important they seem to be for the characters involved. The fact, however, that the speeches are mature, forceful, full of persuasive language, and

also that they seem to follow a certain plan and to use traditional material shows that, although there is no evident thematic connection with *suasoria*, there is a generic one. Taking into account that the amount of evidence in *suasoria* themes is quite limited, it is not surprising that one can not easily draw a connection. *Suasoria* is not as influential as *controversia* is in this novel.

Achilleus Tatios is a master of creating powerful courtroom speeches and other cases where opposing sides flex their rhetorical muscle. Apart from the proper courtroom speeches we have a couple of speeches which can be regarded as extensions of *controversia*.

Characteristic cases are the speeches on love at the end of book 2. Here the subject matter is the merits of homosexual and heterosexual love. We have seen already that in his attempt to convince his lover not to accept his father's arrangement for a wedding with an ugly rich girl, Kleinias uses mainly the *xouνὸς τόπος* of how undesirable a marriage with a woman would be (1, 8). Here we have the use of a stock character which contains an inherent dilemma (ugly and rich) which should be either reconciled or rejected; any time you reject the bad automatically you lose the benefit of the good, thus creating a difficult situation. The speaker finds the chance to present what we could call a “spin-off” of the very popular *thesis* “should a man marry?” and presents a well marshalled speech against women which is also a commonplace and has a long literature tradition. The author here finds it too irresistible to leave it as it is and calls for a fully developed discussion for the purpose of entertainment:

εμβάλλω λόγον ἐρωτικῆς ἐχόμενον ψυχογιάς (2, 35, 1).

In this speech we have advocates for the one and for the other side. The central question is set in a way which recalls socratic irony:

οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ πῶς ἐπικωνιάζει νῦν ὁ εἰς τοὺς ἀθρόους ἔρως (2, 35, 3).

The debate starts with Menelaos first who defends homosexual love by introducing a *synkrisis* (2, 35, 3), which is immediately challenged by Kleitophon, whose response is a refutation (ἀνασκευή) of Menelaos' main argument that the beauty of youths is more intense than that of women.

35 See p. 29ff. and esp. 31f. and 41f.
This point is refuted by strong analogies from nature and mythology which show how elusive and quickly vanishing this kind of love is.

The discussion now becomes more complicated and Menelaos raises the level of sophistication. The challenge needs now more comprehensive and serious attention. With this speech rhetoric comes as close to philosophy as it could ever be.

Menelaos' first sentence is:

\[
\text{Αγνοεῖς ὃ \ Κλειτοφών, τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς ἱδονῆς} \quad (2, 36, 1).
\]

Then, he is going to analyse this topic:

\[
\text{ποθεῖνὸν γὰρ ἓι τὸ ἀκόρεστον} \quad (2, 36, 1).
\]

The speech approximates the *thesis* taught in rhetorical schools in detail at an advanced stage; here Menelaos provides a detailed picture of his topic, using comparison (2, 36, 1-2), then definition (2, 36, 2-3), and then “calls witnesses” who will confirm what he claims:

\[
\text{εἴ δὲ καὶ ποιητὴν δεῖ λαβεῖν μάρτυρα} \quad (2, 36, 3).
\]

He supports his argument with examples taken from Homer and then mythology. Now Kleitophon takes up the challenge to contradict Menelaos' speech. His position is “οὐδὲν ἐξ ἐνυπακόμοιον εἰσαχθεῖ ὃ τών γυναικῶν κάλλους . . .” (2, 37, 1). Like Menelaos, he draws arguments from mythology and more specifically how gods have treated the people they fell in love with.

The next part (2, 37, 5-10) refers to pleasure itself: εἰ δὲ δεῖ μεθέντα τὰς μυθολογίας αὐτῆς εἰσέχων τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις ἱδονήν . . . In this part, Kleitophon makes a brief introduction explaining the limited experience he has in the area, a note which serves two aims; first, it fits the story since Kleitophon is one of the main characters and so the author is giving additional information about this character; secondly, apart from the obvious *captatio benevolentiae* effect, by claiming that he is inexperienced Kleitophon manages to lower his listener's expectations, achieving a much more spectacular effect at the end of a good speech. Often orators show puzzlement (*aporία*) as to where they should start from and weakness to express the seriousness of a given situation, especially in forensic oratory. 37 After describing in great detail the intensity of feeling

---

37 See, for instance, Thersandros' speech in Achilleus Tatos 8, 8, 1 (p. 97 and p. 175).
involved in Aphrodite's action the speaker concludes with a sharp contrast to the same experience with boys.

The speech, especially the last part, does not back up Kleitophon's initial claim that he is inexperienced in love; this is immediately picked up in Menelaos' first speech: ἀλλὰ σὺ μοι δοξεῖς μὴ πρωτόπευος ἄλλα γέρων εἰς Ἀφροδίτην τυγχάνειν (2, 38, 1) and then advances to develop his side: ἐν μέρει δὲ καὶ τὰ τῶν παιδῶν ἀντάξουσον (2, 38, 1), where every point he analyses corresponds to a point made earlier by Kleitophon.

The whole discussion is a sample of rhetorical competition mainly for the sake of display. The speeches are lengthy and full of arguments based principally on examples taken from the literary and mythological past. They are carefully constructed to respond in detail to the points made by the previous speaker, which shows the mentality of the competition between two opposite sides with two equally efficient speakers, although Menelaos seems to lead the way in raising the standards of the speeches on an increasingly theoretical level, and in the end, as with most of the courtroom speeches, we have no clear-cut conclusion. The author seems to accept that the truth has at least two sides and invites the reader to make up his mind as to which speaker made a more convincing case. After all it is the competition that matters and not the conclusion. Seeing them in their cultural context we realise how effective these types of "rhetorical and intellectual contests" must have been to the reader. 

Observing the speaker's rhetorical ingenuity, the reader will have found this conversation intellectually challenging. Therefore, this scene can be seen in the same area as the courtroom scenes and so they are to some extent related to the tradition of controversia.

Similarly, Melite, in her attempt to persuade Kleitophon to sleep with her, makes two different approaches to the matter; elsewhere she refutes Thersandros' accusations that she has committed adultery in his absence (6, 9, 1) in a carefully planned speech containing prooemium, diegema, arguments, and a challenge to verify the witness' ἀπειρακτὴς μαρτυρίας.

---

38 For the discussion of this issue see p. 293ff. (see also p. 290).
39 Achilleus Tatos 5, 25-26; see p. 243ff.
All these cases reveal exposure to rhetorical training and thinking. This evidence shows that Achilleus Tatos has been influenced by material normally found in advanced rhetorical training. The author uses his rhetorical background in a very creative way: rhetoric becomes here a generating device assisting in the creation of fiction.
The impact of advanced rhetorical exercises on Heliodoros.

Heliodoros makes the least use of lengthy advice-giving and controversia-like speeches. Apart from the courtroom scene at the end of the novel, the other interesting rhetorical debate is the one with Thyamis and Arsake disputing over who should be hosting the young couple after the death of Kalasiris (8, 3, 4 - 5).

Further influence by rhetoric taught at an advanced stage can be found in deliberative speeches; speeches which are made to give advice (1, 26, 2-6), to influence somebody as to what they should do, or more straightforwardly, to give advice in an open meeting (9, 5, 9-10).

The first of these examples is in book 1, 26, 2-6, where Charikleia advises Theagenes to keep quiet about their relationship as part of a general plan not to reveal that they are a couple. The speech comes as a response to Theagenes' enquiry on what Charikleia's earlier speech in 1, 22 really meant; in responding positively to the chief-bandit's wedding proposal, Charikleia asked to defer the actual wedding to a later stage.

In 1, 26 Charikleia explains her plan to Theagenes and advises him to cooperate. In her introduction she tries to disperse Theagenes' fears. She reveals the reasons behind her plan:

'If we resisted we would not achieve anything but aggravate his passion, while the speech which gives way (Χυόγ οίκαν έστειλε και τό κάτοξυ τής οδέξεως τῷ ἱδεῖ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας κατεύνασε (1, 26, 3).

In other words, "if we resisted we would not achieve anything but aggravate his passion, while the speech which gives way (λόγος δὲ εἰκών) is a more effective tool to control the situation." In this plan Charikleia takes into account both the power of speech and the psychology of the hearer:

πρώτην γάρ, ὡς οἴμα, πείραν οἱ ἀγροικότερον ἔρωντες τήν ὑπόσχεσιν νομίζουσιν (1, 26, 3). All this is used to convince Theagenes that her plan is sound. And all is left to Tyche's hands and the changes it brings from one

40 See p. 154ff.
moment to the next. Therefore, her plan is summarised in one of her phrases: τὰ πρόδηλα τοῖς ἀδήλοις διακρούσαμένη (1, 26, 4).

These explanations work as arguments for her suggestion to remain quiet about their relationship; they should not reveal it even to Knemon. Although he is φιλάνθρωπος and Ἑλλην, he is also a prisoner and he may give in to the robbers. Also they do not have any evidence of his character since they have not known him for very long. The speech ends with one sententia which at the same time highlights the concept of advantage (ὀφελοῦν - καταβλάπτη):

καλὸν γὰρ ποτὲ καὶ τὸ ψεύδος, ὅταν ὀφελοῦν τοὺς λέγοντας μηδὲν καταβλάπτη τοὺς ἀκούσαντας (1, 26, 6).

The speech relies very much on such general statements, sententiae, which have been translated as “pointed comments.” This practice is expected in deliberative speeches and was regarded as an advantage of a speech to the point that it was overused by many. These types of clever, complex statements functioned as “rhetorical fireworks” in the minds of the listeners and could remain in memory for a long time, apart from their immediate impact. By the time of Seneca the Elder, whose collection of controversiae and suasoriae throws some light on the area, “sententiae-hunting” was overdone, resulting in speeches in which the highlight was not their contents but the number and quality of sententiae they contain. Seneca seems to admire sententiae which can create good effect when used moderately but can become an aim in themselves if overused.

The second example comes strangely enough from a servant. Although servants are not normally expected to be experienced speakers, we see them being particularly fluent in rhetorical speeches and even entering quasi-rhetorical contests in the other novels too. In Heliodoros one of those speakers is the

---

41 Bonner (1949) p. 54; Bonner’s definition of sententia is “a brief pointed comment, aptly summing up some aspects of life or of the case” (p. 54) A large number of sententiae can be found in Seneca, Controversiae and Suasoriae; see, for example, Contr. V,1,1: “spes est ultimum adversarum rerum solacium”; see further Bonner (ibid).

42 Bonner (1949) p. 54-55.

43 Konops in Achilleus Tatios, Plangon and Leonas in Chariton.
female servant Kybele. The majority, if not all of the characters in the novels are presented as capable speakers. 44

In 7, 20, 1-6 Kybele, Arsake's servant, has undertaken to persuade Theagenes to succumb to her mistress' advances. The speech is presented as advice but it is actually an attempt to persuade Theagenes to take her suggestion:

και τὸν ξυστὰ ἀπαρακάλυπτος ἐξηγόρευε, πολλὰ καὶ μυρία ἁγαθὰ συγκατατιθεμένω διεγγυωμένη (7, 20, 1).

Right from the beginning we notice that Kybele pursues one of the most important telika kephalaia, namely τὸ συμφέρον. It is to his advantage to go into such a relationship; she then advances to explain that there are no obstacles in it, there is no κάλυμα (7, 20, 2).

Next, she explains the benefits he will get from it: οὐδὲν ἐκ τοῦτου καταβλάψειν αὐτοὺς δὲ ὀψφελήσειν κτήσεως χρημάτων προσγενομένης καὶ τῶν καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀπολαύσεων (7, 20, 3). Now she pursues the final heading known as the advantageous.

The following point is the inclusion of indirect threatening (ἀπειλὴ 7, 20, 4) in her speech, namely what may happen to him if he does not succumb, which would be to his disadvantage:

Αἱ χρησταί καὶ φιλόνεοι γυναικὲς ἀμεῖλικτοι γίνονται καὶ βαρυμήνιδες . . . (7, 20, 4).

Furthermore, in this section she explains that this is even more true with Arsake who is Persian, who comes from the royal family, and has power and wealth. In sharp contrast, she reminds him that he is a foreigner, he is alone and nobody will protect him. Finally, she "pleads" with him to take care of himself.

In her last attempt she reminds him that she is more experienced than he is in these matters 45 and so she is a good advisor and that she regards him to be on the wrong side because by not accepting Arsake's advances he proves himself cruel (ἀτεγκτος and ἀνήμερος 7, 20, 5). In the end, by talking to Charikleia and asking her to help, she presents all the advantages that are there for her if she helps to achieve this purpose.

44 Notice the fluency and flexibility of Charikleia throughout the novel (see, for example, p. 138ff.) culminating in the trial scene (10, 10ff.) and the rhetorical strength of Arsake, esp. in her dispute with Thyamis (Hel. 8, 3, 4 - 8, 5, 4; see p. 154ff.). See further on p. 36ff.

45 See p. 157ff. and 201, note 25.
As we saw, the speech is based heavily on certain categories of arguments (*kephalaia, topoi*) which are traditionally used in deliberative oratory. This analysis shows that Kybele knows very well what she is doing and she goes about it by following certain rhetorical principles (mainly using the *telika kephalaia*) which create a carefully constructed and comprehensive speech.

Likewise, in 8, 5 when Arsake seeks advice from Kybele on what to do with Theagones, the advice she gets is based on the same topics as here.

We see, therefore, that there is evidence of rhetorical training in some speeches, but the general attitude of Heliodoros to using rhetoric moderately does not allow enough lengthy specimens of *suasoria*-like speeches. We see again that in this novel evidence of *suasoria* is limited compared with the length of the novel.

The direct influence of *controversia* is more extensive but it is limited to courtroom speeches and some similar private debates. When the influence of the two is compared, *controversia* has had a much more manifest impact on the novel than *suasoria*. First, already in Seneca’s book on the subject we find teachers who prefer one type of declamation or dislike another, and some of them systematically avoid declaiming either in *suasoria* or *controversia* themes.⁴⁷ Second, *suasoria* has always been regarded an easier exercise compared to *controversia*⁴⁸ and hence less challenging. We cannot even be certain as to why *suasoria* seems to have had a lesser impact on the novel where it could perfectly be used more extensively to manipulate the development of the story⁴⁹ and to display rhetorical ability. When seen, however, in the general context of the importance the ancients gave to different branches of rhetoric, deliberative speech has always had a second role compared with forensic; this is evident, for instance, from the amount of theory that exists for deliberative and for forensic speeches: the difference in quantity and quality is enormous. Although the novelists make some use of it in several places, they are not so keen on it. Perhaps the very limited area of topics that one can draw from, and the fact that the advisor talks to people who are receptive and who themselves seek the speaker’s help, are two of the reasons why the novelists found that this kind of

⁴⁶ Hel. 7, 20, 5: “πείραν ἔχω σοθ μᾶλλον τῶν ἀφοδίτης.”
⁴⁸ *Ad Her.* II, i, 1; Tacitus *Dial.* 35; see Bonner (1977) p. 278 and Kennedy (1994) p. 84 and p. 169.
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scenes are never going to raise the dramatic tension effectively. The limited pool of arguments means that the author has to follow well-known recipes which beyond a point become exhausted.

49 E.g. by giving the wrong advice in a convincing way, etc.
Conclusions on the use of declamation by the three novelists.

The case of Heliodoros.

Generally, the author is very economical with rhetoric and direct speech in his novel. When compared with Achilleus Tatios one can say that he avoids extensive use of display rhetoric. There are, however, some places where the speakers use remarkable rhetorical techniques. In Achilleus Tatios, by contrast, rhetoric abounds; it is not restricted to rhetorical speeches only. This author indulges in digressions, different types of descriptions where he uses ekphrasis, enkomia, etc. In Heliodoros we see a different attitude towards rhetoric. He is much more interested in “cinematographic descriptions” (an advanced version of ekphrasis) which constitute part of his narrative. His work is much more dependent on complicated narrative techniques. When compared, they out-stage rhetoric and they are given priority in the novel.

When seen from the viewpoint of the second sophistic movement, Heliodoros is quite a restrained author. He uses rhetoric only when he wants to satisfy other needs of his novel. Heliodoros takes away the major role of rhetoric from the novel with the one hand, and gives it something new with the other, balancing in this way the loss and advancing the novel as a whole. Heliodoros is a great innovator in this respect.

Any good thing retains its value as long as it remains new and fresh. Rhetoric played a great role in the development (some claim even in the creation) of the novel, but its excessive use in the novel could transform rhetoric from an asset into a burden. Perhaps Heliodoros was the first - as far as the limited evidence in the history of the ancient novel is concerned - to shake it off.

Heliodoros creates a remarkable courtroom scene at the end of his novel but gives other courtroom speeches in passing and indirectly only;\(^5^0\) In places, he includes a few descriptions (e.g. the marshes of Delta of the Nile: 1, 5; the Korinthean Isthmos 5, 17), some speeches (e.g. thanksgiving and wishing well speech in 6, 7, 1-3; also 5, 15, 1-3), other public addresses (e.g. 9, 6, 2-3; 9, 26, 2-3; 50 See, for example, 2, 9 - 2, 10 or 8, 9, 5-9.
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For him rhetoric is mainly a means and not an end in itself.

**The case of Achilleus Tatios.**

Achilleus Tatios' work is a product of his time; the author "lives in his own world" which in fact is the world of the second century sophistic movement. The reader of the second century finds numerous rhetorical highlights in his novel but only a few (relatively) in Heliodoros. To a second century reader the novel of Heliodoros might not have appealed (perhaps it would not even have been written) as much as it did at the time it was written.

**The case of Chariton.**

Chariton wrote speeches the rhetorical techniques of which were being advanced 100 years later (perhaps earlier by others), notably by Achilleus Tatios (also Longos in Greek and Apuleius in Latin, etc.). Chariton's successors kept and in fact perfected the standard elements of the genre, keeping alive a direct relation with the rhetoric of courtroom scenes, *ethopoiiae*, epideictic speeches, and deliberative oration. In Chariton's times rhetoric had been studied mainly for the court, and even this sometimes was being pursued in the wrong way by sophists who taught only declamation on themes removed from reality. Chariton's use of advanced exercises is present but the use of rhetorical devices in them is not so intricate as in later authors, though more sophisticated than we have recognised until now.

---

51 See also p. 254ff. and 258f.
52 See p. 193.
53 I.e. in the third or the fourth century; see p. 7, note1. I am inclined to believe that the fourth century is a more convincing date for the novel of Heliodoros than the third mainly because of the evidence that the description of the siege of Syene resembles that of Nisibis in 350 AD (see Morgan in Schmeling ed. (1996) pp. 417-421 (esp. p. 419), where further bibliography). Apart from all studies on the issue of the date of Heliodoros' novel (see Morgan in Schmeling *ibid*, also Morgan (1982) p. 226, Bowersock (1994) pp. 149-160), Heliodoros deploys highly sophisticated rhetorical techniques (see, for example, p. 127ff.) which one would expect to be of particular importance at a time when rhetoric is highly appreciated. The next best era, beyond the second century AD, would be the "sophistic Renaissance of the fourth century," as Kennedy calls it (Kennedy (1994) p. 241), when rhetoric reached another peak. However, this is only a hypothesis and rhetoric alone can be used as secondary evidence for the dating of this novel.
How the second century rhetorical “obsession” changed the novel.

We know from the history of education that the study of rhetoric, although quite extensive in the first century AD, became a victim of its own methods. It is well attested that rhetoric became far too fictional and far too distant from real court-room practice.\footnote{Bonner (1949) p. 71ff.; Kaster (2001) p. 322ff.; Sussman (1972) p. 195ff.}

The next century saw a different attitude towards rhetoric. The study of the subject deepens and widens so much as to include all branches of rhetoric, the indulgence in the “modern” rhetorical methods - which were more or less variations with the aim of improving theory originating from Hellenistic rhetorical teaching - as well as the extensive study of the speeches of \textit{rhetores} of the classical era. This holistic, all inclusive approach lead to studies much lengthier than our modern time university years\footnote{See Marrou (1956): “in the fourth century A.D. two students - St Basil of Caesarea and St Gregory Nazianzen - went from Cappadocia to Athens to complete their rhetorical studies: one stayed four years, the other five, perhaps even eight” (p. 204); also in his endnote no 33 “it seems to have been quite the usual thing to spend eight years on rhetoric, according to Libanius \textit{Or.} I, 26.”} (sometimes twice as lengthy as modern undergraduate studies) and to highly educated sophists for whom education had became their second nature. For the audience who managed or did not manage to go through a similar education, anything rhetorical in the novels was regarded as worthy of attention, “important” and in fact an invitation to participate in the story since they had to put their own rhetorical skills into action in order to decipher, judge and appreciate the author’s rhetorical techniques. For the people who did not appreciate them this was probably not a serious problem. They would read/hear them through and appreciate them at a first communicative level and then they would go to the more adventurous bits of action which are abundant in the novel anyway. It might have been though a less interesting part of the novel.

We should bear in mind, however, that the novel, although created by educated people, especially in the second century, is not exclusive in general but in places. As a result, theoretically wider audiences could still be attracted. The audience could more easily become wider when rhetorical fervour succumbed in the next
centuries and other equally mind-challenging (but perhaps not so exclusive) narrative techniques took its place to a certain extent.\textsuperscript{56}

From this aspect, Heliodoros was in a very privileged position. Standing at the "end" of a long tradition, he managed to appreciate that the novel did not need to rely so heavily on rhetoric. In fact, the story itself was a good enough element to make the novel attractive and admirable. That is why he devoted much more effort to the narrative and plot than to anything else; even when he used old material he managed to make his novel more attractive by rethinking the whole way of treating it. That is why narrating is much more important in this novel than rhetorical display, which can also explain the lengthy story of Knemon and Kalasiris inside the main story, etc. Without being disrespectful to the old authority, since he uses it to a certain extent, he manages to concentrate on the main point which is the story.

\textsuperscript{56} See p. 293ff. and esp. p. 297ff. (and note 73).
PART III

Epideictic Oratory in the novel.
In this part we investigate speeches with various forms of associations with epideictic rhetoric, more specifically funeral oration and speeches of praise. We examine a wide range of epideictic material. Some of the speeches present a considerable use of epideictic features and some others merely the occurrence of a few. We believe they belong together because they often inter-link (see p. 237, p. 239, p. 241, p. 250f., etc.) and present similarities in their content, themes, style, tone, and rhetorical techniques. All of them are reminiscent of epideictic rhetoric and follow its rules to a great extent. Some of the short speeches, however, do not have adequate length to present more than a few rhetorical epideictic features. Having this in mind, we tried to include as many of them as possible because, we believe, it would be more profitable to treat them in an inclusive way in order to show how frequently and to what extent epideictic rhetoric is invoked in the three novels. Therefore, short speeches like the ones found on p. 248ff. present just a few rhetorical features but their identification is still worthwhile in our attempt to present a complete picture. They can show the “invasion” of epideictic rhetoric in various parts of the novels and can give us a better vantage-point.
1. **Rhetoric in the form of *threnos* in the novel of Achilleus Tatios.**

Emotional outburst is a basic ingredient of the Greek novel. By the time of Achilleus Tatios, funeral speeches are an area of rhetoric regulated by principles which can be safely detected today. In what follows, I shall discuss the link between funeral oration and certain rhetorical speeches in the novel of Achilleus Tatios, on the one side, and the handling of the mourning speeches by this author, on the other. After this there follows another chapter which assesses the same element in the other two novelists in comparison with *Leukippe and Kleitophon.*

In Achilleus Tatios’ novel we find a considerable number of speeches which belong to the area of oratory called “funeral oration.” These speeches contain a certain amount of rhetorical devices and follow a particular line of principles which are found in funeral speeches and in handbooks on epideictic rhetoric.

Unfortunately, the theoretical treatises on epideictic speeches we have today in Greek are scarce and late. The most comprehensive and analytical work was written by Menandros in the late 3rd century AD. Pseudo-Dionysios’ *Art of Rhetoric,* however, contains a chapter on funeral speeches which was written in the late second century (or early third).

This is not much different from Menandros’ treatises on epideictic oratory. The main differences are the significant amount of sophisticated detail which is contained in Menandros’ treatise and in the distinction of three types of funeral speeches.

According to Theon, *progymnasmata* are absolutely necessary exercises on which the student of rhetoric should work extensively before reaching the stage of an accomplished orator. Good knowledge and experience in *progymnasmatic* exercises should always be expected from a trained speaker. This, however, does not mean that during rhetorical education in schools students were only occupied with this particular lesson. This was what they had to learn very well at the first stages of their rhetorical studies, but the teaching in the schools also

---

2. See Theon in Spengel II 59.1 - 65.25: his introduction where he discusses in detail the benefits of these exercises.
3. See, for example Theon in Spengel II 59.11-15: "περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων, ἢ χρὴ μανθάνειν τὸν μελλοντα ὁγισθεῖν, ἄλλων γραφτεῖσθαι, ἢ δὲ πρὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀναγκαίον ἐστί εἰδέναι τὸ καὶ ἐπιεικὸς ἐγγυμνάζεσθαι, ταῦτα νῦν πειράζομαι παραδοθῶν."
included other lessons such as study of the "classics," for which there is abundant direct and indirect evidence in the treatises or analytical studies on the parts of a speech, etc.

In the rhetorical schools, study of classical examples is very important and students are strongly encouraged to study and use them as much as possible. Usually, if not almost always, the ancient rhetoricians themselves use examples from classical literature and encourage their students to spend time on reading "the elders" and imitate them. The overwhelming majority of the examples the orators use comes from classical literature while oratory of their time is scarcely mentioned in their works.

Having this in mind we should not assume that progymnasmatic exercises were the only influence on literature of the time and regard every rhetorical piece as a direct outcome of a type of progymnasma. Taking into account that classical examples of rhetoric from classical authors are used as "the standard," we should appreciate more that this fact is bound to have a big impact on literature as well, which is expected especially from the ambitious authors of the second sophistic.

Current trends of the time, therefore, or the possibly uninterrupted long tradition of funeral speeches must have had its impact on the novel which more and more is revealed to be a big melting pot of rhetoric where the ingredients in some places mix together and in some others stay quite separate.

The fact that we do not have today a theoretical handbook on epideictic oratory of the first century AD, where funeral speeches belong, does not mean that funeral speeches or theory on them did not exist at the time. Aristides, for example, gives us a few examples of funeral speeches in the second century. If Theon's and Pseudo-Hermogenes' works on progymnasmata had not existed, we would not have been able today to appreciate the extent of influence of progymnasmata on literature. We should not underestimate also the impact of

---

1 See, for instance, Theon's introduction to the progymnasmata, Spengel II 59.1 - 65.25.
2 See, for example, Quintilian's prescription in Ins. Or.: Quint. I, 8; II, 5 and especially X, 1.
3 Aristides (2nd cent. AD) Or. 31 and Or. 32; Dion Chrysostomos (1st cent. AD) Or. 29; Polemon (88 - 144); see Polemon ed. by W. Reader (1996).
the Asianic school whose florid style is also found in this kind of speeches, and each author's personal preferences, abilities and inventiveness.

The types of threnos found in the novels.

In Achilleus Tatios we find the following types of funeral oratory:
1) formal funeral speeches as meant to be delivered in the first place: not so frequent, e.g. the speech of Charikles' father on the death of his son (1, 13).
2) mourning speeches delivered sometime between the time of death and the time of funeral (if there is one).
3) speeches made immediately at the time of death or when the dead person is discovered.
4) speeches which are a secondary product of threnos; the occasion is not necessarily death but the form and the main characteristics belong to the tradition of funeral speeches. They are very popular in the novels where the plot often leads to a dramatic predicament: extreme misfortunes; imprisonment; attraction by unwanted suitors; separation; piracy; shipwreck, etc.

In his article "The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel" which contains a general overview of the history of lament in ancient literature, J. Birchall attempts to link one of the progymnasmatic exercises, the ethopoia, with lament in the novel. He rightly notices that ethopoia's "primary object was to write a speech in which the character and feelings of the speaker were displayed" and he notices that, according to Theon's theory on ethopoia,

---

7 Asianism was a "new style of oratory" which was developed in Asia Minor and some of its main characteristics were "wordplay, emotional effect, bombast, and rhythm" (Hornblower S. - Spawforth A., eds. (1996) *OCD* p. 191). This was quite the opposite of the purist Attic style and sharp criticism by the people who opposed it can be seen, for example, in the following extract from Theon: "ἐπιμηλητέον δὲ καὶ τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν ὅνομάτων, πάντα διδάσκοντα εἶ ὅν διαφεύγοντα (i.e. the students of rhetoric) τὸ κακῶς συντιθέναι, καὶ μάλιστα δὲ τὴν ἐμμετρον καὶ ἐννοιον λέειν, ὡς τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Ἑγκυρον τοῦ ὲμτορος, καὶ τῶν Ἀσιανῶν καλουμένων ὠχτόων, καὶ ταῦ τῶν Ἑπικούρου, οἷα ὧμεν καὶ πρὸς Ἰδομενέα γράφει" Spengel II, 71.7-12. Two important specialised studies on the subject are Norden (1974), I, 131-152 and U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf (1900), "Asianismus und Atticismus" *Hermes* 35, pp. 1-52; see also Boulanger (1923) p. 60f. and Kennedy (1972) pp. 97-100 and 460.

8 2, 24; 3, 10; 5, 25, etc.


10 *Ibid* p. 3.

11 Birchall regards Theon as a rhetorician of the second century (*ibid* p. 2).
there is no occasion calling for laments which can be found in this treatise; also that in other later rhetoricians who have written on *progymnasmata* (Hermogenes, Aphthonios, Nikolaos) there is some vague evidence for that. Only in Libanios he finds fourteen examples (out of 27 given on *ethopoiia*) which are directly concerned with death. Therefore, he concludes, “the surviving evidence suggests that the *ethopoiia*, not primarily an exercise in lament writing, became by the fourth century at the latest a conventional context for practice at writing a lament” (*ibid* p. 3).

According to Hermogenes, *ethopoiia* is the imitation of a person’s *ethos* (*ἥθοποιεία ἔστι μίμησις ἡθούς ὑποκειμένου προσώπου*),\(^{12}\) it is achieved through the speech of an existing person (δύνας προσώπου λόγους πλάττομεν).\(^ {13}\) Some of the examples given are for instance “what Andromache would say over Hektor’s dead body”; “What would somebody say to his relatives upon immigration”; “what Achilleus would say to Deidameia when he was about to go to war”; or “what a general would say to his soldiers after a victory.” According to his work, the *ethopoiiai* are divided into three types:\(^ {14}\)

i. ἠθοποίεια: ἐν αἷς ἐπικρατεῖ διόλου τὸ ἡθος, e.g. “what would a farmer say when first saw a ship.”

ii. παθητικαὶ ἠθοποίεια: ἐν αἷς διόλου τὸ πάθος, e.g. “what would Andromache say over Hektor’s dead body”; and

iii. mixed: αἱ σύνοδον ἔχουσα ἡθοὺς καὶ πάθους, e.g. “what Achilleus would say over Patroklos’ body”; there is *pathos* for the killing of Patroklos, and *ethos* in the places where he is deliberating about going out to the war.

Another basic principle worth mentioning here is the tripartite division of the time in *ethopoiia*. This is based on the idea that when speaking about something distressful, such as on the occasion of somebody’s death in a pathetic or mixed *ethopoiia*, we explain how unbearable the present is for us, how beautiful the past was, and how worse the future is going to be for us from now on. This has the following order in Hermogenes:\(^ {15}\)

i. παρών, ὅτι χαλεπὰ

\(^{12}\) Hermogenes, *Prog.* 9 (20.7-8 Rabe).

\(^{13}\) *Ibid* 20.13.


\(^{15}\) *Ibid* 21.19-22.3.
Distress speeches in the novel are a direct outcome of *ethopoia* and funeral oration (not completely represented in early handbooks); the relation of the last two should be taken as a genus-species relation. In Achilleus Tatos 1, 13 the speech of Charikles' father is a proper funeral speech - closer to proper funeral oration than *ethopoia* -, while in 1, 14 Kleinias' speech is a pathetic *ethopoia* in which he expresses responsibility for Charikles' death through his attempt to make him happy (*antithesis*). The speech belongs to the family of the self-accusation speeches as in Chariton (in Chaireas' trial in book 1 and in Achilleus Tatos (in Kleitophon's trial in book 7).

**Kleinias and Charikles.**

**The speech of Charikles' father.**
In book 1, 12 we witness the tragic accident of Charikles, Kleinias' lover, who is killed by the horse which was given to him as a present by Kleinias. In an elaborate description of the incident by his servant (1, 12), we learn how he died and how terribly his body and face had been damaged, to the extent that he has become unrecognisable.

The first lamentation speech is made by Charikles' father; it is a model funeral speech in which we find many of the characteristics described by Menandros in his three types of lamentation: funeral speech (*ἐξηγησία*), *monodia*, and consolatory speech (*παραμυθητικός*).

It seems that what Menandros calls *monodia* is partly what handbooks on *progymnasmata* include in *ethopoia*; the example “what speech would Andromache make over Hektor's body” found for instance in the “περὶ ἡθοποιοίας” of Hermogenes is given vaguely by Menandros, namely that Homer has made *monodia* speeches for Andromache, Priamos, and Hekabe. The difference is that *ethopoia* covers a far greater spectrum than lamentation. Lament is only one item in its repertory; the *ethopoia* is a speech in character.

---

16 Russell-Wilson eds (1981) *Menander Rhetor*. "consolation": 413.5 - 414.30; "funeral speech": 418.5 - 422.4; "monodia": 434.10 - 437.4.
and its basic characteristic is that the speaker is asked to assume the character of a given person and say what s/he would say in a given situation. Therefore, lament must have been encouraged and cultivated by *ethopoia* but we should bear in mind that lament existed as a separate type of speech well before the classification of the rhetoricians of the first centuries of our era. The themes collected in it and prescribed in the book come from the long tradition of funeral speeches and lament in Greek literature and possibly society. Furthermore, Menandros claims that *monodia* are more suitable for young people and that it can be used by a husband for his wife, etc. (436, 25-26).

Charikles' father follows the advice given both in *ethopoia* and in *monodia*, where we find the suggestion that we should speak in all three concepts of time: starting from the present, going to the past, and ending with the future.

His lament follows this type of division: it starts with the present condition of his child; it continues with the terrible way of his death (immediate past); and it ends with things that Charikles will not be able to do in the future.

The speech starts with an address to his child (τεχνον) and continues with an exclamation “ὁ πονηρῶν ἵππασμάτων,” typical elements in a lament.

Based on Hermogenes' (and other's) classification, this speech would belong to the pathetic *ethopoia*; the example given is the speech of Andromache over Hektor's dead body. According to Menandros, the *monodia*’s aim is “θρηνεῖν καὶ κατοικεῖσθαι” (434, 19). This aim is here clearly met. The speech is called a *threnos* in Achilleus Tatiōs (ἐξήρχε δὲ τοῦ θρήνου ὁ πατήρ πολυτάρακτον βιών 1, 13).

The impact of the boy's death is presented in an antithetical manner. Death takes away the soul but leaves the body as a reminder of the lost person. In this case death took both. Apart from the amplification (αὔξης) that the double

---

17 "εὐθηλον δὲ ὡς αἱ μονωδίαι εἰσόδησαν ἐπὶ νεωτέρους λέγεσθαι” in Men. Rhet. 436, 21-22.
18 See above (p. 227f.) the division of time in *ethopoia*; see also Aphthonios 35.13-14 (Rabe), Nikolaos 65.11 - 66.8 (Felten). Similar advice for the division of time exists in theory for monodia, e.g. in Menandros, Rhet: 435, 17-23 (present), 435, 24-28 (past), 435, 28 - 436, 4 (future).
19 Men. 435, 16: “Διαμηδόθης δὲ τὴν μονωδίαν εἰς χρόνους τρεῖς.”
20 See the earlier classification on p. 227.
21 Men. 434, 18ff.: “εἰ τούτων ἠ μονωδία βουλήθη; θρηνεῖν καὶ κατοικεῖσθαι, κἂν μὲν μὴ προσήκων ἢ ὁ τεθνεῖς, αὐτὸν μόνον θρηνεῖν τὸν ἀπελθόντα, παραμηνύοντα τὰ ἐγκώμια τοῖς θρήνοις, καὶ συνεχῶς τῶν θρήνων ἐμφανίζειν, . . .”
loss serves, the distinction between ψυχή and σώμα is also suggested by Menandros in (420, 12-14):

... τεμείς δὲ τὴν φύσιν δίχα, εἰς τὸ τοῦ σώματος κάλλος, ὅπερ πρῶτον ἔρεις, εἰς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς εὐφυίαν . . .

This is suggested merely for the purposes of praise of the dead. Perhaps the fact that Charikles died in such a terrible accident leaves no space for such enkomion, so the mourning over this situation prevails. The speaker refers to his son's previous appearance which is meant to be taken as "laudatory" but these words are too general.

Therefore, the first and second part of the speech is concerned with the death of Charikles based on the way Charikles died. There are examples of that in Aristides Or. 32, 33; Himerios Or. 8, 13; Libanius Or. 17, 22-26, Or. 18, 267-271, etc. Further advice on similar cases is given by Menandros in 435, 18-21:

μάλλον γὰρ ὁ λόγος κυνητικάτερος εἰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπὶ δύσιν καὶ τῶν νῦν συμβάντων οἰκτίζοι τις, εἰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἡ τὸν τρόπον τοῦ θανάτου λέγω τις, εἰ μικρὰ νῦσῳ περιπετειώδες εἰς, εἰ δέξις ὁ θάνατος . . .

The last part of the mourning belongs to the heart of epideictic oratory. It refers to the future. It starts with two rhetorical questions: "πότε μοι, τέχνον, γαμεῖς πότε σου θύσω τοὺς γάμους, ἵπτευ καὶ νυμφίε;" and the emotional tension rises. The potential wedding that the speaker introduced in this part is a very successful common place (χοίνος τόπος). The antithesis of death and marriage is very common in such speeches, as Alexiou's work has shown.

The remarkable repeated and complex chiasmus figure that follows highlights the opposition between the expected happiness and the tragic reality and is conducive to the amplification attempt (χιαστόν, χαζεοθεία, usually for a period with four parts, a τετράχωλον):

ἵπτευ καὶ νυμφίε;
νυμφίε μὲν άτελές ἵπτευ δὲ δυστυχεῖς.
τάφος μὲν σοι, τέχνον, ὁ θάλαμος.

---

22 See also Men. 413, 3-4: "ἄθρων ὡς οἶδον τε ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ πάθος ἐκ τῶν ἄφοβων ἄγαν εἴπομεν περὶ μοναδίας"; "καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ νομίζων συζήσαςε" (413, 21-22), "αὐθην αὐθην" (420, 4-5), "καὶ αὐθήσασες τὸν οἶκτων" (436, 3), etc. Amplification (αὐθήσα) is a basic technique used by rhetors; its main aim is to present things bigger, better or, in our case, worse.

23 See the reference to "καὶν τὸ ἄνθος τις τῶν προσώπων ἀπολέσθη", in 1, 13, 3.
γάμος δὲ ὁ θάνατος,
θρήνος δὲ ὁ ὑμέναιος, ... 
ὁ δὲ κωκυτός οὖσος τῶν γάμων φθάι.25

The wedding and funeral is a topos also found in Aristides Or. 31, 12; Himerios Or. 8, 8-16; Plutarch Cons. Ux. 9.

According to Menandros, in the case of a dead person being young we base our lament: i. on the young age, ii. on his nature, namely that he was bright or that he had raised great hopes, and iii. on what has happened - e.g. that he would have been married shortly.26

From the future we draw arguments such as “what hopes his family had for him.” This is prescribed in monodia (435, 28-29): “ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος, οἷας εἶχεν ἔλπιδας ἐτοί αὐτῷ τὸ γένος.” This is what this part of speech is all about: “when shall I perform at your marriage the rites that religion demands?”27 The mourning reaches its end with the topos of the destroyed hope28 which comes up in what the father expected from his son’s life (Ἄλλο σοι, τέκνον, προοεδόξων πύρ ἀνάψειν, 1, 13, 6). The dead person often associated with light or fire which is extinguished29 is a common image. Here the fire for a wedding is replaced by torches for a funeral by Tyche.

In speaking on funeral speeches (ὁ ἐπιτάφιος λόγος, ὁ ἐπὶ προσφάτῳ τῷ τεθνεωτὶ λεγόμενος 419, 11-13), Menandros gives an example dealing with this area: “οὐκοῦν ὅτι λαμπρὸν τούτῳ ἔρεις, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει μᾶλλον ἐνδοξάτατον, ἀλλ’ ὅπερ λαμπάδα ἡμέμην ἐν τῷ γένει πεπτωκότα τούτων δαιμόνων ἀπέσβησεν” (419, 18-21). It is not, therefore, accidental that this kind of imagery comes to stage; it is used in the same vivid way by Gregory of Nyssa

24 Alexiou (1974) pp. 151-152, where special reference to Achilleus Tatos is made and elsewhere (see Alexiou, Index in “marriage, death and” p. 272).
25 A.T. 1, 13, 5. For a similar technique in terms of style see Simonides PMG 531 (suggested by Prof. C. Carey).
26 Menandros, 435, 1-5: “ἐὰν δὲ νέος τόπῃ ὁ τελευτήσας, ἀπὸ τῆς ἥλιας τῶν βρήχων κυνήσεως, ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως ὅτι εὔφρης, ὅτι μεγάλα παρέσχεν τὰς ἐλπίδας, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σμήνων ὅτι ἄνυστοι αὐτὸ ἔμελλε μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ τάλαμος, ἔμελλον αἱ παστάδες.”
28 See the examples in Soffel (1974) p. 165; for ἐλπιδας: Lys. Or. 2,73; Arist. Or. 31,1; Him. Or. 8, 21; Lib. Or. 17,31; Or. 18,2; ἐλπὶ δὲ: Arist. Or. 31,11; Him. Or. 8,21; Lib. Or. 17,6; Or. 18,1; and προοεδόξων: Lib. Or. 18,283, etc.
29 Alexiou (1974) Index.
where Abraham laments over the approaching sacrifice of Isaak: “καὶ ἔψω ἐπὶ αὐτῶ ὁ βαπτίζων, ἀλλὰ πῦρ ἔπετάφιον.”

One cannot avoid noticing that the light has been extinguished by what is here called “ἡ πονηρὰ Τύχη” (1, 13, 6). This is much expected and actually is prescribed by Menandros in *monodia* 435, 9-14:

χρή τοίνυν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις εὐθὺς μὲν σχετικάζειν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς δαίμονας καὶ πρὸς μοίραιν ἄδικον, εἶτα ἢ ποῖ τοῦ κατευθέγοντος εὐθὺς λαμβάνειν οἶον ἔξησασαν, οία κατὰ τοῦ πέσοντος ἐκώμασαν . . .

This happens at the beginning of other lament or distress speeches in the novel but not here. Although exclamations to the *daimones* or Tyche are expected, the father here refers to “ἡ πονηρὰ Τύχη.” The *topos* of Tyche is found in Quint. *Inst. Or. III*, VII, 13; Theon 8 (2, 110, Sf.); Herm. *Prog.* 7, 16. 12f.; Aphth. *Prog.* 8, 22. 8. This speech finishes with the antithesis that his wedding procession with the lights has been transformed into a funeral procession.

In this small funeral speech, a *threnos*, as characterised by the narrator, we find a great number of characteristics suitable for funeral oratory, mostly *monodia*; in fact, almost everything contained in this speech can be identified as an element found in other funeral speeches or handbooks dealing with the same questions.

**Kleinias’ lament:**

The mourning of Kleinias is interesting from two aspects; firstly, it is the only other lament from the other important person in Charikles’ life; secondly, Kleinias is one of the chief supporting heroes in the novel and we are much more interested in his character than in the character of Charikles’ father who is used here as a tragic figure.

The speech, introduced by the author in the context of a mourning competition (“καὶ ἢν θρήνων ἀμελλα, ἔριστο καὶ πατρὸς,” 1, 14), is partly a lament which

---

30 See Gregory of Nyssa “De deitate filii et spiriti sancti”; Migne *P.G.* vol 46, p. 568D, quoted by Gaselee *ibid* p. 42, note 1; more on this theme see Alexiou (1974) index.


32 Note the strange absence of a mother figure here which would have given a dramatic scene and would be in accordance to Greek tradition of female mourners; on female mourners see Alexiou (1974) p. 10 and elsewhere; here, presumably, the lover substitutes for the mother.
follows certain characteristics of the family it comes from, but mainly it is a kind of *prosangelia*, a self accusation speech where the person speaking takes all the blame. It belongs to the type of speeches often found in the novels and suitable for persons who take responsibility for the loss of their lovers. The same happens later in the trial scene (7, 7ff.), where in a dramatic twist of the story Kleitophon produces a self accusation speech (*prosangelia* 7, 7). It also happens in Chariton (1, 4), where Chaireas accuses himself in a dramatic outcry and is asking for the death penalty.

Kleinias' speech has a clear rhetorical structure:

i) **first part:** “Ἐγὼ ... χρυσάτ ἢνίας”: I am the only one responsible.

ii) **second part:** starting with the exclamation “οἶμοι Χορίκλεως” and advancing to a ψόγος to the ungrateful horse.

iii) **third part:** the speaker returns to the first person (οἶμοι δυστυχὴς ἐγὼ ...) and repeats his self-accusation.\(^{33}\)

The two rhetorical questions at the beginning of the first part of the speech help raise the dramatic tone of the speech by showing how much the speaker regrets giving this kind of “fatal” present to Charikles. This part highlights the antithesis of the good intention the speaker had with the tragic outcome caused by it. It, therefore, contributes to the amplification of the passion (*pathos*) - misery and sorrow.

The second part of the speech contains an address to the horse which is called the fiercest of all beasts (“πάντων θηρίων ἄγριωτατε”). The accusation against the horse contains elements of a ψόγος for the “wicked” animal. This kind of accusation is not unusual in the mourning speeches but is usually addressed to gods who caused the death. The claim that the horse did not appreciate beauty is related to a *topos* often used in such speeches and prescribed by Menandros\(^{34}\) in 420, 11-12; beauty is always on the agenda of the mourning speech.

This speech is more like an *ethopoia* than a proper funeral mourning. It does not refer so much to the dead person as to the speaker's responsibility and regret for the horse's “crime.” The question “what would a person say in this situation

---

\(^{33}\) Compare the initial “Ἐγὼ μοι τὸν δισσότηταν ἀπολέσα” here with “Ἐγὼ σοι τὸν φωνὴ, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκνησάμην” in Kleinias' lament.

---
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over the dead body of his lover” is ideal for declamation; the speech is an ethopoia.

Kleitophon's emotional world: a man crying.

The next three speeches are laments in three different situations over the same person. Kleitophon produces three mourning speeches in the three cases where Leukippe is apparently dead. The first is in book 3, 16 when Kleitophon witnesses the alleged sacrifice of Leukippe; the second is a small speech in book 5, 7 where Kleitophon mourns over her supposed head-less body; and finally, the third is a speech in book 7, 5 when Kleitophon while in prison hears from a supposed fellow prisoner that Leukippe has been murdered.

The mourner who wants to kill himself (3.16).

The speech is delivered by Kleitophon over the supposed Leukippe’s coffin; Kleitophon takes his sword to kill himself but before using it he delivers the mourning speech (he is alone). The speech is an ethopoia which contains many rhetorical features suitable for mourning speeches.

It starts with an address to Leukippe whom Kleitophon calls “ἀθλία πάντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ δυστυχεστέρα” in an attempt to attract pity and sympathy for her; he then continues with an impressive priamel, a rhetorical device used in Greek literature from a very early time (Archilochos, Sappho, etc.), roughly defined as a "kind of paratactic comparison" whose function is “to single out one point of interest by contrast and comparison.”

---

34 See “ταμεῖς δὲ τὴν φίλον δόχα, εἰς τὸ τοῦ σώματος κάλλος...”; see also Quint. Inst. Or. III, VII, 12; Theon 8 (II,110,6f.); Herm. Prog. 7, 16.5; D. Hal. Rhet. 6.2; Aphth. Prog. 8, 22.7; D. Chr. Or. 29, 3-7; Arist. Or. 31,4; Soffel (1974) p. 255.

35 See the example found in handbooks on progymnasmata: “what would Andromache say over Hektor’s dead body?” See Theon, Prog. 9, 45.9; also Theon 45.13-14 (Spengel); “What would Achilleus say over Patroklos’ dead body?”; also Hermogenes Prog. 9, 20.8-9 (Rabe), Nikolaos Prog. 64.2 (Felten).


37 Race (1982) p. 7ff. where priamel is defined, and pp. 17-30 where we find a discussion on “The Relationship of the Priamel to other rhetorical forms.”
In his study on the priamel, Race associates the priamel with "the motive of amplification" and also with exordium, noticing "the prooimial character of it" (notice that our example functions as a prooimioi). Furthermore, the priamel is associated with rhetorical figures such as embellishment (χόσμος), climax (as a part of the completion of the priamel), parallelism and repetition.

Kleitophon’s speech shows the same principles as the priamel discussed by Race: "the speaker wishes to broach his subject and to say something striking about it, but he does not want to do it directly, lest a due appreciation of its unique character be lacking." The priamel which is unfolded here is as follows:

οὗ τὸν θάνατον δδύσομαι σου μόνον, (1)
οὔδε ὅτι τεθνηκας ἐπὶ ξένης, (2)
οὔδε ὅτι σου γέγονεν ἐκ βίας σφαγῆ, (3)
ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰῦτα τῶν σῶν ἀτυχημάτων παίγνια, (α)
ἀλλ' ὅτι καθάρσιον γέγονας ἀκαθάρτων σωμάτων (b)
καὶ σὲ χῶσαν ἀνέτειμον . .
ἀλλ' ὅτι σου τῆς γαστρὸς τὰ μυστήρια ἐμέρισαν καὶ τὴν ταφῆν (c)
κακοδαίμονι βωμῷ καὶ σοφῷ.

The classical priamel usually contains two or three negative statements which are reversed by usually one positive statement. Here the priamel is stretched to the limits, yet its structure has a remarkable balance. The three initial statements refer to: i) Leukippe's death (τὸν θάνατον); ii) the fact that death happened in a foreign place (ἐπὶ ξένης) and iii) that she was violently slaughtered (ἐκ βίας σφαγῆ).

These three negative (οὗ, οὔδε, οὔδε) statements are picked up immediately by an equal number of positive statements. Both negative and positive statements are conducive to a cumulative result of six reasons why the speaker should be mourning. It is a good way to accomplish amplification, showing the horror of the situation and its impact on the mourner who expresses his pain. The amplification is carried further by the two exclamation-sentences in the last part.

---

38 Race ibid., p. 20 and p. 22, see also Menandros (Rhet. 368, 1 – 369, 17) for the use of "αἴξημι" in the introductions of epideictic speeches.
41 Ibid. p. 27.
42 Ibid. p. 27.
of this speech: "ὦ πονηρᾶς ἐπὶ βωμοῦ δαδουχίας ὃ τροφῶν καὶνὰ μυστήρια"; the exclamations are also typical of a mourning speech (ὀδύρομαι). In this case they introduce the idea that a sacrilegious act has taken place with the human sacrifice, with gods tolerating it. This part of the speech conforms to the strongly emphasised advice by Menandros in 435, 18-21:

This is exactly what the speaker does in most of his speech; he devotes a large part of it mourning (ὀδύρομαι) about the way of Leukippe's death.

In Menandros' treatise on the monodia, there is a detailed discussion of this topos with an emphasis on the characteristics of the face. In this case the body has been mutilated and the lament focuses on the mutilation.

The handbooks on progymnasmata distinguish three types of ethopoiai: these are pathetic, ethical, and mixed. The speech under discussion, though pathetic in the most part, contains an element of ethos, as described by Hermogenes; when in a speech we are dealing only with the person whom we mourn then the speech is pathetic; if, however, we include in some way ourselves in the speech, then inevitably we are presenting aspects of ourselves, our ethos, and then the ethopoia is mixed (i.e. it is both ethical and pathetic); the example given by Hermogenes is the mourning speech of Achilleus over the body of Patroklos, where apart from the "pathos" for the killing of Patroklos, Achilleus deliberates (βουλεύεται) what he should do about the war.

In our case, this element of the speech is contained in the last sentence; but, though small, it still reveals the ethos of the speaker. After the last sentence: "λαβὲ ὦν, Δεινώτη, τὰς πρεποῦσας σοι παρ᾽ ἔμοι χοάς" Kleitophon is described as holding out his sword to kill himself (3, 16). The author exploits this occasion to depict Kleitophon's feelings towards his "lost" fiancée.

---

43 Men. Rhet. 434, 23-26: "ὅν δὲ προσήκοιν ἦν, οὗδεν ἤττον καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ λέγων οἰκτίσεται ἢ διὰ ὀρφανός καταλείπεται ἢ διὰ ἁμίσου πατρὸς ἑστήρηται καὶ τὴν ἐρημών ὀδύρεται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐτὸς."  
44 Men. 436, 15ff.: "εἶτα διατυπώσεις τὸ εἶδος τοῦ σώματος ὦν, ὦν ἀποβεβλήκε τὸ κάλλος...
45 See the classification on p. 227.  
46 Hermogenes, Progymnasmata, "περὶ ἡθοποίας" 9 (20.6-22.5).
Mourning over a stranger's body!

The second mourning speech (5, 7) over the supposed Leukippe's body comes after the “decapitation” of Leukippe. The speech is clearly connected with the previous death (in 3, 15) and uses amplification from the very beginning: “Νῦν μοι Λευκίππη τέθνηκας ἄληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῆ καὶ θαλάσση διαιρούμενον” (5, 7, 8). The new element - standard in funeral oration - we find here is the jealousy of Tyche.\(^47\) The combination of jealousy and fortune is a topos found elsewhere (Aristides, Libanios, Himeros, etc.).\(^48\)

The third and last time that we hear about Leukippe's death is when Kleitophon is imprisoned, the reader knows that there is a plot by Thersandros and sees Kleitophon not unexpectedly lamenting one more time. The lament (7, 5) comes a short while after the alleged death and it is characterised as a ὀφθαλμος by the narrator/Kleitophon: “μεταξὺ δὲ μου θρηνοῦντος” (7, 6, 1).

The threnos has three main parts:

i) the whole misfortune is a game of a daimon (present): “Τίς με δαιμόνων ἔξηπτάτησεν . . . τίς μοι Λευκίππην ἔδειξεν . . . ἡδονή.”

ii) the many unfortunate times with Leukippe in the past: “οἷοι Λευκίππη, . . . πειρατήρων.”

iii) a sense of guilt: “ό δὲ ἄνοσίως . . . πρὸ σοῦ.”

The double rhetorical question and the complaint to the daimon, both typical of a mourning speech, dominate the first part.

The second part (7, 5, 2) recalls the other cases of Leukippe's “death.” With two rhetorical questions it stresses the fact that it is not the first time that Kleitophon has lamented for Leukippe; however, that was in the past; this time, Fortune is not joking (Τῦχης παιδειά). The antithesis of the better past and the worse present is also found in the distinction of the “three divisions of time”

\(^47\) On Moira and Tyche in laments in Greek literature see Alexiou (1974) p. 110ff.

suggested in Menandros (435.16ff and 413.14ff.).\textsuperscript{49} This antithesis is stretched 
even more when Kleitophon speaks of the first and the second time, comparing 
the past with the present for the sake of amplification:
\[\text{τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ὅλον σοι τὸ σῶμα,} \]
\[\text{τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, κἂν τὴν κεφαλὴν δοξῶν μὴ ἔχειν εἰς τὴν ταφὴν,} \]
\[\text{νῦν δὲ τεθνήκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχής καὶ σώματος (7, 5, 3).} \]

However, Kleitophon had characterised the second case as “θάνατον διπλοῦν” where 
for the sake of amplification, he had argued that her death is a truly 
double death, shared by land and sea (5, 7). The past was bad but not as bad as 
the present.

The third part of the speech is in line with the tradition in which the lover 
accuses himself of being responsible for the other person's destruction. 
Kleitophon confesses his guilt both because he complied with Melite's advances 
and because, as a result, Melite caused Leukippe's death.

**Lament-like speeches of Kleitophon.**

In the novel of Achilleus Tatios there are a number of highly distressing 
occasions where Kleitophon, desperate and frustrated, makes lament-like 
speeches which share common characteristics with funeral orations and follow 
similar principles. These speeches are *ethopoiiai* with strong rhetorical features. 
The first interesting speech is the one which Kleitophon makes after the 
shipwreck and his arrest by the savage *boukoloi* in book 3, 10. That night, when 
the others were asleep, Kleitophon finds some privacy to mourn for Leukippe: 
\[\text{Tότε, ὡς ἔξον ἡδη, κλαίειν ἦχοιν τὴν Δευκάπτην (3, 10, 1).} \]
The speech is instigated by Kleitophon's guilt for the misfortunes of Leukippe 
(καὶ δὴ λογισάμενος διὰν αὕτη γέγονα κακῶν αἰτίως 3, 10, 1) and is 
introduced in a similar way as a mourning speech would be introduced 
(κωχύσας ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ βύθιον 3, 10, 1), but it is a private speech (τῷ δὲ νῷ 
κλέψας τοῦ κωκυτοῦ τὸν ψόφον), more like a *monodia*. It is clearly recognised 
as a *θρήνος* by the narrator in 3, 11, 1.

\textsuperscript{49} See the distinction between the past and the present; Himerios Or. 8.5 (Colonna): 
The speech presents a remarkable amount of material found usually at the very heart of funeral oration. In fact the speech is comparable to the one found in book 1, 13 delivered over Charikles' body by his father.

The speech has a clearly cut structure:

- **Introduction**: "Ω θεοί... κακῶν."
- **The present predicament - amplification**: "γίνει δέ... χειρονομίαις."
- **proper threnos for Leukippe**: "wód τῶν ἀτυχημάτων... πρὸς ἐρασθήν δυστυχόντα."  
- **The address to "θάλασσα"**: antithetical ending - "ψθόνος": by benefiting them, the sea has harmed them: "μάτην σοι ἡ θάλασσα, ... ἀποθανεῖν."

The speaker starts in a classic way with an address to "θεοί" and "δαίμονες" and typically blames on them all the misfortunes which he and Leukippe have suffered. This follows the advice given by Menandros in *perί μονωδίας*:

> "Χρῆ τοῖνυν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις εὐθὺς μὲν σχετιλάζειν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς δαίμονας καὶ πρὸς μοῖραν ἐδικον."

This is how Kleitophon begins his speech:

> "Ω θεοί καὶ δαίμονες, εἶπερ ἔστε ποὺ καὶ ἄκοψτε, τί τηλικοῦτον ἡδικήκαμεν, ὡς ἐν ὀλίγοις ἡμέραις τοσοῦτον πλήθει βαπτισθῆναι κακῶν;" (3, 10, 1).

The next step according to Menandros' *perί μονωδίας* is "εἶτα ἀπὸ τοῦ κατεπείγοντος εὐθὺς λαμβάνειν οἷον ἐξήρπασαν, οἷα κατὰ τοῦ πεσόντος ἐκώμασαν."  

That is happening next in Kleitophon's speech (νῦν δὲ καὶ παραδεδώκατε ἡμᾶς λησταῖς Αἰγυπτίως, ἦν μὴδὲ ἐλέους τύχωμεν, 3, 10, 2), which amplifies the situation. The gods did not simply hand them over to robbers but to Egyptian robbers with whom they can not even communicate in order to explain themselves and to plead for pity (see ἐλέους - ἐλεον).

This part contains also an internal reference to the power of rhetoric: ὁ γὰρ λόγος πολλάκις τὸν ἐλεον προξένει (3, 10, 2). Indeed, this is the aim of this speech as well. Immediately after it, the speaker goes deeper into the explanation of how λόγος can cause pity in the soul of the listener. The extract contains, surprisingly enough, an explanation of the whole aim of the speech. It looks like

---

instruction from a handbook on rhetoric! In fact, it could perfectly have been one.\textsuperscript{52}

The despair of the situation is shown by the typical rhetorical questions “\textit{νῦν δὲ ποία μὲν φωνὴ δεηθῶμεν; τίνας δὲ ὃρχους προτείνωμεν;}”. The combination of the questions and the bad situation as present (\textit{νῦν}) is also a standard element of lament.

The transition to the next section (3, 10, 4) is made smoothly by the exclamation “\textit{ὁ τῶν ἀτυχημάτων. Ἡδη τὸν θρῆνον ἔξορχησομαι}”: this part, devoted to Leukippe, is full of expressions and imagery taken from lament. Here we find the antithesis of (small) pain over his personal misfortune as opposed to the bitter \textit{threnos} over Leukippe’s misfortune. The speaker’s plight is shown by two rhetorical questions of equal number of syllables and assonance: “\textit{ποίω στόματι θρηνήσω; ποίως δίμαι δακρύσω;}” It continues with the antithetic parallelism of the carefully balanced address (\textit{isocolon}: 12 syllables on each side of the column) and the \textit{homoechon} in the beginning of the clauses \textit{πιστὴ - χορηστὴ:}

\begin{center}
\textit{ω πιστὴ μὲν πρὸς ἀνάγκην ἔρωτος, χορηστὴ δὲ πρὸς ἔραστὴν δυστυχοῦντα.}
\end{center}

Then the mourning imagery is intensified by further classic examples from the funeral oration, as seen elsewhere.\textsuperscript{53} The imprisonment (as death) is represented ironically in terms of a wedding procedure: the comparison of the prison with the bride’s chamber, the earth as her marriage bed, the ropes and cords are her wedding jewellery, and a robber is outside instead of a bride’s escort, and instead of an \textit{hymenaion} somebody sings her a \textit{monodia} (funeral song).

The antithetical imagery is stretched to the limits and the wedding-funeral \textit{topos} is being exploited to show the extremity of grief. The last part returns to the “blaming” \textit{topos} where the speaker reproaches the sea for destroying him and Leukippe by salvation (μὲμφομαί σοι τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ). The paradox is based on this antithesis; the φθόνος idea\textsuperscript{54} which comes at the end completes a remarkable speech full of the armoury of rhetorical lament.

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{52}] See “\textit{τὸ γὰρ ποιούντι τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ γλῶττα πρὸς ἅπειρον διακοινομένη τῆς τῶν ἀκούοντων ψυχῆς ἡμερο τὸ θυμοῦμενον}” in Achilleus Tattios, 3, 10, 2.
\item[\textsuperscript{53}] See, for example, p. 230f.
\item[\textsuperscript{54}] See p. 237.
\end{itemize}
The other two notable cases where Kleitophon is represented lamenting are found when Kleitophon finds out that Leukippe has been struck by some kind of madness in book 4, 9 and again, after he meets Kleinias and hears from him that Sostratos, his uncle, had in the meantime actually offered his daughter as Kleitophon's wife, just at the moment when they were about to depart secretly from their home (5, 11).

The first speech is a combination of a plea (to untie Leukippe) and a lament-like speech. The speech contains a number of antitheses; (he loves her but he does not untie her; they were saved by fortune but they suffer;).

The antithesis reaches its peak in a carefully balanced construction:

\[ \text{où δυστυχεῖς ήμεῖς δι'αυτά εὐτυχήσωμεν} \\
\text{τούς οίκοι φόβους ἐκπεφευγαμεν,} \\
\text{ίνα ναναγίαν δυστυχήσωμεν:} \\
\text{ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης περιγεγόναμεν... (lacuna)} \\
\text{ἐκ τῶν ληστῶν ἀνασυσώμεθα:} \\
\text{μανίας γὰρ ἐτηρούμεθα.} \]

This paradox full of antitheses highlights the predicament in which the couple has been. After it another antithesis unfolds where the speaker expresses fear of good fortune. This leads to his main idea that he is the most unfortunate person:

\[ \text{τίς οὖν ἡμῶν κακοδαιμονέστερος, οἱ φοβούμεθα καὶ τα εὐτυχήματα;} \]

We should also mention the use of rhetorical questions and the blaming of Tyche for their misfortunes.

The next speech (5, 11), called θρήνος, is interrupted by Kleinias and is relatively short. It is an accusation against daimon who caused him to miss the date of his wedding. It contains a few exclamations and the complete imagery - typical in lament - of γάμος and θάνατος, θρήνος and ζήμεναι. In the last sentence the speech is internally linked with the funeral speech over the beheaded corpse earlier in the book (5, 7) by the antithetical thought of fortune “giving” him the bride whose corpse she refused to give in this case! This lament is over an idea (namely the unfulfilled wedding prospect) that the speaker so

55 See "οἱ θρήνοι καιροῖς" in 5, 11.
56 See also p. 232, p. 237, and p. 239.
much wanted to be realised (and in fact he has suffered so much for it) and he just realises that he has lost his chance.

Lament-like speeches of female figures: Pantheia and Melite.

Two more independent speeches are going to occupy us in this discussion of this aspect of rhetoric in the novel of Achilleus Tatios. The one is the lament of Pantheia (2, 24), Leukippe’s mother, when she realises that her daughter has been receiving a foreigner at night; the other is a long quasi-lament, a speech on the sufferings caused to Melite by her love for Kleitophon.

Pantheia’s speech (2, 24) is an ethopoiia on the borderline of mourning speech and ψόγος. The mourning side is prevalent here. The speech is divided into three parts:

**Part I: the falsified expectation:** “Απώλεσας... προσεδόκων.”

**Part II: wish or curse:** “δισέλον... δυνάς.”

**Part III: amplification:** How bad is the “present”: “νών σε... δούλος ἔν;”

The speech starts with the topos of “the destroyed hope.” According to Menandros, if the dead person is young then, apart from other areas, we will base our arguments on his “nature,” the fact that the hopes we had were great:

“Aπώλεσας μου, Λευκίπη, τάς ελπίδας.” Then she continues with an address to her husband, Sostratos, and moves swiftly to the typical technique (for this type of speeches) of the antithetical expression:

ἔν Βυζαντίῳ πολεμείς ύπερ ἀλλοτρίων γάμων,

ἔν Τύρῳ δὲ καταπεπολέμησα (2, 24, 2).

The next idea is again on the same topos taken from funeral speeches (the defeated expectation) which closes the circle opened with the first sentence:

οἷμοι δειλαία, τοιούτους γάμους δίψεθαι οὐ προδεδόκων (2, 24, 2).

The next part is also common in ancient lament. This is what Alexiou describes as “the expression of an unfulfilled wish.” As she has rightly pointed

---

57 See p. 230f.
58 See also Kleinius’ lament over Charikles’ death (1, 14) on p. 232f.
59 See “ἀπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας τὸν θρήνον κινήσεις, ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως ὅτι εὕφυὴς, ὅτι μεγάλας παρέχειν ταῖς ἐλπίδοις...” 435, 1-3; also 420, 2-3: “κρείττους εἶχον ἐν τούτῳ τὰς ἐλπίδας οἱ τρέφοντες” also “καὶ γένος ἐστέρησεν τῆς ἐλπίδος καὶ γονέας...” 413, 18-19.
out, it has different forms which can be classified under categories such as “had I never been born” (as Helen or Andromache said) or “that the death had occurred at a different time or place or in a different manner.” This is exactly the idea behind the series of Pantheia’s wishes, with the difference that the subject in question is not death but suspected rape. She had better stayed in Byzantium and suffered rape in the conditions of war. This would have been better than the present state: οὔκ εἶχεν ἡ συμφορὰ διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην ὅνειδος (2, 24, 3). This idea is also a way of comparison which introduces smoothly the next part of the speech, the amplification part. This section bases the argument on another typical topos from funeral oration: “How terrible is the present situation.”

Starting with “νῦν δὲ,” which is repeated later, it refers to a double misfortune (ἀδοξείς ἐν οἷς δυστυχεῖς). The balanced sentence (2, 24, 4) “ἐπιλάνα δὲ με καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐνυπνῶν φαντάσματα, τὸν δὲ ἄληθέστερον δνειρὸν οὕκ ἑθεασάμην” contains both an antithesis of ideas and an equal number of syllables (isocolon).

The antithetical statements contribute to the amplification of the misfortune which is made clearer further on by the introduction of the comparative (νῦν ἀθλιώτερον ἀνετμήθης . . . αὕτη δυστυχεστέρα τῆς μαχαίρας τομῆ . . .).

The series of exclamations spread in the three parts of the speech are also suitable to this type of speeches: οἴμοι, Σώστρατε; οἴμοι δειλαία; οἴμοι τῶν κακῶν.

The speech is full of material usually found in funeral oration, creatively adapted to suggest that what happened is worse than death.

Another creative and interesting treatment of the same area of rhetoric can be found in a couple of speeches of Melite (5, 25-26). Melite does everything to persuade Kleitophon to become her lover (and husband). The first is a lament-like speech, the second is a suasoria. The speeches in this scene are given a remarkable weight by the author, comparable only with the discussion (controversia) on straight love and homoeroticism at the end of book 2 or the speeches in the trial scene, with the difference that here we have to deal with epideictic and deliberative oratory. The first speech is introduced by the narrator’s comment on Melite’s delivery:

---

61 Ferrini (1987-88) has analysed this speech and has underlined its rhetorical features.
“τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ προσώπου τοσαύτα εἶχεν, ὅσα εἴπειν ἥθελεν” (5, 25, 2); later “ἡ δὲ ἐπιράγωδει πάλιν” (5, 25, 4) and finally “ταύτα ἔλεγε, καὶ ἦμα ἔκλαιεν” (5, 25, 8). Then the next speech is introduced, stating that she delivers it in a different mood: “Ὡς δὲ ἐσιώπων ἔγνω κάτω νευρυκώς, μικρὸν διαλιπτούσα, λέγει μεταβαλοῦσα” (5, 26, 1).

The speeches are so powerful that the author feels the need to explain how a woman (who has not followed the educational system designed normally for men) can make such speeches. It is Ἑρως - not school education - that taught her how to declaim: διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἑρως καὶ λόγους (5, 27, 1). Her speeches have rendered Kleitophon unable to resist any longer (“Επισθόν τι άνθρώπινον... περιβαλούσῃ οὖν ἤνεχόμην καὶ περιπλεκόμενης πρὸς τὰς περιπλοκὰς οὐκ ἀντέλεγον” 5, 27, 2-3).

Melite’s first speech, conforms to the theory and practice of funeral oration (in a wider sense). The beginning of each section is introduced by an exclamation:

I Ὡς δυνατῆς ἔγνω (5, 25, 2): her impossible situation.
II Ὅς ζευγος κατʼ ἐμοῦ γοήτων (5, 25, 3): her deception by the couple.
III οἱ μοι δειλαία τῶν κακῶν (5, 25, 4): repercussions of the situation on her marriage and on her personality.
IV ἄπιστε καὶ βάρβαρε (5, 25, 6): Kleitophon is acting against the will of the god (Eros).
V Ὅ καὶ ληστῶν ἀγριώτερε (5, 25, 7): amplification: even a heartless robber would have succumbed!
VI εὐνοῦξε καὶ ἄνδρογυνε καὶ κάλλους βάσκανε (5, 25, 8): curse/insult.

The repeated use of exclamations helps the amplification process; the actual exclamations function as headings.

Part IV consists solely of five rhetorical questions, where the listener is not given the faintest opportunity to defend himself by disrupting her arguments.

The speech contains the familiar antithetical expression of ideas and a well-balanced parallelism in the isocolon, as for instance:

καὶ μισομένη τῶν μισοῦντα φιλῶ
καὶ ἀδυνομένη τῶν ἀδύνοντα ἔλεω

62 Perhaps they reveal the ἐφαρμογή-part in the work of the orator, namely the search for kephalaia - material for arguments.
As expected, amplification works right from the beginning and is elevated a step higher in each section, reaching its peak in section V:

ω καὶ λυστῶν ἀγριώτεροι...

ἀλλὰ, τὸ πάντων ὤριστικότατον...

and finishing in section VI with the triple abusing characterisation (with more syllables in every next step): εὔνοουχε καὶ ἀνδρόγυνε καὶ κάλλους βάσκανε and the curse, which is common in this kind of speeches.63

The whole scene recalls laments or accusation speeches from tragedy and indeed the author calls part of her speech a result of τραγῳδέω (ἐτραγῳδεῖ). We have seen that Melite uses every possible rhetorical device to show, indeed to magnify, the predicament she is in, before she advances to the second speech, her suasoria (5, 26).

Conclusions

The threnoi in the novel of Achilleus Tatios show a remarkable amount of rhetorical material also found in funeral speeches and in the theory preserved about them. We can only associate them with the progymnasma called ethopoia, because there is no other earlier surviving handbook on funeral speeches with which we could find a link.

The evidence, however, contained in them shows that by the time of Achilleus Tatios laments are a well developed type of speeches with standard characteristics found in later handbooks. The fact that there has not survived a handbook specially discussing them does not exclude the probability that the genre was well developed by that time and distinct from other types of speech, including ethopoia. The sophistication of those speeches and standard particular characteristics found in them suggests that threnos64 is a mature type of speech very popular with the novelists.

64 Speeches of this kind are called ‘threnos’ by the author on many occasions: see 1, 13, 2; 3, 11, 1; 7, 6, 1, etc.
This survey has shown that the author follows a tradition of creating laments by employing either certain characteristic imagery and sophisticated rhetorical techniques or texts and handbooks that do not survive today. Based on Menandros, Dionysios of Halikarnassos (whose short treatise on funeral speeches does not deviate from the traditional line found in Menandros) and the progymnasmata, we find sufficient evidence to argue that he follows some kind of teaching in the creation of his speeches (possibly the traditional teaching which survives in great detail in Menandros).
2. *Threnos* in Chariton and Heliodoros in comparison to Achilleus Tatios.

In what follows we try to identify rhetorical influences in a number of mourning speeches in order to assess the impact of epideictic rhetoric on the three novels in question. These speeches have all a common theme: their speakers are lamenting for a sad event (death, slavery, etc.); this common feature allows us to class them together. Our aim is not to prove that all these speeches are formal rhetorical laments, but to identify to what extent these speeches can be associated with funeral speeches and if there has been any rhetorical influence on them. Many of the speeches are very short and adapted to the context of the novels. But, still, we believe, it is remarkable to find even the occurrence of a few (two or three) rhetorical features in a speech of a limited length; for example, Kallirhoe's six-line speech in Chariton 1, 11 contains a couple of motifs which are also found in funeral oration and the subject of the speech is compared with lamenting (1, 11, 4) and crying (1, 11, 2).

*Threnos* in Chariton.

In the novel of Chariton there is a high frequency of lament and lament-like speeches. We witness Kallirhoe mourning for Chaireas extensively (three times)

---

1 The majority of laments and other lament-like speeches belong to Kallirhoe.

A. Kallirhoe mourning for misfortunes and calamities:
1, 8, 3-4: in tomb.
1, 11, 2-3: on board.
1, 14, 6-10: on board.
1, 8, 6-7: pregnant.
5, 1, 4-7: Distress speech - complaint to Fortune.
5, 5, 2-4: Lament about her Fortune and beauty.
6, 6, 2-5: Kallirhoe after hearing the intentions of the King.
7, 5, 2-5: When she thinks she has been captured on Arados.
7, 6, 7-8: When she thinks that the admiral (Chaireas) who captured Arados will want her as his wife.

B. Kallirhoe mourning for Chaireas
3, 7, 5-6: When interpreting her dream about Chaireas (she thinks he is dead).
3, 10, 4-8: Kallirhoe's lament when realising she is going to be sold.
4, 1, 11-12: Formal lament.

C. Chaireas' laments
3, 3, 4-7: Chaireas' *threnos* in the empty tomb: death and wedding.
and for misfortunes or ordeals she is going through (quite often); We find Chaireas lamenting (four times) and other characters making lament-like speeches, like Dionysios (two times), Kallirhoe’s mother and Statira. Apart from Chaireas and Dionysios, the two successful suitors in Kallirhoe’s life, all the other mourning speeches are delivered by female characters. Let us analyse some of the most representative speeches to see whether elements found in Achilleus Tatos existed also in the much earlier Chariton.

Kallirhoe Lamenting.

Mourning over misfortunes.

In 1, 8, 3-4, after regaining consciousness in the tomb where she was buried, Kallirhoe starts mourning for her predicament. It is actually a mourning for her own “death”! The speech contains the basic characteristics of a funeral speech, like the initial exclamation (οἵμοι τῶν καικῶν), the paradoxical antithesis (ζωσα κατώρυγμαι μηδὲν ἄδικον καὶ ἀποθνήσκω θάνατον μαχρόν. Ὑγιαίνουσάν με πνεύσουσι . . .); the rhetorical question which shows her desperate situation (τίνα τίς ἄγγελον πέμπει;); and the standard traditional τίνηπίτι (πεινοῦσι . . . 1, 8, 4), a complaint or blame usually directed to Fortune or god but here addressed to Chaireas who is the main responsible of her predicament. The speech finishes with the rhetorical address to Chaireas (ἄδικε Χαίρεα) and a series of negative statements followed up by a positive (μέμφομαι δὲ οὐξ ὅτι ... ἄλλα ὅτι ... οὐξ ἔδει ... οὔδε ... ἄλλα . . .)

In 1, 11, 2-3 (on board) when realising she is going to be sold as a slave, Kallirhoe makes a lament-like speech, full of antithetical thinking; it ends with the amplification of the description of Kallirhoe’s predicament. In this simple

3, 3, 15-16: When discovering the boat with Kallirhoe’s jewellery.
4, 3, 9-10: Chaireas: when he hears about Kallirhoe’s marriage with Dionysios.
5, 10, 6-9: Chaireas before “committing suicide.”

D. Other laments
2, 6: Dionysios’ distress speech.
3, 4, 2-3: Kallirhoe’s mother lamenting when she sees her daughter’s jewellery.
5, 10, 1-5: Dionysios’ lament after the complications in court.
8, 3: Statira’s short lament on Arados.
complaining speech both antithetical thinking and amplification stem from funeral oration.

Antithetical thinking is a basic characteristic of funeral oration. Here, the large number of Athenian ships that her father defeated in the past is indirectly contrasted to the small cutter ("κελὼς μικρὸς" 1, 11, 2), yet her father is unable to help her. Although she is of noble origin, she is taken to a foreign country where she is going to become a slave; the antithetical thinking reaches a peak with the idea that the conqueror is going to be conquered: "τάχα δὲ ἀγοράσει τις τὴν Ἐμοκράτους θυγατέρα δεσπότης Αθηναίος" (1, 11, 3). The whole passage compares and contrasts the past with the present and the past is presented as always better than the present: "πόσοι μοι κρέαττον Ἕν ἐν τάφῳ κείσθαι νεκρῶν" (1, 11, 3). This is compared with what happens now: "νῦν δὲ καὶ ζώντες καὶ ἀποθανόντες διεξεύχθημεν" (1, 11, 3). The presence of antithetical thinking along with the process of amplifying the idea of misfortune indicate rhetorical association with mourning speeches.

In her next lamentation in 1, 14, 6-10 Kallirhoe mourns for her being sold to Leonas. The amplification starts from the first sentence ("Ἀλλος τάφος . . . ἐρμιστερός ἐκεῖνον μᾶλλον 1, 14, 6), continues with the address and complaint to Fortune and the development of the idea that "even though the past was bad the present is much worse and hence unbearable." In this we find a rhetorical question "τίνα δὲ ἐνταῦθα καλέσω;", which again contributes to the amplification purposes.

Her situation looks much more sad with the series of antithetical thoughts which dominate the speech ("τὸν ἔραστήν φονέα ἐποίησας"; "ἐλάκτισε καιρῶς με τὴν φιλοῦσαν" 1, 14, 7). Her beauty did not work for her own benefit but for Theron's financial gain. She is sold in an isolated place and not even in a city as a slave.

The amplification continues in the second and last part of the speech which is addressed to Chaireas. Now, she claims, she has lost him for ever (Ἀληθῶς ἀπόλωλά σε, Χαιρέα, τοσοῦτο διαξευχθείσα πελάγει); while he is mourning.

---

3 See also p. 227f. and p. 237f.
4 Notice the use of the comparative ἐρμιστερός for amplification purposes found also later in 1, 14, 8: τοὺς πειρατὰς φοβερωτέρους.
over an empty tomb she—Hermokrates’ daughter—is sold as a slave! In other words, the present experience is much worse than the previous one. Tyche is blamed in Kallirhoe's next distress speech in 2, 8, 6-7 in which she expresses regret for the fact that she is pregnant, arguing how badly she has been treated by Tyche which now adds one more complication in her life. In the second part the speech becomes more emotional; it is addressed to her unborn child based on the antithesis that the child has been buried before it has even been born; the idea of the bad future is enhanced by two rhetorical questions in which her child-to-be is called a slave and an orphan without fatherland. Similar things happen in her other mourning speeches. In 5, 1, 4-7, for example, while on her way to the trial, Kallirhoe makes a distress speech—a complaint to Fortune—where she uses amplification, rhetorical questions and accusations to Fortune, the idea with which she starts her speech. In 5, 5, 2-4 when Kallirhoe hears that she is going to take part in a trial she makes another lament-like speech. The speech has a notable balance; first there is a series of *asyndeta* where in 5 verbs we have the whole story of Kallirhoe. Immediately after it there are a couple of equally well-balanced sentences:

> “οὐκ ἠρξει σοι διαβάλειν ἀδίκως με πρὸς Χαῖρεαν, ἀλλ' ἐδώκας μοι παρὰ Διονυσίῳ μοιχείας ὑπόθεσιν”

and

> “τότε μοι τὴν διαβολὴν ἐπόμενας τάρφ,
νῦν δὲ βασιλικῷ δικαστηρίῳ . . .”

The next part contains a few rhetorical questions which underline her impossible situation; it finishes with a complaint against her beauty which causes her such hardship; there is the paradox that instead of her being lucky for being beautiful she feels threatened by her own good looks! The lament-like speech of Kallirhoe after she hears the king's intentions towards her (6, 6, 2-5) is similar in tone but goes one step higher in the amplification process. The first sentence has an internal connection with Kallirhoe's other lament-like speech in 5, 5, 7 where she had predicted that she would not cross the

---

5 A similar idea can be found in Achilleus Tatois 7, 5, 3; see p. 237.
6 See also p. 232, p. 237, and p. 239.
river Euphrates and expressed her fears that when she is away from Ionia someone might find himself attracted to her. This is now happening, and she is once again complaining for her bad luck. Now it is certain, she claims, she would never see her country and relations; once more the present time is depicted as being much worse than the past (σουκέτι γὰρ ὑμᾶς δύσομαι). Like Kleitophon in Achilleus Tatos' novel, Kallirhoe claims that now she is really dead (νῦν ἀληθῶς Καλλιρόη τέθνηκε; 6, 6, 3). Notice the similarities of this beginning with Kleitophon's speech: "Νῦν μοι Λευκίσση τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, . . ." in 5, 7, 8.

She blames her κάλλος for this predicament:

"ὡς κάλλος ἐπιβουλον,
σύ μοι πάντων κακών αἴτιον.
διά σὲ ἀνηρεθήν,  
διά σὲ ἐπαράθην,
διά σὲ ἐγήμα μετὰ Χαρέαν,
διά σὲ εἰς Βαυβιλῶνα ἡχθην,
διά σὲ παρέστην δικαστήριῳ."*

And then with the introduction of a rhetorical question she intensifies the amplification:

"πόσοις μὲ παρέδωκας:
λησταίς, θαλάττη, τάφῳ, δουλεία, κρίσει.
πάντων δὲ βαρύτατον ὁ ἔρως ὁ βασιλέως
καὶ οὐκ ἔχεις ἤκακον τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ὀργῆς
αφοβεωτέον ἠγούμαι τὴν τῆς βασιλίδος ἡλιοτυπίαν," etc.

We witness the same features in 7, 5, 2-5, when Kallirhoe, while in Arados, complains to the statue of Aphrodite, and later in 7, 6, 7-8 when Kallirhoe becomes suicidal because she thinks she is going to be captured by the general who wants to marry her.9

---

* Char. 6, 6, 4.

7 Notice also the comparison between past (τότε) and present (νῦν), following the principle of comparison between past and present where the latter is always presented as worse than the former, a common idea in funeral oration (see p. 227f. and 237f.).

8 The motif wedding - death is recalled here: γάμον οὐχ ἄφομένω, θάνατον εὔχομαι.
Apart from these lament-like speeches, Kallirhoe delivers one proper funeral speech for Chaireas in 4, 1, 11-12 and on two other occasions she mourns for Chaireas' supposed death: 3, 7, 5-6 (short) and 3, 10, 4-8.

The first (4, 1, 11-12) contains many basic elements of funeral speech in a condensed form: antithetical thought, parallelism, paradox, references to Tyche's φθόνος (ἐφθόνησας)\(^{10}\) and address to Tyche; in the other two we find similar techniques.

In a similar way we find Chaireas making lament-like speeches, notably in 3, 3, 4-7, in 3, 4, 2-3, in 4, 3, 9-10, and in 5, 10, 6-9.

In the first case we find rhetorical questions, complaint to some god, and the θάλαμος-τάφος imagery. In the other two we find similar elements. Likewise, in other lament-like speeches of secondary characters we notice the same features.\(^{11}\)

In this general overview of threnos in Chariton we find the following repeated motifs coming up frequently in the speeches:

- address to the person by whom the threnos is caused or to Fortune;
- complaint or blame (μέμψις) to a god;
- antithetical thinking (very frequent);
- exclamations and apostrophe;
- rhetorical questions (frequent).

As we saw earlier, all these elements are found also in Achilleus Tatios but in a much more developed and analytical form. Chariton does make use of the basic elements of funeral speeches, which shows that he is also aware of the fact that in these particular places he has to follow some principles. Although much earlier than Achilleus Tatios and still considered belonging to a time before the second sophistic movement, Chariton seems to follow roughly the same basic rules of the funeral oration which are later expanded and displayed to the extreme. One can in no way argue that his motifs have reached the sophistication of those used by Achilleus Tatios but it can be said that there is evidence in his work of their presence even if sometimes they have an elementary form. His mourning speeches do not reach the careful balance of

---

\(^{10}\) See also p. 237, note 48.
Achilleus Tatos’ lament-like speeches and the richness of their imagery, but still they are permeated by a limited but persistent repertory of features found in funeral speeches. Achilleus Tatos was probably familiar with Chariton’s novel and this early novelist’s work was a significant step, from a rhetorical point of view, in the progress the novel made in his successor’s hands.
Charikleia makes a couple of notable speeches which can be examined under the category of *threnos*. There is not a single real lament over Theagenes' death. Her speeches are lament-like complaints about her sufferings, either to Apollo for the suffering he caused to the couple in the initial stages of the novel (1, 8, 2-3) where the reader is informed swiftly of what has happened to them until now, or about her ordeals while in Nausikles' house (5, 2, 7-10), or in 5, 29, 4, when she is in distress because she realises Trachinos' intentions to marry her, or in 7, 14, 4-8, where Charikleia laments over Kalasiris who died recently. This particular speech contains some characteristic elements of a funeral speech such as the motif of the "great loss" ("ἀπεστέρημαι πατέρα" 7, 14, 5; "ἀπολώλεκα" 7, 15, 6), and the technique of amplification (αὔξησις) where Charikleia exaggerates her misery:

"τὸν μὲν φύσι γεννήσαντα οὐκ ἔγνωκα,
tὸν δὲ θέμενον Χαρικλέα, οἶμοι, προδέδωκα,
tὸν δὲ διαδεξάμενον καὶ τρέφοντα καὶ περισώζοντα ἀπολώλεκα . . ." (7, 14, 6); address to the dead person (τροφεῖ καὶ σῶτερ; 7, 14, 6) and a couple of rhetorical questions showing her despair in the second part (such as τί γὰρ καὶ

---

13 Lament Speeches in Heliodoros:

**Charikleia**

1, 8, 2-3: "we have suffered enough."
5, 2, 7-10: Lament; she hopes that Theagenes is alive.
5, 29, 4: Distress speech.
6, 8, 3-6: Charikleia's long lament speech (she knows he is alive).
7, 14, 4-8: Charikleia's mourning.

**Theagenes**

2, 1, 2-3: he thinks Charikleia has been killed.
2, 4, 1-4: when he thinks that the murdered girl they found in the cave is Charikleia.
5, 6, 2-4: lament-like speech against Fortune.

**Demenaithe**

1, 13, 3: (indirect).
1, 14, 6: (indirect).
1, 15, 3-6: (Distress speech).

**Thyamis**

1, 31, 1: (very short).

... eis poiaan afrotontas elpida), and a remarkably long string of *asynedeta*, full of metaphors:

"o xeiropgyos tis zevnis,
eta baxthria tis plani,
o xevangos tis epi tin enegkousan
o ton phytovn anagnorismos,
et parapnykh ton doustyxematos,
et euporiax kal lisis ton amexanov,
et pantovn ton kath' hmas xynura Kalasiric apollale" (7, 14, 7);
or the last part of her speech:

"oixetai et semh xal melexos,
et sophi xal et pola tpr dnti phin . . . ."

In his attempt to describe the dead person's life and to underline the significance of the loss, the speaker makes virtually an *enkion*. The idea is not strange to Menandros who, in fact, encourages the person who makes the funeral speeches to mix *enkion* in his funeral speeches.16

The technique of a persistent repetition of a certain pattern, as illustrated here by Heliodoros, cannot be found to this degree in Achilleus Tatos who is very artful with his laments, but it is found in later rhetoricians - who might even have been contemporary with Heliodoros.17

This characteristically standardised style became very popular especially with the Christian orators - many of the early ones in fact had gone through the same pagan educational system as Achilleus Tatos or Heliodoros. A simple comparison of the passage of Heliodoros with that of Gregory of Nyssa, for example, says it all:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀφηρέθη τῆς φιλανδρίας ὁ τύπος,</td>
<td>the death of the beloved is a type of filandria, a model of filial piety,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ἄγνυν τῆς εὐφροσύνης ἀνάθημα,</td>
<td>the loss of the joy is a memorial of joy, a sign of mourning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἦ εὐπρόσιτος σεμνότης,</td>
<td>was the most respectful of the mourners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἦ ἀκαταφρόνητος ἤμερότης,</td>
<td>was the most disrespectful of the mourners,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Notice the reference to three divisions of time which represent the transition from past to present to future emphasizing the progressively worsening tragic situation.

The text given above is an example of the technique in discussion comes from Gregory's funeral speech for the Empress Aelia Flaccilla, who died in 387. We can identify the same features in the *enkomion*, which shows their association in the two different types of speech. In Proklos' *Enkomion to the Holy Virgin Maria* we find the same encomiastic feature:

Equally interesting and closer to traditional devices is the long lament-like speech in 6, 8, 3-6 where Charikleia, taking Knemon's wedding with Nausikles' daughter as a starting point, reflects on her personal misfortune. In the middle of the joy of a wedding scene, the author makes Charikleia retreat to her room and make a lament-like speech based on the wedding - funeral motif, well-known from funeral oration, thus performing a kind of funeral ritual in a wedding context! The underlying antithetical motif acts as a constant reminder of the sadness of death, especially when contrasted with the joy of life or, as here, the

---

17 See the impact of it on later laments in Christian hymns, e.g. the *Akathistos Hymnos* (to the Virgin Mary) and other Christian hymns; see Alexiou (1974) p. 152ff.

18 Gregory of Nyssa, Migne 46. 884 b-c.

19 "Ἐπιτάφιος λόγος εἰς Πλακύλλαν Βασιλίσσαν."

20 Proklos (episk) *Oratio ἡ* Migne 65. 681 A-B.
merriment of a wedding day.\footnote{See also the lament of Charikles' father (A.T. 1, 13) on p. 230ff.} The whole speech is orchestrated in such a manner that it contributes to the amplification. We also find an address to *Tyche* and *Daimones* (6, 8, 5) to whom she casts a *μέμψις* she finishes with an address to the person for whom the whole lament takes place (Theagenes).

**Theagenes' mourning speeches.**

On several occasions Theagenes thinks that Charikleia is dead and, therefore, he finds himself mourning for her death (2, 1, 2-3; 2, 4, 1-4); on another occasion we find him complaining in a speech for the misery that Fortune has caused him. The first of these three speeches (2, 1, 2-3) is the most remarkable from the aspect of technique. Theagenes, believing that Charikleia has been killed, starts a bitter lament. His speech follows traditional patterns - found also in Achilleus Tatos - such as the *isocolon* οἶχεται Χαρίκλεια, Θεαγένης ἀπόλλωλε, as does the amplification process in which the present situation is presented as much worse than one could normally expect:

"οὐ μὴν ἔτι σωθήσομαι σου, φιλτάτη, κειμένης
οὐδὲ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς φύσεως νόμῳ, τὸ χαλεπώτατον,\footnote{Notice the use of comparison; see also note 4.}
οὐδὲ ἐν χερόιν ἀπολιποὺσης τὸν βίον αἰς ἡσουλήθης
ἀλλὰ πυρὸς, οἴμοι, γέγονας ἀνάλωμα . . . " (2, 1, 3);

Then the idea of a funeral instead of a wedding comes up:\footnote{Found also in Thyamis' short speech when killing the girl in the cave (1, 21, 1) “τοιαύτας ἐπὶ σοι λαμπάδας ἀντὶ τῶν νευρικῶν τοῦ δαίμονος ἄψαντος” (2, 1, 3). A praise to her beauty which was lost in such a sad way (καὶ δεδαπάνηται τὸ ἄξι πᾶν χάλλος); a blame to the cruel god who did it and a reference to the deprivation that the god caused him (προσαφήνηται με ... ἀπεστερήθησιν 2, 1, 3); the use of *asynedēx* “ήνυσθω, λελύσθω πάντα, φόβοι, κίνδυνοι, φροντίδες, ἐλπίδες, ἔφωτες” (2, 1, 2) all show a strong rhetorical construction.} “τοιαύτας ἐπὶ σοι λαμπάδας ἀντὶ τῶν νευρικῶν τοῦ δαίμονος ἄψαντος” (2, 1, 3). A praise to her beauty which was lost in such a sad way (καὶ δεδαπάνηται τὸ ἄξι πᾶν χάλλος); a blame to the cruel god who did it and a reference to the deprivation that the god caused him (προσαφήνηται με ... ἀπεστερήθησιν 2, 1, 3); the use of *asynedēx* “ήνυσθω, λελύσθω πάντα, φόβοι, κίνδυνοι, φροντίδες, ἐλπίδες, ἔφωτες” (2, 1, 2) all show a strong rhetorical construction.
On the second occasion (2, 4, 1-4) when Theagenes takes the dead body of a woman in the cave as Charikleia’s, he makes another moving and remarkably artful funeral speech, similar to that of Achilleus Tatos. Again the speech starts with an exclamation for the god-sent misery (“οὐ συμφορᾶς θεηλάτου” 2, 4, 1) and a rhetorical question in which he wonders about who the god responsible for this misfortune may be:

Τίς οὖν ἀκόρεστος Έφινυς (2, 4, 1); the parallel structure:

“φυγήν τής ἐνεγκούσης ἐπιβαλοῦσα, χινδύνοις θαλασσών κινδύνοις πειρατηρίων ὑποβαλοῦσα, λησταίς παραδοούσα, πολλάκις τῶν ὄντων ἄλλοτριώσασα;”

and “κεῖται Χαρίκλεια . . .
κεῖται δ’ οὖν ὄμως . . .”;

the idea of deprivation (“ἀνήρπασται” 2, 4, 2);25 the address to the dead person: “ἀλλ’ ὡ γλυκεία, . . .”; the exclamations (2, 4, 3); the mouth that has been silenced (2, 4, 3)26 and the eyes which have lost their illumination;27 the destruction of her beauty; the bride imagery,28 etc.

Also there are a number of rhetorical questions which show his despair and a promise that they meet again soon. All these are common places in a funeral oration as we have seen in Achilleus Tatos. In other speeches we find similar devices common to funeral oration, as in Theagenes’ complaint for his bad luck in 5, 6, 24.

From this general overview on threnos in Heliodoros we can see that the author uses general devices found also in real funeral orations in his lament-like speeches where his characters are in distress; however, this happens in a more

25 See note 24.
26 Notice here the striking similarity of the text with the theory of Menandros 436, 15-21: “τίτα διατυπώσεις τὸ εἶδος τοῦ σώματος οἷς ἦν, οἷον ἀποβιβάζει τὸ κάλλος, τὸ τῶν παρειών ἔρθημα, οἷα γλώττα συνεστάλτα, . . . ὀφθαλμῶν δὲ βολαὶ καὶ γλῶνα κατακομμηθεῖσα, βλεφάρων δὲ ἐλεικεῖς οὐκέτα ἐλεικεῖς, ἄλλα συμπεπτωκότα πάντα”; see also Heliodoros 2, 1, 3.
27 The imagery of light and darkness is clearly exploited here where light is a metaphor for life and darkness for death (see more on this popular metaphor and its use in funeral oration in Soffel’s (1974) commentary on Menandros 419, 19-21, p. 243ff.; see also Alexiou (1974) pp. 187-189 for more on light and darkness in lament.
28 See “ἄλλ’ ὡ τι ἐν σε τῆς ὀνομάσεις; νῆμψην; ἄλλ’ ἀνόμφευτος γαμετήν; ἄλλ’ ἀπείρατος” (2, 4, 3).
subtle way, from the aspect of the plot, than in Achilleus Tatos. He never insists too much on using and stretching motifs extensively; he rather prefers traditional, common structures. In a few instances, however, he demonstrates the whole repertoire of his oratorical armoury; this usually happens on the occasions which need a "real" funeral speech drawing motifs and imagery from proper funeral oration. It is here that the author comes closer to Achilleus Tatos in terms of style. By contrast, Achilleus Tatos exploits all the opportunities available to use rhetorical devices drawn from funeral speeches.

The fact that Heliodoros is less interested than Achilleus Tatos in doing so is further corroborated by their author's habit of giving reported lament-like speeches on many occasions\(^\text{29}\) where he could have provided us with direct speeches - thus creating and exploiting their dramatic effects. Perhaps he is more concerned with the plot and advanced narrative techniques and less with oratorical display in his novel.

\(^{29}\) See p. 254, note 13. The same happens with courtroom speeches: see p. 218.
The impact of funeral oration on the novels.

Ancient novelists have been criticised as “killing” their heroes far too often and then bringing them back to life again. This has been one of the odd and unattractive parts of the novels for the reader of today. It just seems too implausible and unnatural. If we try to look at the advantages that this has in the novel we soon realise that among other things (it raises the dramatic tension; it makes us empathise with the hero; it creates twists in the story, etc.) the occasion is created for the heroes to express emotion and to describe their psychological situation by delivering a speech. These speeches are a good demonstration of the authors’ rhetorical training and, particularly in the second sophistic, they are used for display purposes. The rhetorical quality of these speeches can also make a difference in the sketching of the characters. Achilleus Tatios, for instance, is very much interested in this area. Every time a tragic situation occurs we find rhetoric of some kind behind it. This happens so extensively that is leaves no doubt that authors used rhetoric as a recurrent component of their story. Whether the frequency of such scenes is an immediate result of the authors’ desire to display their rhetorical abilities is a question that cannot be easily answered. The fact is that the novelists summon up all their rhetorical abilities from this particular area - the funeral oration - whenever the occasion arises.

Lament speeches are essential for this kind of literature since they reveal the inner emotional world of the heroes. Emotion is a basic ingredient of the ancient romance. Therefore, these speeches become the “carrier” of this feature of the novel. They show us the weak points of their heart, even of brave and tough or cruel characters, and they help the reader to form a rounded picture of the characters involved. Apart from that, when seen in a broader perspective, the high frequency of mourning speeches contributes to the enhancement of the reader’s sympathy and his emotional entanglement in the story. The speeches are used as “pressure releasers” in which the characters let out all emotions and rage and explain to others (indirectly) how they feel. They are a window which lets the reader take a view of their emotional suffering.
There is also a difference in the treatment of mourning speeches among the three novelists. While Achilleus Tatios is prepared to include almost any element of funeral oration in his laments (or lament-like speeches) creating thus rich speeches full of related imagery and allusions which show a close link to proper funeral oration, Heliodoros treats his speeches more freely. He is more relaxed with the themes which he incorporates in his speeches, and he shows individual style; he is selective with motifs, shortens the speeches or the imagery in it and often presents them in indirect way, summarised by others in reported speech (e.g. Demenaite's speeches) when he is not so much interested in depicting a character completely. Often Heliodoros - though this cannot be denied completely for the two other authors - uses his lament-speeches to advance his plot. Chariton, on the other hand, uses many features found in funeral oration but he does not reach the height or the variety found in Achilleus Tatios' or Heliodoros' works.

Rhetorical display is evidence of "quality" in any type of work. However, in the later work of Heliodoros this tendency seems subdued. Although the use of rhetoric in this novel is still considerable, it has started to become less artificial. Things are not said just for the sake of saying them. The dust of the second sophistic movement, where rhetoric was the predominant force, appears to settle down. This is true for the authors of secular literature as opposed to the Christian authors. If we take a look at Christian orators of late antiquity - St Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzos; Synesios, Proklos, etc. - we will realise that the high pitched oratorical force goes on for many more centuries in the service of Christianity.

30 See 1, 13, 3; 1, 14, 6.
31 J. Birchall has shown this in his (1996) article.
32 Achilleus Tatios' and Heliodoros' kind of rhetoric is found abundantly in their work and this has its reasons. Early Christian orators are not so much concerned with the means of persuasion as with their aim which is to convert the pagans, to strengthen the belief of their followers and to impress newcomers. All these purposes were served with the rhetorical-display style.
33 See, for example, Dihle (1994) p. 518.

Epideictic oratory has played an important role in the ancient novel and the use of *enkomion* (or *psogos*) can be found as a constituent ingredient in several speeches of a different nature and purpose, although there is no such thing as a complete *enkomion* or *psogos* in the novel. This, however, does not mean that epideictic oratory played a subsidiary role in the creation of the novels. On the contrary, there are many instances in which we find it used in the formation of arguments for praising or blaming speeches and in non-epideictic speeches where the epideictic element is dominant.

As we will see later on (p. 265ff.), Achilleus Tatos makes his heroes create small *enkomia* in the playful intellectual competition between Konops and Satyros. Similarly, the first part of the priest’s courtroom speech in Achilleus Tatos (8, 8, 9) is reminiscent of many characteristics which are also found in *psogos*, although this part of the priest’s speech seems to be strongly influenced by classical oratory. It is on this that the priest builds all his other arguments. Likewise, Heliodoros uses encomiastic technique in the presentation of his heroes in order to convince us of their superlative beauty and to attract our admiration for them.

*Enkomion and Psogos* in Chariton.

After the abduction of Kallirhoe, while on board, the pirates deliberate about their destination; Theron states his opinion on Athens and the inquisitive nature of its people. The speech belongs to the deliberative kind. However, in his attempt to convince his fellow-pirates that Athens is not the right destination for them, Theron uses the following piece of argument suitable to an invective speech (*psogos*):

"μόνοι γὰρ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκουέτε τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν Αθηναίων; δήμος ἐστι λάλος καὶ φιλόδικος, ἐν δὲ τῷ λιμένι μυρίου συκοφάνται πεύσονται τίνες ἐσμὲν καὶ πόθεν ταῦτα φέρομεν τὰ φορτία. ὑποψία καταλήπτεται πονηρὰ τοὺς

---

1 See p. 83, p. 185, and p. 189ff.
The speaker starts with a rhetorical question and then presents a series of negative statements of increasing intensity: the Athenians are talkative and keen on litigation, then he moves to μυρίοι συκοφάνται, then to δραχμεὺς, who are called "βαρύτεροι τυράννων" and concludes with the idea that the Athenians are worse even than the Syracusians (μᾶλλον). Responsible for this climactic presentation are rhetorical principles found in epideictic oratory.

Additionally, encomiastic elements can be found in the introductory description of the two main heroes of the novel by the narrator, where the heroes are praised for their beauty. We find these in 1, 1, 1-2, for Kallirhoe; and in 1, 1, 3, and 1, 1, 5, for Chaireas.

In the first instance (1, 1, 1-2), for example, the narrator praises Kallirhoe for her κάλλος. She is a “θαυμαστόν τι χρήμα παρθένου” and “ὔγαλμα τῆς ὅλης Σικελίας.” Her κάλλος is not human-like (amplification) and can be compared with that of goddesses (comparison). Her φήμη is spreading everywhere and she is a “παράδοξον θέαμα.”

This short presentation of the heroine contains a number of standard encomiastic elements found in almost all the rhetorical handbooks on enkomia:

- The praise of (or reference to) κάλλος
- Amplification
- Comparison
- The impact on others

All or some of these principles are found again and again in such speeches.

---

2 Men. Rhet. 371, 14-17: “μετὰ τὴν γένεσιν ἔρεις τι καὶ περὶ φάσεως, οἷον δι’ ἐξέλαιμιν ἐξ ὄψεως εὐεξίας τῷ κάλλει καταλαμίζων τὸ φανάριον ἀστέρια καλλύτερα τῶν κατ’ οὐρανὸν ἐφίλλως.” Also in his funeral speech (420, 13) there is reference to “τὸ τοῦ σώματος κάλλος” and elsewhere; see especially 436, 15-20 with specific details; see also Theon 8 (II, 110. 6f. Spengel), Hermog. Prog. 7, 16. 5f. (Rabe), etc.

3 In 1, 1, 3 Chaireas is praised for his beauty (“μετράκιον εὖμορφον”), he is “πάντων ὑπερέχον” (comparison), and he is composed to mythological heroes, another characteristic found in the handbooks. See enkomion in almost all authors of progymnasmata; see, for instance Theon 8 (II, 111. 1f. Spengel). The presentation is shortly after followed in 1, 1, 3 where Chaireas is described as going home “στῇβὼν ὄπιστος ἀστής”; there is reference to his "gleaming face" ("τὸ λαμπρὸ τοῦ προσώπου... "). In praises the orators are specifically instructed by Menandros to illustrate the "λαμπρότητι τῶν προσώπων." See Men. Rhet. 420, 7-8: "Τῶν καὶ ἡ λαμπρότητι τοῦ προσώπου
As we have seen here, Chariton is not too much interested in creating proper speeches of praise (or blame), but he makes some use of material known from this kind of speeches. Encomiastic elements are used moderately and for very specific purposes; this is probably because *enkomion* and *psogos* became more fashionable in later times. Chariton cannot be regarded as contributing as much as the other novelists to this rhetorical aspect of the novel.
Enkomion and psogos in Achilleus Tatos.

Quite different is the case in Achilleus Tatos’ novel. Here we find the paignion⁴ between Konops and Satyrros (2, 20-22). Some of the speeches there are called mythoi,⁵ a part of which can be regarded as encomiastic; the praise of the mosquito thematically recalls the praise of the fly (μυίας ἐγκώμιον) by Lucian, where we find a detailed description of the fly and a frequent comparison with other animals of similar kind, including the mosquito (gnat).

In this intellectual competition speakers use techniques suggested in rhetorical handbooks of progymnasmata (in the relevant chapters on enkomia). Both sides present a myth. The first (2, 21), related by Konops (about the lion’s weakness), contains a praise of the lion’s virtues and a basic synkrisis between the lion and the elephant in terms of their weak points. In the second one (2, 22) there is again a synkrisis between the gnat and the lion with the ultimate aim to praise the gnat. Theon’s “Περὶ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου” in his progymnasmata begins with the definition of enkomion:

“Εγκώμιον ἔστι λόγος ἐμφανίζων μέγεθος τῶν κατ’ ἀρετὴν πράξεων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν περὶ τι ωρισμένων πρόσωπων” (Theon, 8; Spengel II, 109. 20-22).

In Satyrros’ myth the gnat compares himself to the lion (hence the synkrisis) in a self-encomiastic speech - which, of course, applies to the whole species.

Further on, Theon gives practical advice - in the form of a “recipe” - on how to go about different types of enkomia - which, by the way, are divided into three categories according to the subject they are treating:

i) εἰς τοὺς ζώντας (ἐγκώμιον)

ii) εἰς τοὺς τεθνεότας (ἐπιτάφιος)

iii) εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς (ὦμος)

⁴ See the description of their “competition” by the narrator in the words “προσεπαίζε” and “ἀντιπαιζε” in 2, 22.

⁵ Achilleus Tatos 2, 20: “... φέρε σου μέθον ἀπὸ κάνωπος εἴπω.” In 2, 21, immediately after follows the mythos that Konops relates to Satyrros. In 2, 21 Satyrros introduces his own story which is nowhere called a mythos; he calls it a “λόγος φιλοσόφων” whereas he calls mythos the story he just heard from Konops: “Ἀκούσων κάμιθ τινα λόγον, εἶπεν, ἀπὸ κάνωπος καὶ λέοντος, ἐν ἀκριβαί τινος τῶν φιλοσόφων χαρίζομαι δὲ σοι τῷ μύθου τῶν ἔλεγχατα.” In this clearly the gnat tries to diminish the lion’s virtues and to enlarge his own powers with the ultimate aim to present himself also the most virtuous by comparison.
His advice for all three types of praise is the same and the speaker should take care to adapt it to his needs. In this general plan, therefore, when speaking in praise of somebody one should take care to cover the following areas of virtues:

(tων δὲ ἀγαθῶν)

i) τὰ μὲν περὶ ψυχῆν τε καὶ ἥθος
ii) τὰ δὲ περὶ σώμα
iii) τὰ δὲ ἐξωθέν ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει. 6

Following that, there is a more detailed catalogue of specific points that the speaker should make under each of the three categories. In the “τὰ περὶ τὸ σῶμα” there is advice to go through the following topics:

tοῦ δὲ σώματός ἐστιν ὑγίεια, ἱσχύς, κάλλος, εὐαίσθησις. 7

In the same way there is advice for the “ψυχικὰ ἀγαθά” which are “τὰ σπουδαῖα ἡθικὰ καὶ τούτων ἀκολουθοῦσαι πράξεις, οἷον ὅτι φρόνιμος, ὅτι σώφρων, ὅτι ἄνδρείος, ὅτι δίκαιος, ὅτι ὁσίος, ὅτι ἐλευθέριος, καὶ ὅτι μεγαλόφρων, καὶ δόσα τοιαῦτα.” 8

Interestingly, the gnat uses several of them in presenting himself. Firstly, his power (ἱσχύς), then his bravery (ἀνδρεία) and all the things he can do. 9 His speech is well planned. Its plan is revealed to the trained/initiated reader. On three occasions the speaker uses “areas of finding arguments” (κεφαλαία), such as those given in the theoretical handbooks. When moving from one area to another the gnat says: “ἐμοὶ δὲ μέγεθος μὲν . . . , κάλλος . . . , τὴν δὲ ἄνδρείαν μου” (2, 22).

The same areas have been used in the first part of the speech not for encomiastic purposes but for the opposite effect: to make the lion look common and useless in comparison with the gnat. There is some advice in the progymnasmata that when working on the opposite of enkomion, effectively on psogos, we should use the same topics but to the opposite aim. 10

The last part of his speech (2, 22, 3) has to do with the gnat’s achievements; there is advice for this, too, in the handbooks: “ἐπαινεταὶ δὲ εἰσὶν αἱ πράξεις καὶ αἱ...

---

7 Theon, ibid 110. 6-7.
8 Theon, ibid 110. 7-10.
9 “πράξεις” or “ἐπιτηδεύματα”; see Theon, ibid.
10 See, for instance, Theon’s advice: “Ἐκ μὲν τούτων ἐπαινεσθεμένα, ἰσχομέν δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων”; Theon, ibid 112. 17-18.
For Hermogenes\textsuperscript{12} and Menandros\textsuperscript{13} the πράξεις-part in an enkomion (either alone or as a part of a funeral speech) is the most important (τὸ δὲ κυριῶτατον αἱ πράξεις). For Hermogenes - a contemporary of Achilleus Tatos - there is another issue quite useful for this discussion. In his chapter on where we can find arguments for our encomiastic speech\textsuperscript{14} the most important ἄρομα is the following:

It is mainly this topos that is being exploited in this speech and that is why this mythos looks more like a synkrisis. Mythos and synkrisis are supported by the encomiastic nature of the speech.

In his advice on how to go about enkomia on animals Hermogenes specially suggests that we should follow similar procedures to those in the other types of enkomia; the following more specified subjects are also mentioned:

Πῶς τρέφεται;

ποταπῶν τὴν ψυχὴν;

Ποταπῶν τὸ σῶμα;

τίνα ἔργα ἔχει; etc.\textsuperscript{16}

All these points are included in the speech in question (2, 22).

In the contest of myths, the question “who is stronger and better equipped” can satisfactorily be answered by looking at the areas of body (σῶμα) and acts (ἔργα).

Further on the issue of the speaker announcing the area he is going to develop, which is being mentioned by the gnat, we can find some information in Menandros who actually advises that this should be a normal procedure in enkomia because it makes the hearer more attentive, making thus easier the amplification procedure:

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid. p. 110.

\textsuperscript{12} Hermogenes, \textit{Prog.} 7, 16. 10f. (Rabe).

\textsuperscript{13} Men. "Περὶ ἐπιταφίου" 420, 24 - 27.

\textsuperscript{14} Hermogenes, \textit{Prog.} 7, 14-18 (Rabe).

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. 17. 2-4.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. 17. 9-12.
χρή δὲ γινώσκειν καὶ φυλάττειν τὸ παράγγελμα ὅτι, ὅταν μέλλης ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου μεταβαίνειν εἰς κεφάλαιον, δεῖ προοιμίζεσθαι περὶ σοῦ μέλλεις ἐγχειρεῖν, ἵνα προσεκτικὸν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐργάσῃ καὶ μή ἐξαλανθάνειν μηδὲ κλέπτεσθαι τῶν κεφαλαίων τὴν ἁτῆσιν αὐξήσεως γὰρ οίκειον τὸ προσεκτικὸν ποιεῖν τὸν ἀκροατὴν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ώς περὶ μεγίστων ἀκούειν μέλλοντα. τίθει δὲ σύγχρισιν ἐφ’ ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεφαλαίων τούτων, διὰ συγγρίζων φύσιν φύσει καὶ ἀνατροφὴν ἀνατροφῇ καὶ παιδείαν παιδείᾳ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀνευρῶν καὶ παραδείγματα, οἷον Ῥωμαίων βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἐνδοξότατων.¹⁷

From this extract we can also see that Menandros too considers *synkrisis* as an important technique in the *enkomia*. The speaker should pay special attention to comparing similar things, e.g. φύσιν φύσει, etc., something that the lion and the gnat do in the two speeches respectively. In sum, one can see that far too many similarities exist between those two speeches and rhetorical features especially suitable to *enkomia*, to be coincidental.

---

Achilleus Tatios’ *enkōmia* of cities.

Apart from *enkōmia* of people and animals, there are *enkōmia* of things, ideas, etc. Generally speaking, the basic principles for making an *enkōmion* of any type can be found in the different *progymnasmata*. More specifically, one can find advice in the first treatise attributed to Menandros:

Πῶς χρῆ χώραν ἐπαινεῖν (344, 15 – 346, 25);
Πῶς χρῆ πόλεις ἐπαινεῖν (346, 26 – 351, 19);
Πῶς δὲι λιμένας ἐγκομιάζειν (351, 20 – 352, 5), etc.

In Achilleus Tatios’ book 5 (5, 1 - 5, 2) the narrator gives us his impression of Alexandria from the day he first visited it. He is stunned by the beauty of the city (τῆς πόλεως ἀστράπτων τὸ κάλλος) and the pleasure he got from the sight. The narrative is partly a description of the city and partly an *enkōmion* of Alexandria, the principal intention being to praise the city for its beauty.

The narrative contains amplification techniques: the ἀστράπτων κάλλος of the city, the narrator cannot satisfy his eyes (θεατὴς ἀκόεστος ἤμην καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἄλως οὐκ ἔξηκοκοιν ἰδεῖν). The *polysyndeta* “τὰ μὲν ἔβλεπον, τὰ δὲ ἔμελλον, τὰ δὲ ἐπειγόμην ἰδεῖν, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἡθελον παρελθεῖν” as well as the *asyneton* which immediately follows: “ἐκράτει τὴν θέαν τὰ ὀρῶμενα, ἐὰν καὶ τὰ προσδοκῶμενα” all assist the amplification process.

In Menandros’ “*enkōmia of cities*”18 there is clear advice on how to go about praising a city. Praises of cities are essentially based on headings taken from praises of countries on the one side and individuals on the other. So in the material borrowed from praises of countries we are concerned with “position” (τὴν θέσιν 346, 29) and the related topics arising from it (climate, mainland, sea, territory, etc.)19 In the material borrowed from praises of individuals we are dealing with “origins, actions, and accomplishments” (τὸ γένος, τὰς πράξεις, τὰς ἐπιτηδεύσεις 346, 30-31). Each of those is extensively analysed (with some puzzling gaps in places) in the following chapters of this particular section of Menandros’ “How we should praise cities.”

---

18 Πῶς χρῆ πόλεις ἐπαινεῖν, 346, 26 – 351, 19.
In Achilleus Tatios 5, 1-2, Alexandria is praised in terms of its position, surroundings, size, population, festivals, namely, a scheme which is very similar to that given in Menandros. This also agrees to a great extent with the advice given in Dionysios of Halikarnassos where the headings are among others, θέος, μέγεθος, buildings, mythical traditions.20 Similarly, in Quintilian 3.7.26 there is advice on how to adapt a praise of a man in order to make a praise of a city. This is, for example, what Aristides does in his “Smyrnean Oration (I)”21 Especially in 17. 9 – 17. 12, 17. 14, 17. 16, 17. 17, 17. 21 – 17. 22, we find features parallel to the description of Alexandria. More specifically, in 17. 9 we find the position of the city “it lies spread above the sea, ever displaying the flower of its beauty”;22 further on he speaks about its magnitude and beauty in similar terms as in Achilleus Tatios (5, 1, 6: “μεγέθους πρὸς κάλλος ἀμιλλαν”): “and its magnitude adds to its beauty” (17. 9).23

Based on Aristides’ Or. 17.23 and Libanios’ Or. 11.150,24 Russell and Wilson observe “that a section on the character of the δῆμος was normally expected,” and that “there is nothing of this in Menander.”25 However, there is extensive reference to δῆμος (especially its size) in the last part of 5, 1, 6.26

In Achilleus Tatios, because of the festival, Alexandria is lit after the darkness with torches and this beauty is a challenge to the beauty of the Sun: “Τότε γὰρ εἶδον πόλιν ἐρείζουσαν περὶ κάλλους οὕρανω” (5, 2, 2). Similarly, in Aristides there is extensive reference to the surrounding cities and the special celebrations such as the Dionysia (in 17. 5).

In Aristides 17. 10, the impact the city has had on him is discussed continuously, as in Achilleus Tatios. Similarly in Aristides 17. 8: “and it itself holds the eyes in thrall without beguiling the ears”;27 “ever displaying the flower of its beauty” 17. 9; “the city, . . . , takes one’s breath away through three

20 Rhet. 257.6ff. U-R; see ibid 275.19ff.
21 Aristides Or. 17; transl. by Behr (1981) vol. II.
22 Aristides, 17; 9; transl. by Behr (1981).
23 “καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτὴ τὸ μέγεθος κάλλους περιουσία” (Dindorf I, Smyrnean Oration (XV) p. 374, 14-15); again in Monody for Smyrna “προσώπην μὲν εὐθὺς ἄστραπη κάλλους καὶ μεγεθῶν ἀρνύμη” (Dindorf I, XX, p. 425, 18-19).
26 See Aristides, Smyrnean Oration (XV) “περὶ γὰρ δῆμον τί δει λέγειν; αὐτὸς γὰρ κρινεῖς καὶ ἐκ βελτίων ποιήσεις ἐξηγούμενος πρὸς τὸ κάλλιστον” (Dindorf I, p. 381, 15-17).
spectacles most fair, nor can one find a place where he might rest his eyes. Each object attracts him, like the stones in a variegated necklace" (17. 10). Also in 17. 17: “and no one is in such a hurry that he stares straight ahead at the road and does not change his view, shifting his eyes to his right, and what was to his left before his gaze. For the city attracts him as a magnet draws bits of iron and masters him with voluntary compulsion . . .”

Alexandria has the same impact on the narrator’s eyes: “καὶ μον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐγέμισεν ἡδονῆς” (5, 1, 1). The same is seen in 5, 1, 4-5: “ἔγω δὲ μερίζων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς πάσας τὰς ἀγωνίας, θεατὴς ἀκόρεστος ἤμην καὶ τὸ κάλλος διὰς οὐκ ἐξήρωκυν ιδεῖν. τὰ μὲν ἔβλεπον, τὰ δὲ ἔμελλον, τὰ δὲ ἡπτευόμην ἱδεῖν, τὰ δὲ οὕν ἢθελον παρελθεῖν ἐκράτει τὴν θέσιν τὰ ὀρώμενα, εἶλκε τὰ ὀρώμενα, εἶλκε τὰ προσδοκώμενα.” Moreover, his confession “ὀφθαλμοὶ νευκήμεθα” is similar. Furthermore, “εἰ δὲ εἰς τὸν δήμον ἐθεασάμην, ἐθαυμάζων, εἰ . . .” and “καὶ τοῦτο μέγιστον ἐθεασάμην”; also “τότε γὰρ εἴδον πόλιν ἔρχουσαν περὶ κάλλους οὕραν,” etc.

All these parallels show that the same principles are applied by Aristides in his far longer and more detailed speech on Smyrna and by Achilleus Tatos’ narrative on Alexandria. There is clearly some resemblance between enkomion of cities and the passage in question. The rhetorical techniques followed in both passages evidently follow established principles taught at the time of both authors and show another aspect of Achilleus Tatos’ indebtedness to rhetoric.

28 Ibid., p. 5.
Achilleus Tatios' praise of objects.

In Achilleus Tatios we find also a couple of interesting speeches in praise of objects, such as red wine (2, 2, 4-5).

"Πόθεν, ὥς ἔνεε, σοὶ τὸ ὀδωρ τοῦτό τὸ πορφυροῦν;
Pόθεν οὔτως εὖρες αἴμα γλυκύ;
οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἔκεινο τὸ χαμαί δέον.

τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰ στέρνα καταβαίνει καὶ λεπτὴν ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν
tοῦτο δὲ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ στόματος τὰς ὅινας εὐφοραίνει καὶ θιγόντι μὲν ψυχρὸν
ἐστι,
eἰς τὴν γαστέρα δὲ καταθορὸν ἀνάππει κάτωθεν ἡδονῆς πῦρ."

The speech resembles poetical forms on similar themes. It is so artful that it can be compared with Hellenistic epigrams. It is evidence of how rhetoric has invaded and assimilated areas of poetry. It starts with two rhetorical questions beginning with πόθεν which introduces the comparison between water and the unknown liquid - red wine - and the advancing pleasure the latter gives as it is being consumed - presented gradually in three stages: the aroma just before drinking, the cool feeling at the moment it is being drunk and the overwhelming effect after it is drawn which lights the fire of pleasure.

The second praise of an object is a prose paraphrase of a song (2, 1, 2-3):

"όδον γὰρ ἔπηνε τὸ ἄσμα. εἰ τις τὰς καμπὰς τῆς ὑδῆς περιελῶν ψιλῶν ἔλεγεν ἁρμονίας τὸν λόγον, οὔτως ἐν ἐστίν ὁ λόγος.
Εἰ τοῖς ἀνθέσιν ἦθελεν ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπιθεῖναι βασιλέα,
τὸ ὄδον ἄν τῶν ἀνθέων ἐβασιλεύε.

γῆς ἐστὶ κόσμος,
φυτῶν ἀγλάίσμα, 
ὅφθαλμος ἀνθέων, 
λειμῶνος ἐρύθημα, 
κάλλος ἀστράπτων·
ἐρωτος πνεύει,
Αφροδίτην προξενεῖ,
This short presentation of a poetical praise to roses shows the close relation between epideictic oratory and Hellenistic poetry and the challenge oratory poses in this poetical territory. Although in both “praise to red wine” and here we are not given the poetical form of the praises, the resemblance is strong.

In the Greek Anthology, both roses and wine are frequently mentioned in a praising manner. Rose is the object of admiration for its excessive beauty; it is mentioned as a main constituent of a wreath or as a decoration of the bridal room; as a simile for a woman; associated with Eros; or as a comparison with the lips (V, 236). Oinoe, on the other hand, is also a very popular topic in Hellenistic poetry. It is usually associated with love; fire (IX, 749), etc.

The context in which this praise is made is also interesting. According to Vilborg, this chapter (2, 1) “was regarded by Calderini” “as a later addition,” a view which Vilborg does not share. This chapter, as well as the next one, is a good example of illustrating Achilleus Tatos’ method of work. As Vilborg notes in defending his view that the chapter is not an interpolation, “it is characteristic of our author to make an excursus of this kind whenever an occasion presents itself”; this is true but this particular occasion is carefully prepared and is not incidental as somebody might think. The scene is perfectly functional; the “literary riddle” which was popular in the time of Achilleus Tatos is also present here.

The themes are a preparation for the reader who may take the hint of how this novel is going to evolve. Leukippe’s initial song about the fight between the boar

---

29 See Lesky (1966) p. 830: “Whole genres like the encomium or the epithalamium, which once belonged to poetry, have now (i.e. in the second sophistic) become the permanent property of rhetoric.”
30 A similar song given in prose we find in Longos 2, 7.
31 See, for example, IX, 610; XII, 58; XII, 195; XII, 234. 1; IV, 1.6; V, 62; V, 142; V, 144. 3-4; V, 81. 1.
32 XVI, 388; V, 147. 4.
33 XV, 19. 8.
34 VII, 557. 3.
35 XVI, 388; V, 147. 4; see ἀλήθαιστον ἡδόν V, 136. 5; also V, 144.
36 See, for instance, V, 167. 1-2; V, 199; XII, 175.
38 Ibid. p. 37.
and the lion (2, 1) prefigures the fight of the protagonists against ill fate and their dangerous adventures, while the praise of the rose alludes to their love, and the happy end. This last topic – love – had been brought up by Kleitophon before (1, 16-19) in his attempt to make Leukippe accept his advances. There is a discussion about the peacock and the peahen (1, 16), the power of love (1, 17) over various living and lifeless objects (plants, etc. 1, 27), water, reptiles (1, 18), followed by 1, 19 where we hear Kleitophon – the narrator – praising Leukippe to the initial narrator and of course to us. Now this last chapter is in many ways associated with the praise of the rose found in 2, 1.

In the previous chapter (1, 19), after the whole scene engineered between Satyros and Kleitophon to give Leukippe a hint of Kleitophon's love, we are told that Leukippe responds positively: ὥ δὲ ὑπεσήμαινεν οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἄχοϋειν.

The narrator at the first opportunity presents what he thought of the girl in a short speech which is equivalent to a praise of Leukippe:

Τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἀστράτητον τοῦ ταῦ ἤττον ἐδόκει μοι τοῦ Λευκίππης εἶναι προσώπου (1, 19, 1);

τὸ γὰρ τοῦ σῶματος κάλλος αὐτῆς πρὸς τὰ τοῦ λειμῶνος ἡρωεῖν ἄνθη (1, 19, 1). Leukippe's song of ὄρδον can be taken as an indirect acknowledgement by the heroine, assuring her listeners that she has taken the hints.

In both praises (1, 19, 1-2 and 2, 1, 2-3) we can trace a certain pattern which is known from rhetorical handbooks. The encomiastic topoi on external appearance "τὸ τοῦ σῶματος κάλλος" found in Menandros' "περὶ ἑπιταφίου" (420, 13; see also 419, 11-13), can also be found in his "βασιλείας λόγος" where he gives advice on how to praise a king (371, 14ff.), and also in other handbooks.40 This is clearly borrowed from enkomia; information found elsewhere on this can also be legitimately used in detecting the encomiastic nature of any speech. We can compare the praise of Leukippe with the following passage of the "Περὶ μονωδίας"41 which elaborates in great detail on how to praise specific elements of external (bodily) appearance:

39 See, for example, "βουλόμενος οὖν εὐάγγειλον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσας, λόγων πρὸς τὸν Σάρτορον ἡχώμην, ἀπὸ τοῦ δρῦνδος λαβὼν τὴν εὐκαμψάν" in 1, 16, 1.
40 Theon Prog. 8 (Spengel II, 110. 6), Hermogenes Prog. 7 (16. 5), Dion. Hal. Rhet. 6, 2; Aphthonios Prog. 8 (22. 7f.).
41 It is stated in Menandros (434.21ff.) that "monody is made up of encomiastic elements"; See Russell-Wilson eds. (1981) Menander Rhetor p. 325. Since praise is a standard constituent in
This advice on how to express sorrow over the lost beauty is based on encomiastic *topoi* on the *eidoi* tou *swmatos*. The reference to the *kallos* of Leukippe's *prosopopion*, also reveals that the speaker follows a certain rhetorical plan. In comparison with Menandros' text given above and our praise of Leukippe we find the following striking similarities which illustrate this:

- Reference to "*kallos*" is the basic idea in a praising description of the unique beauty of a person. The expression "*tou swmatos kallos*" is frequently found in Menandros when he wants to refer to different topics in praising a person; this expression is the heading of a standard encomiastic *topos* found also in Theon "*tou de swmatos estin ygeia, ischi, kallos, euaisphasia*",42 Likewise, in Hermogenes: "*ereis gam peri men swmatos oti kalos*..."43

- The "*pareia*" in Menandros is found in "*rodon de anetellev en tis pareias*" of Achilleus Tatos.

- The "*ophthalmoi bolai kai ylhnai," namely the encomiastic reference to the eyes, is here replaced by the "*ton de ti ou ophthalmoi emasmiafen ayni.*"

- The reference to hair, "*bostrochi komy*" is here made by the "*a de koma bostrochiomei mallo eilittonto kittoi.""

In examining the use of oratory in Achilleus Tatos we realise that he calls it into action carefully any time we wants to accomplish a certain plan. Here, for example, he draws material from rhetorical encomiastic *topoi* because he wants to illustrate his heroine's beauty, which is the initial reason that brings the couple together. Additionally, apart from the connection with the next chapter (2, 1), the passage exploits the information given earlier in the description of the

---

42 Theon 8; Spengel II, 110. 6f.
43 Hermogenes *Prog.* 7; also D. Hal. *Rhet.* 6.2; Aphth. *Prog.* 6; Also Arist. XXXI, 4 Behr (1981); Dindorf I (1829) p. 127.
garden (1, 15), which also contains praising elements with no obvious function to the superficial view.

Achilleus Tatios also uses headings from *psogos* in a forensic speech in book 8, 9. After Thersandros accused the priest of protecting the young couple, the priest makes a speech, the first half of which is devoted to blaming Thersandros’ character and way of life. The priest’s speech appears to follow advice form theory of *psogos* to a certain extent. Ancient rhetoricians treat *enkomion* and *psogos* in the same chapter, claiming that the material we use to praise somebody can equally be used for the opposite purposes if inverted. In his *psogos* of Thersandros the priest goes through the following headings found also in the theory of *enkomion* and *psogos* in Hermogenes and other authors of *progymnasmata*.

In the heading “φύσις ψυχής” (8, 9, 2) we find:
- σεμνότητα (8, 9, 2),
- σωφροσύνην (8, 9, 2)
- παιδείας (8, 9, 2)

καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἀσκεῖν τὴν ψυχήν ἐνομίζετο (8, 9, 3).

In the heading “φύσις σώματος” (8, 9, 4-5) we find information about Thersandros’ πράξεις and ἐπιτηδεύματα; more specifically he refers to ἀσέλγειαν; ἀναισχυντίαν; ὑφρίζων; ἀναιδειαν; βλασφημεῖν; (8, 9, 5). Notable is also the persistent use of comparison (and comparatives) suggested in handbooks as a suitable technique for praise.

All these are elements of *enkomion* and *psogos*, borrowed here by the priest in order to create an effective *psogos* of Thersandros with the aim to discredit him. This can be traced in the rhetorical handbooks, where there is a clear division of σῶμα and ψυχή, which is suggested in almost all handbooks on *enkomiα* (for instance Theon, *ibid*): "Πείτε ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου": "ἐπεί δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ μάλιστα

---

44 For more on the way character can be used by speakers and its significance see May (1988).
45 Aphthonios *Prog*. 9, 27.17 – 28.6; Theon *Prog*. 8, 112.17-18; Nikolaos 53.20 – 54.2.
46 In *psogos* we use the same material (κεφάλαια) as in *enkomiα*; Aphthonios *prog* 9, 27.17-18 (Rabe).
47 Hermogenes, *Prog*. 7, 15.18 – 17.4.
48 See p. 279, note 60, and p. 281, note 64.
49 Hermogenes *Prog*. 7, 17.2-4; Aphthonios *Prog*. 8, 22.9-10 (Rabe); Nikolaos *Prog*. 52.13 – 53.6 (Felten).
Here the priest starts from ψυχῆς in 8, 9, 2–3, speaking among other things about his insolent tongue (τὴν γλώτταν μεστὴν ὑβρεως ἔχει); his lack of σεμνότητα, σωφροσύνη and παιδεία, etc., revealing in the end that he is developing this topic by his final statement: καὶ οὐτω μὲν ἀσκεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐνομίζετο (8, 9, 3). Next he goes to σῶμα (8, 9, 5) and concludes that Thersandros cannot be praised either for his σῶμα or his ψυχή.

In Μέθοδος ἐπιταφίων Dionysis of Halikarnassos gives advice on enkomion. When we want to praise a person who has died we use the same heading as in enkomia: ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τῶν ληπτέων, ἀφ’ ἕν περ καὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια: πατρίδος, γένους, φύσεως, ἀγωγῆς, πράξεως. Concerning ἀγωγὴ he says: “Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀγωγῇ γενόμενοι ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν κοινῶν... ἐν τοῖς ἱδίοις τὴν ἀνατροφὴν καὶ τὴν παιδείαν καὶ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα...” (6, 3).

Concerning πράξεις he suggests: “ὁπόταν δὲ περὶ ἑνὸς τινὸς λέγωμεν, περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ποιησόμεθα τὸν λόγον, οἶον περὶ ἀνδρείας, περὶ δικαιοσύνης, περὶ σοφίας οποῖος περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐν τούτῳ, ὁποῖος ἱδία περὶ ἱκαστα’ ὁποῖος περὶ φίλους, ὁποῖος περὶ ἐχθροῦς,” etc.

Similar information we find in Hermogenes: “εἶτα ἢ ἀγωγῆ, πῶς ἐχθῆς ἢ πῶς ἐπαιδευθῆ... ἐρεῖς γὰρ περὶ μὲν σώματος, ὅτι καλὸς, ὅτι μέγας, ὅτι ταχύς, ὅτι ισχυρὸς, περὶ δὲ ψυχῆς, ὅτι δικαίος, ὅτι σωφρῶν, ὅτι σοφός, ὅτι ἀνδρείος, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων, οἶον ποιον ἐπετηδεῦσε βίον, etc.”

Similarly, in all other authors of Progymnasmata and in Menandros. In Theon, for example, “περὶ ἐγκώμιον καὶ ψήγου,” we find all the details presented here by the priest.

---

50 Hermogenes, Prog. 7 (16. 3–5 Rabe).
51 Dion. H. Rhet. VI U.-R.
52 Ibid. p. 278, 16–18 U.-R.
53 Ibid. VI, p. 279, 19–22.
54 Ibid. p. 280, 2–6 U.-R.
55 Hermogenes ibid 16. 3ff.
57 Theon Prog. 8 (109. 28 – 112. 8 Spengel); see also p. 279, note 60, and p. 281, note 64.
Enkomion in Heliodoros.

The praising dimension in a speech is taken further by Heliodoros but with a clear purpose: either to idolise his heroes' virtues in the case of the main couple, or to be used as a deceiving device with which the characters flatter their listeners in order to persuade them to do what they want (see Kybele's speech). His main purpose is to exaggerate the beauty and the preciousness of his two main heroes. Thus in 2, 33, 3-5 Charikles makes a straightforward speech in praise of Charikleia; in 3, 3, 4-8 the presentation of Theagenes contains a strong praising element.

In 3, 4, 1-6 we find a praising description of Charikleia that corresponds to 3, 3, 4-8 where Theagenes is presented. In 7, 12, 4-6 Kybele makes a speech in praise of the Greeks while in 7, 14, 2-3 Kybele praises Arsake to Theagenes and in 10, 7, 4-5 Persinna's speech to Hydaspes praises the young girl and can be associated with 3, 4, 1-6 where we find the description of Charikleia.

The praising element in the first speech (2, 33, 3-5) serves a very specific purpose. Charikles tries to persuade Kalasiris to speak to his daughter in order to make her change her mind on the subject of love and marriage. Charikles admits that he has been unable to do that. A large part of this is an enkomion of her. By going through her education, her physical beauty, her commitment to Artemis and virginity (even if this is supposed to be causing trouble to him at the moment) and especially her good rhetorical education he shows how precious she is. These are all topoi for praising found in the rhetorical handbooks which deal with enkomia. The speaker uses auxesis here: his daughter is better than he expected her to be; note the use of the comparative "κρείττων" (2, 33, 3); then she acquired the Greek language very rapidly: note the use of superlative "τάχιστα"; also τάχιστα she developed from child to youth like a flower and her beauty has exceeded the others so much (οὔτω δὴ τὰς πάσας ὑπερβεβλῆκε, 2, 33, 3) that everybody watches her as an "ἀρχέτυπον ἀγαλμα." The fact that he cannot win her over with promises or arguments shows how well founded her education is. As Charikles claims:
This one of the most important virtues of the girl, apart from her brightness and her beauty, and it is not difficult to understand how this information sounded to a sophisticated audience. Charikles has managed to equip his daughter with the ideal education so well that even he cannot escape the effects of her good rhetorical training.

In the "Περί ἐγκωμίου" of the progymnasmata of Hermogenes the author discusses the whole range of places where one should look for ideas and arguments when making an *enkomion*. Some of the basic things that should be mentioned are "ἡ ἄγωγη"; φύσις ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος; for σῶμα (καλός, μέγας, ταχύς, ἵσχυρός); for ψυχή (δύκαιος, σώφρων, σοφός, ἀνδρείος); and also "ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων οἶον ποιῶν ἐπετήδευσε βίον, φιλόσοφον ἢ ἐπιτηδευμόν ἢ στρατηυτικόν;"59 This shows there is extensive correspondence between what is said about Charikleia in this speech and the theory on *enkomion* found in progymnasmata.60

Later on, in 3, 3, 4-8 when narrating his story, Kalasiris gives a description of Theagenes (*ekphrasis*). The description focuses on the external appearance of the hero and it is here that the praising element is concentrated. Everybody turns his eye to him as he advances; he is like a flash of lightning and the impact he has on his viewers is overwhelming (see for instance 4 and 8). The main characteristics discussed here are ὀργαστής (3, 3, 7), ἀνδρεία, and κάλλος.

Similarly, in 3, 4, 1-6 Kalasiris describes Charikleia (*ekphrasis*) as an extraordinarily beautiful lady who shines even more brightly than the light of a torch.

---

58 2, 33, 5.
59 The other basic *topoi* are "origins," "acts," etc.; see also Men. Rhet. 420, 9-12: "καὶ θλη γενέσθω τὰ ἐγκώμια τῶν θρήνων. ἐγκωμιασμοὶ δὲ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τόπων τῶν ἐγκωμιαστικῶν, γένους, γενέσθως, φύσεως, ἀντιφράζων, σωφρονείας, ἐπιτηδευμάτων..." and elsewhere.
60 Similarly, in the earlier Theon (Prog. 8, 109.28ff.) the three main categories for praising the good sides of a character "τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς," "τὰ περὶ σώματα," and τὰ ἔξωθεν with σωφρονεία, κάλλος among the main subcategories of these. Likewise, in the later authors of progymnasmatic theory: Aphthonios, 21.20 – 22.9 (Rabe); Nikolaos, 50.4 – 53.6 (Felten).
With these two *ekphraseis* the author tries to emphasise the fact that his two heroes are extremely special. In the end Knemon is certain that he recognises them by the description: “Οὗτοι ἔχειν Χαράκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης” (3, 4, 7).

But in the next comment of Knemon the author shows more clearly his whole plan:

‘Ο δὲ ὁ πατέρ, θεωρεῖν αὐτούς καὶ ἀπόντας ὑήθην, οὗτος ἔναστὼς τε καὶ οὗς οἶδα ἰδὼν ἡ παρὰ σοῦ διήγησις ὑπέδειξεν’ (3, 4, 7).

This is exactly what the rhetoricians suggest that the speaker of an *ekphrasis* should do. He should put the item in front of his hearer’s eyes and the main characteristic of such a speech should be ἐνάργεια.61

Hermogenes in the chapter “Περὶ ἔκφρασεως” makes an interesting remark about this. He acknowledges that he knows that some orators do not think that ἔκφρασις is a separate *progymnasma* because it can also be found in other types of speeches, among them *enkomia*:

"Ιστέον δὲ, ὡς τῶν ἀριστεστέρων τινὲς οὖν ἔθηκαν τὴν ἔκφρασιν εἰς γύμνασμα ὡς προειλημμένην καὶ ἐν μύθῳ καὶ ἐν διηγήματι καὶ ἐν τόπῳ κοινῷ καὶ ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ, φασιν, ἔκφραζομεν καὶ τόπους καὶ ποταμοὺς καὶ πράγματα καὶ πρόσωπα.”62

Here the descriptions and *enkomia* have similar aims.

**Kybele’s speech.**

On two occasions Kybèle speaks in praise of the Greeks and of the young couple. In the first instance (7, 12, 4-6) she uses ἐπαίνος to gain the good-will of the couple in order to make them accept her plans. Their appearance, she claims, betrays their noble origins and the fact that they are Greeks means they have something in common with her.

In the second instance (7, 14, 2-3) in her attempt to persuade Theagenes to succumb to her mistress’s advances, Kybèle makes a speech in praise of Arsake.

---

61 See, for instance, Hermogenes, 'Περὶ ἔκφρασεως': “Ἔκφρασις ἐστι λόγος περιηγηματικός, ὡς φασι, ἔναστὼς καὶ ἕτοι ὅπως ὄνομα τὸ δηλητήριον” (22. 7-8 Rabe); further on ἀρεταὶ δὲ ἔκφρασεως μᾶλλον μὲν σαφῆνες καὶ ἐνάργεια δεῖ γὰρ τὴν ἐμιγνώσειν διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς σχέσεων τὴν ὄριν μεχανόσχεια” (Hermogenes, 23. 9-11 (Rabe).

62 Hermogenes *ibid* 23. 15-19 (Rabe).
Persinna’s speech.

In 10, 7, 4-5, just before sacrificing the two youngsters, Persinna makes a speech pitying Charikleia. This speech is in effect a praise which stands between enkomion and funeral speech. The girl is praised for her extraordinary κάλλος, her εὐγένεια (εὐγενῆς τὸ βλέμμα), her μεγαλοφροσύνη, her (τῆς) κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀκμή, and her Greek origins all found in Theon "Περὶ ἐγκωμίου καὶ ψόγου," for example, as topoi for praising a person:

We praise basically three aspects of a person:

τὸν δὲ ἄγαθὸν

tὰ μὲν περὶ ψυχῆς τῇ καὶ ἡθος

tὰ δὲ περὶ σώμα

tὰ δὲ ἔξωθεν ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει

Starting from the last part Theon indicates:

tὸν ἔξωθεν πρῶτον μὲν εὐγένεια ἄγαθον, διιτὴ δὲ ἡ μὲν πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους καὶ πολιτείας

η δὲ γονέων καὶ ἀλλων οἰκείων.

Then, "τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἑστὶν" among other things κάλλος, the main feature that concerns the novelist, and finally ψυχικὰ ἄγαθα:

tὰ σπουδαία ἡθικὰ καὶ τούτως ἀκολουθοῦσαι πράξεις ὁδὸν ὅτι φρόνυμος . . . καὶ ὅτι μεγαλόφρων, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα.

When seen in this light, this short speech of Persinna showing pity for the imminent loss of a remarkable girl reflects certain encomiastic procedures recommended in the progymnasmata. It prepares the ground for the overturning twist of the story at the end.  

---

63 Heliodoros here uses an (ironic) adaptation of the standard literary motif of the “mother mourning over her child.”

64 Theon, Prog. 8 (Spengel II, 109. 19ff., esp. 110. 2, 110. 6; 110. 8; 110. 10, etc.)

65 The speech can be associated with 3, 4, 1-6 as confirming the description of Charicleia.
PART IV

The novelists’ creativity and their readers’ response.
1. Creative use of rhetoric by the novelists.

As we have seen so far, there is sustained use of rhetoric in the three novels under discussion, but the question that now arises is "how creative is this?" Do the novelists only reproduce rhetorical devices in the novels with no other purpose apart from showing off their rhetorical training? Or does rhetoric serve a function in each particular case in the novels and thus constitutes a more purposeful device? In order to address these questions we should discuss a number of specific cases in which we can see how rhetoric is used in each of the three novels.

The fact that the three novelists make use of their education and follow rhetorical principles still detectable today does not automatically suggest that their use of rhetoric is mechanistic, rather the opposite. Their use of rhetorical strategies on various levels (motifs, strategies, headings, situations borrowed from rhetorical themes, etc.) in the context of a novel is often indicative of their creativity. Rhetoric is used in various ways, such as to characterise people, to show their ingenuity, their viciousness or their manipulative abilities, etc.; it is used to present a convincing story which is enriched with incidents similar to those encountered in rhetorical teaching. In the hands of the novelists rhetorical themes and techniques become vital units of their novels; a closer study of how they employ rhetoric will show how resourceful these authors were. The authors do not simply copy examples or put into practice slavishly the advice found in rhetorical handbooks. They show their creativity in the way they adapt them for their novel's needs. The significant advice, for example, that the speech should

---

1 The fact that rhetoric is used creatively by the novelists has been also noted by others. According to Ruiz-Montero's conclusions (Ruiz-Montero (1996) p. 67) in the case of rhetorical exercises by the novelists "these exercises are instruments at the service of the creativity and talent of each author; they are not a beginning and end in themselves, but rather a means." The extent of creative use of (mainly descriptive) rhetorical passages in Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros can be seen in Bartsch (1989); Bartsch finds similarities of the use of descriptive (rhetorical) passages in the novels with other works of rhetoricians, such as Lucian, the Philostратi, etc., who "not only used the devices found in the Progymnasmata but developed and deployed them with a view to their own larger literary goals"; these rhetoricians "are concerned not only with showing their skill at simply describing but also at interpreting what is to be described, or manipulating the description in such a way that it takes on a new relation to the material it introduces or in which it is embedded" (Bartsch (1989) p. 14). Therefore, in the works of these rhetoricians "a descriptive passage" is used "to draw in its audience and ask of them an effort of interpretation" (ibid. p. 15). In these lines she discusses the presence of similar passages in the two novelists in discussion (ibid. pp. 171-177 and passim).
have a tripartite temporal division is used to show intense pain through the comparison of the (happy) past with the unbearable present (and the destruction of future expectation).  

Even in the schools of declamation students had the liberty to use their ingenuity and show originality. After a period of teaching it was clear that students should not be allowed to rely on others too much and that they should take the initiative to develop their own ideas in their own way. The priest's attack on Thersandros in Achilleus Tatos (8, 9) may have a resonance from Aristophanes and similarities with character assassination of the Aischinean type, but the way the whole speech is presented with the use of *ethos* as a means of persuasion betrays the author's resourcefulness, as he makes the priest use the whole array of rhetorical weaponry to demolish Thersandros' credibility.

If anything, education in the declamation schools had a clear appreciation of the "cleverness or novelty" of what the speakers said. Creativity is highly sought after in the schools of declamation, and the speaker would be expected to use rhetorical techniques in his own way by combining his chosen topics in his own style. The novelists who, as it appears, had a good rhetorical training adopt it for a variety of purposes in different forms and contexts. For example, *auxesis* (amplification) is used in the presentation of Kleitophon's suffering after he learns in prison that Leukippe has been murdered (7, 5). In his lamenting speech he uses amplification in expressing the idea that Leukippe, after a number of previous false deaths, is now really dead and thus the present situation is presented as worse than what happened in the past (see p. 237f.). In another instance, in Melite's speech amplification helps her to be convincing by presenting Kleitophon as utterly emotionless in front of her suffering (see p. 244).

Likewise, in Chariton (1, 14, 6-10) Kallirhoe describes her predicament (the result of her sale to Leonas) with the assistance of *auxesis* in order to verbalise her already difficult (and worse than before) situation and to express it in the

---

2 See p. 227ff., p. 238f. (and note 49), and p. 250.
3 Quint. II, X, 14-15; also Bonner (1949) p. 51.
4 Bonner (1977) p. 274; also Quint. II, VI, 5-7.
5 See p. 174, p. 177ff. (esp. 182f.); see also p. 276ff.
6 See p. 83ff.
darkest possible colours (see p. 249; similarly in 6, 6; see p. 250). In similar lines, Charikleia in Heliodoros (7, 14, 6), for example, tries to present the situation as “even worse than it appears” in her lament for the death of Kalasiris (see p. 254f.). In all these cases amplification is used as a means to enhance the sense of a tragic picture.

Another rhetorical device which is used in a purposeful way is the final heading (telika kephalaia). This device is particularly favoured by Heliodoros (see p. 154ff.). Especially in the confrontation between Thyamis and Arsake the deployment of this device dominates the speeches; this shows how powerful cases can be made based on those headings, to the point that Arsake, defeated in the rhetorical confrontation, loses her temper and resorts to threatening (see p. 156f.). The use of eschematismenos logos is another rhetorical device used by the same author in a very interesting way, to make a dramatic scene full of suspense which is also intellectually demanding. While we read the scene, provided that we are aware of the technique and its special rules, we wait to see whether this specialised rhetorical device used in the speech of Hydaspes (10, 16, 4-10) is going to work (see p. 145ff.).

Much of these rhetorical techniques do not appear to be simply reproduced in the novels, but seems to have been adapted to their environment. The purpose of the school exercises, especially the progymnasmata, for example the saying (γνῶμη), was to give scope to the students to exercise on such rhetorical techniques, especially the amplification, in order to be able to use it later in any environment. In fact, declamation was nothing more than an exercise in which the speaker’s ingenuity was tested. Both the nature of the complexity and the fictional nature of the themes given meant that creative imagination was a primary ability required in constructing an interesting speech. “Sophistry is also one place within the rhetorical system where allowance is made for genius and inspiration, something that technical handbooks cannot create.”

---

8 Bonner (1977) p. 258f.
10 See, for example, Seneca, Contr. 1,4; 1,6; 2,2; 7,1, etc.
The novelists' creativity is also manifested in their ability to see things from different angles, as when arguing both sides of an issue. Their construction of rhetorical scenes, their discovery and selection of arguments appropriate to the situation show how rhetoric has taught them to be flexible and inventive. Their stylistic ornamentation, the choice of topics, the adaptation of themes and their incorporation in their stories show their resourcefulness. Their ability to create paradox in the rhetorical speeches, especially the forensic ones, shows how they try to exploit it. In Chariton 1, 5, 4, Chaireas - the killer - instead of a defence speech presents a direct self-accusation speech while Hermokrates - the victim's father - speaks for his acquittal (1, 5, 6-7)! Likewise Kleitophon, in a last-moment change of mind, decides to confess to a crime he has never committed (7, 6, 3), and his friend Kleinias defends him by trying to disprove his claims! In Heliodoros, instead of speaking for the salvation of his daughter, Hydaspes is shown (apparently) to argue for her sacrifice to an audience which he hopes will reject this idea. This reversal of the purpose of speeches, along with the occasional reversal of the normal order of speakers (such as that in Achilleus Tatios 8, 10, 1), shows how freely the novelists used rhetorical techniques in the courtroom speeches.

In our attempt to expose the influence of rhetoric on speeches in the novel, we often concentrate on the similarities of a given speech in the novel with a certain real speech or, more frequently, with advice given in various rhetorical handbooks. This, however, should not give the impression that the speeches are always reproduced following word by word either other speeches or technical advice. Despite the fact that they often recall bits and pieces of other speeches or adopt certain techniques, nobody has ever identified with any certainty a speech or a specific handbook which has been slavishly imitated by our authors; they create their speeches independently and are not interested in pure reproduction. Their use of traditional teaching material shows rather that this material comes from various sources, has been absorbed and reworked, in the form of advancement, expansion, shortening, and imaginative adaptation. Their extensive use of rhetoric shows that they have assimilated rhetorical knowledge

12 See, for example, p. 69ff., p. 195, p. 198ff., p. 209ff., etc.
and are well aware of rhetorical principles, which they use freely in the invention of their novels.

The novelists' inventive use of rhetoric also shines through in their use of epideictic (encomiastic) material. Because of its limited range of techniques and topics, this is an area that can easily be exhausted. Nevertheless, in the three novels we witness the heroes being described, praised or denounced through it, being mourned, sympathised or pitied, or even expressing their inner emotional world through it. Rhetorical theory of lament and praise has had a strong impact on describing the novel's characters or on presenting them lamenting, but here, too, a selection of material has been made, modifications have taken place and the final product is intended for rather different purposes. In Chariton, for example, we find a surprisingly large number of mourning or distress speeches, and epideictic rhetoric is used here widely with the effect of producing highly emotional dramatic scenes. The principles of his praising or mourning speeches are derived from epideictic theory, but the speeches are his own creations which are adapted to their context, focus on specific purposes on each occasion for the sake of the novel and, though a product of rhetorical training, are constructed according to the novel's wider needs (plot, characterisation, dramatic tension, pace, etc.).

The use of epideictic rhetoric has mainly a common purpose in all three novels: the display of emotions on behalf of the characters. With them the reader is allowed access to their emotional world. The speakers' rhetoric cries out for the natural human reaction of sympathy with the person suffering. The characters verbalise their emotional despair using proven rhetorical devices to an extent that can seem excessive, at least by today's standards, although this varies. They appear to use all means available to attract sympathy, and what better advice could one follow than to use professionally tried epideictic techniques and

---

13 See p. 247, note 1.
14 See also Reardon in Schmeling (1996) p. 332.
15 For example, south Europeans would perhaps find it easier to appreciate such overwhelming expression of emotion in comparison to western phlegmatic societies where the presentation of emotion in this way seems inappropriate or undignified. Besides, all three authors come from the Near East.
topics appropriate to the subject? We find, however, some instances where topics of rhetoric are mixed\textsuperscript{16} with topics of poetry.\textsuperscript{17}

In epideictic rhetoric the comparison of Menandros' work with speeches in the novels has revealed a tendency to broadly follow a traditional rhetorical plan. This, however, in no way indicates pure reproductive use. The essence of rhetorical teaching was to have ready at hand a certain way in which the speakers would construct their speeches, a certain mould and certain areas from which they would draw their ideas. What material they would put into action for their specific case or what ingredients they would choose and in what quantities was each orator's choice. Audiences were not interested in or did not expect so much innovative material to be presented to them, but were interested mainly in the way it was presented, the right choice, their effective presentation and their persuasiveness.

Another instance where we see the novelists' creative imagination at work is in the adaptation of oratory for the needs of the plot. In the trial scenes, for example, the details of the crime usually appear before the speeches and thus the narration part in them is quite different from that in real trial speeches. In a real forensic speech the speaker narrates the "facts," emphasising or leaving out the sides of the story that are not helpful for his case. In these speeches narrative is a vital part and a matter for serious scrutiny. In the novels, however, the author gives the details to the reader beforehand, so that he observes the speakers from a higher vantage-point of prior knowledge. The irony that arises from this gives the reader an opportunity to assess the speakers' abilities and their trustworthiness.\textsuperscript{18} In this way the reader knows the truth but is placed into a position in which he is able to witness how the characters manage to escape from an awkward position or how they can achieve what they want, etc.

Another imaginative use of rhetorical devices, such as \textit{ekphrasis}, can be seen in the way these are embodied in the novels. One example is the symbolic meaning of the abduction of Europa by Zeus described at the beginning of the \textit{Leukippe}

\textsuperscript{16} See p. 273f.
\textsuperscript{17} As Anderson (1989), p. 122 rightly claims for similar cases in the second sophistic: "the material itself was infinitely adaptable, and it is easy to be misled by mechanical and highly repetitive recipes for panegyric from the handbooks into supposing that all was predictable. On the contrary, the audience knew what to expect, and it was the sophist's job to see that they did not always get it."
and Kleitophon, etc. The apparent analogies of the stories depicted in rhetorical descriptions (ekphraseis) with the heroes' own prospects play an important role in the process of reading the novels. The reader is invited to interpret them and to make hypotheses which are later confirmed or disproved. In fact, the latter can often be more entertaining than the former.

Intertextual references to classical orators create parallels between characters and figures of the past (Demosthenes, Aischines; see p. 83, note 19, and p. 173ff). These allusions are not mere borrowings for the sake of persuasion only; they add a historical dimension with the inevitable comparisons they evoke. Allusions to highly esteemed orators (e.g. Demosthenes, etc.) are used to give their novels a certain elevated status.

Elsewhere, we see specific rhetorical advice found in handbooks being ignored. In Achilleus Tatos' courtroom scene (8, 10), we see a good example of a speech that is deliberately over-ambitious in the manner of the Asianic school and in sharp contrast with the priest's speech (8, 9). By violating some basic rhetorical principles (see p. 87, p. 99f. (and note 50), p. 107f., p. 174, note 1), Sopatros spoils his case and fails in his attempt to support his client. The novelist has here presented a negative character ignoring or breaking the prescriptions of the rhetorical handbooks. Similarly, Thersandros' second speech contains a number of weaknesses (see p. 107), which assist in the failure of that trial.

Another example which shows that the novelist's priorities were not to reproduce rhetorical advice slavishly is the scene with Kleitophon's false "confession" of his crime in Achilleus Tatos 7, 8. Here the situation is much more complicated than the Hermogenean treatise On Issues provides for. Hermogenes' aim is to provide a scheme on how to acquit the defendant. Here, Kleitophon is concerned with a double purpose: one for himself (death penalty) and one for Melite (her implication in the murder). In his speech Kleitophon uses both counterposition (acceptance of responsibility) and transference (transference of responsibility to someone else) because he takes responsibility for his wrongdoing and transfers part of it to Melite. Hermogenes, however, sets

---

out a strategy for either accepting full responsibility and suggests a certain set of principles, such as showing that something beneficial has arisen from it (ἀντίστασις; see p. 117, note 85) or for transferring it to the victim or to a third party, which again aims at the acquittal of the accused. Achilleus Tatios, by contrast, adapts these prescriptions for his own story, showing Kleitophon using both techniques at the same time in order to achieve different objectives.

"Deceit speeches," such as self-denunciation, eschematismenos logos, etc., appear in the three novels, but they are quite different in each case. In Chariton (1, 5, 4-5; see p. 45f.) it is a straightforward case of self-denunciation where the person making it believes he has committed the crime and asks for the death penalty; in Achilleus Tatios (7, 7, 2-6; see p. 68ff.) Kleitophon is well aware of the situation and his self-denunciation speech (prosangelia) appears as a reaction to it and aims at the involvement of a third party in the "crime," while in Heliodoros (10, 16, 4-10; see p. 145ff.) Hydaspes' speech shows how a speaker can manipulate his audience in order to achieve the desired result. Although all three cases belong to the same family of speeches, they show great originality in the way they are adapted to their contexts.

The theory of telika kephalaia (see p. 154ff.; also p. 200ff.) cannot be implemented without ingenuity. The author has to know this persuasive technique in theory, but how these headings will take form and work for his stories is a totally different matter. Without their inventiveness the authors would have been unable to use this technique in their novels with such subtlety that it often escapes the reader's attention that such a strategy is in action.

Another major piece of evidence of the creative use of rhetoric in the novel is its transformation into a functional device for the involvement of the reader. In "watching" the characters' use of rhetoric, the reader makes assumptions about the degree of success of their rhetorical abilities (be it forensic or deliberative or other). The sophistication of the rhetorical techniques applied illustrates their ability to use persuasive language in general. This invites the reader to judge the

---

20 Bartsch (1989) suggests that the rhetorical descriptions in the novels invite interpretation (p. 15). Rhetoric is used as part of a general strategy to involve the readers in the reaction, the irony, and the interpretation of scenes (ibid. p. 172ff.).

21 Hermogenes, On Issues, 39.1-10 (Rabe).
speeches' effectiveness and to try to anticipate the other characters' reactions and the consequences of the speeches in the development of the story.

Speeches in the novels tend to have short-term effects. Kleitophon's self denunciation (7, 7) in his trial brings about the death sentence at the end of the trial (7, 12, 1), which raises the suspense. Meanwhile, speeches presented for both sides in this trial aim at the salvation or condemnation of the main hero. Their purpose is to involve the reader, principally the one equipped with rhetorical education.

Similarly, in Heliodoros' novel Charicleia proves the effectiveness of her rhetoric on numerous occasions, for instance in her delaying tactic to Thyamis' wedding proposal (1, 19; p. 134ff.) or in her speeches at the court of Hydaspes (p. 142ff.). In Heliodoros, rhetoric is in general terms effective. Demainete manages to take revenge in a similar way as Kleitophon does in Achilleus Tatos, achieving the condemnation of her son-in-law, although he is later vindicated. At the moment, however, the outcome of the trial produces injustice and a new thread in the plot, a subplot, which creates expectation and thus involvement.

In Chariton's novel rhetoric often appears ineffective. Initially, although Chaireas produces a self-denunciation regarding the accidental death of Kallirhoe, his speech is ignored by the judge, who is also the father of the victim, and Chaireas is acquitted. Later, in Dionysios' and Mithridates' trial scene, Mithridates wins his acquittal only when he produces hard evidence (5, 8, 8), that is, Chaireas himself - disproving Dionysios' claims. However, Dionysios is still entangled in the trial case since now he has to prove that he, and not Chaireas, is the legitimate husband (5, 8, 8); this is used to raise the suspense again. The trial is, however, postponed indefinitely until the war is over, when it appears that Dionysios gains Kallirhoe as a reward for his bravery in the war (7, 5, 15), while Chaireas' bravery at sea leads him to unexpectedly find Kallirhoe in 8, 1, 8. Here again, the careful use of rhetorical techniques in the trial scene is used as a means to raise suspense (even before the proper trial we witness the careful preparation and worries of the two litigants, especially those of

22 From the moment the king gives the litigants five days to prepare we are constantly reminded of the passing of the time with details as to what is happening to Kallirhoe while she is hosted by Stateira (5, 9, 1ff.), Dionysios' reaction (5, 9, 8ff.), a series of his ethopoiai (5, 10, 1 and 5, 10, 2-5), Chaireas' reaction and ethopoiai (5, 10, 6-10).
Dionysios). Although carefully prepared speeches and attention to detail raises expectations and suspense (and slows down the pace of the story), the effectiveness of the use of rhetorical techniques is reversed by external factors.

The difference in the treatment of rhetoric by Chariton in comparison to Achilleus Tatios and Heliodoros presents similarities with the different literary tendencies of sophistic authors which Bartsch discussed in her 1989 book, where regarding the “employment of the descriptive in the works of the prominent sophists of the period,” i.e. Lucian, the two Philostrati, etc. she notes that we “see how a descriptive passage might be used to draw in its audience and ask of them an effort at interpretation.” However she notes that there are differences in technique in the use of descriptive passages by the sophists. Others, such as the Philostrati, provide an explanation of “context and meaning” in their descriptions while others, such as Lucian, leave their viewers wondering about their meaning until somebody else supplies an interpretation. This tendency, characteristic of the sophists of the second sophistic, to analyse and look eagerly for a deeper meaning in a picture can be seen as exploited more by Achilleus Tatios and Heliodoros and considerably limited by Chariton (whose descriptive rhetorical material is considerably less anyway).

In terms of rhetorical techniques the novels are not original; in terms of their implementation they are. The speeches contain a selection and combination of techniques, ideas, etc. that show imaginative use and versatile adaptation. Summing up, we can say that the three novelists under discussion follow the prescriptions of the rhetorical handbooks only in order to make speeches more persuasive. Occasionally, handbook advice is deliberately ignored in order to make the failure of a speech appear plausible. The differences between Chariton, Achilleus and Heliodoros in their attitude to oratory generally can also be observed in their creative adaptations of rhetorical prescriptions to specific contexts or situations in their respective novels.

24 Ibid. p. 15.
25 Ibid.
27 Ibid. pp. 36-37.
2. The readership of the ancient novels.

The question of the readership of the ancient novels is a complicated one, principally due to lack of sufficient hard evidence from antiquity. It became more complicated in the hands of modern scholarship. As a relatively new area of study, the novel provoked the "philological reflex" which automatically compared these texts with works of the classical era and attributed the differences to the targeting of a less well educated readership than that of classical literature.\(^{28}\) Since then, scholars have tried to address the question of the educational level of the novels' readership. To show how the debate has developed over the last two decades, it may be useful to trace briefly its main stages. This will also help to clarify my own position in this question.

Hägg (1983) in his attempt to locate the place of birth and readership of the novel claims that "the first novels were aimed at the educated classes of the Hellenistic cities of Asia Minor, to people who looked back with a certain nostalgia to the fifth and fourth centuries"\(^{29}\) and afterwards it reached Alexandria "and once there, its real flourishing and its movement down the social scale started."\(^{30}\) Furthermore, according to him the "theory of a predominantly female audience" is "at least partly confirmed."\(^{31}\) Wesseling (1988) started from the point that "there are at least a few indications that some intellectuals were acquainted with Greek and Latin novels";\(^{32}\) after examining various references to the novels by such people, he suggested more realistic estimates of the general rates of literacy, especially in rural areas, and also rejected the idea of a female readership because of their restricted education

\(^{28}\) Cf. for instance Perry (1967) who in talking of its uses identifies the readership of the novel in the "children and the poor-in-spirit" or the "intellectuals on isolated occasions for the ostensible purpose of satire or parody," etc. Perry (1967) p. 5; also Reardon (1991) p. 41: "the romance is a popular form, in the sense that it is addressed originally to a fairly wide and probably not unduly cultivated audience" (thus approximating Hägg's (1983) views); or "one might think of romance as the relaxation of the literate" (thus approximating Perry's (1967) views); see further in Reardon (1976) p. 130. It should be noted that these are only ideas that are put forward at an early stage of the scholarship on the matter. Much more comprehensive studies (which we discuss here) came a bit later. Further on this in Bowie (1994) p. 441ff.

\(^{29}\) Hägg (1983) p. 98.

\(^{30}\) Hägg (1983) p. 98; note that this seems to be the opposite of what Reardon has assumed, although it is based on similar criteria; see note 28.

\(^{31}\) Hägg (1983) p. 96; see criticism of this view in Bowie (1996) p. 96f.

\(^{32}\) Wesseling (1988) p. 68.

\(^{33}\) Ibid. p. 70.
in general\textsuperscript{34} and lack of such data. He concludes that the intended audience of Achilleus Tatios, Longos, Heliodoros and Chariton - with the exception of Xenophon - is “the intellectuals in the first place but not exclusively”\textsuperscript{35} and that the novels’ function is that of entertainment which however varies “as to the character of the work in question” and “to the nature and education of individual readers.”\textsuperscript{36}

For Heliodoros, Morgan (1991), based on the “assumption that the responses of this series of functional audiences are intended to stand in some sort of relation to those of the real audience outside the narrative frame,” investigates the possible relation between internal audiences in scenes of the novel and its real readership and concludes that the three audiences in the \textit{Aithiopika} which the author has examined “offer the reader some degree of narcissistic identification”\textsuperscript{37} mainly through the fact that “they reflect and form the reader's own responses”;\textsuperscript{38} Knemon, in particular, appears as an “exact fit, cognitively and affectively, with the reader.”\textsuperscript{39}

Morgan (1995) in evaluating the kind of readers the novel had, concludes that the “romance then was being read by those rich enough to own luxury villas”;\textsuperscript{40} furthermore, that “the novelists were not, and did not project themselves as, members of the seething masses. Neither they nor their books, as physical objects, are in any sense down-market of other literature.”\textsuperscript{41} For the “sophistic romances,” in particular,\textsuperscript{42} he concludes that “in the course of its development the novel came to demand of its readers a degree of sophisticated self-awareness and reflexivity that would have restricted full appreciation to those with a high level of literary training.”\textsuperscript{43} Additionally, it is suggested that the “intellectual classes”\textsuperscript{44} were its “readers all along” and that the “earlier novels” would have

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid.} p. 72.
\item \textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.} pp. 75-76.
\item \textsuperscript{36} \textit{Ibid.} p. 77.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Morgan (1991) p. 99.
\item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.} p. 99.
\item \textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ibid.} p. 99.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Morgan (1995) p. 136.
\item \textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.} p.137.
\item \textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.} p. 141.
\item \textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.} p. 143.
\item \textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.} p. 143.
\end{itemize}
been read by others as well. Therefore, "the novel-reading public was not an entity distinct from the rest of the reading public, and that the novels are better regarded as off-duty amusement for the highly literate than as a product aimed at those with lower grades of taste and education." Earlier Stephens (1994) had shown that the "social structure of the ancient world" seemed to preclude the idea of the novels "being a popular source of entertainment." In comparing the number of fragments of the novels with fragments of other genres she finds a considerable disparity in number to the disadvantage of the novels. However, the quality of the production and texts of the surviving fragments reflects the high social status of their owners and classes them among other groups of "works of the high culture." All these observations suggest that the reading public of the novels is "a public that in education and in inclination and ability to read and write matches well with the authors of novels themselves, a public for which their contemporaries were writing."

Bowie (1994) argues for a predominantly male readership and against a female and juvenile audience. He also argues against the wide spread of readership (popularity) of the novels among the less educated, suggested mainly by Hägg (1983), and he assumes an educated and well-to-do readership. Furthermore, he provides lengthy argumentation to show that "there are insufficient grounds for denying that the novel was known in intellectual circles" and concludes that the evidence suggests that for Longos, Achilleus Tatos, Heliodoros along with Chariton and *Metiochos and Parthenope* an educated readership is expected.

Hägg (1994) rejects the views of a number of modern scholars who oppose the suggested wide "popularity" of the genre as expressed by Perry and Reardon.

---

46 Ibid. p. 143.
47 See also Stephens (1990) in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), pp. 148-149.
49 Ibid. p. 410ff.
50 Ibid. p. 412f.
51 Ibid. p. 415.
55 Ibid. pp. 443-448.
56 Ibid. p. 448; especially for Longos see *ibid.* pp. 451-452.
mainly on the basis that if popularity of the novel is rejected then the "widely accepted" explanation that was given principally by Perry about the creation of the novel, which is based on "the general sociocultural and psychological background" is also seriously undermined. This applies only to the early novels and not to "the three "sophistic" specimens whose sophistic readership can never have been in serious doubt." Therefore, Hägg suggests that we should treat the early novel (which reveals the initial readership) and the sophistic novel separately. He claims that Chariton (and *Parthenope*) is an isolated case and aims high, but this does not exclude different audiences like "his own equals," on the one side, and "a potential — and larger — audience people a step or two further down the sociocultural ladder," on the other. According to him, it is not a "condition for a reader of *Callirhoe* to be well-educated — though it would of course have constituted a definite advantage, because it would give fuller satisfaction." Besides, Hägg continues, "the narrative suspense, the emotional impact, the escapist function were there for all, the rhetorical and classicizing embellishment for some." According to him, exclusiveness depends on the complication of "the narrative structure and the phraseology," he claims that these constitute a "hindrance for the less literate" in the sophistic novel but not in Chariton, "though these things are of course extremely difficult for us to assess." However, the author concedes that "there is no way of actually proving that Chariton did address himself to others than his equals" but he reserves for himself the right to doubt that readers who "were unable to appreciate certain rhetorical niceties," etc. should "be excluded from either the actual or the intended readership of his novel." Furthermore, Hägg rejects Stephens' (1994) views on the high readership of the novel based on the physical appearance of the surviving papyri, suggesting that "money and intellectuality do not

---

59 Ibid. p. 50.
60 Ibid. p. 50.
61 Ibid. p. 52.
62 Ibid. p. 53.
63 Ibid. p. 53.
64 Ibid. p. 54.
65 Ibid. p. 54.
66 Ibid. p. 54.
67 Ibid. p. 54.
68 Ibid. p. 54.
69 Ibid. p. 55.
necessarily go together" and that the novels were read to others "primarily by means of recitals, within the household, among friends, or even publicly." As far as internal evidence is concerned, stereotyped phraseology, recapitulations, and foreshadowing in Xenophon and Chariton give a helping hand to the inexperienced reader. While Hägg accepts that certain techniques, such as foreshadowing, would "no doubt stimulate inexperienced readers to keep on reading, listeners to stay listening," he does not regard demanding material such as the use of specialised rhetorical techniques, allusions, etc. to be off-putting for the inexperienced readers. Although Hägg put forward good ideas and contributed enormously to the discussion on the readership, his hypothesis seems to suffer from the common enemy of any discussion of this matter, namely the lack of any hard evidence which would make it is readily acceptable.

Later, Bowie (1996) examined the two opposing views that had been formed by that time. The one, mainly supported by Hägg, claimed that the novel was created "as a literature designed for a new category of reader, men and women who were literate but not intellectual, readers of huge Hellenistic cities," and the other that "the texts were primarily produced for and read by the same social and intellectual élite who read Plutarch and historians or attended philosophy lectures," a view which Bowie also shares. After claiming that the intertextuality found in both "sophistic" and the earlier novels "holds the two groups together" in terms of readership and that a distinction should be made

---

70 Ibid. p. 57.
71 Ibid. p. 58.
72 Ibid. p. 58ff.
73 Kaimio (1996) working in similar lines with Hägg, suggests that "the stereotyped phrases describing the reactions of the surrounding crowd" are used by Chariton as a "guidance to his own audience as to the perception of his work" (p. 72), conceding at the same time that such phrases exist in the other extant novels as well but are, according to him, "a minor part of the complex narrative" (p. 72). Similarly, Paulsen (1995) examining mainly some instances in Heliodoros where the reader is invited to solve "riddles" (see p. 352ff.), such as the opening scene of the novel (whose secret is revealed at the end of book 5), suggests that, irrespective of the degree of their education, all people, as long as they could read (or enjoy recitations), could find pleasure and enjoyment in reading Heliodoros' novel. This argument overlooks the fact that even the instances with the "riddle-solving" require some king of experience and a trained audience. Moreover, it does not answer the question satisfactorily of what can we do with the less accessible intertextual references or the sophisticated rhetorical material which abound in the novels we have examined in this study, for example?
74 Ibid. p. 63.
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between "actual" and "intended readership," he warns against over-dependence on the arguments that readership should be explained in accordance with the emerging needs of the "late Hellenistic man" or the needs of the society, as Perry and Hägg had suggested. Bowie concedes that the intended readership of the "sophistic novels" is generally assumed to be "highly educated," and he is prepared to accept with great caution that in the case of novels like that of Chariton "their writers may have envisaged a few less highly educated readers," while the surviving evidence of actual readers of the sophistic novels suggests educated readership.

As far as the early novels are concerned he rejects the idea of a female readership on the basis of the limited number of educated women. Based on the use of allusions in Chariton and the Metiochos and Parthenope, he suggests that the readership is the same as that of classical texts, but concedes that some of Hägg's arguments in his 1994 article have considerable force (e.g. that "the narrative suspense, the emotional impact, the escapist function were there for all, the rhetorical and classicizing embellishment for some," which means that "Chariton may have had several audiences in mind.") Later on he explains that Hägg's suggestion that the idea of lower readership is supported by the existence of linking summaries, recapitulations and foreshadowing in these novels could be explained not only in Hägg's way (namely as a helping hand for the inexperienced reader or the listening audience). Bowie suggests that this may be explained as responding to real needs of any readership, and therefore high as well, since a reader "resuming the reading of the work after a pause might welcome a reminder," moreover, he suggests, the raising of the dramatic tension achieved with foreshadowing cannot only be regarded as intended for lower readership. Therefore, the evidence used for such an suggestion is

---
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dangerously shaky. To this contributes the scarcity and unreliability of evidence of the actual readership of the early novels which again, wherever it exists, may suggest a cultured reader. Bowie’s comprehensive examination of the issue and his juxtaposition of intended and actual readership leads him to reach interesting and viable conclusions on readership on the basis of existing evidence and less (if at all) on the basis of speculation.

Holzberg (2001), starting from the estimate that a maximum of 15% of the population could read and write at the time and that only the rich and educated were reading literature, concludes that the people who were reading Chariton were the same as those who were reading Thukydides, for example. In view of the demanding literary language and intertextuality of the novels he notes that the illiterati who could possibly have heard the novels from others – who supposedly were reading or reciting them – would have had very little to identify with. Holzberg suggests that it would be difficult to imagine that the novelists (even Chariton and Xenophon) aimed for anything less than the upper classes.

The contribution of the present thesis to the debate (which is on the verge of saturation, due to a desperate lack of hard evidence) is very close to Bowie’s view of a well-educated readership (Bowie 1994 and 1996). The material discussed here can only endorse the view that the intended readership was educated, given the quality and quantity of rhetoric in the novel. The evidence gathered indicates that all three novelists go to great lengths to present rhetorical material, such as forensic, epideictic, and deliberative speeches, which would have been a waste of time for the authors and a tedious experience for the readers if they were not expected to be appreciated and enjoyed by an at least similarly educated audience. Added to that, the ubiquitous presence of explicit or implicit allusions, which all previous scholars dealing with readership accept, makes it untenable to claim that these authors did not have in mind a cultured audience. Now the idea that the novels were actually enjoyed by a wider audience who did not have the background to appreciate their subtle rhetorical techniques seems strange and goes against the kind of evidence which we have discussed in this study.

90 Ibid. p. 56.
As discussed in chapter 2 of part I (p. 50ff.), Chariton's novel, for example, which has often been included in the category of a lower readership, goes to great lengths in his courtroom speeches to follow the traditional structure and techniques, to the point that the speeches of Dionysios (5, 6) and Mithridates (5, 7) are seen as following a model structure of a forensic speech. Furthermore, the choice and variation in the introductions of direct opening and subtle approach according to the circumstances (which we compared on p. 52ff. with the theory found in the Ad Herennium), the attempts to attain all aims of the introduction (p. 54ff.), the three qualities of a narration, some of them explicitly stated (p. 57ff.), and the sophisticated presentation of arguments and proofs in their speeches, all indicate that Chariton had in mind rhetorically highly alert readers, equipped with at least similar educational experiences. In fact, his care in constructing his forensic speeches is such that he might give the impression of taking all measures in the speeches so as not to be seen as lacking rhetorical knowledge or being incapable of creating rhetorical speeches according to the instructions provided in the forensic arts. Chariton's carefully structured forensic speeches imply that they are expected to be evaluated by educated people capable of recognising and appreciating their inner qualities.

Regarding Achilleus Tatios and Heliodoros, things are even more obvious. In the section on Kleitophon's trial we discussed the structure and techniques (p. 68ff.) and we saw that they follow various rhetorical techniques (see, for example, Kleinias' speech in p. 71ff.) or the priest's highly allusive and carefully prepared speech (p. 82ff.), or even Sopatros overlooking some principles of forensic oratory (treading in hostile territory) and derailing the whole process (p. 87ff.), or the rhetorical techniques used in the speeches (p. 89ff.), or even the complicated application of the equally complicated issue theory in the courtroom speeches (p. 110ff.): all these examples show that Achilleus Tatios' audience would have lost a lot of appreciation and pleasure in reading his novel without being familiar with rhetorical theory accessed only by educated people. In fact, without

91 Ibid pp. 56-57.
92 See further p. 50ff. and also Schmeling (1974) p. 116ff.
93 A further example of the subtlety that Achilleus Tatios' use of rhetoric can reach is the use of Asianic style by Sopatros (in 8, 10) in contrast to the Atticistic style by Kleinias (in 7, 9) (see Winkler in Reardon (1989) p. 263, note 65). One should expect only educated readers to have noticed the different styles and to make inferences as to the qualities of each character or why
appreciating this, Achilleus Tatos' great care in presenting a variety of rhetorical devices would have proven pointless to his readers to a greater extent than that of Chariton. In modern times, when these novels were approached without the appreciation of the relationship of the educated author with the educated intended readership, they were sometimes judged to be tedious.\textsuperscript{94}

In Heliodoros the sophistication is such that again much of his rhetorical sophistication would have gone unnoticed if not intended for educated readers. For example, the carefully presented speech of Charikleia (p. 138ff.) with which she manages to postpone her "wedding" to Thyamis (1, 21-22), is so full of rhetorical techniques that only a rhetorically aware reader can fully appreciate what Charikleia is doing there. For example, the fact that she appears to gather her thoughts and keeps her head in a certain position is a rhetorical posture which sends certain messages to the audience (p. 138f.); it would have been recognised only by highly educated readers. Another example which relies extensively upon the expected ability of the educated reader to recognise rhetorical techniques is Hydaspes' use of \textit{eschematismenos logos} (p. 145ff.). How could one appreciate what Hydaspes is doing in his speech – which is virtually playing with fire – if one was not aware of the subtle techniques and the effectiveness of the figured speech, which Heliodoros here transforms masterfully into a literary device? Or how could one fully appreciate the verbal conflict between Thyamis and Arsake (p. 154ff.), and why she is using the rhetorical devices she is using, without being familiar with the techniques of \textit{telika kephalaia}? The speeches are in fact so sophisticated and so subtle that an uneducated reader would have been at a loss in the same way as a modern reader is if unfamiliar with the rhetoric of the time. In fact, reading these speeches without this knowledge is in places similar to reading a handbook on specific techniques of DNA fingerprinting without even knowing anything about biology.

\textsuperscript{94} See p. 16ff., esp. 19f.
Furthermore, as we have seen in the case of Achilleus Tatios - but no doubt a further investigation would reveal similar allusions in Chariton\(^95\) and Heliodoros - the allusions to classical oratory (p. 173ff.) would go undetected by the uneducated reader and therefore what would be the point of them being there? The use of advanced rhetorical techniques examined in this thesis (p. 192ff.) points in the same direction. The exploitation and treatment of themes which recall progymnasmatic and declamatory material of the rhetorical schools have one target: the educated reader. By contrast, stories like the \textit{Aisopika} or even the \textit{Life of Alexandros} might have been more appealing to a wide audience and thus more appropriate.\(^96\)

The evidence of extensive use of epideictic rhetorical material by the three novelists (p. 222ff.), either in the form of praise or blame or in the form of laments or other similar speeches, shows that they are so fully dependent on rhetorical motifs and techniques that there should be some expectation of people appreciating them as such. In fact, we should interpret them as literary pools where the educated readers find concentrated rhetorical material for the stimulation of the cultured. Interestingly, Chariton appears to be following the same principles in his use of epideictic material as Achilleus Tatios (p. 247ff., esp. p. 252f.); this may indicate that he, too, aimed at a similarly educated readership.

All the evidence presented in this thesis, therefore, suggests that, without proper education, the novels would not have been appreciated properly - with increasing difficulty as we go higher on the ladder of rhetoricity and sophistication. It should be kept in mind that our evidence focuses only on the rhetorical aspects of the novels and the use of this criterion as evidence for the novels’ readership; outside this\(^97\) there is other evidence summarised conveniently by Bowie (1994 and 1996). However, when assessing the readership of the ancient novels the use of rhetoric in them can be a valuable criterion, since it is at the heart of any discussion of the education of the people of the time.


\(^{96}\) Holzberg (1995) 16-17. Even Xenophon of Ephesos would have posed difficulties in places, though considerably less so than the other novelists; see Bowie (1996) p. 106.

\(^{97}\) See, for instance, Reeve (1971) pp. 514-539.
Conclusions.

In the previous chapters we have examined and analysed the issue of rhetoric in three of the five extant ancient Greek novels and in some of the surviving fragments.

Our choice and rhetorical analysis of some of the most characteristic speeches of the novels in question does not claim to have exhausted the analysis of rhetoric in the novel in every aspect and detail. Indeed, we often omitted material that could be used to show additional rhetorical features, because this would have taken us beyond the aims of this study. These omissions, however, did not harm our main objective. The present selection of speeches and subjects aims to show the nature, extent, and dimensions that rhetoric has in the novels and establish their strong relationship with rhetorical theory.

The analysis has shown that the three novelists were familiar with technical rhetorical principles in all branches of rhetoric which can be traced in the ancient rhetorical handbooks of Roman times and later Greek antiquity. Forensic rhetoric is, of course, dominant in the novels, and it is this that strikes us first to such an extent that when talking about rhetoric in the novels our mind goes mainly to forensic rhetoric. As a result, the other two branches have been seriously neglected. This is also true for the handbooks which place emphasis mostly on the theory of forensic rhetoric.

That is why we started our survey from the courtroom speeches. In the first chapter we attempted to show that Chariton uses technical rhetorical strategies which can be traced in mainstream rhetorical theory. Chariton's use of rhetoric shows a well-trained orator. The Ad Herennium offers good assistance in the process of tracing these rhetorical strategies and leaves no doubt that what Chariton does in his courtroom speeches is comparable with what is being taught in the schools of rhetoric and that the author has received such training which he applies in his work. Of course, this kind of rhetorical training is not necessary in writing a novel; it can, however, become a useful tool in producing interesting scenes. The more one knows about rhetoric the better equipped one is

---

1 I have not encountered yet any extensive study on the use of epideictic or deliberative rhetoric in the ancient novels.
to appreciate the novel fully. Here, rhetoricity is low in comparison to other novels, such as that of Achilleus Tatos, and thus a reader who is uninitiated in rhetoric can still approach and enjoy the novel without any major difficulties.

A comparison of Chariton's and Achilleus Tatos' courtroom speeches shows that there is some correlation between them. From this aspect Chariton is much closer to Achilleus Tatos than we would expect. His use of rhetoric is more complex than we used to think.

The courtroom speeches of Achilleus Tatos must have been some of his moments of pride. They are very well planned and play a central role in the novel. Apart from the detailed discussion of the different parts of the speeches, the detailed exposition of the arguments and the techniques used show that the author used forensic-rhetorical material to a remarkable length. His speeches can withstand detailed rhetorical analysis which reveals an immense amount of careful rhetorical planning, a kind of serious "rhetorical premeditation." The extent of this is not immediately obvious, since Achilleus Tatos as a competent orator hides his art. His way of thinking and working is the same as that found in rhetorical handbooks.

Further analysis of Achilleus Tatos' courtroom speeches based on Hermogenes' *On Issues* has shown that the information given in the handbook helps reveal the technical preparation of Achilleus Tatos' speeches and illustrates how much rhetorical information is hidden behind these "simple" and short imaginary forensic speeches.

The case of Heliodoros is also very interesting. One or two centuries after Achilleus Tatos, he is still very knowledgeable on the area. There is evidence that he has mastered advanced rhetorical techniques which he uses moderately where he wants to raise the dramatic tension, to create intellectually challenging discussions and, mainly, to delineate his heroes' character and ingenuity (mainly that of Charikleia). Subsequently, the author's use of rhetoric shows the dynamics of this art. One of the best examples of that - apart from Charikleia's speeches - can be found in the use of *eschematismenos logos* made by Hydaspes. Another good indication of Heliodoros' rhetorical ability can be found in the confrontation of Thyamis and Arsake. The speeches there show a rhetorical agenda which is exposed with the help of the theory on the final headings.
The investigation of the fragments has shown that the rhetorical element is spread through a considerable number of novels, in addition to the complete ones, and thus it cannot be claimed that rhetoric was a peculiarity of some (later) novels only. It provides us with a good indication that rhetoric followed the novel from the very first stages of its appearance. Therefore, rhetoric did not perfuse the novel in the second sophistic movement but competent rhetorical skills were present in earlier authors too. Additionally, the range of the evidence shows that rhetoric was not only a characteristic of a certain stage in the development of the novel. The only thing that changed during the centuries was its style, its quality, and the extent of its application, whenever used. The evidence that we have today, however, does not show consistent presence of rhetoric in all the fragments. This may indicate that rhetoric was not a necessary component in all ancient novels.

The chapter on the relationship between classical oratory and the novel of Achilleus Tatios (p. 173ff.) has shown that there is firmly traceable evidence for the way and the extent to which classical oratory influenced the ancient novels. The information given is only an indication of the existing relationship, and further investigation with this single objective in mind might result in a separate thesis. The evidence of the influence of classical oratory on the novel indicates that we should not underestimate that classical oratory still had a considerable direct effect a couple of centuries later on the novelists of late antiquity through their training.

In the second chapter of part II (p. 192ff.) we have tried to show that much of the material contained in the novel was produced under the influence of advanced rhetorical exercises practised at the last stage of rhetorical education. This is evident mainly in the courtroom speeches of Chariton and in several speeches of Achilleus Tatios and Heliodoros.

In comparison with the other two, Heliodoros is restrained in his use of lengthy rhetorical speeches, apart from the courtroom scene. His use of lengthy rhetorically charged speeches is confined to specific areas, while Achilleus Tatios has the habit of exploiting any appropriate occasion.

However, intermediate rhetorical training such as that of the progymnasmata had a stronger and more straightforward impact on the novel than the advanced
rhetorical exercises. This may be because fewer people reached the highest stage of specialisation in rhetoric. Moreover, it may have been a matter of personal choice. Besides, the variety of the *progymnasmata* offered much more diverse material to the novelists and that is a main reason for their popularity among them.

The section devoted to epideictic oratory (p. 222ff.) shows that all authors were familiar with this area of rhetoric as well. In its first stage we dealt with funeral oration and in the second with *enkomia*. We found out that Achilleus Tatios was very fond of mourning speeches. He is very careful in the construction of them. Their characteristics indicate that these speeches are indebted heavily to the author's excellent knowledge of epideictic rhetoric. Chariton also shows a significant range of epideictic material which has not been fully appreciated up to now. Concerning Heliodoros there is evidence that the author was familiar with sophisticated epideictic oratory, but he is usually restrained in its application and his use of material is rather traditional.

In the part which refers to *enkomion* and *psogos* (p. 262ff.) we found also that the authors were aware of the relevant techniques at an advanced level. Differences exist but in general the three novelists use material taught in detail in the rhetorical schools. Correspondence between the rhetoric in speeches discussed and the instructions found in the surviving manuals on epideictic rhetoric is remarkably close.

Focused on the three representatives of the genre - from the early Chariton to the late Heliodoros - and based mainly on various rhetorical handbooks we tried to show that the novelists use rhetoric in various areas of their work. This is illustrated by the way they think, which shows their "rhetorical premeditation," and their ability to apply rhetorical devices in a purposeful way.

Rhetoric of all branches is abundant in the novels, and the authors employing it are not newcomers. The complex techniques they borrow and their ingenuity in their application shows that they are not following slavishly existing patterns but they put rhetorical devices into the service of their novels. Their rhetorical techniques must have appealed to contemporary readers who were "rhetorically alert." The novelists' persistence in using them indicates that these people must have been very sensitive and appreciative towards rhetoric.
In the last part of this thesis, based on the evidence discussed in this project, we support the idea of an educated readership and of an artful deployment of rhetoric by the novelists who avoid reproduction of rhetoric mainly by giving it a function in each case.

In evaluating the rhetorical element of Chariton's novel in terms of quality and quantity, and when contrasting it with the other “sophistic” novels of Achilleus Tatos and Heliodoros, we find ourselves at variance with what is widely believed today about the “sophistic” and the non- or pre-sophistic novels. These names and the theory behind them are misleading. Chariton's novel contains much more ambitious rhetorical material than would be expected by a “non-sophistic” novel.

We have seen more or less that rhetoric exists to some degree in almost all novels. In those we have examined there is a difference in the use of rhetoric by each author but overall all three of them use it quite extensively. Rhetoric had been evolving with varying intensity both during republican and imperial times. Of course, it reached a peak in the second century and this is obvious in Achilleus Tatos. The divisions, however, among the novels can no longer be accepted in the traditional way. It is the quality and quantity and the variety that changes from author to author and not the existence of rhetoric. Unless we “stretch” the date of Chariton so much as to shift him into the second sophistic movement - even its very beginning, a hypothesis which would be hard to prove - we have to rethink what we mean by attributing the term “non-sophistic” to the novel of Chariton.

Those parts of the novel which are characterised as “highly rhetorical,” though very well embodied in the story, are not perfectly fused into it. On the contrary, they may have been intentionally crafted to stand out as artful highlights. The author considers it an advantage to be able to use rhetorical ingenuity to shift his story-line in different directions, slow down the pace, create dramatic tension, etc. Modern scholarship has been very slow to appreciate this. If not ignored, the use of rhetoric in the novel has been criticised, especially in times when people felt entitled to be judgmental towards ancient literature of this type, without realising that there might have been something lost in our

---

2 See p. 16ff.
communication with the ancient novel, whose many aspects are still puzzling us today. Therefore, it is these passages or dimensions of the novel that have been from time to time rashly dismissed as boring, artificial, tedious or detrimental to the plot, that need special attention. In order to appreciate the literary qualities of the novel we have to judge it on its own merits. Rhetoric in the novel is responsible for some of the most memorable "highlights" of these works. The great effort devoted to them is the reason why these speeches are some of the finest moments of the novelists' works.
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