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ABSTRACT

The thesis comprises, in roughly equal proportions, a commentary on the first book of Heliodoros Aithiopika (a Greek novel of the third or fourth century A.D.); and prolegomena which treat issues raised by the work as a whole. A literal translation of Aithiopika I is included as an appendix.

In the commentary a range of points is covered, including philological and textual points, and questions of literary interpretation, and of the historical background of the action of the novel. Some of the literary points relate to the whole corpus of extant ancient Greek novels. One particularly obscure historical point, the identity of the 'Boukoloi', is given extended consideration.

The prolegomena consists of five chapters. The first is a brief survey of the textual tradition of the work. The second examines the question of its date of composition and of the identity of its author, surveying the history of this debate, and showing how the evidence of vocabulary can be used to add weight to the argument in favour of accepting the fourth century date (rather than the third century date favoured by some scholars), and the view that Heliodoros was a Christian. The third chapter disputes the current view that the use of terms for divine agencies in the text reflects a lack of a systematic theology. The fourth chapter asks whether the text bears any traces of the local cult of the author's home town of Emesa, and answers with a tentative affirmative. In the fifth chapter the author considers how his contributions to our understanding of the historical and conceptual background of the text could affect our interpretation of it as a literary work.
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A NOTE ON THE TEXT

In the commentary the text of the Budé is quoted in the lemmata, even where I disagree with it. As a result, it is the text which is criticized most often. Nonetheless, it is probably the best text, as well as the most accessible for many readers. It also has the advantage of numbering sentences as well as sections. However, the Budé line breaks, by which references are given in the TLG, have not been retained, nor has the practice of starting each sentence with an upper case letter.

One result of the lack of co-operation between Dörrie, Rattenbury and Lumb, and Colonna is that they each have differing systems of assigning letters to the manuscripts of Heliodoros. For convenience a table has been compiled of the three sets of sigla used by Dörrie, Rattenbury and Lumb, and Colonna. Detailed descriptions of the MSS are to be found in Colonna's introduction, as well as in some of the library catalogues. In the commentary I rely largely on the reports of the MSS given in the apparatus of the Budé, and employ the sigla used there; these are in bold type in this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Budé</th>
<th>Colonna</th>
<th>Dörrie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VATICANUS GRAECUS 157</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCIANUS 411</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ν₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VATICANUS OTTOBONIANUS 226¹</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ν₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCIANUS 409 ff. 1-163</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONACENSIS 96 ff. 278-322 (books I-III)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>e₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIEROSOLYMITANUS cod. palimp. S. Crucis 57 (frgs.)</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCIANUS 410</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VATICANUS GRAECUS 1390 ff. 159-200²</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONACENSIS 157 ff. 124-167</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ν₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUGDUNENSIS XVIII 73 F ff. 1-195</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>k₁</td>
<td>νν₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUGDUNENSIS VOSSIANUS GR. 61 A</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>νν₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINDOBONENSIS HIST. GR. 130 ff. 1-62 (books I-IX 13)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARISINUS GR. BIBL. NAT. 2905</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALATINUS 125²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>m₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARISINUS GR. BIBL. NAT. 2896</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>m₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCIANUS 607 ff. 1 sqq.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINDOBONENSIS HIST. GR. 116</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURENTIANUS MEDIC. LXX 36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAURINENSIS B III 29 ff. 29-106 (olim CV11; cat. no. 120)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARISINUS GR. BIBL. NAT. 2904</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARISINUS GR. BIBL. NAT. 2906</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARISINUS GR. BIBL. NAT. 2907 ff. 1-162</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAPOLITANUS BORBONICUS GR. III A ²⁴</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITIANI TRANSLATIONIS FRAGMENTUM</td>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM. VALLICELIANUS GR. 61 a (XCII Allacci) cont. excerpta</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANUS BIBL. NAT. 11 cont. excerpta</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTABRIGIENSIS UNIV. Dd. IV 16 cont. excerpta²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATRITENSIUS GR. 73 (nunc 79) ff. 181-196v; 212-213v; excerpta</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ESCURIALENSIS I-Γ-6, anno 1671 combustus]</td>
<td>Ξ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[MEMMIANUS DEPERDITUS]</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. AMHERST 160 (cont. VIII 16.6-7, 17.3-4)⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Erroneously described by the Budé as 228.
²Erroneously described by Dörrie as 1930.
³Erroneously described by Dörrie as Parisinus 125.
⁴Colonna describes this as III AA 2, and says in his introduction that it is 205 in the catalogue of Cyril (in fact it is on p.194 of the catalogue of Cyril, which has no numbers other than page numbers). Dependence on Colonna probably explains why Dörrie describes it as Borbonicus Neapolitanus 205, a number which cannot otherwise be interpreted from the published catalogues (unless there is an alternative edition of the catalogue of Cyril which I have not seen). There is a new catalogue of this library; the manuscript in question does not appear in vol. I, published in 1962; the long promised vol. II has not yet appeared.
⁵Erroneously described by Dörrie as Dd IV 28.
⁶Pack 2797. This is a fragment of parchment written on both sides in an uncial hand of the sixth or seventh century. There is a transcription and brief discussion of this fragment of in
Dörrie, Rattenbury and Lumb, and Colonna worked at a time when confidence in stemmatics was at its height, and all offer rather different stemmata for Heliodoros, none of which are conclusive. The proposed stemmata do of course reflect the affinities which exist between manuscripts. The main advantage of the stemmata is to enable an editor to decide which manuscripts not to use. The reader is referred to the stemma in the first volume of the Budé for a general outline. Essentially the stemma of Colonna differs from that of the Budé editors in that it assumes that Z is derived from the archetype via an independent exemplar, rather than being derived from the same exemplar as CBP (so the tradition is in effect regarded is tripartite rather than bipartite). Dörrie differs by making M a descendant rather than a brother of V. There is enough contamination to make the stemma of the manuscripts which are used of little help when deciding which reading to print. The texts of the Budé and of Colonna are fairly sound, but over-reliance on stemmatics, and an associated tendency to favour particular manuscripts is the main cause of the poor decisions about which reading to print which these editors made.

In addition, both Colonna and the Budé editors, although at odds with each other, were reluctant to print emendations, on the grounds that the style of Heliodoros is in any case strange and unconventional. Colonna was more extreme in this policy. The editors of the Budé felt obliged to emend more often, partly because they favoured a third century date for Heliodoros whereas Colonna favoured a fourth century date, and it was assumed that more stylistic oddity was possible for a fourth century author. They were restrained to some extent by their policy of printing the manuscript reading at those places (which are indicated in the apparatus) where only Rattenbury or only Lumb wished to emend. Furthermore, although both the Budé editors (vol. I pLXI) and Colonna accept that departures from ‘pure’ Greek usage should be expected in Heliodoros, both made judgements based on their own rather impressionistic ideas about the extent of the departures from pure Greek to be expected. (Koraes, on the other hand, knew ‘late’ Greek, and could compare Heliodoros directly with fourth century contemporaries, and did not compare his Greek with pure Attic.)

M. Gronewald ZPE 34 (1979) 19-21. The only implications for the text appear to be 1. to support the conjecture of Koraes, το ἰτεύ, at VIII 17.4.3; 2. to supply the variant ἔκπαντι at VIII 17.4.2, a variant which has a Heliodorean ring. The complete lack of papyri of Heliodoros is not surprising if the Aithiopika was composed in the late fourth century.

7 A point which the Budé editors accept in the introduction to their vol.III, pV.
An important bone of contention between Colonna and the Budé editors is the value of C. Colonna rightly regards this manuscript as 'corrected' by a scholar who removed many genuine readings where the Greek is unconventional, and argued that the Budé editors sometimes went wrong because they over-valued it, a charge which they partly accept in the introduction to their third volume.

There are two ways in which the procedures of the earlier editors can be improved. The first is to improve our knowledge of good Greek usage; in this we are assisted now by the availability of the electronic Thesaurus (TLG), which enables us for instance to demonstrate that the MSS reading at I 13.1 is good Attic, and that the 'normalising' emendation has no support either in Attic or in late Greek (v. the note below ad I 13.1 πολίτην ... ἀποφήμας).

The second way in which the procedures of earlier editors can be improved is by attempting to define Heliodoros' own linguistic habits. Where the text is suspect the attempt is sometimes circular, but in other cases it is possible to form a clearer idea of what to expect than the earlier editors had, partly with the help of the electronic Thesaurus. For instance it can be demonstrated that many words which editors regarded as hapax legomena, presumably relying on Dindorf's Stephanus, are indeed hapax legomena, and there are enough such words to show that they are a feature of Heliodoros' style: therefore it would be wrong to suspect a word because it is otherwise unattested. It is also possible to demonstrate that there are several words and usages not found before the fourth century: therefore there are no adequate grounds for suspecting any single reading simply because it is inconsistent with pre-fourth century usage. On the other hand there are no usages in the manuscripts which (with the exception of Heliodoros) are restricted to a documentary context; and there are no semitisms: therefore any defence of a suspect manuscript reading on the grounds that it may represent a colloquial or local usage not attested in other literary texts (which is perhaps the kind of defence which Colonna sometimes has in mind when he prints indefensible readings) must be treated with great caution.

---

8 In spite of his low opinion of this manuscript, Colonna asserted that it preserves readings of the copy used by Maximus Confessor in his Florilegium (PG 91, 721-1018). In fact the attribution of the Florilegium to the seventh century Maximus, accepted by Colonna, is spurious. It is likely to date from the ninth or tenth century, but in the absence of a critical edition it is unclear whether the quotations from Heliodoros belong to the original, or a later, augmented version of this Florilegium (v. M. Richard 1962).
The question of how much consistency to expect in Heliodoros’ use of Greek remains problematic; there are things in the Greek of Heliodoros which it is tempting to say are simply wrong, (e.g. oi φώντες = ‘parents’, when it normally means ‘offspring’; cp. J.R. Morgan (1978) ad IX 11.6, and S.A. Naber Mnemosyne N.S. I 1873 145-169; the gender of πρηστήρ: cp. note below on I 22.4 καταγγέλοντες), although not nearly so many as Naber (ibid.) claims.
THE DATE AND IDENTITY OF HELIODOROS

Current estimates put the date of the *Aithiopika* between the third and the fourth centuries A.D. Some of the scholars who accept the fourth century date also accept the assertion of the earliest testimonia, that Heliodoros became a bishop. I will argue that the fourth century date is certainly right, and that within the fourth century the years 350-370 (as suggested by J.R. Morgan 1978) are the most likely. I will also argue from internal evidence that Heliodoros was certainly familiar with some Judaeo-Christian literature, and that he probably knew Latin.

The only external evidence for the date of Heliodoros are some testimonia in church historians; we have no papyri of the *Aithiopika*, and the fragment of parchment form the sixth century adds nothing to our knowledge of the date. The internal evidence may be divided into historical and linguistic evidence. The testimonia and the internal historical evidence have been thoroughly studied, and work on these areas is briefly reviewed in the first two sections of this chapter. The internal linguistic evidence has been less thoroughly discussed, and in the third section, which deals with this evidence, some new material is offered.

I. THE TESTIMONIA

The ancient and medieval testimonia on Heliodoros are collected in A. Colonna's 1938 edition of the text. There is a sensible discussion of them in the introductory epistle of Koraes (1804). The earliest mention of Heliodoros by an ancient author is made by the church historian Socrates, and this gives us our only really firm *terminus ante quem* (Socrates seems to have died in the late fifth century). Koraes, like virtually all earlier scholars, accepts the statement by Socrates, that Heliodoros, Bishop of Trikka in Thessaly in the late fourth century, was the author of the *Aithiopika*. He rejects the

---

9 E. Feuillâtre (1966 p147) places the *Aithiopika* in the time of Hadrian. He writes 'Nous croyons en effet qu' Héliodore a écrit son roman pour illustrer, grâce à une fiction édifiante, la veracité de l'oracle, le prestige de Delphes comme centre religieux ou intellectuel, la mission civilisatrice échué à la cité d'Apollon. C'était le temps où Hérode Atticus en même temps que l'empereur continuent à rendre à Delphes une partie de sa gloire.' His arguments concerning the date can be safely ignored.

10 Socrates' statement is in his book V, which covers the reign of Theodosios. Therefore it is implicit, but not certain that Socrates thought that Heliodoros was bishop during the reign of Theodosios.

11 Socrates *Ecclesiastical History* V 22 (PG 67,63) ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ ἔθους Ἀρχηγὸς Ἡλιόδορος Τρίκκας τῆς ἐκεῖ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος, οὗ λέγεται κοινήτα ἐρωτικά βιβλία ἅ νεος ἀν ἱστυτάξε καὶ Λιθοπακτία προστήρειτος. The context is that Heliodoros is alleged to have introduced celibacy for the priesthood in Thessaly.
additional information of the later testimonia as erroneous. Koraes largely defined the *communis opinio* of the nineteenth century.\(^{12}\)

The late nineteenth and the twentieth century tradition of placing Heliodoros in the third century has its origins with E. Rohde. Rohde (1914) 460(432)-473(444) spent thirteen pages refuting the view of Koraes that Heliodoros was Christian, and arguing that his theology was rather Neo-Pythagorean. From these pages one can get the impression that Rohde thought that Heliodoros is not bad enough to justify us damning him as a fourth century writer and a Christian. He takes the fact that Heliodoros shows familiarity with Philostratos *Life of Apollonios of Tyana* as a *terminus post quem*; he regards Heliodoros as a heliolater and an admirer of Apollonios of Tyana, and believes (496(466)-498(467)) that these proclivities point to a date in the reign of Aurelian.

It does not seem useful to dwell on the debate about whether Heliodoros became a bishop; there is not enough solid evidence to go further than S. Goldhill (1995 121), who quotes the argument of J.R. Morgan (TAPA 1989 p320), that the *Aithiopika* 'has elevated love to the status of a sacrament', and comments that 'this makes understandable the identification that ancient writers made: that Heliodoros was a Christian bishop.' Koraes probably overemphasized any Christian element in Heliodoros, and Rohde was to some extent right to detect elements in the religiosity of Heliodoros which can be found in third century paganism. On the other hand Koraes appears to be familiar with Greek patristic writing; Rohde, by contrast, demonstrates little knowledge of Christianity.\(^{13}\) and an attempt is made below to demonstrate\(^{14}\) that Koraes' claim to find typically Christian words and phrases in the *Aithiopika* is not as groundless as Rohde believed.

Many twentieth century scholars have accepted a third century dating; before the debate about the possible historical sources for the siege of Syene in book IX they accepted it on the basis of the arguments put forward by Rohde, and subsequently, on the basis of the argument that Julian's account of the siege of Nisibis, historically inaccurate, was modelled on the siege of Syene in Heliodoros IX, rather than the other way about.\(^{15}\)

\(^{12}\)Represented, for instance, by A. Chassang (1862 p415) in his monograph on the ancient novel.

\(^{13}\)Rohde's attitude to Christianity may be studied in the final chapter, entitled 'Das Ende', of E. Rohde (1925) vol II 396(683)-404(691).

\(^{14}\)Below, in section III 'The Linguistic Evidence', p16.

\(^{15}\)Recent scholars to accept a third century date include E.L. Bowie (1985) 136, 249-250; and R. Lane Fox (1986) p137-138 with n52.
II. THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

As far as Koraes and Rohde were concerned the only internal evidence for the date of the *Aithiopika* were details of language and thought, particularly religious or philosophical thought. M. van der Valk (*Mnemosyne* 9, 1941 97-100) introduced a new piece of evidence when he argued that the siege of Syene in Heliodoros IX is based on the allusions to the siege of Nisibis of 350 by Julian (*Or. I* 22-23; *III* 11-12). The ensuing debate is summarised and examined in detail by J.R. Morgan (1978) ii-xxviii. This is the best discussion of the issue; Morgan concludes that neither Julian nor Heliodoros imitates the other, but that they shared a common source; and that the *Aithiopika* was composed after, and probably within twenty years of, the siege of Nisibis of 350 A.D.

For present purposes a brief overview of the literature on this topic will suffice.

R. Keydell *Polychronion: Festschrift F. Dölger* Heidelberg 1950 245-250 argues that the siege of Syene is unnecessary to the plot of the *Aithiopika*, and that its inclusion requires some other explanation. Keydell supposes that Heliodoros included it after being impressed by the accounts of the siege of Nisibis by Julian. 16 He also argues that the key rôle of the sun god in the *Aithiopika* is no less consistent with a fourth than a third century date; and that the Ethiopians’ rejection of their πατρια of human sacrifice at the end of the novel, and the Gymnosophists’ rejection of all sacrifice, amounts to a recommendation of Christian worship.

A. Colonna *Athenaeum* 28 (1950) 79-87 draws attention to the similarities between the description of cataphracts in Heliodoros and the descriptions of them by Julian (*Or. I* 30, *III* 7), and emphasizes the verbal similarities between the description of the siege of Syene in the *Aithiopika* and Julian’s descriptions of the siege of Nisibis. He argues that while the version of the siege of Nisibis in Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist. II* 30, followed by Zonaras XIII 7.1ff, vol. *III* ed. Dindorf) is reliable, Julian’s rather different version is supported by Ephraem and the *Chronicon Paschale*, and is too historically accurate to be influenced by fiction. He also draws attention to the testimony of the ninth century Theodosios Melitenus that Heliodoros was bishop of Trikka in the reign of Theodosios, and, identifying him as Theodosios I (379-395), notes that the date

16This point is emphasized by J.R. Morgan 1978. The implication of Keydell’s argument is that the imagination of Heliodoros was fired by reading of the siege in Julian, giving the date of publication of Julian’s *Orations as a terminus post quem*; whereas Morgan, suggesting that Julian and Heliodoros had a common source, makes the siege of Nisibis itself the *terminus post quem*. 
harmonizes with the idea that the *Aithiopika* was composed after the publication of Julian’s orations.\(^\text{17}\)

J. Schwarz *AC* 36 (1967) 549-552 accepts the case made by van der Valk. He also draws attention to apparent imitations of the *Aithiopika* in the Historia Augusta which, he argues, suggests that these works were close to one another in date.

C. Lacombrade *RÉG* 83 (1970) 70-89 argues in favour of accepting that Heliodoros was Bishop of Trikka in the second half of the fourth century. He cites some linguistic evidence (v. p16 below); he also argues that Neo-Pythagorean elements in the world view of the *Aithiopika* are as consistent with a fourth as a third century date; and that the exclusion of pederasty from the novel, and an emphasis on virginity and on the sacredness of marriage reflect a fourth century concern for purity. He regards the view that Heliodoros depended on Julian for his description of cataphracts, and of the siege of Syene as the only reasonable one; and is inclined to accept the testimony of Nikephoros Kallistos as well as that of Socrates.

T. Szepessy *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24 (1976) 247-276 accepted that there is a close link between Julian’s account of the siege of Nisibis and Heliodoros’ siege of Syene. He argued that Heliodoros is likely to be an early third century writer, and was the first to suggest that Julian imitated him. In his view the evidence of Theodoret, St. Ephraem and the *Chronikon Paschale* show that the construction of a bank around the walls of Syene and the formation of a lake upon which boats could sail had no part in the historical siege. He concludes that Julian imitated these details from Heliodoros.

E. Feuillâtre (1966) was not alone in seeking evidence other than that produced by an examination of the relations between the siege of Syene and Julian’s accounts of the siege of Nisibis to determine the date of the *Aithiopika*.\(^\text{18}\) A.M. Saracella *Maia* 24 (1972) 8-41, in an article arguing that the *Aithiopika*, with its frequent lamentation, and the pessimistic opinions which Heliodoros is said to display, reflects the turbulence of the times in which it was written, favours a date at the end of the of third century.\(^\text{19}\) G. Anderson (1984 p91) in a book

---

\(^{17}\)Theodosios Melitenos is not necessarily an independent witness: the Theodosian date could be seen as implicit in Socrates’ testimony: v. n10.

\(^{18}\)cf. n9.

\(^{19}\)A.M. Saracella’s tentative arguments about the date are tucked away in a footnote, p10 n6, which is perhaps surprising in an article which endeavours to relate the *Aithiopika* to the conditions of the age in which it was written. G.N. Sandy *CW* 67 (1974) 348 missed these arguments, stating that Saracella favours a fourth century date. They are: 1. The respect with which Hydaspes is described reflects the theocratic monarchy founded by Diocletian in 293; 2. The elevation of Helios-Apollo is linked to Diocletian’s persecution of Manichaeans and
whose thesis is that much of the narrative material in the Greek and Roman novels is derived from Near-Eastern traditions of folk-tale and legend, draws attention to an eighth century B.C. inscription from Syria relating the siege of Hatarikka, and implies that Heliodoros could have known about a siege of this type regardless of whether he knew about the siege of Nisibis: "We must abandon any reasonable hope of establishing a contemporary allusion for a technique so long established and memorable."\(^{20}\)

C.S. Lightfoot *Historia* 37 (1988) 105-125, in a fine and detailed study of the historical siege of Nisibis, concludes that Julian's accounts contain a mixture of factual information (in particular, that the city walls were breached by a torrent of water released against them), and of fiction (in particular the idea that a dyke erected around the city produced a lake upon which ships could sail\(^{21}\)). Lightfoot assumes that Julian imitated the fictional components of his account from Heliodoros, and provides perhaps the strongest argument on the side of those who believe that Julian imitated Heliodoros. Of course, even with Lightfoot's view of the evidence, it remains possible that the fictional elements in Julian's account were invented by himself and imitated by Heliodoros, or derived from a source (not necessarily an historical account of the third siege of Nisibis) which he shared with Heliodoros. The links between Heliodoros' siege of Syene and what Lightfoot regards as the factual elements in the sources for the siege of Nisibis are slight: the diversion of a river, and the collapse of part of the city walls under the weight of water. However, against those who would use Lightfoot's arguments to support a third century date for Heliodoros, the argument that contemporary public interest in the siege of Nisibis is required to explain why Heliodoros included the siege of Syene in the *Aithiopika*, an incident not essential to the plot, retains its validity.

P. Chuvin (1991), in an appendix on the date of the *Aithiopika* (320-325), accepts the fourth century date. He points out that as a Syrian Heliodoros was well placed to know about the siege of Nisibis, reviews the debate about the date, and draws attention to Themistios *Disc.* II 36, (a discussion of kingship which seems barely relevant to the date of the *Aithiopika*). He notes that Syriac *til*', if it can mean *tumuli*, can also mean *πρόχωμα*. On an apparent discrepancy between the account of Julian and Heliodoros' Siege of Syene, and

---

\(^{20}\) The inscription in question can be found at ANET\(^3\). It is far from certain that it refers to a siege which was prosecuted by *inundation*.

\(^{21}\) This is the key feature of the accounts of Julian and Heliodoros which makes M. Maróth *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 27 (1979) 239-243 conclude that they are based on a siege other than the siege of Nisibis referred to by Theodoret, Ephraem and his biographers.
the other accounts of the siege of Nisibis, he writes, speculatively, “Enfin, si aucun historien ne parle du transport des machines de guerre par bateaux, la plupart mentionnent néanmoins l’abondance de ces machines et Chapour a bien dû les mettre sur des pontons, au moins pour les approcher des murailles.” He regards Heliodoros, Julian and Ephraem all as well informed about the siege of Nisibis.

G.W. Bowersock\[^{22}\] (1994), having discussed some of the previous contributions to the discussion of the date of Heliodoros, describes T. Szepessy’s interpretation of Ephraem as ‘simply wrong’. Szepessy objected that the *tumuli* in Ephraem’s account of the siege of Nisibis could not be compared with the earthworks which surrounded Syene. Bowersock asserts that Szepessy was misled by the Latin translation of Ephraem which he used, stating of the word there translated *tumuli*, “The Syriac plural *talāla* matches precisely the use of *χῶμασα* to describe the earthworks in Heliodorus (9.3), and *χωμαια* is similarly the word used in two places by Julian in his account of the siege of Nisibis.”\[^{23}\] Bowersock then points out that the embassies to Hydaspes in Heliodoros X appear to be echoed in the Historia Augusta: *Aurelian* 33 includes Blemmyes, Exomitae (Aksumites) and giraffes; *Aurelian* 44 includes Blemmyes, Exomitae and Seres (Chinese). He argues that because the Chinese would not historically have visited Ethiopia Heliodoros and the HA are interdependent. He also suggests that the presence of cataphracts in both the *Aithiopika* and the HA\[^{24}\] reflects a general interest in this type of armour among late fourth century writers; and concludes that the HA imitated Heliodoros.


\[^{24}\]Historia Augusta Sev. 56.5; Aur. 34.4.
III. THE LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

Several scholars have argued that the way in which Heliodoros wrote Greek points to a fourth century date for the composition of the Aithiopika. Koraes (1804), although he did not claim that the language of Heliodoros is specifically fourth century, does claim that it supports the view that he was Bishop of Trikka, which implies a fourth or fifth century date.

A. Wifstrand (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1944-1945 69-109) adduces a handful of linguistic arguments which he asserts point to a later rather than an earlier date for Heliodoros. These are, in brief: that the periodic style with many participle constructions is typical of fourth century writers such as Julian, Themistios, Basil, that ἐνεγκοῦσα for πατρίς, λοιπόν for ἤδη, εἰς for ὤς (preposition with accusative), and an article placed between attributive adjective and noun, are late usages; that abstract nouns with possessive pronouns are a 4th - 7th century usage; and that constructions like ἀλλ' ὁμοίως πατέρα, γυνὴ καὶ πρεσβύτης ἔργου εἰσέπετο (IX 3.8) become commoner in later Greek. R.M. Rattenbury CR 60 (1946) 110-111 replies simply that this evidence is not conclusive.

M.P. Nilsson (1974) 565-567 [542-544] accepts Wifstrand’s arguments, and confines himself to religious points. He asserts that various religious features of the Aithiopika, which he enumerates, are more typical of the fourth than the third century. He adds three verbal usages which he asserts point to the later date: οἱ κρέιττονες / τὸ κρέιττον for divinities; δύναμις for magical power; and ἀντίθεος for a spirit which hinders magic.

C. Lacombrade RÉG 83 (1970) 70-89, as well as mentioning τὸ κρέιττον, notes as late usages some terms for virginity (ἀκήρατος, ἀδιάφθορος, ἄχρονος). 25

25I quote form his introductory epistle, vol. I p24-25 (my translation): “Those who do not believe that the author of the Aithiopika was a Christian are very irrational. Even if we lacked the testimonies of Socrates, Photios and Nikephoros, a careful reading of the text is enough to persuade us of the author’s religion. Words and phrases from the ecclesiastical books of the Christians, hinting at Christian history and customs, are so scattered in different parts of the work that it is difficult to doubt that the author was a Christian.”

26These three words occur once in Heliodoros, all together in II 35.5. As an argument for a late date their use here carries little weight. They are certainly used often by fourth century, especially Christian, writers, both with reference to chastity and in other contexts. This may be because late and Christian writers wrote more about chastity than earlier writers, but their use for virginity or chastity is not exclusively a late development, as is shown by the following references for their use in these senses by earlier writers. The list is complete up to the end of the third century AD: ἄχρονος, Achilles Tatiōs VIII 17.4; Xenophon of Ephesos II 13.8, IV 3.3; Ps-Lucian Amores 22.2 (of avoiding homosexuality); Oppian Kynegetika I 238; Josephos Bell. Jud. V 381; Clemens Alexandrinus Stromata III 12.82.5; Origen Scholia
J.R. Morgan (1978) frequently identifies words or uses of words which appear to support a fourth century date. He treats this evidence with great caution. The possibility of using the electronic thesaurus to make more or less exhaustive checks of attestations of words in extant literature allows us to reject some of these examples, but to use others with much greater confidence.

The evidence which can be gathered using the electronic thesaurus shows that some of these linguistic points from the *Aithiopika* do indicate a date not before the fourth century. There are many other such points in the text. In this section I collect some points which seem to indicate a fourth century date. I then collect some usages which are wholly or largely confined to Jewish or Christian writing, and these, taken together, strongly suggest that Heliodorus was familiar with Jewish and Christian texts. I also collect a few usages which suggest that Heliodorus knew Latin. These three collections of linguistic points are made on the assumption that no single point is decisive on its own, but that cumulatively they carry great weight.\(^{27}\)

The catalogues of expressions indicating a fourth century date, and indicating a familiarity with Christian literature include only those examples where the statistical evidence is most compelling.\(^{28}\) There are probably other expressions which could be adduced, even from the books I have examined, particularly in the case of phrases, which are more difficult to check than individual words. There are certainly words not included in the catalogues for which the statistics

\(^{27}\) For this survey I have examined only books I and II. The points collected from books IX and X are mainly the result of following up suggestions in J.R. Morgan (1978). In the books not covered by Morgan’s work or my own there are probably many similar linguistic points which could have been included, and which would have added to the weight of evidence without changing its general import. A slightly different approach to using vocabulary to study the dating of Chariton is adopted by C. Ruiz-Montero *CQ* 61 (1991) 484-489. She examines the overlap between his vocabulary, and the vocabularies of Diodorus Siculus, Philo, Josephos, Dio Chrysostom, and Plutarch (concluding that a greater coincidence between Chariton and the latter two points to a date for Chariton closer to their time). Where a text offers the right kind of evidence, a survey of the present kind points to more secure conclusions because it utilizes almost all extant Greek texts for comparison.

\(^{28}\) Where there are ten or more attestations, I have in general included only words where less than ten per cent of the attestations are earlier than fourth century (for the first catalogue), or are not Jewish or Christian (for the second catalogue).
point to a late date or a familiarity with Christian literature, or both, but less decisively than is the case for the expressions included.

1. Linguistic usages which indicate a date not before the fourth century.

In this section expressions found in Heliodoros which are rarely or never found in texts securely datable before the fourth century are collected. The supporting evidence is in some cases presented as a complete list of those attestations which are found in texts earlier than the fourth century, or where it is not too cumbersome, a complete lists of attestations which includes the fourth, and sometimes later centuries.²⁹ For the sake of completeness these lists include attestations found in texts which cannot be securely dated, or which may have been subject to later revision (in particular, texts of lexicographers and medical writers). When assessing the weight of evidence that a particular expression points to a late date for the text in which it occurs, in order to avoid circularity only those attestations found in securely datable texts should be taken into account.

For a discussion of the implications of the following for the dating of the text the reader should refer to the commentary ad loc.: I 8.4 τὸ κρείττον; two phrases in I 14.1, ἡ ἐνεγκούσα, meaning 'mother country'; also in I 14.1 the phrase εἰς τὸ δήνεκες; in I 15.8 the compound ἐναπομείνατεν; I 16.5 σιμύχω used of emotion; the phrase at I 17.3, ἐκ γειτόνων; and at I 24.4 the use of ἐνθατίμως in connection with marriage. These are the most compelling linguistic usages in book I which indicate that the text was not composed before the fourth century. Such usages in other books include the following.

αὐχονος: there are twelve attestations of this word and its cognates (not including one each in Hesychios and the Suda); apart from Heliodoros, only one of these precedes the fourth century.³⁰

βαρύτημος: only one author other than Heliodoros uses the adjective βαρύτημος to describe a person who sells goods at a high price: Heliodoros has the phrase μὴ βαρύτημος εἶναι in this sense at II 30.2; the phrase μὴ βαρύτημος ἐστο occurs twice, with the same sense, in the writings of Basil of

²⁹The lists of attestations are based mainly on searches of the version of TLG or the TLG index, or both, current in 1995. Although there were still gaps in the TLG’s coverage of Greek literature, the coverage up to the end of the fourth century A.D., which is the significant period for present purposes, was largely complete.

³⁰ἀνίκηνος is found at Epictetos Diss. ab Arrianoe digestae IV 1.106. The other, later attestations are: in Scholia on Euripides; Scholia on Oppian; A scribal note ad Babrius 92 (recorded in the edition of Crusius); three times in Epiphanius; cognate nouns and an adverb are attested in John Chrysostom; Epiphanius; Sophonias; and the Concilia Oecumenica.
Caesarea. Incidentally, the thirty occurrences of the word, which is normally applied to goods such as precious stones, are all in Christian writers, except one occurrence each in Heliodoros, Aischylos and Strabo.

βοθισμός: this noun, derived from βοθιζω, and used by Heliodoros at IX 8.6, is first attested in the fourth century.

ἐκτετόρευται: The compound, used by Heliodoros at II 11.4, is otherwise limited to the fourth century.

μουσουργία: This word, used by Heliodoros at II 24.3, is not otherwise found before the fourth century.

πυρακτομένη: Heliodoros applies this to Arsinoe, who is described as ζήλω πυρακτομένη at II 9.1. The use of the verb, applied to a person undergoing mental suffering, is perhaps transferred from its common application to heated weapons, which inflict suffering. In any case, a search of TLG up to the fifth century yields only two other references where the verb is applied to persons, and they both belong to the fourth century.

ρυίσκομαι: used by Heliodoros at II 19.6, the verb does not seem to be attested before the fourth century.

---

32 The authors in which the word is attested are: Aischylos, a Scholium to Aischylos, Strabo, New Testament, Clement of Rome, Heliodoros, Basil, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Eusebios, John Damascene, Theophylaktos, The Suda.
33 There are two other attestations before the Byzantine period: Didymos the Blind Fragmenta in Psalms ed. Mühlenberg 746 (ad Ps. 70.21); Gregorios of Nyssa in Opera ed. J. McDonough vol. V 143 c9.
34 Apart from a Byzantine reference (Anna Comena Alexias iii 3.4) the other occurrences found in a search of TLG are John Chrysostom PG 62.228, 578; and Greg. Nyss. Comment. in cantic. canticorum in Opera ed. H. Langerbeck vol. vi 411.12.
35 However, μουσουργία occurs twice in Lucian. The authors in which μουσουργία occurs (according to search of the TLG index) are Greg. Nyss., Scholia in Theoc., Constantius VII Porphyrogentius, Vettius Valens, Aristides Quintilianus (date uncertain; 3/4 AD?), Theophylactos Simocatta, Eustathios.
36 John Chrysostom PG 60.739; Greg. Nyss. Comment. in cantic. canticorum in Opera ed. H. Langerbeck vol. VI 287.11.
37 The other attestations are: Oribasios V libri ad Eunapium IV 6.6; Proklos In Plat. rem pub. ed. W. Kroll II 31.27; Simplicios, in Comm. in Aristot. Gr. IX 722.30; Eutekmios (date unknown) Paraphrase of Nikander ed. I Gualandri 36.29; Sophonias, once; John Philoponus, ten times; Eustathios, seven times.
There are some words and usages attested first in Heliodoros. These never become common in literary Greek, and their value as evidence for a late date is difficult to weigh. This is true of κοστίπος in the sense of wales of a boat. The compound κοτερεπθρικό (Heliodoros X 18.3) is not otherwise found before the fifth century. θάλακενο usually means 'to be idle' or 'to be stupid' but in Heliodoros it seems to mean 'to live in luxury'. This is recognized as a possible meaning in the Suda, but there are only three other attestation of the verb where it fits.

2. Linguistic usages which show that Heliodoros was familiar with Jewish and Christian texts.

There is a significant number of usages and phrases in the Greek of Heliodoros which are common in Jewish and Christian writers, but never, or almost never found in other writers. Once again, no usage on its own is sufficient to allow us to draw any conclusion, but the accumulation of typically Jewish and Christian usages is telling. In some cases the words in question can have a technical or quasi-technical religious or theological sense, but very often they do not, yet their relatively greater frequency in Philo and in Christian writers is statistically significant, and requires explanation. The explanation proposed

---

38 ζοστίπο is discussed in my commentary on I 1.2 (p82 below).
39 J.R. Morgan (1978) points this out in his commentary ad loc. (and a search of TLG confirms it); Morgan gives the following references: Cyril of Alexandria Hosea 164a = Pusey I 236; Amos 303d = Pusey I 464.
40 Again J.R. Morgan (1978) ad loc. points out that this sense is late. A search of the Duke databank suggests that the verb is never attested in documentary texts. I have examined all the attestations produced by a search of TLG: apart from Heliodoros X 31.4, the only ones which require the sense 'to live luxuriously' are Prokopios De bellis 8.12.8; Secret History 9.15; and probably Damaskios Life of Isidoros (ap. Photios) 50.
41 Statistical note: The are several words and usages noted in this section which are predominantly found in Christian or Jewish writers, or both, whether one compares Christian with pagan writing of the fourth century alone, or whether one compares Jewish and Christian writing with pagan writing for the whole Roman period, or for all Greek literature up to the end of the fourth century. It might be objected that more frequent attestation of a word in Christian writing reflects the greater overall bulk of Christian writing. Therefore it is necessary to quantify the relative bulk of Jewish, Christian and of pagan literature which is recorded on the TLG and from which the lists of attestations are drawn. The relative bulk of pagan, Jewish and Christian writing has been calculated for the first, second, third and fourth centuries, relying, except where otherwise stated, on the dates and word counts given in the TLG Canon. The word counts in the Canon are for individual works, rather than the authors' entire output; to arrive at a figure for an author's whole output the figures for individual works have been added together, including works listed as doubtful but not those listed as spurious. Obviously the division into centuries is only approximate, and doubts about date and authorship of certain works mean that the figures can only be approximate. In order to make the calculation less cumbersome authors represented on the TLG by a total of less than 1,000 words have been ignored. A further source of inaccuracies is that earlier work sometimes appears quoted in later authors or in
ancient anthologies; and where quotations are from works no longer extant they are often included in one or more modern collections of fragments; therefore some material is recorded on the TLG more than once, sometimes under different dates. It is difficult to assess the extent of this type of inaccuracy, but it does not seem likely to be great enough to distort the figures for the relative bulk of pagan, Jewish and Christian writing by more than about 10%.

### Table of word counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Pagan</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Century</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch</td>
<td>986,999</td>
<td>491,291</td>
<td>145,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrian</td>
<td>118,736</td>
<td>460,627 Ep. of Barnabas</td>
<td>7,057 Ignatius 28,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dio Chrysostom</td>
<td>184,008</td>
<td>5,000 Others</td>
<td>95,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Ephes. (TLG as 2nd Century)</td>
<td>17,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,121,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,464,001</td>
<td>956,918</td>
<td>281,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Century</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen</td>
<td>2,608,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,145,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps-Galen</td>
<td>178,917</td>
<td>8,641 Origen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>419,992</td>
<td>4,195 Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td>275,966 Justin Martyr 168,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaios</td>
<td>288,522</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,475 Sibyl. Oracles (Judeo-Christian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td>286,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristides</td>
<td>331,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassius Dio</td>
<td>451,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td>224,602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Emp.</td>
<td>209,334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilles Tatios</td>
<td>43,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longos</td>
<td>20,929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,282,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,345,073</td>
<td>12,836</td>
<td>1,762,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd Century</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotinos</td>
<td>216,398</td>
<td></td>
<td>168,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porphyry</td>
<td>345,744</td>
<td>c.5,000 Acts of Thomas</td>
<td>36,833 Other Hagiography &amp; Apocalyptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>265,452</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Christian 9,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>827,594</td>
<td>c.5,000</td>
<td>224,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
here is that the writers who used them shared a body of texts which they read, but which were little read by other, ‘pagan’ writers. In most cases the usages in question are first attested in the Greek versions of the Old Testament or in the New Testament, and this is probably how they entered the tradition of Jewish and Christian literature in Greek.

Even where Heliodoros uses a word which could have a technical significance in Christian writing, such as ἐνδογαγελλείζομαι, his use of it does not seem to reflect that technical significance in any way: the impression the reader gets is that he is not selecting ‘Christian’ vocabulary deliberately, but that for him this vocabulary is an ordinary part of the literary Greek which he writes. We are forced to conclude that Heliodoros had read some Jewish and Christian literature. We are also forced to conclude either that his reading was unusual for a non-Christian writer, and that most other non-Christian writers had not read such literature, or that if other writers had read such literature, Heliodoros differed from them in being less careful than they were to exclude linguistic usages found in such literature from his own Greek. Of course, it could be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Century</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oribasios</td>
<td>536,335</td>
<td>Hagiography</td>
<td>24,266</td>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libanius</td>
<td>537,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themistios</td>
<td>355,523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theodoret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>109,661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eusebious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephaision Astrol.</td>
<td>163,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gregoriros Nyssenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himerios</td>
<td>43,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg. Nazianzenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintos Smyrnaios</td>
<td>62,202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athanasios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosios Gramm.</td>
<td>57,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Didymos the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematicians:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synesios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theon (Pagan?)</td>
<td>167,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappus (Pagan?)</td>
<td>203,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martyrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serenos (Pagan?)</td>
<td>32,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>260,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,529,595</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall totals for all four centuries are: Pagan 13,166,263; Jewish 999,020; Christian 13,861,030, so about 47% of the literature is pagan. In the most general terms, for a word whose popularity did not change through the centuries, we may assume that where significantly less than 47% of attestations are in pagan writers that word was more favoured by Jewish or Christian writers than by pagan writers; for a word whose popularity varied through the centuries, and for which we must examine the evidence of one century in isolation, we may assume that where significantly less than 18% of fourth century attestations are from pagan writers, that word was more favoured by Jewish and Christian writers than by pagan writers of the fourth century. In practice, for present purposes I have adduced only words which are almost never found in pagan writers. Many of the words in question appear first in the Septuagint, including the apocryphal books this has a word count of 622,931.
argued that Heliodoros had read only very few Jewish or Christian texts, and that his reading does not therefore reflect any exceptional interest in such texts for a pagan writer. However, it seems likely that Christian texts had formed a more or less substantial part of the reading of Heliodoros, though at what stage in his education he read them, under what circumstances, and with what objectives and response, we can only guess.

The following usages, discussed in the commentary ad loc., not only point to a fourth century date, also seem to be typically Christian. I 14.4 εἰς τὸ δισμέκες; I 15.8 the compound ἐναπομείνειν; I 16.5 σημύχω used of emotion; I 24.4 ἐνθήσιμος used in connection with marriage. There are many other typically Christian usages in the Aithiopika, of which some are listed below.

ἀντίθεος is used by Heliodoros IV 7.13 not in the Homeric sense of ‘godlike’, but to mean ‘a spirit opposed to god’. Used adjectivally in the sense ‘opposed to god’ the word is restricted to Christian authors (some of whom also use it in the Homeric sense). The use of the word as a noun is almost confined to Christian writers. There are at least 80 attestations of the word in the negative sense, although it is not always easy to distinguish the adjectival from the substantive use. In the only pagan text in which the word has a negative sense the word is used much as it is by Heliodoros: lamblichos De mysteriis III 31: πονηροὺς ἄντι τῶν θεῶν εἰσκρίνοντα, οὕς δὴ καὶ καλοῦσιν ἄντιθέους.

βέβηλος Heliodoros II 12.2, V 5.2, VI 14.7; βεβηλῶ Heliodoros II 25.3, X 36.3: the adjective is found predominantly in the Septuagint and Christian writers, the verb almost exclusively so.

ἐμπεριπατέω, Heliodoros II 32.1: this verb is found predominantly in Jewish and Christian texts.

42 As far as I know, the only Christian or Jewish text for which a verbal echo in the Aithiopika provides incontrovertible evidence that Heliodoros was familiar with it is Philo Life of Moses: G. Lumbroso Archiv für Papyrysforchung 4 (1907) 66, draws attention to a close parallel between the statement that the Egyptians regard the Nile as a god in Philo Life of Moses II 195 (III 24 in the edition used by Lumbroso) and the same statement in Heliodoros IX 9.3.

43 A search of TLG produced attestations in the sense of ‘opposed to god’ in Athanasios, Athenagoras Apol., Epiphanius, Ignatios, Ireneus, Romanus Melodus, Didymos the Blind, John Chrysosotom, Basil of Caesarea.

44 With the exception of Hesychios s.v. παλαιμνισις (if that is a pagan text).

45 Of over 330 attestations of the verb, four are in lexicographers and one in a scholium. There are seventy-seven in the Septuagint and two in Philo. All the rest are in Christian writers apart from Julian Or. VII 22; and Julian, after all, had a Christian education, and shows familiarity with Judaeo-Christian scripture in his Contra Galilaeos.
Heliodoros II 31.1: the verb is otherwise attested about 800 times. It is not found in the New Testament or the Septuagint; nonetheless, the other attestations are without exception in Christian writers, of whom over 30 use the word as a theological term meaning 'to be incarnate'.

Heliodoros X 18.3: this compound is otherwise attested only in Jewish and Christian writing. It occurs once in the Septuagint (Pr. 8.31), where, as elsewhere, it means 'to take pleasure in, to enjoy'. The normal construction, followed by Heliodoros, is with the dative, but in the Septuagint, and occasionally elsewhere it is constructed with ἐν + dative.

Heliodoros has two of the 35 attestations of the verb ἐπιφορτίζω at II 25.2 and VIII 9.14; all or almost all the rest are in Christian writers.

ἐὐσυγγελίζω is used eight times by Heliodoros, and ἐὐσυγγέλιον three times. The verb in particular is largely restricted to Jewish and Christian writers: the TLG index reports over 1,400 attestations, of which 52 are in the New Testament, and of which only 22 are not certainly Jewish or Christian; no other pagan writer uses it as often as Heliodoros does.

The verb occurs seven times in LXX, fourteen in Philo and once in Josephos. It occurs once in the New Testament; the rest of the 186 attestations are spread throughout over 25 Christian writers, with the exception of Achilles Tatios I 6.6, three occurrences in Plutarch, four in Lucian, one in Galen and one each in Hesychios and the Suda.

The possible exceptions are, Galen ed. Kühn vol VIII 785.3; Cassios Iatrosophista Med. (date uncertain; 2-3 A.D.?); Xenophon of Ephesos V 2.2. Because the texts of lexicographers and medical writers have been subject to more or less constant revision, it is better to leave their evidence aside from the current study. Until the question of whether the text of Xenophon of Ephesos is an epitome (possibly of late date) has been settled, this too should probably not be regarded as furnishing a certain attestation of the word in a non-Christian author.

46 The verb occurs seven times in LXX, fourteen in Philo and once in Josephos. It occurs once in the New Testament; the rest of the 186 attestations are spread throughout over 25 Christian writers, with the exception of Achilles Tatios I 6.6, three occurrences in Plutarch, four in Lucian, one in Galen and one each in Hesychios and the Suda.

47 There is one attestation in the Suda. The noun ἐνυσυγγελίζης is also attested about 800 times, exclusively in Christian texts; many references are given by Lampe.

48 Philo, 10 times, including De vita Moses II 211; Gregory of Nyssia TLG ref 032 6.214; Basil, 4 times, including PG 31.928; Origen Comm, in Ev. Joannis 1.9.55; Eusebios, 5 times; Didymos the Blind 4 times; and a handful of occurrences in later Christian texts.

49 e.g. Eusebios Comment, in Isiam ed. I. Ziegler 1.71.59.

50 The possible exceptions are, Galen ed. Kühn vol VIII 785.3; Cassios Iatrosophista Med. (date uncertain; 2-3 A.D.?); Xenophon of Ephesos V 2.2. Because the texts of lexicographers and medical writers have been subject to more or less constant revision, it is better to leave their evidence aside from the current study. Until the question of whether the text of Xenophon of Ephesos is an epitome (possibly of late date) has been settled, this too should probably not be regarded as furnishing a certain attestation of the word in a non-Christian author.

51 I 10.1; II 23.2; IV 15.1; V 22.3; V 30.3; VI 6.3; X 1.3; X 2.1.

52 I 14.3; I 14.4; X 3.1.

53 ἐὐσυγγελίζω is used by the following Jewish writers: LXX, 20 times; Philo, 12 times; Josephos, 9 times; Joseph and Ase Nath, once. It is used three times by Plutarch and by Lucian; twice each by Polyaenos Strategemata, Dio Cassius, and Longos (II 33.1; IV 19.2); and once each by the following: The Suda; Lamblichos (VP II 12.15); Aristophanes; Menander Comic.; Chariton; Demosthenes; Lycurgos; Theophrastos Char.; Soranus med.; Herodian gramm.; Herennius Philo gramm.
εὐχαριστία: the pattern of distribution is similar for εὐχαριστία, used by Heliodoros at II 23.3. Of 997 attestations, 15 are in the New Testament; 77 are Jewish; only 15 or so are in texts by writers who are not certainly Jewish or Christian.

θαυματουργήμα Heliodoros X 39.3; θαυματουργέω Heliodoros IX 5.5, 21.4; X 16.6: The noun is otherwise found exclusively in Philo and Christian writers. The verb is attested about 300 times. Of these 300 attestations only three, besides those in Heliodoros are in pagan writers.

κενοδοξοῦντες Heliodoros IX 19.5: the words κενοδοξία and κενόδοξος are found predominantly in Jewish and Christian writers, the verb κενοδοξέω almost exclusively so.

μέρους μόνον ἢ μέλους: καὶ τραῦμα οὐ μέρους μόνον ἢ μέλους ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχής σύμη γέγονε Heliodoros VII 10.2 (cf. ὡς μέλους μὲν ύμον τοῦ σώματος ἢ μέρους τῆς βασιλείας ἀπολαλότος Heliodoros X 4.2.) for the apparently pleonastic phrase, referring to parts of the body, A. Wifstrand (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1944-1945 69-109 p.102) draws attention to several passages in Philo. The hendiadys, with μέλος and μέρος in the same number and case, and usually joined by a conjunction is almost confined to Jewish and Christian writers: there are forty-three occurrences in Jewish and Christian writers up to the end of fourth century, and

54 LXX, 4 times; Philo, 68 times; Josephos, 5 times.

55 Setting asside as of doubtful provenance attestations in Ps-Aristotle Divisiones, decree in Demosthenes 18.91, Menander in CAF III 693 (suspect on the grounds of this word and other vocabulary), various versions of the Hist Alex. Mag., Hippokrates Praeceptiones, and ps-Andronicus (Fragmenta Stoicorum Veterorum III 273), we are left with five attestations in Polybios, one in Plut. Timoleon, one in Diodorus Siculus, two in Themistios, four in Libanius, one in Aesop, and five in Philodemos De ira.

56 A search of the TLG index gives the following frequencies: Athanasios 7 times; Asterios 1; John Chrysostom 8; Hippolytos 4; Philo 1 (De vita Mosis I 83); Gregorius Monachus Chronog. 1; Photius 2.

57 The three pagan attestations are: Xen Symp. 7.2; Plutarch Quaestiones Platonicae 1004 e 6; Plato Tim. 80 c 7 (quoted in Stobaeos, and in Galen Frag. in Plat. Tim., CGM Suppl. I).

58 I list all the references for the verb thrown up by a search of TLG with the exception of those in Scholia, lexicographers and Herodian Grammaticus; of these only the first two in the list are not either Jewish or Christian: Polyb. XII 12c 4.6; Dio Chrysostom Or. 38.29; LXX Macchabes IV 5.10, 8.19; Martyrium Polycarp (extracted from Eusebius Eccl. Hist.) ed. Musurillo 10.1; Martyrium Pioniis ed. Musurillo 17.1; Epiphanios Haer. I 224, III 182; Greg. Naz. Or. in laud. Basilii ed. Boulenger 63.5; Ps-Makarios (quater); Philo De mutatione nominum 96, 227; Constantine VII 161.16; Ps-Clement Romanus (4th cent) Homiliae 4.9 (Gr. christ. schriftsteller 42); Ps-Justyn Martyr Ep. ad Zenam ed. Otto 509 c4; Athanasios PG 28.901; Origen Contra Celsum 8.74.3.
four occurrences in other writers. Even if we were to exclude from the reckoning Philo, with whom the expression seems to have been a particular favourite, the tendency for it to appear in Christian rather pagan writers would still be statistically significant.

παρθενευεῖν: In Christian writers the active is often intransitive, meaning ‘to be a virgin, to remain a virgin’; in pagan writers other than Heliodoros, the active is always transitive, meaning ‘to keep as a virgin, to bring up as a virgin’. Heliodoros has the verb in the following places: II 33.4 παρθενευεῖν, II 37.3 ἐπαρθενευεθη, V 4.5 παρθενεύοντος ἑρωτος (genitive absolute; a transitive construction, supplying a pronoun object, would not be

A search of TLG for μέλας and μέρος used in parallel in the same number and case shows that they are usually joined by καί, τε καί or ἢ. The references yielded by such a search for writers up to the end of the fourth century are as follows:

a) Jewish and Christian writers: Philo Judaeus De mutatione nominum 173.10; De somnis II 108 (conjecture); De Josepho 27 (οὗ μέρος, οὗ μέλας), 187; De specialibus legibus III 182; Quod omnis probis liber sit 89; In Flaccum 176; Legatio ad Gaium 131, 267, Virt. 32.5; De opificio mundi 67.10 (in a passage which appears also in collections of fragments of Theophrastos and Posidontios: apart from the general doubtfulness of these attributions by the editors, the use of the phrase μέλας καί μέρος indicates that the words themselves are probably Philo’s own); De aeternitate mundi 143; Quod Deus sit immutabilis 52.5; De vita Mosis I 128, II 106; Eusebius Prep. evan. III 13.6; VIII 12.17; Hist. Eccl. VIII 12.1; Demonstr. Evan. IV 5.10, 4.1, V 1.13; De Laud. Constant. 12.11; 12.14; 13.2; Antiquor. mart. PG 20.1533, 1583; Comment, in Psalm. PG 23.608, 1200; Basil Regulae morales PG 31.861; John Chrysostom In Rom PG 50.605; In illud: Domine . . . PG 56.158; In Joannem PG 59.101; Theodoret Instr. in Psalm PG 80.1221; Clement Stromata I.13.57.4, IV 26.163.1; Protrepticus I 8.3; Paedagogus III 11.64; Adamantius Judaeus Physiognomica II 1; Athanasios Exp. in Psalm. PG 27.224, De sancta trinitate PG 28.1121, 1165; Ps-Makarios (late 4th/early 5th century) Semones 64 XVIII 1.7 ed. H. Berthold; Ps-Clement Romanus (4th cent) Homilae 6.4 (Gr. christ. Schriftsteller 42).

b) Writers not known to be Jewish or Christian: Plato Leges 795 e 4 (also in Stobaeus); Tim. 77 a 1; Alexander In Aristot. topicorum comm. ed. M. Wallies 118.18; Hermogenes περι ιδεών 1.12.24; Lamblichos Theol. Arith. 36.5; (a fifth century pagan occurrence: Proklos In Plat. Rempub. I 6).

c) References ignored in the current calculation because of uncertainty over their dates: [Themistios] (?Sophonias) In parva nat. comm. (Comment. in Aristot. Graeca vol. V.6 p21); Ps-Makarios Homiliae Spiritualia 50 Homily II (bis) ed. Dörrie et al.; Ps-Hippolytos Fragmenta in Psalm. 13 (Gr. christ. schrift. i.2); [Dionysios of Halikarnassos] Ars rhetorica 10.6 (tentatively assigned to the reign of Diocletian by D.A. Russell & N.G. Wilson (1981) 362).

I have checked every active attestation of this verb, including participles, in pagan writers: none is intransitive (with the possible exception of Zonaras Epitome of Dio Cassios 7.8.11 ed. Boissevain I 21.18, where the accusative relative pronoun could be either the subject or the object of παρθενευεῖν). The active used intransitively is frequent in Christian writers, and a few examples will suffice: Clement of Alexandria Stromata 3.7.60.4; Origen Hom. in Lucam 17.108 (Gr. Chr. Schrift. 49 (35); John Chrysostom De virginitate (Sources Chrétiennes 138) 2.1 et passim in this and other works; Palladius Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton 4.13.
impossible); VII 8.3 τὸ παρθενεῖον ('the maidens'); X 8.2 παρθενεῖειν; X 22.3 παρθενεῖειν; X 33.1 παρθενεῖειν; X 36.2 παρθενεῖειν. All the actives here are intransitive, in harmony with the normal usage of Christian writers; the passives are probably best translated 'she has been kept as a virgin'.

προετοιμαζω is normally deponent in pagan writers; Christian writers more often than not use the active form, probably because it occurs twice each in the Septuagint and the New Testament. Apart from Heliodoros II 19.3 and II 19.4, only 3 of the 73 attestations of the active form are in pagan writers.61

ὑποστηρίζω Heliodoros I 2.2: First attested in the Septuagint, of about ninety occurrences only five are in authors which are not Jewish or Christian.62

φοβω τοῦ κρείττονος Heliodoros IV 18.6: The phrase φοβως τοῦ κρείττονος is found also in one other fourth century writer, Eusebios.63 φοβως [τοῦ] κυρίου and φοβως [τοῦ] θεοῦ are common enough in the Septuagint and the New Testament, and in Christian writers. However, φοβως with a dependent [τοῦ] θεοῦ or a synonym for [τοῦ] θεοῦ seems to be completely unattested in the Greek of non-Christian writers.65

φωστήρ Heliodoros II 24.6: Of some 685 attestations seven are in late pagan writers. All the rest are in the Septuagint or in Christian writers.66 The distribution is similar for the noun υποστηριγμα.

3. Linguistic usages which suggest that Heliodoros knew Latin.

In the commentary there are four usages noted which seem to be unparalleled in Greek, but which are easily explained if we assume that the Greek of Heliodoros was contaminated by a knowledge of Latin: ψυχή = anima (as a term of endearment) I 8.4; βακτηρία = baculum (as a support) I 13.1; σφόζον

61These are Diogenes Laertius Life II 38; Appian Bell. Civ. II 8.53; Libanius Ep. 65.3.
62LXX Ps. XXXVI 17; CXLIV 14. There are about ninety occurrences on TLG excluding those in Lexicographers, scholia and medical writers. Of these only the following are not in Jewish or Christian writers: Ps-Longinos De sublimitate 32.5; Epitome of Aristoph. Hist Animal. Teubner ed. p60 1.3; Lucian VII I 32; II I Hist. Conscr. 3.
64Translating ἐννύω.
65The search of TLG for φοβως + synonyms of θεος other than κρείττον and κύριος was partial, not exhaustive.
66There are four occurrences of the word in ‘fragments’ of Porphyry, Plutarch, Chrysippus and Pythagoras, all preserved in Christian writers, and three in the Suda. Of the seven ‘real’ pagan examples, three are in Vettius Valens, one in Themistios, and three in Proklos. There are nine occurrences in the Septuagint; all the rest are in Christian writers, including two in the New Testament.
= salve (as a greeting, not, as is usual in Greek, as a 'Farewell') I 14.4; μισθός ἐλεοθερίας (i.e. μισθός construed like the Latin praemium, that is to say, defined by a word in the genitive, rather than by a word in the same case, as is usual) I 16.5. For a fuller discussion of these points the reader is referred to the relevant passages in the commentary.
SOLAR THEOLOGY IN THE AITHIOPIKA

I. INTRODUCTION

Rohde thought that in the Aithiopika the god Helios-Apollo occupies a supreme place. He made a strong case, emphasizing how this god motivates the plot, and plays a major rôle in the story. More recent scholars have argued the more extreme views, on the one hand that the novel is primarily a piece of religious literature, on the other, that it contains a confusion of deities and no consistent religious outlook.

Although the author’s purposes may be difficult to determine, the Aithiopika is undoubtedly informed by a theology in which the sun god is a supreme god, both for the main characters and in the plot, and the moon plays a complementary part. This theology is revealed by a consistent use of terms for divine powers from which neither the narrator nor the main characters (the three priests, Charikles, Kalasiris, Sisimithres; Theagenes and Charikleia; her parents, the king and queen of Ethiopia) ever depart, and by direct divine intervention in oracles and dreams.

J.R. Morgan, in the introduction to his dissertation, in a section entitled ‘The religious background of the Aithiopika’, reviewed the various arguments which have been advanced that Heliodoros displays a specific religious outlook. One of the reasons he gives for rejecting such arguments is, in his own words, ‘Apart from the fact that ὁ διατιτων preponderates in laments, there is no discernible pattern in the author’s use of different divine powers, and in several cases the same events are ascribed to differing forces within the one sentence, apparently with no other aim than to vary the vocabulary.’ Partly to answer this objection, and partly because of the need to provide discussions of lexical points to which the reader of the commentary can refer, the method here is to examine some of these names and terms for divine forces in detail.

It is certainly true that several deities and other spirits are mentioned in the Aithiopika. Nonetheless, it will be argued that in the direction of the plot, and in the use of language, a consistent divine economy is discernible. Apollo is identified with Helios; when the phrase ὁ θεὸς is used in a sentence where it is otherwise undefined it always refers to Apollo-Helios, who is the only named god who is significant for the plot. Artemis, Isis, and Selene, who are to be identified with one another, are sometimes referred to simply as Ἡ θεὸς; they constitute the only personal goddess who is significant for the plot. This god

---

67 E. Rohde (1914) 465(436)f
69 op. cit. lv.
and goddess direct the fortunes of the main characters in the face of adverse events, which are attributed to ὅ δαίμον, and random chance, which is attributed to Ἡ Τύχη.

Although Helios-Apollo is central in the Aithiopika, other divine and semi-divine powers are constantly referred to. There are many references in the Aithiopika to 'the gods', sometimes in expressions such as 'the local gods' or 'the sea gods'. οἱ κρείττονες, οἱ θεοὶ (which never refers to named gods, except where it is used of the gods of the Ethiopians), and more specifically, οἱ ἐγχώριοι θεοὶ, and so on, are part of the mental furniture of the characters, especially Kalasiris, Theagenes and Charikleia. They are not a sign of theological confusion, and they designate powers which are not essential to the development of the plot. The sun is not the only divinity who exists for the characters, any more than he was the only divinity in the solar theology of Julian, whom I take to be contemporary with Heliodoros. It is not necessary to be able to assign a place in a theological system to every divinity which appears in Heliodoros in order to show that he does present a coherent religious outlook. However, the frequent references to Ἡ Τύχη and ὅ δαίμον, powers which, like Helios-Apollo and Artemis-Isis-Selene, are significant for the plot, do have to be taken into account. Therefore, as well as arguing for the central position of Helios-Apollo, I examine the use of these two terms in

70 For references v. p105 below.
71 The plural of θεοὶ occurs 179 times in the Aithiopika. Almost all of these occurrences are in direct speech, and along with the other references to the divine they do reveal some religious attitudes in the characters. When a character says θεοὶ it does not follow that he or she is referring to gods other than the principal ones in the plot, or that they do not know to which gods they mean: all it means is that the gods are not identified to the reader. It is the purpose of the present chapter to outline those divine powers which direct the plot and are important for the main characters, not to analyse in detail the religious attitudes displayed by the characters. In addition to their explicit statements and actions, one way in which characters reveal such attitudes is by a set of contexts in which the gods in general are typically referred to. For example, Heliodoros sometimes has characters calling οἱ θεοὶ to witness or swearing by them (I 10.4; I 25.1; II 19.2; IV 19.1; VI 6.2; VIII 5.4; VIII 7.5; VIII 12.1; X 11.3). Salvation (σωτήρ / σωτηρ), which in classical writers and inscriptions tends to be linked with individual named gods, is in Heliodoros often associated with οἱ θεοὶ; (II 23.3; IV 12.2; V 8.3; V 22.5; VI 5.3; VIII 11.8,11; IX 5.1; IX 6.4; IX 24.2; IX 25.4; X 9.5; X 17.1; X 20.2; cf. IV 7.8; IX 22.7). Sometimes οἱ θεοὶ are addressed in the vocative (I 8.6; I 12.3; I 15.5; II 5.3; II 23.3: ἀπολλων... καὶ θεοὶ; IV 7.5; V 1.5; VIII 5.11; VIII 11.1,3; IX 24.2; IX 25.1; X 11.3; X 22.1). The idea that different places have their own gods comes out in phrases like οἱ ἐγχώριοι θεοὶ (I 28.1; II 23.1: θεοὶς ἐγχώριοις ταῖς ἐλληνίσκοις καὶ κατὰ αὐτὸν γιὰ Ἀπόλλωνα Πυθία; II 27.3; II 33.7; X 6.3; cf. I 30.5: τοῖς ἐστίοις θεοῖς; III 4.11: τοῖς νυχῶσις θεοῖς; III 5.1: gods of the night; IV 19.7: θεοῦ τῶν πατρίδων; V 4.6: θεοὶ Ἑλληνίσκοι; V 20.2: ἐναλλάξθησθα θεοῖς; IX 25.4: τοῖς κατὰ Μερόπην θεοῖς; X 1.2: ἐνορίσθησι θεοῖς; X 2.2: τοῖς πατρίσις ἱμῶν θεοῖς; X 24.1: πατρίδων καὶ γενεάρχαι θεοῖ). Assembling and examining such references would be a possible method of proceeding with a detailed enquiry into the religious beliefs displayed by the characters in the Aithiopika.

72 Julian Oration IV(XI) 13-138.
Greek literature before Heliodoros, and demonstrate how Heliodoros has largely followed their conventional uses by quoting all the places in the Aithiopika where these terms occur. This point is emphasised because a major objection to the heliocentric reading of the Aithiopika has been that a range of divine powers come into the Aithiopika without any coherent pattern.

The expressions τὸ κρεῖττον\(^\text{73}\) and τὸ θεῖον\(^\text{74}\) are also part of the ‘mental furniture’ of the main characters. They do not refer to separate divinities which influence the plot; when the sense of these terms is understood it is clear why they were appropriate for the context where they are found.\(^\text{75}\) τὶ δαιμόνιον (VII 6.4) seems to mean something like ‘fate’, τὸ δαιμόνιον (V 16.4; V 33.5) ‘the heavens,’ and τὸ δαιμόνιον (X 4.2; X 19.2) either of the two; these do not clearly affect the plot. It is possible that δαιμόνιον, when it lacks the article, should be translated simply as ‘spirit,’ as it must be translated when it appears in the plural,\(^\text{76}\) although it is perhaps better to translate δαιμόνιον in the same way in which ὁ δαιμόνιον should be translated.\(^\text{77}\) Apart from these expressions, the idea that some things are fated crops up, and does raise a question about the way in which the will of the gods operates in the novel; however it does not negate the view that the only divine powers who significantly influence the direction of events in the plot are the ones identified above.

The problem of the relationship between ὁ θεὸς, ὁ δαιμόνιον and Ἡ Τύχη in the divine economy of the plot is approached here by using catalogues of references to analyse in detail how Heliodoros distinguishes between these words. The first point to notice is that although Heliodoros makes particularly frequent use of these terms for deities, they are already current in classical Greek. Broadly speaking, ὁ θεὸς was used to refer to a general, unidentified divine agent. Events which were unpleasant from man’s point of view, however, were rarely attributed to ὁ θεὸς in classical Greek and never in later Greek. If unpleasant events were attributed to an unidentified, maleficient divine agent ὁ δαιμόνιον was used. Events attributed to Ἡ Τύχη were those events characterised by their apparent randomness: by unfathomable, amoral chance. Such events, which intimately affected human lives, could not logically be ascribed to named gods of the Olympian pantheon, whose personal character was not consistent with truly random behaviour; therefore it is perhaps not surprising that Ἡ Τύχη, identified as their source, was given her own cult. On the other hand ὁ θεὸς and ὁ δαιμόνιον had no cult: the way these terms were used in classical Greek was just a lexical habit.

\(^{73}\) For references v. p105 below.  
\(^{74}\) I 8.4; I 22.6; II 25.3; III 18.3; IV 16.3; IX 10.2; X 9.6.7; X 16.7; X 17.2; X 39.3.  
\(^{75}\) v. commentary on I 8.4.  
\(^{76}\) I 13.3; II 5.4; II 7.3; III 13.1; VI 1.3; VI 8.5; VIII 9.12.  
\(^{77}\) References for δαιμόνιον are given in the catalogue for ὁ δαιμόνιον below.
The use of δαίμον, θεός and ἄνδρα in Heliodoros is discussed by Rohde. He recognizes that ὁ θεός in Heliodoros is certainly to be identified with Helios-Apollo. Rohde argues that Heliodoros’ use of δαίμον points to a dualistic idea, according to which nothing bad is attributed to the gods but is made the responsibility of δαίμονες who are intermediate between gods and men. (His distinction of the personal from the general δαίμον in Heliodoros is perhaps unnecessarily sharp.) His assumption that what in Tragedy and Oratory is little more than a lexical habit has in Heliodoros hardened into a religious belief is perhaps supported by Plutarch’s information in Isis and Osiris quoted in section IV below. The problem with his dualistic interpretation, as he says, is the question of where ἄνδρα fits into the scheme. This problem is tackled below.

Full references for the later Greek writers’ avoidance of attributing anything bad to an otherwise undefined ὁ θεός would be unwieldy, and this general linguistic habit can be checked by looking into the thesaurus. For our study of Heliodoros the point is not important, except insofar as it is the background for the contrasting use of ὁ θεός and ὁ δαίμον, which Heliodoros has inherited from the classical writers. Heliodoros himself certainly never attributes anything bad to ὁ θεός, but only to ὁ δαίμον. That Heliodoros’ use of ὁ δαίμον was found also in classical Greek, albeit much less frequently than in Heliodoros, is supported by references which are given below in section IV.

A close examination of Heliodoros’ use of ὁ θεός shows that the identity of the god in question is never, or almost never, undefined. In every case the context shows that when the principal characters say ὁ θεός, he must be Helios or Apollo, although this is not always immediately obvious. Like the use of ὁ δαίμον, this is not a usage invented by Heliodoros, but one which he took over from classical Greek, mainly tragedy, and used much more frequently than any previous writers: in tragedy ὁ θεός is used where the context demands the translation ‘the sun’. When Herodotus refers to the sun as οὖν ὁ θεός he may be reflecting the words of an Egyptian source for his information; later, Iamblichos repeatedly refers to the sun as ὁ θεός in De mysteriis VII 2.

ὁ θεός in Heliodoros refers principally to Isis, (who, like Artemis, was often identified with the moon in the Roman period, and Selene in book X. There is a handful of cases where ὁ θεός or ὁ θεός is explicitly applied to another god; these cases are all in speeches of minor characters.

---

78 E. Rohde (1914) 462(434)-466(438).
79 Aesch. Persae 502, Orestes 1025; Sophocles Supplices 469, (7)208, Trach. 145; Euripides Alectis 722, Medea 353, Rhes. 331.
80 Herodotos II 24.
81 Discussed below on p68.
82 v. n104 below.
An examination of τόχη in Heliodoros shows that its use is quite distinct from the use of θεός and δαίμων. When it does not mean one’s station in life (and perhaps also when it does) τόχη simply means ‘chance’ in Heliodoros, and, I think, in Greek in general. It is used for the notional agent of events which take place apparently at random, with no detectable sign of guiding intelligence or of deliberate beneficence or maleficence. Actions are attributed to ὁ θεός or ὁ δαίμων when they are perceived as emanating from a reasonable being who acts with some purpose, even where the purpose is not obvious; actions are attributed to τόχη when events seem to occur with an utterly unfathomable randomness.

Before moving on to the detailed discussions and catalogues of references for ὁ θεός, ἡ θεός, ὁ δαίμων, and ἡ τόχη, I offer a general discussion of the proposition that the Sun and Moon are the principal deities in the Aithiopika.

II. THE SUN AND MOON IN THE AITHIOPIKA

The argument that the Aithiopika is informed by a heliocentric theology does depend on an acceptance that Apollo is a sun god. Apollo’s Delphic prophecies are the main evidence of divine involvement in the overall structure of the plot. Theagenes, the hero, is a protégé of Apollo, and Charicleia, the heroine, of Apollo’s sister Artemis. The identity of Artemis with the moon is classical and widespread. The extent to which the identity of Apollo with the sun was classical or widespread is a matter of controversy. It is not necessary to revive the debate here, but simply to adduce enough evidence to indicate that an educated person of the time of Heliodoros would have been aware that the identification was sometimes made. That Heliodoros wishes his readers to make the identification is clear enough, since it is to Charikles, who as Apollo’s priest at Delphi ought to know, that he gives the words . . . Ἄπολλωνα, τὸν σύντον ὄντα καὶ Ἡλίων . . ., “. . . Apollo, who is the same as Helios . . .” (X.36.3.)

Indeed, both T. Szepessy and J.J. Winkler adduce literary arguments for the identity of Apollo and Helios. Szepessy argues that the general shift from references to Apollo in the first five books to ὁ θεός, and then explicitly to Helios is part of a process by which Heliodoros emphasizes the identity of Helios with Apollo, universalizing and ‘hellenizing’ him. He suggests that Charikles, priest of Apollo at Delphi, is brought all the way from Delphi to Meroe in book X, in a way which may seem superfluous to the plot, in order to give at a climactic point an authoritative statement of this identification which

has been slowly revealed in the course of the text. Winkler argues for the identity on the basis of the co-incidence of the commissions entrusted to Kalasiris by the Aithiopian god, Helios, and the Pythian Apollo.84

Here then is a selection of evidence for an identification of Apollo with the sun prior to Heliodoros. Cornutus, the Stoic mythographer writing in the middle of the first century A.D., says (§32, ed. Lang p65): ἐστὶν ἡ σελήνη διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἑκατέσιν πόρρῳ τῶν ἄκτινων σινγαρτόμενοι. καλονύται δὲ ὁ μὲν ἥλιος ἀκτιος δία τοῦτο, ἡ δὲ ἐκατέ τῷ ἕκαθεν δεύρῳ ἀφιέναι καὶ ἀποστέλλειν τὸ φῶς, κτλ. “Next then, child, Apollo is the sun and Artemis is the moon; therefore they suggest the idea of the sending forth of rays. The sun is called ‘Hekatos’ or ‘Far-Shooting’ and the moon is called ‘Hekate’ or ‘Far-Shooting’ because they give out and transmit light to us from far away. etc.”

The earliest evidence for Apollo as a sun god is from the tragedians. For example, Euripides Phaethon Fr. 781 (Nauck) 11-12: ὃς ὃς ἄπολτοις ἢ ἅλτοις ἡμὰρ καλἡ, “Bright shining Sun, how you destroy me and him! You are rightly called Apollo by mortals.” This line was well enough known in late antiquity for Macrobius, probably writing in the early fifth century A.D., to attempt to quote it from memory (Saturnalia 1.17.9-11): ... ut Euripides in Phaethonte: ὃς χρυσοφθεγγες ἢ ἅλτοις ἄπολτοις, / ὅθεν σ’ ἄπολτοι ἐμφανως κλησε βροτος, ... denique inustos morbo ἀπολλονοβλήτους καὶ ἑλιοβλήτους ἀπελλατ, et quia similes sunt solis effectibus effectus lunae in iuando nocendoque, idea feminas certis adflictas morbis selinobλήτους et ’Ἀρτεμιδοβλήτους vocant. “As Euripides says in his Phaethon, ‘Golden Sun, how you destroy me! Therefore mankind openly honours you as Apollo.’ So they call men troubled by disease ‘Apollo-struck’ and ‘Sun-struck’; and since the harmful and the beneficial effects of the moon are similar to the effects of the sun, they describe women afflicted by certain diseases as ‘Moon-struck’ and ‘Artemis-struck’.”

84 J.J. Winkler YCS 27 (1982) p.150: “At this moment [IV 12-13] Kalasiris learns that what had seemed to be two different divine plots were actually two ways of saying the same thing. [Winkler’s italics.] His Aithiopian commission was to send back the lost princess, whoever she might turn out to be; his Apolline commission was to guard the young lovers on their way to a dark land, wherever that might be. These are now seen to be two incomplete descriptions of the same plot, though they came from opposite ends of the earth. What was indefinite in the one is definite in the other. This movement of revelation is parallel to the announcement of that Apollo in Delphi and Helios in Aithiopia are the same divine force, which is the penultimate religious theme of the novel (x.36.3).” Winkler’s rather subtle arguments need to be read in the context of his overall thesis in order to be fully understood.
In view of the importance of the solar deity in the *Aithiopika*, it is curious that it is specifically Horos, described as a representation of the Nile, whom the Egyptians are represented as worshipping. In fact, there is some evidence that by the late fourth century Horos was regarded as a solar deity. In *PGM I* (dated on palaeographical grounds to late fourth or fifth century) Helios appears to be identified with Horos, as he does on some (undated) gems. The identification is also made by Porphyry, and Macrobius, where we learn that the identification was made because Horos was thought to represent the seasons of the year. Heliodoros seems to have this idea in mind in the statement that Horos represents the Nile, which, he says, marks the seasons of the year. J.R. Morgan (1978, p.206), commenting on the identification of Horos and the Nile, draws attention to a passage in Jerome which makes it clear that Horos' link through the letters of *Neîλος* with number 365 indicates a solar character for him.

Horos was identified not only with Helios, but also with Apollo. The identification of Horos with Apollo, found occasionally in epigraphic dedications, is attested first in Herodotos. The identification is also made by Aelian, where the falcon is said to be sacred to Apollo / Horos because he can look at the sun with impunity. Edfu, sacred to Horos, was called in Greek Apollinopolis. In the comic poet Theophilos an athlete exclaims "Ἀπολλόν, Ὀμε καὶ Σοβάζετε. It would be interesting to know whether such an identification lay behind the name of the writer on Egyptian wisdom, Horapollo.

Horos and Apollo are both identified with Mandoulis in a set of inscriptions from the Roman period found on a temple at Talmis in Nubia. The inscriptions are interesting but incomplete and difficult to translate. However,
it is clear that Mandoulis is a sun god, and he appears to be called θεὸς μέγας. He had a chapel at Philae, and in the Talmis inscriptions he is closely associated with Isis, who seems to be identified with the moon and Artemis in the Aithiopika.

The simultaneous identification of Horos and Apollo with the sun is ascribed by Plutarch to Hermetic writings (although it is not found in the surviving Corpus Hermeticum): ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἤρμων λεγομέναις βιβλίοις ἱστοροῦσι γεγραμμενί περὶ τῶν ιερῶν ὁνόματων, ὅτι τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου περιμορφώσεις τεσσαρεῖς δύναμιν ὦρον, Ἑλληνες δ' Ἀπόλλωνα καλοῦσιν. ‘In the writings called Hermetic they recount that it is written concerning the divine names, that they call the divine power of those overseeing the sun’s orbit Horos, but that the Greeks call him Apollo.’

It is likely that Heliodoros chose to give Horos a special place among the Egyptians because he regarded him as a sun god, just as he regarded Apollo as the sun god of the Greek world. He identified Horos with the Nile because of the convenient fact that ἑλίος in numerical terms adds up to 365, a number already regarded as magical because it is the number of days in a solar year. Plutarch does not mention the solar number 365, which Heliodoros presumably knew directly from magical or gnostic teaching, or from the Christian attacks on these teachings which are our main source today.

There are many points which indicate the importance of the sun, and to a lesser extent, the moon, in the Aithiopika. The hero and heroine are dedicated to Apollo and Artemis. These gods actually appear to the old priest, Kalasiris and give him charge of them. The story begins in Delphi, where Charikleia’s adoptive father, Charikles, is priest of Apollo, and ends in Ethiopia, which is quite explicitly called the land of the sun by the oracle at Delphi. The sun, the moon, and Dionysos are mentioned as the ancestral gods of the Ethiopians, information which is found in Diodoros and Strabo, but Dionysos soon drops out of the story. At the end of the book the hero and heroine, Theagenes and Charikleia, become priest and priestess of the sun and moon.

Charikleia had already dedicated herself to the service of Artemis, a moon goddess, while she was at Delphi as adoptive daughter of Charikles. She

95 H. Gauthier op. cit. 89.
96 Plu. Isis & Osiris 61 / 375F.
97 III 11.5.
98 II 35.5.
99 X 2.2.
100 The widespread identification of Artemis as a moon goddess is discussed conveniently by J. Gwyn Griffiths (1975) 117.
101 II 33.4.
emerges from the temple of Artemis at the beginning of the day on which she will first meet Theagenes. This is remarkable. Many gods and goddesses had temples at Delphi but there is no evidence of a temple to Artemis. Unless Heliodoros has been particularly careless, he must have had some specific reason for selecting Artemis as Charikleia’s tutelary deity. Since she becomes priestess of the moon in Ethiopia, in the last book, Artemis was probably selected because she was the principal moon goddess in the Greek pantheon.

The association of Charikleia with the moon explains a puzzle. When the book opens the bandits come upon Charikleia, dressed, as we learn in book V, in the garb of the priestess of Artemis. We are told that they are so impressed by her beauty that they think she is Artemis, or the local goddess, Isis. It seems strange that she could be compared at once with Isis or Artemis, because Isis is almost never identified with Artemis. However, in the Graeco-Roman world Isis is, like Artemis, sometimes identified with the moon. This is because the horns on her head were interpreted as a representation of the moon. If Heliodoros did equate Isis with the moon, this piece of syncretism would be more consistent with the later, fourth century date, but is occasionally found at an earlier date.

This discussion by no means exhausts the subject of the prominence of the sun and moon in Heliodoros. There are three important priests in the book: Charikles, who is priest of Pythian Apollo, Kalasiris, who is priest of Isis, (who, as just noted, may be identified with the moon,) and the gymnosophist Sisimithres, whose name is patently a synthesis of Isis and Mithras, a solar god. There are constant references to both Apollo-Helios, and to the moon goddesses Artemis, Isis and Selene. The sun is rising in the very first sentence of book I. Kalasiris makes a point of mentioning the sanctity of oaths by the

---

102 III 4.1.
103 1 2.
104 The horns of Isis were originally conceived of as cow’s horns. They are compared to the moon in Ovid Metamorphoses IX 723-724 (= HF 152); Apuleius Met. 268 (XI init.). Other references for the identification of Isis with the moon are, Diodoros I 25 (= HF 104); Diodoros I 11.1 (= HF 93); Eusebios, Praeparatio Evangelica II 2.6 (= HF 477); Diogenes Laertius Proem. 11; Hecataeus Abderita, FGrH 2 F7 (= HF 60); Porphyry and Eusebios, Praep. Evan. III 11.49 (= HF 470); John of Lydia IV 45 (= HF 698); the Suda s.v. ἀγαματίζει (HF 749). A verse inscription to Sarapis and Isis addresses her thus: ὄχονσά τε καρτί σελήνην ἀγωνίαντον, Ἰσε. (L. Vidman (1969) no. 320 L2 = A. Mordtman Rev. Arch. (1879) 258-259.) The connection with the moon is clearly behind the identification of Isis with Diana in a second century AD. inscription from Dacia (L. Widman op. cit. no. 690 = CIL III 7771): Σαραπίδι | Iovi Soli | Isidi Lunae | Dianae, | dis deabus(que) | conservatorib(us) | L. Aemil(ius) Carus, | Leg(atus) Aug(usti) pr(o) p(r(actic)] | III Daciarum.
It is the narrator who describes the sun and moon as the purest and brightest gods. In addition to these points, the importance of the Sun and Moon as deities in the *Aithiopika* is illuminated by the catalogue of references for *θεός* which follows. 

III. THE USE OF *ΘΕΟΣ* IN THE *AITHIOPIKA*: BACKGROUND, AND A CATALOGUE

In this section all the instances where *θεός* is used in the singular in the *Aithiopika* are quoted. The principle conclusion is that whenever the main characters say *θεός* they are referring to Helios or Apollo, or when it is feminine, to Isis or the Moon. The most important fact about Helios-Apollo which emerges from a reading of these quotations is that it is he who is ultimately responsible for the direction of the plot. In the adventures of the hero and heroine his providential guidance finally overcomes the misfortunes they encounter, which are ascribed to ὁ δίαιμον, and the vagaries of pure chance, which are ascribed to η Τύχη.

Broadly speaking, in archaic and classical Greek the expression ὁ *θεός* is used to refer to a previously named god; or it refers to divinities collectively, either divinities in general, or the divinities dominant in the situation under discussion. In tragedy there is a third use: ὁ *θεός* sometimes refers to the sun even where Helios has not been named, as the context shows. In most cases this is how Heliodoros uses the expression; and perhaps where Helios or Apollo are called ὁ *θεός* rather than named the dominance of the sun god in the story is thereby underlined.

As noted above writers of Hellenistic Greek avoid attributing anything bad to divinities described as ὁ *θεός*, or to a named god (although gods of love and war sometimes have negative epithets, at least in verse). The lines at Iliad XXIV 527-528,

δοιοι γάρ τε πίθοι κοτακείσαι ἐν Διος οὐδεὶ δόρων οἷον διδοσι κακῶν, ἐτερος δὲ έκαων.

---
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were criticized by Plato (Respub. 379d) for misleadingly attributing bad things to the gods. Plutarch, when he discusses this and other poetic texts where bad things seem to be attributed to the gods, argues that these are places where poets are using the names of gods metaphorically. In this case, he says, Zeus is a metonym for ή Τύχη or ή εἰμιμενή (Plutarch Moralia 25B). For Plutarch, then, texts where bad events are ascribed to gods are confined not to early authors, as I have suggested, but to poetry. However that may be, the convention found in Greek prose and Hellenistic poetry of not ascribing bad things to θεός or to named gods is followed by Heliodoros, and provides the context for our understanding of his use of the terms δαίμων and ή Τύχη.

ο θεός, ‘the god’, is the sun at I 18.3, καθ’ ὅν γὰρ καιρὸν ἀλεξηρύνες ἁδοῦσιν, εἰτε (ὡς λόγος) αἰσθῆται φυσικῆ τῆς ἥλιου καθ’ ἕμας περιστροφῆς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πρόσφερσιν κινούμενο, εἰτε ... “It was the time the cocks crow, whether because, as it is said, they are stirred up by the physical sensation of the sun in his course above us to greet the god, or...

In the inscribed band which the Ethiopian queen Persinna leaves with Charikleia when she sends her away as a baby, the word θεός does not explicitly mean any particular god, but the reader is led to think that he is probably Helios. ὅς μὲν οὐδὲν ἀφικοῦσα, παλιάν, οὕτω σε γενομένην ἔξεβημι οὐδὲ πατέρα τὸν σῶν ῥάσπη σὺ τὴν σῆν θεοὺς ἀπεκρυφάμην, ἐπικεκλῆσθοι μάρτυρι τὸ γενεαρχής ἤμιν Ἡλίους ἀλλ’ ὅμως άπολογούμει πρὸς τε σε ποτε, θύγατερ, εἰ περισσοτείχης, πρὸς τε τὸν αναπαρακόμενον, εἰ τίνος σοι θεοὺς ἐπιστήμει, πρὸς τε αὐτὸν ὁλον τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον, ἀνακαλύπτουσα σὺν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐκθέσεως. ἥμιν πρύγονοι θεῶν μὲν Ἡλίος τε καὶ Διόνυσος ἡρῶν ἰε Περσεύς τε καὶ Ἀνδρομέδα καὶ Μέμινων ἐπὶ τούτους. (IV 8.2). “That I did not do wrong, child, when I sent you away after you were born, nor did I hide your sight from your father Hydaspes, let Helios/be called to witness. All the same, daughter, I will defend myself before you, if you survive, and before the person who takes you in, if god gives you such a person, and before the world at large, by explaining the reason for sending you away. Of the gods our ancestors are Helios and Dionysos, and of the heroes Perseus and Andromeda, and Memnon in addition to these.” (θεός here could be Dionysos, but he plays a much smaller part than

110Plutarch Moralia 22B-24C quotes many verses of this kind, especially from Homer. Others not quoted by Plutarch include Minnemos 1.10; 2.15-16; Pindar P. III 80-82.
Helios in the Ethiopian scenes in book X, so Helios is the most likely candidate.)

The agent of prophecy at Delphi, who can only be Apollo, is called ὁ θεὸς at II 27.1 bis; 27.2 bis: . . . ἀνεφθέγγατο ἡ Πυθία τοιάδε:

ίχνος ἁειράμενος ἀπ’ ἐστάχυος παρὰ Νεῖλου
φεύγεις μοιράων νήματ’ ἐρισθενέων.

tέτλαθι, σοι γὰρ ἐγὼ κυναγύλακος Ἀιγύπτωι
ἀψα πέδον δίσων νῦν ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσσο φίλος.

ταῦτα ὡς ἥθεσπισεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐμαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῖς βασιλείς ἐπιβαλὼν ἔλεον εἶναι τὰ πάντα ἰκέτευον ὁ ὁ ὁ πολλὶς τῶν περιστὸτον ὁμιλοῦ ἄνευρίσκησαν τὸν θεὸν τῆς ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ παρὰ τὴν πρώτην ἐντευξίν προφητείας, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐμακάριζον καὶ περιεύθων τῷ ἐντεύθεν παντοίοις, ἐφιλούν ἴκειν με τῷ θεῷ μετὰ Λυκούργον τινα Σακρατίτην λέγοντες καὶ ἐνοικεῖν τε μουράμενον τῷ τεμένει τοῦ νεὼ συνεχῶρον καὶ σιτηρέσιν ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου παρέχειν ἐμπροσθάντο. καὶ συνελοντί λέγειν ἄγαθον ἀπέλιπτεν οὐδὲν ἢ γὰρ πρὸς ἱεροῖς ἢ ἢ πρὸς θυσίας ἔξηπταζόμην, ὡς πολλάς καὶ παντοίας ἀνὰ πάσαν ἡμέραν ἔχονσ τε καὶ ἑγχώριος λεώς τῷ θεῷ χαρίζομεν δράσιν, ἢ φιλοσοφοῦσι διελεγόμην οὐκ ὀλίγος δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος βίος συρρεῖ περὶ τὸν νεὼν τοῦ Πυθίου καὶ κυναγύλακα ἔστιν ἀτεχνῶς ἢ πόλις ὑπὸ μουσηγητῇ ἥθε φοιβαζόμενη. (26.5 - 27.2). "The Pythian priestess said the following: ‘You who direct your footsteps away from the fertile Nile are fleeing a destiny spun by mighty Fates; have courage, for I will give you back the land of Egypt with its black soil. Now you will be my friend.’ When she had prophesied this I prostrated myself before the altar and prayed that everything would turn out propitiously. The large crowd of bystanders praised the god for giving a prophecy at my first request. They said I was fortunate, and thereafter gave me every consideration. They said that after a Spartan, Lycurgos, I was the favourite of the god, and voted to give me permission, if I wanted, to live in the temple precinct, and to provide me with a food allowance from public funds. In short I lacked nothing. I was either at the rituals or present at the many and varied sacrifices with which the foreigners and the local people honour the god all day, or I discussed philosophy. Not a few of that type of person gather round the temple of the Pythian Apollo, and the city is simply a museum under the prophetic direction of the god who leads the Muses.”

Clearly ‘the god’ here is the prophetic god of Delphi, Apollo. By the wording of the oracle the god indicates that he is not only foretelling, but bringing about the return of Kalasiris to Egypt, and thus directing a major turn in the plot.

Another Delphic prophecy is given by ὁ θεὸς, ‘the god’, who again can only be Apollo, at II 35.5-36.1, in which the great journey and happy ending for the
hero and heroine is cryptically predicted: ... ἀναφέργεται ἡ Πυθία τοιαῦτα:

τὴν χάριν ἐν πρώτως αὐτὰρ κλέος ὑστατ' ἔχουσαν
φράζεσθ', ὦ Δελφοί, τὸν τε θεὰς γενέτην
οἱ νηὸν προλιπόντες ἐμὸν καὶ κύμα τεμόντες
ιξοντ' ἡλίου πρὸς χθόνα κυανῆν,
tῇ περ ἀριστοβίοι μέγ' ἀέθλιον ἐξάψονται
λευκὸν ἐπὶ κροτάφοιν στέμμα μελαιομένων.

Ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἀνεῖπεν ὁ θεός, ἀμηχανία πλείστη τοὺς περιηγήτως εἰσεδόθη ... "... the Pythian priestess uttered the following: 'Delphians, consider what is graceful at first and receives honour in the end [a pun on Charikleia's name], and consider the man born of a goddess [a pun on Theagenes' name]. leaving my temple and crossing the waves they will reach the dark land of the sun, where at last they will gain the great reward of virtuous lives and wear a white crown on a black brow.' The god said these things, and the bystanders were at a loss ..."

This last oracle is alluded to at IV 4.5, where Kalasiris is telling his story to Knemon, so here once again ὁ θεός, 'the god', who is directing the paths of the main characters, can only be Apollo: ἐγὼ δὲ αὐθεσ ἄτυπος ἢ τὴν τε φυγήν ὁποι τραπόμενοι λάθομεν ἢν ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ πρὸς τίνα χάραν ἄρα παραπέμπει τοὺς νέους ὁ θεός ἐννοῶν. Τὸν μὲν δὴ δρασμὸν μόνον ἐγγονικα κατὰ θάλασσαν εἶναι ποιητέον, ἀπὸ τοῦ χρησμὸ τὸ συνοίστον λαβὼν ἐνθα ἐφασκέν σαῦτοὺς

κύμα τεμόντας
ιξοντ' ἡλίου πρὸς χθόνα κυανῆν.
"I was sleepless again, wondering which way we might escape without attracting notice, and to what land the god intended to direct the young people [i.e. the hero and heroine]. I only knew that the escape had to be by sea, taking my confidence from the oracle where it said they would 'cross the waves and reach the dark land of the sun.'"

Kalasiris consults the god of the oracle τὸν ἀμα τοῖς νέοις δρασμὸν ὑψηληγότατος χρηστηρίῳ τὸν θεόν ἱκετεύσων. (IV 16.2) "at the same time asking the god to reveal by an oracle the best way for the young people to escape." (i.e. Theagenes and Charikleia, whom Kalasiris was helping to elope.) He tells us that the Pythian god answered his prayer by the turn of events in which he meets Phoenician merchants. This takes us on to a speech where minor characters use θεός for a god other than Helios-Apollo. As a result of a dream which had foretold a victory in the Pythian games for one of their number, they were going to worship Herakles, ... τὸν πάτριον ἡμὼν τὸν δὲ θεόν ... (IV 16.7) "... our ancestral god ..." They add, καὶ τὴν τινὸν τὴν θυσίαν ἄγει τῷ θεῷ τῷ φηναντι νικηθηρίῳ τε καὶ χαρισθηρίῳν, ἀμα δὲ
He [the winner at the games] is making a victory sacrifice and thanksgiving sacrifice, and also a sacrifice for safe travel, to the god who appeared to him.

The special part played in the story by Apollo as the god of the oracle is again emphasized at IV 18.3. Kalasiris expresses optimism for the future of the hero and heroine on the grounds that “the beginning of the journey was undertaken with the god’s help.” The phrase σὺν θεῷ was used by Greek writers from Homer onwards to mean ‘with divine assistance’ or ‘with divine consent’. At first sight it seems to be used in that neutral way here, but on reflection the reader will remember that the god which assisted the beginning of the journey was Apollo. Heliodoros sometimes uses a common expression in an unconventional way in order to catch his readers’ attention. Here he uses the common phrase σὺν θεῷ, but he uses it unconventionally, by applying it to a specific god.  

Heliodoros again uses periphrases to underline rather than obscure the importance of Apollo at V 5.4. As priestess of Artemis Charikleia has a bow and quiver. She gives them to Theagenes to carry, and they are called φόρτον ἥγεσεν καὶ θεῷ τῷ κρατοῦντος ὀπλον οἰκειότατον. “a most pleasant burden for him, and the equipment especially associated with the god who is in control.” The god’ here is masculine, so it can only mean Apollo, who shared an association with the bow and arrow with Artemis.

Only in two places is ὁ θεός used with some ambiguity. At V 34.2 Kalasiris finds Charikleia asleep in a temple. Before leading her back to their lodgings he weeps, πρὸς τὰ βελτίωνα τρέψω τὰ κατ’ οὔτῃν ἱκτεύσας τὸν θεῶν . . . “praying to the god to change her fortune for the better . . .” There is a temple of Hermes in the vicinity, but it is not clear whose temple Charikleia is in here. It is probably simplest here to take τὸν θεόν as the god controlling the young couple’s destiny, that is, as Apollo.

ὁ θεός is qualified, but not identified by name, at II 30.4. Charikles is trying to give Kalasiris a bag of jewels, and says “. . . ἐπόμνομι γε τὸν ἰδρυμένον ἐνθάδε θεῶν ἀπαυγά δώσειν . . .” “I swear by the god who resides here that I will give you everything . . .” Charikles has used ὁ θεός, ‘the god’, for Apollo (see below on II.29.3); here he is referring to the god at Katadoupoi, whom he does not name. Heliodoros’ grasp of the topography of the area is shaky, and he seems to mistakenly regard Katadoupoi as a town rather than a Cataract: he

---

111 The alternative expression σὺν θεοῖς is used only at V 16.2, by Nausikles, for whom the chief gods of the Aithiopika have no special importance.

112 V 13.2.

113 V 15.3.
may be confusing it with Elephantine, which was noted for a temple of Khnum.

Charikles prays to ὄ θεός, ‘the god’ at II 29.3; he sacrifices to him at II 35.2; he prays to him again, in the temple of Apollo, at III 18.1; he recalls receiving a prophecy from him at IV.19.3: ἐμοὶ γῆμαντὶ παιδία ὅπου ἔγινετο, ὅπε δὲ ποτὲ καὶ βραδὺ τῆς ἡλικίας πολλὰ τὸν θεόν ἰκετεύον θυγατρίου πατήρ ἀνηγορεύθην, ὅπο ἐπ’ αἰείοις ἐσεθοί μοι ταύτην τῷ θεῷ προαγορεύσαντος. “I was married and had no child. Entreating the god, I was told, late in life and heavy with age, that I would be the father of a young girl, and the god foretold that she would not be propitious for me.” (II 29.3) . . . ὅραν εἶναι τῷ τὴν θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ προσάγειν ἐλεγεν . . . “. . . he said it was time to offer the sacrifice to the god . . .” (II 35.2). ἔστι δὲ πλησίον ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ καὶ ὅμοιον ἀποθεῖε τῷ θεῷ τεταραγμένος τι κατὰ τοὺς ὀρνους. “He [Charikles] is nearby, in the temple of Apollo; he is performing an incantation for the god because he has been disturbed by a dream.” (III 18.1) . . . ταυτηνί τινο τὴν δίκην, ἦν . . . ὃ θεός μοι προείπεν. . . . “. . . I am suffering the punishment which the god predicted to me . . .” (IV 19.3) When Charikles prays to ὃ θεός, ‘the god’, and ‘the god’ replies, and when he sacrifices to him, we can be confident that the god in question is Apollo, since Charikles is his priest at Delphi.

θεός is the Nile at XI 22.7. The Nile is identified as Horos, who may be regarded a solar deity.

At X 6.5 τοῦ θεοῦ in the words of the narrator refers back to Dionysos in the previous sentence.

No particular god can be identified when Thyamis, about to fight his brother, says, ἔξικήσας δὴ ὅνθα θεόν νεόντος, οὖκ ἀποκτείναι προηρημαι: “I have decided to win, god willing, but not to kill him.” (VII 5.4); and says to Theagenes that if he loses, τὸν ἀστρικὸν διαφλάσεις βιον ἐκείν τοῖν εἴς ἄν τοῖν τελός τῶν κατά σε δεξιώτερον ὑποφήγη θεός. “you will suffer the life of a bandit until god reveals some happier conclusion to your circumstances.” (VII 5.5).

Sometimes the Persian king, or the old priest, Kalasiris is referred to as θεός (Kalasiris, IV 7.8; Hydaspes, V 9.2, IX 22.7, X 6.1). θεός is just some unidentified god, ‘a god’ who has no significance for the plot, at II 9.5; V 10.2; VII 11.3; X 9.2. These references are not relevant to our enquiry, but are included for the sake of completeness.

114 This is based on the assumption that the mistake arose from a misunderstanding of Hdt. II 17.
115 v. Section II above, p33ff.
The two conclusions to be drawn from this catalogue are that where a masculine θεός is important in the plot he is always Apollo or Helios; and that wherever ὁ θεός or τὸν θεόν stands in a sentence in which it is not otherwise identified it clearly refers to Apollo or Helios.

We turn now to θεός in the feminine. The catalogue includes the only goddesses referred to in the novel. These are Artemis, Isis, and Selene, who are important in the novel; and besides, one reference to Athena (Ι 10.1), in the context of Knemón's story which is set in Athens. If the view that Isis is associated with the moon is accepted, then with this one exception ἡ θεός is in every instance a moon goddess.

In I 2.1 when the bandits see Charikleia they think she is a goddess (καὶ θεός εἶναι ἀναπειθουσά). Some of them think she is “the goddess Artemis, or the local Isis” (θεόν Ἀρτεμιν ἡ τὴν ἐγχώριον Ἰσίν, I 2.6). When they see her concern for the wounded Theagenes, they change their minds, saying, “How could a goddess behave like that?” (ποῦ ταῦτ’ ἂν εἶν θεόν τὰ ἔργα, I 2.7).

Isis is ἡ θεός at I 18.4. She appears to Thyamis in a dream, and makes an accurate prediction which he, in the grip of desire, misinterprets to mean that he will marry Charikleia. Following negotiations with his men and with Charikleia Thyamis is persuaded to march to Memphis. Therefore, the dream initiates an important turn in the plot, but only because it is misunderstood. In the dream Isis clearly indicates that she is guiding Charikleia’s destiny. Thyamis dreams he enters the temple of Isis. The scene is described. The dream continues: ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν ἐντὸς ἦκεν τῶν ἀνακτόρων, τὴν θεόν ὑπαντῶσαν ἐγχειρίζειν τε τὴν Χαρίκλειαν καὶ λέγειν ὡς Θυώμι, τίνυς τοὶ τὴν παρθένον ἕγώ παραδίδωμι, σὺ δὲ ἔχων σοὶ ἔξεις, ἄλλ’ ἀδίκος ἔστι καὶ φονεύσεις τὴν ξένην ἡ δὲ οὐ φονεύσῃσαι.” “[I dreamt that] then I entered the shrine, and the goddess, meeting me, placed Charikleia in my hands and said, ‘Thyamis, I am giving you this maiden. Having her you will not have her, but you will do wrong and kill the foreigner; but she will not be killed.’” Later, when events do not turn out as Thyamis expects, he becomes distressed, “blaming the goddess for being deceitful.” (καὶ πολλὰ τὴν θεόν ὡς δολερῶν ὀνείδισας . . ., I 30.5).116

Isis is ἡ θεός to whom Rhodopis makes sacrifice at II.25.2. The arrival of Rhodopis at Memphis to tempt Kalasiris is a key element in the plot. However, it is not attributed to Isis but to the evolutions of the heavenly bodies.

---

116 However, it is argued below in the commentary ad loc. that the correct reading here is not τὴν θεόν, but τὴν θεόν, “the vision.”
Isis comes into the story when Kalasiris has returned to Memphis, where he was her priest. He enters the shrine to lay aside his priesthood, “making libation and prayer to the goddess” (σπείσας τε τῇ θεῷ καὶ κατευξάμενος, VII 8.7). In VII 9.1 Queen Arsake lingers in the temple, as a pretext “indulging in a lot of worshipping of the goddess (πλέοντι θεραπείᾳ δῆθεν τῇ περὶ τήν θεόν ἐναλόουσα πλὴν ἄλλ’ ἀπεχώρει γε . . .). Arsake’s servant arrives at the temple “saying she was going to offer a sacrifice to the goddess” (θυσίαν ὅγειν τῇ θεῷ λέγουσα . . . VII 11.2) and is told that Kalasiris shortly before dying, “made libation and prayed a lot to the goddess” (σπείσας τε καὶ πολλὰ ἐπεύξασθαι τῇ θεῷ. VII 11.3).

In the explanation of the myth of Isis and Osiris, ἡ θεός is used of Isis (ποθεὶ γοῦν ἀπόντα ἡ θεός “So the goddess grieves for the absent [Osiris]” IX 9.5).

The sacrifices made to the Sun and Moon in Meroe are described in X.6.5, where ὁ θεός is used to refer back to the Sun (Helios); and ἡ θεός refers back to the Moon (Selene), as it does also at X 7.7.

This catalogue of the uses of θεός in the feminine illustrates the importance of Artemis, Isis and Selene in the plot. It also draws attention to the fact that there is no reference to any other goddess mentioned, with the single exception of Athene in Knemon’s story - a point emphasized by the way ἡ θεός is sometimes used without immediate identification, but where a consideration of the context shows that she must be Artemis-Isis-Selene.

IV. Ὡ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ IN THE AITHIOPIKA: BACKGROUND, AND A CATALOGUE

The actions attributed to ὁ δαίμων in the Aithiopika are invariably to the disadvantage of man, although not always undeserved. δαίμων without the article, too, seems always, or almost always, to be used by Heliodoros for an evil or malevolent spirit. The purpose this section is to establish the precise meaning of the term in Heliodoros; it includes a catalogue of all the occasions on which he uses δαίμων in the singular, first with then without the article.

Before cataloguing the uses of ὁ δαίμων in the Aithiopika it will be useful to say something about the background in earlier Greek for the way Heliodoros uses ὁ δαίμων. The nature of ὁ δαίμων and its relationship with ἡ τύχη and ὁ θεός has given historians of religion undue difficulty.117 This survey of the background starts with ὁ δαίμων in classical literature; then a statement of Plutarch is quoted in which he describes a Mithraic belief in which the dualistic

117 The problem is discussed at RE VIIA 1654, 1.58ff.
use of ὁ θεός and ὁ δαίμων is particularly close to that of Heliodoros; finally there is a discussion of ὁ δαίμων and ὁ δαίμων in Christian literature.

The word δαίμων basically means a supernatural being. It may be applied to gods or to minor spiritual entities. Its semantic field is almost as wide as that of the English word 'spirit', so we should not be too disappointed when a study of its full range of usage does not add up to very much in the way of an identifiable concept in Greek religious thought. Plutarch offers an extended metaphysical explanation of what δαίμονες are. He says that they are spirits between gods and men, and are a mixture of good and bad. It is doubtful whether many of the authors who used the word could have given so precise a formulation of what δαίμων means.

For the purpose of translation the various uses must be carefully distinguished. Firstly, δαίμων sometimes refers to an explicitly identified god or spirit. This class includes both references to previously named or implicitly identified gods on the one hand, and on the other expressions for lesser spirits, such as ὁ πάρον δαίμων, or Plato's ὁ ἕκαστον δαίμον for a person's peculiar spirit or fate. Heliodoros uses ὁ δαίμων (the best attested reading) as a general term for a previously defined being when Kalasiris refers to Hermes as the real father of Homer, at III 14.2.

Secondly, classical authors use δαίμων for supernatural beings who are not identified; to this class of use belong many of the occurrences of the word in the plural, and phrases like τις δαίμων, ὁ γαθός δαίμων.

The third use, and the one adopted by Heliodoros, is ὁ δαίμων where it has the article in the singular but does not refer to a particular spirit which is otherwise identified. The key to a proper interpretation is to distinguish the cases where δαίμων is grammatically determined. Only if it is determined are we entitled to assume that the δαίμον in question is a particular, individual entity with individual characteristics which it may be possible to identify. In the case of ὁ δαίμων it is important to remember that, at least for pagan writers, this is apparently a purely literary usage, found mainly in Tragedy. In other words, ὁ δαίμων has no cult, and is unattested in documentary evidence.

---

118 ὁ δαίμων as a general term for supernatural beings is discussed by U. v. Wilamowitz (1931) I 362-370; see also West Works and Days (1978) ad 122.
120 Homer is here claimed to be Egyptian, so this must be the Egyptian Hermes, or Thoth, the putative source of Hermetic teaching; the implication is presumably that Kalasiris regards Homer as a fountain of Hermetic wisdom.
121 The concept of nominal determination is discussed by Schwzyer-Debrunner II p19-27.
These three uses of δαιμόνιον do overlap. In general what they had in common is that a δαιμόνιον was thought of as a spirit between the gods and men, (sometimes the spirit of a deceased person), as is expounded in detail by Apuleius. The use of ὁ δαιμόνιον to refer back to a named god (where ὁ θεὸς would be more usual) is found in Homer, and does not die out in later Greek, but is rare in prose. In prose, particularly in fifth century prose, the pairing θεὸς καὶ δαιμόνιον is frequent. In this context a δαιμόνιον is an intermediate spirit, between gods and men, as is fairly clear, for instance, from Plato Apology.

ὁ δαιμόνιον, like ὁ θεὸς when it refers to a general unnamed deity, appears first in the fifth century B.C. It is invariably the agent or foreteller of something undesirable, while ὁ θεὸς never is. Originally, at any rate, it was presumably used through reluctance to attribute anything bad either to ὁ θεὸς or to a named god. This use for a malevolent deity does occur without the article, when it does, however, it is frequently unclear whether one should think of ὁ δαιμόνιον in this specific sense, or merely of the neutral τίς δαιμόνιον, which can be both malevolent and benevolent.

I have examined all the examples of the simple expression ὁ δαιμόνιον from Herodotos, Aischyllos, Sophokles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Aeschines, Antiphon, Lysias, Demosthenes, Isokrates, Xenophon of Ephesos and Achilles Tatos, where the reference is not to a particular, previously defined spirit, or to a spirit defined by an adjective or adjectival phrase. In every case these examples seem to conform to the principle that ὁ δαιμόνιον, used alone, refers to the agent of unpleasant events or intelligence. The use of ὁ δαιμόνιον with no defining antecedent is not found in Pindar, Thucydides, Aristotle, Xenophon, Polybios, Chariton, 125 Longos, Lucian or Plato.

---

122 Apul. Soc. passim.
123 Pl. Ap. 27c-e (τοῦ δὲ δαιμόνιος οὕτω ήταν θεῶς γε ἡγομένης ἡ θεῶν παῖδας).
124 Herodotos I 210.1, II 765.4; Aischyllos Persae 601 (the chorus says that when ὁ δαιμόνιον gives good things one should still expect the worst), Septem contra Thebas 813; Sophokles O.C. 76, 1370, 1443; Euripides Medea 1231, Supplices 352, Helen 915, Orestes 394, 667 (if ὁ δαιμόνιον is interpreted as ironic), Bacchae 481, 1374 (τα τοῦ θεοῦ μὲν χρήστα, τοῦ δὲ δαιμόνιος / βαρέα), Phoenissae 413, 984 (in these two passages ὁ δαιμόνιον may be used ironically), 1662, (1653 is badly corrupt); fragments 140, 554 (Nafplio); Aristophanes Plutus 7, 726; Aeschines Ctesas 115, 157; Antiphon Tetr. 2.3.4, 2.4.10; Lysias II 78, XIII 63, XXIV 22; Demosthenes XVIII (De corona) 192, 208, in Demosthenes LX (Epitaphios) 19.5, 21.7 (ὁ παντον κύριος δαιμόνιον), 31.6, and Isokrates Evag. 25 ὁ δαιμόνιον acts favourably towards one man but only at the expense of someone else, Xenophon of Ephesos I 5.4; Achilles Tatos I 4.9.7, 18.4.4. Ailios Aristides Rhodakos (ed. Dindorf I 797-823) uses ὁ δαιμόνιον four times for the power which caused an earthquake and the resulting disaster, and uses ὁ δαιμόνιον in contrast with ὁ θεὸς at Embassy to Achilles 432 (ed. Dindorf II 597-8).
125 However, a personified δαιμόνιον may appear in Chariton I 16.5 to 16.16 πλὴν καὶ ἐνταῦθα τις εὕρηθ’ βάσκανος δαιμόνιον, ὥσπερ ἐκεί φασί τὴν Ἑρών. ἐσπραχαλόγηε δὲ
One use of δαίμων in tragedy is discussed by E. Fraenkel, who gives references for the interpretation of the word in tragedy in the recent literature. Fraenkel argues that sometimes δαίμων is more or less an equivalent of πότιμος. This interpretation does not confirm that δαίμων is used invariably for something bad in tragedy; it is, however, not inconsistent with it, (although it could be argued that it may be only the tragic context which determines that this synonym of πότιμος is always the bringer of bad fortune.) Karl Reinhardt makes frequent reference to the concept of Daimon in Sophokles. However he does not defend or explain his use of the term. The explanation is implicit. As H. Lloyd-Jones writes, ‘Yet Reinhardt himself clearly shows how the action of a Sophoclean play is rapidly swept onwards to its appointed conclusion by the force of what he calls the daimon. In speaking of the daimon the word ‘fate’ is inappropriate; in Sophokles, the daimon is a god-directed force, and the gods control the action quite as firmly as they do in Homer or in Aeschylus.’

δαίμων is frequently used for death in epitaphs from the middle of the fifth century. This date coincides with the earliest use of ὁ δαίμων as a specifically negative divine power. θεός is not used in this way.

ὁ δαίμων is not found in documents. In deeds of divorce from the fourth and sixth centuries A.D. δαίμων (without the article) is sometimes cited as the grounds for divorce. In some other papyri it is the cause of sickness.

αὐτός [the suitors] ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ Χαϊρέων πόλεμον ὁ Φθόνος. 1.2.5 to 2.6 ἐφοπλισμὸ γάρ αὐτῷ [Chaireas] Ζηλοτυπεῖαν, ἢ τις σύμμαχοι λαβοῦσα τὸν ἔρωτα μέγα τὸ κακόν διαμαρτύρετο.

There is a possible exception at Leges IX 877a, if δαίμων there is taken apart from αὐτός, rather than being translated as the man’s individual δαίμων.

There is a general discussion of δαίμων in tragedy in RE, S III 286f, although no attempt is made there to distinguish δαίμων and ὁ δαίμων. The same is true of G. François (1957). Even by conventional standards François understates the bad side of δαίμων, which he treats as almost equivalent to θεός. His main thesis is that for classical writers the use of these terms in the singular does not point to a monotheistic outlook.

E. Fraenkel Agamemnon (1950), ad 1341f.


H. Lloyd-Jones (1979). The closest K. Reinhardt himself comes to explaining his understanding of ‘daimon’ is in K. Reinhardt (1949) 14: 'In der Form alten Dämonenglaubens setzt sich der Gedanke fort: Hybris, wenn sie erst einmal in einem Hause eingessessen ist, gebiert, die alte, eine junge, einen Dämon, der ihr gleich ist, während Dike, die so lang als Segengeist darin gewohnt hat, aus dem sündhaft reichen Hause auszieht.'

Some references are given in RE IV 2010.

P. Cairol. Preis. 2,3, both 362 AD; P. Grenf. 76, 305-6 AD; P. Strass. 142, 391 AD; and the following all from the sixth century: P. Cairol. Masp. 67153, 67154, 67121, 67311; Flor. 93; BGU XII 2203; P. Lond. V 1712, 1713; SB XIV 12043.
Plutarch, exceptionally, seems to use ὁ δαίμων without a consistently negative sense; however, it is a statement concerning the theological dualism of the Magi in Plutarch Isis and Osiris\textsuperscript{134} which gives the clue to why Heliodoros took this fixed but occasional usage of the classical writers and employed it with unprecedented frequency: νομίζουσι γάρ οἱ μὲν θεοὶ εἶναι δύο καθάπερ ἄντιτέχνους, τὸν μὲν ἄγαθὸν, τὸν μὲν φαῦλον ἰδιμούργον· οἱ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἀμείνονα θεὸν, τὸν δ’ ἐτερὸν δαίμονα καλοῦσιν, ὡσπερ Ζωρόαστρης ὁ μάγος . . . μέσον δ’ ἀμφότερον Μιθρην εἶναι. "They [the dualists] think that there are two gods like rival craftsmen, one a manufacturer of good things, one of bad; they call the good one theos and the bad one daimon, as does Zoroaster the Magus . . . and in between them is Mithras."

At several points in the commentary it is argued that Heliodoros has some lexical usages which are distinctively Christian. Therefore it is necessary to consider whether Heliodoros’ use of δαίμων owes anything to the practice of Christian writers. The strongest argument that it does is that in the Aithiopika δαίμων without the article seems always to be bad in its connotations. This agrees with the invariable practice of the Christian writers. In other non-Christian writers ὁ δαίμων is always bad, but δαίμων alone is neutral: it may be good or bad, and no pattern can be discerned; in Christian writers δαίμων is a demon.

Christian writers do not consistently distinguish δαίμων from δαίμονιον, which also means ‘demon’.\textsuperscript{136} For Christians demons usually cause temptation

\textsuperscript{133}Βασκανία δαίμων is the cause of sickness in a prayer for relief from sickness, BGU 954 (sixth century (?), original destroyed; the opening is quoted below in note 142); δαίμων is almost certainly a cause of sickness in SB V 8007, (the editor’s date is ‘c.300 AD’; the editio princeps lacks photographs), a bill of sale for a slave who is described as πιστὴν καὶ ἀδραστὴν οὐδὲν εὐκόσιον καὶ ἑπαρξής [καὶ ἀνεπίληπτον ὁπό δαίμονος . . .; δαίμων may be a cause of sickness but probably refers to more general misfortune in PSI 767, 331-2 AD, which is a petition to have a debt extended: συνβέβηκεν γὰρ μοι αἰτία των τύχων χρήσασθα πονηροῦ δαίμονος . . . 1.47-48.

\textsuperscript{134}Plu. Isis and Osiris 46 / 369D-E.

\textsuperscript{135}The concept of μέσον, which the dualists applied to the sun according to the statement of Plutarch quoted above, is discussed and assigned to Helios by Julian Or. IV(XI) 138c-139d\textsuperscript{18} who connects it with the fact that in astrology the sun is the middle of the seven planets. Our examination of the use in Heliodoros of ὁ θεὸς leaves no doubt that unless he has an attribute which defines him as something else, he is equivalent to Helios-Apollo. Heliodoros differs from Plutarch’s dualists in that for him Helios is the same as ὁ θεὸς, not an intermediate god between ὁ θεὸς and ὁ δαίμων. Bad things are never ascribed to Helios-Apollo under his own name, except by Charicleia in her lament at I 8 (for which Theagenes chides her).

\textsuperscript{136}δαίμονιον is used by Heliodoros for lesser supernatural beings, a meaning which is unremarkable by classical standards; as noted in section I, where the references are given, τὸ δαίμονιον does not play a major part in the divine economy of the plot, so does not require discussion here.
or wrongdoing. In the *Aithiopika* ὁ δαίμων brings misfortune but not temptation. There are times however when Christian writers refer to δαίμονες as bringers of misfortune. In Josephos too, at the one place where δαίμων is used it is the bringer of misfortune, in a speech by Herod: ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ δαίμων τις τῶν ἐμὸν οἶκον καὶ μοι τῶς φιλάτως ἐπανίστησιν ἄει . . ., “. . . but when some evil spirit devastates my house and continually causes those closest to me to revolt . . .”

ὁ δαίμων meaning ‘the evil power’ or ‘the Devil’ is found in Christian writing, but with much less frequency than in the *Aithiopika*. The pagan writer other than Heliodoros who comes closest to using δαίμων in the Christian sense of ‘evil spirit’ is Iamblichos. In the *De mysteriis* δαίμονες, spirits between gods and men, govern the physical side of man’s nature. According to Iamblichan Neo-Platonism the physical side of man’s nature is base, and Iamblichos clearly states that because δαίμονες are associated with it undesirable events are to be associated with them.

Heliodoros uses the expression ὁ δαίμων much more frequently than earlier writers, Christian or non-Christian, but his use of it follows the same pattern as theirs. I quote every instance where he uses the term, and in view of the unequivocal statement by Plutarch quoted above, have ventured to translate ὁ δαίμων as ‘the evil power’. After this his uses of the singular δαίμων without the article are quoted.

I 1.6: καὶ μυρίον εἴδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικρὸν τοῦ χωρίου διεσκέψατο, οἷον ἁμαρτίας καὶ συμποσίως πόλεμον ἐπιτήδευσα, φόνος καὶ πότους, σπονδάς καὶ τροφάς ἐπισυνήμιν, καὶ τοὐτοῦν θέασαν ἐλεύθεροι Ἀγαμπτικοὶ ἐπιδείξας. “The evil power devised a great variety of things in a small space, polluting wine with blood, starting a battle at a party, joining killing with drinking and libations with slaughter, and displayed this scene to the Egyptian bandits.”

I 26.4: θεοὶς τὰ ἐξής ἐπιτρέψασα καὶ δαίμονι τῷ τὴν ἁρχὴν λαχνότι τῶν ἠμέτερον ἐπιτρέπεσθε ἑρωτα: “. . . entrusting the future to the gods and to the evil power which has been assigned the power to govern the twists and turns of our love.” (This is the only occurrence of ὁ δαίμων where the context would also permit a translation in which he is not represented as malevolent.)

---

137 References can be found in Lampe, δαίμων D.2.
138 Josephos Bell. Jud. I 628. We do not know whether Josephos distinguished καὶ δαίμονας, defined as hostile spirits of the dead at Bell. Jud. VII.185.
139 E.g. Euseb. *H.E.* VII 31 τῶν δαίμονος, αὐτὸ τῇ τοῦ θεομάχου Σατανᾶ. Other references can be found in E.C.E. Owen *JTS* (1931) p 147.
140 The possibility that Iamblichos was a major influence on the theological and philosophical thought of Heliodoros is discussed below, p65ff.
II 1.3: ἂλλα πυρὸς, οἴμοι, γέγονας ἀνάλωμα, τοιαύτας ἐπὶ σοι λαμπάδος ἀντὶ τῶν νυμφικῶν τοῦ δαίμονος ἀγαπτος. "Alas, you have become the price exacted by the fire, and the evil power has set these firebrands for you instead of bridal torches."

II 4.4: ἔξεσται πάντας ἄλληλοις συνεϊναι μετὰ γούν θάνατον εἰ καὶ ζῶσιν ὁ δαίμων ὁ δεῖ ἐπέτρεψεν. "At least we will be able to be together after death, even if the evil power does not permit it to us while we are alive."

II 17.2: κακῶν μὲν, ὁ Θεάγενες, ἀδήλων ὅστις πλεονεκτεῖ· ἀφθόνος γὰρ κάμοι τῶν συμφορῶν ὁ δαίμων ἐπηνύθησεν. "Theagenes, I do not know who has more troubles, for the evil power has unstintingly poured misfortunes over me too."

II 25.3: ἄρχὴν δὴ τῶν ἐσομένων καὶ προσαγορευθέντων μοι πρὸς τοῦ θείου δύσчερων τὴν γυναῖκα φαρσάς καὶ συνείς ὡς τῶν πεποιμένων ἐστίν ὑποκρίτης καὶ ὡς ὁ τότε εἰληφῶς δαίμων οἶονεῖ προσωπεῖον αὐτὴν ὑπῆλθεν, "... detecting that the woman was the beginning of the problems which lay in the future and had been predicted to me by the heavens, and understanding... that the evil power then in control was possessing her like a mask."

II 29.4: ἰπτραγώδει τούτο τῷ δράματι καὶ ἔτερον πάθος ὁ δαίμων καὶ τὴν μητέρα μοι τῆς παιδός ἀφαιρεῖται μὴ τοῖς θρήνοις ἐγκαρτερήσασαν. "The evil power added a further tragedy to this drama, and took away the mother of my child because she could not cope with the mourning."

III 14.2: δαίμων is here used of an explicitly identified divinity (if the reading is right) so this example differs from the others, where ὁ δαίμων is otherwise unidentified: πατήρ δὲ τὸ μὲν δοκεῖν προφήτης τὸ δὲ ἀφενδές Ἠρμῆς, οὔτε ἦν ὁ δοκῶν πατήρ προφήτης τῇ γὰρ τούτῳ γαμητῇ τελούσῃ τινὰ πάτριον ἀγιστείον καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν καθευδοῦσῃ συνήλθεν ὁ δαίμων καὶ ποιεῖ τὸν Ὀμήρου φέροντα τι τῆς ἀνομοίου μιξεως σύμβολον. "The apparent father was a priest, but the real father was Hermes, of whom the apparent father was priest. When his wife had celebrated a traditional ritual and was sleeping in the temple the god (ὁ δαίμων) came to her and created Homer, who bore a mark of this unequal union."

Although in this example ὁ δαίμων is not used absolutely, and thus does not properly belong with the other examples listed, it is interesting to ask why Heliodoros makes Kalasiris refer to Hermes as ὁ δαίμων rather than as ὁ θεός.
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Perhaps Heliodoros is echoing the Homeric practice of applying δαιμον to the Olympians. Or perhaps in his theological system Hermes had some connection with ο δαιμος the malefactor. Most likely, perhaps, he wished to preserve the title ο θεος for the supreme god in Kalasiris' speech, and regarded Hermes as an intermediate spirit. It may be objected to this last idea that Heliodoros does not show similar scruple in preserving η θεος for the supreme goddess; he applies it to Athena in the mouth of Knemon at I 10.1. On the other hand it is doubtful whether he would have regarded the alternative η δαιμον as permissible Greek, or considered theologically correct language appropriate to Knemon.

IV 8.8: τας εμψυχους και εν ωφοςωις ωμιλιας του δαιμονος στερησαντος, "the evil power having deprived [me] of live and face to face communication,"

IV 19.8: ο της ομελικτου καθ' ημων του δαιμονος φιλονεικιας: "Oh, what unrelenting[141] antagonism of the evil power against us!"

V 2.7: νυν δε ο μηθεποποτε κεκορεσιμος εμε δε εξ αρχης ειληχως δαιμων μικρων των ηδουν υποθεμενος ειτα ηπατησε. "But now the ever insatiable evil power which has controlled me from the start has given a little pleasure and then disappointed."

V 6.2: αρχη τινος ελεγε φευξομεθα την πανταχου διωκουσαν ειμαιρενην; ειζωμεν τη τυχη και χωρησωμεν ωμος τω φεροντι κερδησωμεν αλην αναλυτουν και πλανητα βιον και την επαληηλου του δαιμονος καθ' ημων πομπειαν. "[Theagenes] said, 'How long will we be running away from the fate which pursues us everywhere? We give in to chance and go along with circumstance; we get pointless roaming, a wandering life, and the continuous procession on which the evil power leads us.'"

V 20.1: κυμα φασιν επι κυματι προσεβαλλεν ο δαιμων. "The evil power added, as they say, wave upon wave [of trouble]."

V 29.6: προς τοπτο μεν ο δαιμων αντεπραξεν εν αυτοις δε τοις δεινοις εμβεβηκαμεν, "the evil power opposed this [an easy flight], and we embarked among these difficulties."

[141] The precise meaning of ομελικτος is not certain: cf Synesios Ep. 79 / 227D (PG 66, 1452D): αλλα ταυτην γε την φωνην δεινου ειπεν και υπερ Μαξιμου, και υπερ Κλεινιου, ους εμι δοκειν αν και δετις ομουτος δαιμονων ηλεισεν. Εξερηθαιν του λογου θοις τε και Ανθρωικοι, οι μονοι δαιμωνον ομελικτοι.
VI 8.3: 'Come,' she said, 'and we will do a dance to the evil power who is in control according to his own style, we will sing laments to him and dance to the sound of wailing . . .''

VII 14.5, 14.6: 'Theagenes,' said Charikleia, 'the evil power gives us these blessings in which the difficulties exceed the apparent advantage.'

IX 24.4: Things which the evil power has afflicted with complicated beginnings can only be brought to their conclusion by circuitous means.

Without the article ὁ δαιμόνιον seems sometimes to be used for ὁ δαιμόνιον. However, since there are some ambiguous cases, it would be dangerous to insist that δαιμόνιον is indistinguishable from ὁ δαιμόνιον in Heliodoros. Nevertheless, the translation 'an evil spirit' suits the context consistently enough to require serious consideration, and it is used in this list of references. The translations are therefore tentative, and the argument does not rest on them but only on the catalogue for ὁ δαιμόνιον above.
I 2.7: "How could these be the deeds of a goddess, or how could an evil spirit show such solicitous love for a dead body?"

II 6.2: "First let’s find my beloved, unless some evil spirit is still joking at our expense."

II 33.2: "I decided not to delay at Katadoupoi in case the jealousy of some evil spirit took away my second daughter." 142

IV 18.5: "that he will not make love to me before I reach my family and home, or if an evil spirit prevents this, not, at least, before I become a wife with my full consent, or not at all."

V 7.1: "for the evil spirit against which we struggle is not a favourable one, which will permit a quick escape from misfortunes, ..."

---

142 βασακανία is occasionally used of the Devil. It would be interesting to know whether the δαίμονος βασακανία was a specifically Christian concept. The only other two examples of the collocation of these words are worth quoting. One is a Christian prayer, BUG 954 (referred to above in note 133; c. sixth century, original destroyed): Δέσποτα Θεός, παντοκράτωρ | ὁ πατήρ | τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σοι στέφανος ἡμῶν | [Π]ησοῦ [Χ]ιστοῦ καὶ [κ]αι (?) ἄγιε [Σ]ερήνε | εὐχαριστώ ἐγώ Σιλουανός υἱός | Σαραπιάνος καὶ κλίνα τὴν | κεφαλὴν | κεκτητοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ παρακαλάν, ὅπως διώ | [ἐ]τις ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, τοῦ δούλου μου | τὸν δαίμονα προβάσακαν καὶ | τὸν κλειστὸ πάσαν (?) καὶ τὸν τῆς | ἀνθρώπου καὶ (?) πάσαν | δὲ νόσον | καὶ πάσαν μαλακίαν ἄρείλε | ἀπέ' ἐμοῦ, κτλ. (1-13). The other is an inscription from the Black Sea region commemorating the premature death of an important citizen. It is not clear whether the context is Christian or pagan. Its last publication seems to be as 2059 of Boekh’s C IG II 126, where dates from the first century BC to the first century AD are suggested. 1.31: ὑπὸ τοῦ βασακακίου δαίμονος ἀφροθέθη μὴ διατελεῖται τὴν ἄρχην ...; To these should perhaps be added Plutarch Dio 2.6, τὰ φαύλα δαίμονα καὶ βασακανία.
VI 13.3: καὶ γίνεται τῶν ὀλίγων βαρεὶς βουλήσει δαίμονος καὶ παις ὁ ἐμὸς. βέλει Περσικὸ πρὸς τὰ στέρνα, ὡς ὦρατε, βληθεὶς: “and among those who fell, by the unkind will of an evil spirit, was my son, struck in the chest, as you see, by a Persian spear.”

VII 13.1: πάντων μὲν τῶν ὄντων, πολλαὶ δὲ ἦν, ἀποκαλυπθέντες μᾶλλος δὲ αὐτοῖς περισσοθέντες καὶ κατὰ τὸ δεξίον βουλήμα δαίμονος τῇ πρὸς τῷ ἡρῴῳ Καλασίριν συντυχία χρησάμενοι ἀφιγμένοι τε ἐνταῦθα ὡς τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ χρόνου μετ’ αὐτοῦ βιοσώμενοι, νῦν ὡς ὄρας πάντων ἔρημοι καὶ μόνοι περιελείμμεθα, . . . This is the only example of δαίμονων without the article where translation such as ‘evil spirit’ or ‘malevolent power’ does not clearly fit. However the blessing referred to here was very much a mixed one, since from the speaker’s (Charileia’s) current perspective her situation is ultimately worse than if she had never met Kalasiris. In view of this, and in view of the weight of evidence for δαίμονος in Heliodoros being hostile, it is translated as ‘evil spirit’ here too. “We were stripped of our possessions, which were great, and scarcely survived, and by some kindness of an evil spirit we met the great man Kalasiris, and arriving here spent the rest of the time with him, and now, as you see, we have been left alone and bereft of everything . . .”

VII 25.7: μὴ γὰρ ὀφείλωσιν ἡ δαίμονος τοῦ ἡμετέρου βαρύτης ἰσχύσειν ὡστε με τὸν Χαρικλείας ἀπείρωσιν ἄλλης ὁμολογίας παραλήμιος μικρόθηκην. “May the gravity of our evil genius not be so strong that I, who have not known Charileia, should be illegitimately polluted by congress with another.”

VIII 10.2: τὸ μὲν γὰρ καὶ νομομαχόν ἐστὶ τῆς σωτηρίας δαίμονια τινὶ καὶ θεία παντάπασιν ἔσοικεν ἐνεργείᾳ . . . πλὴν εἰ μὴ θευματοποίητα τις ἐπὶ δαίμονος εἰς τὰ ἐσχατὰ μὲν βάλλοντος ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἀπόρων διασώζοντος. ‘She said, “The novelty of my salvation is like some supernatural or divine beneficence . . . unless it is some miracle of an evil spirit who takes us to the brink of destruction and then saves us from our state of helplessness.”

X 13.5: Hydaspes, seeing the tokens which prove Charileia is his daughter, says, [How do we know she is not dead.] τοῖς δὲ γνωρίσμαιν ἐπιτυχον τις ἀποκήρυξε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς τύχης; μὴ τὶς δαίμον ἤμιν ἐπιταχέζει καὶ ὡσπέρ προσωπεῖον τῇ κύρῃ τοῦτᾳ περιθείς ἐντυφώσα τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ περὶ τεκναποιῶν ἐπιθυμία . . . “and someone who found the tokens by chance is using them? I hope that it is not an evil spirit playing with us, who, placing these things in the girl's hands, mocks our desire for offspring.”
Editors of Greek texts have a capricious habit of deciding whether to personify τύχη with an initial capital on impressionistic grounds. There are rare cases where internal evidence confirms that Τύχη is a deity. However, in general where no attribute is stated, and there is room for ambiguity, the decision about whether one is dealing with a particular, individual entity Τύχη, or with one of a number of possible τύχαις, must rest on whether the noun is determined by the presence of the article or of a vocative marker. In cases where Τύχη is a particular entity, the attempt to distinguish between it as an abstract concept and as a personification is misconceived. Where it is not determined, to treat it as a particular entity, in other words, to determine it by giving it a proper name with a capital letter, is to presume to add to the text information not provided by the author. In simple terms, there is usually no adequate defence for personifying an undetermined τύχη in a text; Τύχη determined by a definite article is a definite concept which was already personified throughout the Greek world, and we are justified in signalling this by printing it with a capital.

In the case of Heliodoros Ή Τύχη has a prominent rôle in directing events. We cannot really say whether she is to be regarded as a divine power. She was commonly respected as a deity: her cult was certainly widespread throughout the Hellenized world. On the other hand deities in Heliodoros usually receive some cult; there is no sign of a cult for Ή Τύχη. In any case, we can look at how she behaves in the story, and show that, goddess or not, her presence and activity by no means preclude the idea that Helios-Apollo is supremely important both in motivating the plot and in the beliefs of the protagonists.

A defence of the view that in Heliodoros Ή Τύχη is random chance devoid of guiding intelligence is perforce negative: it is necessary to show an absence of a discernible pattern or motivation in its actions. In order to do this I simply present all the cases where it is used in the singular, determined by an article but with no stated attribute which defines it as some particular Τύχη. The reason for making this distinction in the catalogue is that the key question for the present study is not the meaning of the word τύχη; the question is, if Ή Τύχη is to be regarded as a deity in the Aithiopika, (which is not certain), what is her significance for the theology which informs the work?

143 Some will argue that this is precisely what editors do when they add paragraphs and punctuation. However, the decision to personify an abstract concept is potentially a more arbitrary kind of intervention, and should only be taken upon a systematic and unambiguous principle.
I 13.2: Ἡ Τύχη ἀπροσδοκήτω φόβῳ τὸ ξίφος τῶν τούτων χειρῶν ἐκπεσείν παρασκευάσασα “By a sudden fright Fate caused the sword to fall from my hand.”

I 15.2: εἶ δὲ τι τῶν μὴ κατὰ γνώμην ἐκβέβηκεν, ἐκεῖνα μὲν τῇ Τύχῃ λογιστέον· “If something happens not according to plan, put it down to chance.”

I 22.4: τῆς ὀλκάδος ἐκστάντος καὶ τῇ Τύχῃ κυβερνῶν ἐπιτρέψαντος. “. . . giving up control of the boat and letting chance steer her.”

II 21.4: χαίρειν ἐκέλευεν, τῷ δὲ οὖ δύνασθαι φήσαντος, ἐπειδὴ μὴ οὖτω συμβαίνειν αὐτῷ παρὰ τῆς Τύχης. “He [Knemon] said, ‘Good day!’ He [Kalasiris] replied that he couldn’t have a good day when he was so out of luck.”

IV 8.6: τὸ ἐκ τῆς Τύχης ὀμφίβολον . . . θανάτου προδήλου . . . προτιμότερον “The uncertainty of chance is better than a certain death.”

IV 8.8: τὸ γὰρ ἀδήλον τῆς Τύχης ἀνθρώπως ἀγνωστὸν “Mankind cannot find out the uncertainties of chance.”

V 6.1: ἀχανεῖς εἰστήκεσαν οἰον ἀπαλγοῦντες πρὸς τὴν Τύχην “They stood and gaped, distressed by their bad luck.”

V 6.2: εἶδομεν τῇ Τύχῃ καὶ χωρήσομεν ὑμοί τῷ φέροντι “We shall yield to chance and go along with events.”

V 7.1: τὴν μὲν Τύχην ἐν δίκη κακηγορεῖσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν φάσκωσα “. . . accepting that their luck was justly accused by him,”

V 18.2: θαυμάζοντες ὡς παραλόγῳ τῇ Τύχῃ χρησαμένους εὐδιών τε καὶ ἀπήμονα πλοῦν ἐν χειμερίῳ “. . . astonished that by an exceptional piece of luck the voyage, although made in winter, was calm and trouble-free.”

V 29.2: πλοῦτον ὄν πολλοὶ πόνοι καὶ φειδωλοὶ συνήθροισαν ἀσώτῳ συμποσίῳ τῆς Τύχης ἐνυβρίσασα παραδούσης, “wealth gathered by great labour and parsimony, as luck would have it, was wasted on a ruinous drinking party.”

VI 8.5: καὶ οὐ τῶν ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνος ἡμῖν μέμψις, ὁ Τύχη καὶ δαιμόνες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πράττοιεν κατὰ γνώμην, τὸν δὲ καθ’ ἡμᾶς . . . “I don’t blame you for their happiness, O Luck and spirits, (I wish them all the best), but for our circumstances, . . .”
VII 21.5: φερειν τα προσπίπτοντα ἰδη μὲ πολλάκις ἡ τε Τύχη καὶ ἡ γνώμη παρεσκεύασε. “My luck and my intelligence have taught me to bear misfortunes.”

VII 26.2: νῦν τε ἐπειδῆ με καὶ δούλον ... ἡ Τύχη σὸν ἀπέφηνε, πολὺ πλέον εἰς πάντα ἐτοιμὸς εἶκειν. “since luck has made me your slave ... I am all the more ready to accept anything.” (ἡ Τύχη is here indistinguishable from the τύχη which is one’s lot in life, as it is in the following example.)

VII 27.2: σὲ μὲν γὰρ, ὦ βέλτιστε, ἡ Τύχη εἰδέναι τὰ τοιαῦτα καταναγκάζει, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἡ φύσις τὰ πρακτέα καὶ ὁ κατά τὸν ύπαγορεύει, “Friend, your luck has taught you this kind of thing, my innate intelligence and the need of the moment tells me what to do.”

VIII 6.4: ὦ δὲ ἡν πλέον ἀνήρ τῶτε ... μεγαλευχύμενος ἀμα πρὸς τὴν Τύχην ... “he was then more of a man ... looking luck boldly in the face.”

VIII 9.12: καθὸρὰν μὲν εἶναι με τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ὑμεῖς ἔστε μάρτυρες ἐκοῦσαν δὲ ὑπομένουσαν τὸν θάνατον διὰ τὸς ἀφορήτως τῆς Τύχης ἐπηρείας: “[Sun, Moon, and spirits] you are witnesses that I am innocent of the charges, but that I willingly await death because of the insupportable insults of fate.”

IX 2.1: καὶ βαβοὶ τῆς λαμπρᾶς ἔσοι μεταβολῆς· ταῦτα ἡμῖν ἡ Τύχη τὰ μεγάλα φιλανθρωπεύεται· χρυσὰ σιδηρὸν ὑμείβομεν. “Hurrah for the amazing change! Luck has been kind to us! We have changed our iron [fetters] for gold ones!”

IX 5.1: καὶ τὸν Ὀροουνδάτην ἐπικηρυκεύεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Ὕδάσπην ἰκέτευον, δ’ ἐπείθετο μὲν, δοῦλος καὶ ἄκων τῆς Τύχης γινόμενος, “they entreated Oroondates to send emissaries to Hydaspes. He agreed, because he was a slave, even if an unwilling one, to Fate.”

IX 6.3: οὐ γὰρ τυραννεῖ τὴν νίκην, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀνεμέστην διακεῖ τὴν τῶν ἄνθρωπων Τύχην. “He [King Hydaspes] did not act tyrannically in victory, but governed the fate of men moderately.”

IX 11.6: [The Syenian babies crawled on hands and knees towards the Ethiopian army] καθόπερ σχεδιασούσης ἐν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἱκέσιαν τῆς Τύχης. “as if Chance was improvising an appeal with them.”
IX 20.6: τὸν καιρὸν τῆς Τύχης εἰς ἐκθροῦ ὁμοίως, ὡς ἐφεκτεῖ, θηρώμενος. "trying, as it seemed, to use the opportunity presented by luck to take revenge on an enemy."

IX 26.1: τοὺς μὲν διαφοροῦμενος, οὓς δοῦλους ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγνώριζεν ἡ Τύχη, τοὺς δὲ ἐδὲ γεγονότας ἐλευθέρους ὁφείες. "giving away those whom fate had recognized as slaves from the first, and setting free the well born."

IX 26.2: οὐδὲ ἐπεζάγω τὴν Τύχην πρὸς πλεονέξιαν οὐδὲ εἰς ἀπειρον ἐκτείνω τὴν ἀρχὴν διὰ τὴν νίκην, "I will not push my luck excessively, or use victory to extend my power limitlessly."

X 2.1: τὴν νίκην ὡμίτοι τὴν κατὰ Περσῶν εὐστρεφεῖσθαι, οὐκ ἀλαζονεύομενος τὸ κατόρθωμα (τὸ γὰρ ἀδύρροπον τῆς Τύχης ἴλασκομαι), "I bring you the good news of victory over the Persians. I am not boasting of my success, for I do not want to tempt Fate,"

X 7.4: ὡς δὲ καὶ εὐγένεις τὸ βλέμμα, ὡς δὲ καὶ μεγαλόφρον πρὸς τὴν Τύχην, "How noble her look! What courage in the face of Fate!"

X 13.5: Hydaspes, seeing the tokens which prove Charikleia is his daughter, says, ["How do we know she is not dead,"] τοῖς δὲ γνωρίσμασιν ἐπιτυχόν τις ἀποκέχρητο τοῖς ἐκ τῆς Τύχης; "... and someone is making use of the tokens which by luck they have happened to find?"

X 16.3: πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιοῖν τῆς Τύχης ὑφ’ ἡδονῆς τε ᾗμα καὶ ἐλέους διακρύνοντας ... "weeping with pleasure and pity at the way luck had arranged things."

X 34.6: μέμφου δὲ τὴν Τύχην, εἰ τὴν ἐπιζητομένην οὖς εὐρίσκεις. "Blame luck if you do not find what you are looking for."

In several of these examples it is not clear whether ἡ Τύχη means Luck, or an individual’s fate or lot in life. In the following cases of ἡ τύχη it is clear that a pronoun denoting the individual whose personal τύχη is meant has been elliptically omitted: I 19.5; I 20.1; I 29.4; V 8.5; VII 26.10.

In fact in Heliodoros the personal τύχη, the general Τύχη and the various undetermined τύχαι all seem to act with precisely the same unmeaning randomness. However, it has been necessary to distinguish ἡ Τύχη, who could be regarded as a deity which affects lives, and can play a part in motivating the plots of novels, and examine her operation in isolation because of the confusion that has arisen in the scholarly literature about the relationship between θεὸς, δόξων and the deity Τύχη both in Heliodoros and in general.
In Apuleius *Metamorphoses*, by contrast, Fortune is random in the sense that her actions do not seem to be teleologically motivated, but she is also specifically a force for bad, the source of misfortune. Fortune in the Greek and Roman novels is discussed by V. Ciaffi. He argues that Fortune is primarily the adversary of preordained plans, but that she does have an actively hostile quality which is especially characteristic of her in Apuleius. In general the theological system in the *Metamorphoses* is very different from that in the *Aithiopika*. For Lucius, the central character of the *Metamorphoses*, Fortuna invariably brings changes for the worse, and in this respect mirrors Ὀδυσσεῖον in Heliodoros, but her influence is displaced in book XI by the benign Isis-Fortuna.

In Chariton τύχη, used in direct speech or by the narrator, is invariably bad except where it means a person’s lot or status in life. There are two exceptions to this generalisation: when τύχη is used by the brigands they regard its potential influence as beneficial.

Xenophon of Ephesos does not use the word τύχη, although he has the adjectives δυστυχής and εὔτυχής. Achilles Tatios too has these adjectives, and εὔτυχής, and cognate verbs, but with two exceptions does not use the noun τύχη. The exceptions are αἱ τύχαι at VII 2.1 where the influence of Fortune is bad, and its use in a good sense in the last paragraph, VIII 19.3: πορθέμεν οὖν ὡς καὶ συνεθήσοντες αὐτῷ καὶ εὐχόμενοι τῷ θεῷ τοὺς τε ἐμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖνου γάμους σὺν ἄγαθοῖς φυλισθήσοντοι τύχαις. This unique appearance of τύχαι in a good sense may signify that Fortune changes for the better at the end of the novel, or it may reflect formulaic usage in marriage prayers.

**VI. SUMMARY**

The purpose of this study has been to show that the various names which Heliodoros uses for the divine forces which influence the plot of the *Aithiopika* are not a sign of theological confusion. On the contrary, they are perfectly compatible with a coherent theological outlook. This coherent theological outlook is maintained by consistency in the use of terms for divine powers by the narrator, and in the construction of the plot. The same consistency in the

---

144 V. Ciaffi (1960).
146 τύχη means a person’s lot in life at Chariton II 5.9; II 10.7; II 11.5; III 8.1; in the first three of these four cases the status in life is in fact a bad one.
147 Chariton I 10.2; I 13.4.
use of divine terms is followed by the main characters: so much of the book is in direct speech that this is almost a prerequisite if a coherent theology is to be conveyed to the reader.

The supreme deity in the novel is the Sun, who is identified with Apollo and referred to as ὁ θεός. The hero is sacred to Apollo, and subsequently to the Sun; and the heroine to Artemis, and subsequently, to the Moon, (probably to be identified with Isis). ὅ δαίμον is another deity, or another aspect of the supreme deity, who is responsible for the misfortunes of the main characters. These misfortunes, however, do not prevent the ultimate realisation of the will of ὁ θεός, and may at times advance it. Ἡ Τοχα plays a part in motivating the plot, but does not actively oppose the will of ὁ θεός. She operates as completely random chance; it is not clear whether she is to be seen as a divinity.

This consistency does not demonstrate that the book was written with a religious purpose in mind, but it removes one of the principal objections to that view. A thoroughgoing solar theology in a philosophically developed form (rather than simply a solar cult) is unattested before lamblichos, in particular in his lost work or works which Julian used for his fourth oration. Thus the combination in Heliodoros of elements of Neo-Platonic or Neo-Pythagorean thought with heliolatry tends to support the fourth century date argued for elsewhere in this thesis.

148 Or. XI in the edition of Bidez. Julian acknowledges his dependence on lamblichos at 150d and 157cd.
HELIODOROS AND THE CULT OF THE SUN

This chapter is a survey of what we know about the cult of the Sun at Emesa, and asks whether there is any connection between The Aithiopika and the cult. First there is an examination of the novel's closing sentence, or sphragis, and what it tells us about the author, in its possible historical context. The historical background of the idea of the pagan saint, represented in the novel by Kalasiris, is considered. Then such evidence for the Emesene cult as may be relevant to The Aithiopika is collected; this evidence is found mainly in historical accounts of the emperor Elagabalus. In the next section some possible parallels between this cult and the novel are suggested. I conclude that while nothing is proved the possible connection of both the author and his novel with a sun cult need not be entirely dismissed: there are enough possible links to invite an intertextual relationship between our historical knowledge and our reading of the novel.

I. THE SPHRAGIS IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

We learn that Heliodoros came from Emesa in his book's final sentence, or sphragis: 

τοιόνδε πέρας ἔσχε τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν περὶ Θεαγένης καὶ Χαρίκλειον Ἀιθιοπικῶν ὁ συνέταξεν ἄνηρ Φοίνιξ Ἐμησηνός, τῶν ἀρ’ Ἡλίου γένος, Θεοδοσίου παῖς Ἡλιόδωρος. “This is the way the composition 'The Aithiopika' about Theagenes and Charikleia ends. It was composed by a Phoenician from Emesa, who belongs to the family descended from Helios, Heliodoros son of Theodosios by name.” There are a couple of problems with this statement. It is interesting that Heliodoros describes himself as a Phoenician. In 194 Septimius Severus divided Syria into Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice. Emesa was in the latter. Under Theodosius it was included in the new province of Phoenicia Libanensis, where it appears in the geographical writings of Hierocles and Ptolemy. We do not know when Emesenes first began to call themselves Phoenicians (it is not impossible that it was earlier than 194, but the evidence is slight). In the Epitome de Caesaribus Elagabalus is said to be Phoenician. According to the dating accepted here Heliodoros was writing at roughly the same time as Ammianus Marcellinus. Ammianus, who came from Antioch, includes in Syria Antioch, Laodicea, Apamea and Seleucia; in Phoenicia he includes Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Emesa, Damascus. Incidentally, there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of this sentence. J.R. Morgan (1978) ad loc. insists that stylistically it is entirely typical of the author, particularly the way the structure of the sentence draws attention to the name in the final position. I am sure he is right. The specific phrase used by Heliodoros, ἐν Φοίνικι, is discussed above, p76.

149 I refer to intertextuality to emphasize that my interest is in the readers' response to the text, and not an authorial process. The possible relevance of a knowledge of the historical and intellectual provenance of the text is discussed in the next chapter (p74ff).

150 Incidentally, there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of this sentence. J.R. Morgan (1978) ad loc. insists that stylistically it is entirely typical of the author, particularly the way the structure of the sentence draws attention to the name in the final position. I am sure he is right.

151 The specific phrase used by Heliodoros, ἐν Φοίνικι, is discussed above, p76.
The word γένος also presents a problem. For the omission of the article J.R. Morgan\textsuperscript{152} draws attention to parallels at I 19.4 (of ancestry; cf my commentary ad loc.), II 34.2 (of ancestry), VIII 17.3 (of race), but how should the word be translated here? Morgan, who rejected the view that the religious element in The Aithiopika has a consistent character, solar or otherwise, suggested as one possibility that Helios is here a family name. Helios is occasionally attested as a personal name for a gladiator;\textsuperscript{153} it is not attested as a personal name in Syria. When Julian\textsuperscript{154} refers to the service of the sun as inherited he is almost certainly referring to his membership of the imperial house, whose solar character is discussed by J. Maurice.\textsuperscript{155} Himerios,\textsuperscript{156} in an oration probably addressed to Constantine\textsuperscript{157} writes: ὁ καὶ τοῦ σαυτοῦ γένους ὡμία φανότατον, καὶ ταῦταν τῷ γένει γενόμενος, ὅπερ καὶ σοι πολλάκις ὁ προπάτωρ Ἡλιὸς. “O, brightest luminary of your family line, you have conferred the same advantage on that line as your ancestor the sun has often conferred on you.” Does this mean that Heliodoros is claiming to be a member of the imperial house? We cannot rule it out, but I think there is an easier explanation of his use of the expression τῶν ὑπὸ Ἡλιοῦ γένος. Both γένος and γενεά are used by Christian writers for the ‘family’ of all Christians. In Photios’s Damascios οἰκεία is similarly used for a pagan priesthoth at Heliopolis, who combine cult service with philosophy, just as Heliodoros’ Kalasiris does: ἐὰν ἔσεα γενεά καὶ ἐσπερίδη διέξη βίον θεοφιλή καὶ εὐδοκίμων, τῶν τε φιλοσοφούντα καὶ τῶν τὰ θεία θεραπεύοντα. ἀνέκακον ὑσιῷ πυρὶ τούς βομύοις. “The religious order leads a godly and blessed life among itself, studying philosophy and looking after the cult. They light the altars with sacred fire.” In view of the good press Heliodoros gives to Kalasiris, who is at once a saint, priest and philosopher, it is tempting to think that he himself belonged to such a religious order at Emesa. The existence of such an order is clearly indicated by the lines of Avienus (1083-1090):

\begin{quote}
Et quae Phoebeam procul incunabula lucem  
Prima fovent, Emesus fastigia celsa renidet.  
Nam diffusa solo latus explicat, ac subit auras  
Turribus in caelum nitentibus: incola Claris  
Cor studis acuit, vitam pius imbuit ordo;  
Denique flammicomo devoti pectora Soli
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{152}loc. cit. The omission of the article with γένος is an imitation of Herodotos found only in Philostratos, and here and elsewhere in Heliodoros (cf. note ad I 22.2 in the commentary below), so this stylistic feature strongly supports the view that the sentence is authentic.  
\textsuperscript{153}For references v. H. Seyrig \textit{Syria} 48 (1971) 373 n1.  
\textsuperscript{154}Jul. \textit{Or.} IV 131d.  
\textsuperscript{155}J. Maurice (1912) II pxx-xlvi.iiii.  
\textsuperscript{156}Himerios ed. A. Colonna \textit{Fragment} I 6.  
\textsuperscript{157}v. Himerios ed. A. Colonna p.xvi.
Vitam agitant; Libanus frondosa cacumina turget,
Et tamen his celsi certant fastigia templi.

And the cradle which first nurtured Phoebus' light, the Mount of Emesa, gleams on its heavenly peaks. Its extensive slope spreads out on the ground, and it approaches the upper air with its turrets which stretch towards heaven. The inhabitant refines his heart with distinguished studies and the pious order instructs his life. In short, those who have devoted their heart to the flaming sun lead their lives there. Mount Lebanon swells with its leafy tops; however the peaks of this heavenly temple compete with them.

Avienus' work is broadly based on the geography of Dionysios Periegetes of the time of Hadrian. Dionysios' poem must have contained lines on Emesa but they are unfortunately lost. Therefore we cannot tell how much of this goes back to Dionysios and how much is due to Avienus; in short, we cannot tell whether this attestation for a religio-philosophical order belongs to the third or the late fourth century. The documentary evidence for priestly families and associations at Palmyra, Hatra and Tyre is collected by J.T. Milik (1972). Often the orders are described as clans (φύλακτοι), but the expression used by Heliodoros can be compared with the phrase οἱ ἐγ γένοις Ζαβδιωτηρίων which is found in an inscription of 178/9 from a portico in Palmyra. On the basis of appearances of the BNY ZBDBWL in inscriptions and tesserae from Palmyra J.T. Milik concludes that this was a family of priests in a temple sacred principally to the sun, in conjunction with Allath and Râhim.

It is disputed whether the name Heliodoros has any religious significance. The name is common throughout the Roman Near East. It is one of the few names attested on the inscriptions by votaries, probably priests, of Bel from the area of the Elagabalium on the Palatine. Many examples of the name Heliodoros were found at Dura-Europos. The name Ἱεβσομισος found on a painting in the temple of the Palmyrene gods at Dura is plausibly identified as a translation of Heliodoros by F. Cumont, although we have no inscriptions recording an individual who bore both the names Heliodoros and Ἱεβσομισος. However, there is an inscription dated 153 from the temple Αζαζαναθκονα at Dura.

158 v. C. Müller GGM II p161.
159 W. Dittenberger (1905) 635.
160 ClSem 3950-3955.
162 IGUR 117,118; cf 119; these inscriptions are discussed by F. Chausson (unpub.) as are possible Semitic equivalents of the name Heliodoros. I am grateful to Dr. Chausson for showing me this article in advance of publication.
164 M.I. Rostovtzeff (1934) p151.
naming a Heliodoros whose father Theodoros also bore a solar Semitic name, Σωρούνος (‘The Sun created’). All in all, in view of the perennial importance of names in non-Christian Semitic cultures it would be rash to assume that the name Heliodoros had nothing to do with the religious affiliations of the writer’s family.

II. THE PAGAN SAINT AND THE AITHIOPIKA

Kalasiris in The Aithiopika presents himself as learned in philosophy: both speculative philosophy, which is broadly derived from the Platonic tradition, and the practical philosophy of pure living which is broadly derived from the Pythagorean tradition, and which, by the fourth century tended to go hand in hand with Platonic thought. He is also a priest, and is, or presents himself as, an assiduous devotee of cult practices. In this combination he belongs to the type of the ‘pagan saint’ which is readily identifiable in biographical and hagiographic literature at least from the late third century on. Kalasiris also, alone of the characters in the Aithiopika, receives the epithet θείος, which is typically applied to the holy man, both pagan and Christian, in the third and increasingly in the fourth century.

An interesting early indication of the impulse to link religious cult with philosophy can be found in Philostratos Life of Apollonios of Tyana. This work, which was written at the behest of Julia Domna, and probably published during the reign of Elagabalus, creates an image of the philosopher Apollonios as a sage and miracle worker. To what extent this portrayal is fictional is disputed. At II 38 we are told that Apollonios is in the habit of praying to the sun. This fact is mentioned only once, and is contextually irrelevant; the simplest explanation for its insertion is that Philostratos added this point at the request of Julia Domna, (who was the daughter of a priest of the Emesene god). Philostratos Life of Apollonios of Tyana, presents a ‘pagan saint’,

---

165 Kalasiris as addressed as θείος (by Knemon) at III 14.1, and as θείος (by Nausikles) at V 12.2. Charikleia refers to him as θείοτος at VIII 11.2 and 9.

166 Examples of its application to Iamblichos by Julian, Libanios, and others are given by G. Fowden JHS 102 (1982) 36 n18 and E. Zeller & R. Mondofo 1961 5 n6. When applied to pagan holy men it is usually taken to mean ‘divine’ (e.g. by G. Fowden, op. cit. 36), and its application to Pythagoras, for example, to whom was attributed divine parentage, seems to support this translation. However, its similar application to Christian saints, whom Christian writers might have called ‘holy’ but not ‘divine’, must cast grave doubt on this translation.

167 Even if one accepts the usual surmise that the work was published only after Julia Domna’s death, and during the reign of her great-nephew Elagabalus, there is no reason to assume that Philostratos would have gone through the earlier books deleting material which he had included to please her. It seems to me that the inclusion of this point in the Life of Apollonios probably indicates that Julia Domna was interested in the cult of the Sun, but that the small part which Philostratos has given it indicates that, whatever our assessment of the
holy man who is both a philosopher and a miracle worker. Moreover, Heliodoros alludes to the Life of Apollonios, he was certainly familiar with the work, and probably aware that it was commissioned by the Emesene Julia Domna.

Closer to the fourth century date which is the most likely for Heliodoros, Lamblichos (who probably flourished in the second half of the third century) was presented as a ‘pagan saint’ of this type by his followers. Indeed, Lamblichos, who may have been a product of the house of priestly rulers of Emesa, seems to have been a key figure in the integration of cult and philosophy, and the creation of the idea of a sage who combined an interest in both.\textsuperscript{168} The bulk of his work has not survived, and it is not possible to prove that he combined an adherence to Emesene ritual with his Neo-Platonic and theurgic speculations, although he does seem to have had an interest in ritual in general. It is certainly notable that he continued to be known by his Semitic name, which had been associated with his family in the past, when it was usual for hellenized easterners to use a Greek name.\textsuperscript{169}

Lamblichos’ own interest in the idea of a holy man who combines philosophy with magical powers is evident in his \textit{De Vita Pythagorica}. This work shares several preoccupations with Philostratos \textit{Life of Apollonios}. In both we find an emphasis on the virtues of restraint, of purity and of vegetarianism, on the holy man’s almost divine status, his magical powers, and his practical, political wisdom as well as his esoteric knowledge. The Pythagorean elements in the \textit{Aithiopika} are closely linked with the biographical tradition of the ‘pagan’ holy man, simply because it is through the biographical tradition that much Pythagorean thought is mediated. As well as vegetarianism, the Pythagorean biographical tradition implicitly advocates bloodless sacrifice,\textsuperscript{170} such as the gymnosophists of Heliodoros X would prefer. If the \textit{Aithiopika} does reflect Neo-Pythagorean thought it is tempting to link the importance of Apollo in the plot with the importance of Apollo for Pythagoreanism.\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{158}The importance of Lamblichos in the integration of cult and philosophy is discussed by G. Fowden \textit{JHS} 102 (1982) 52-53. The information about Lamblichos’ royal descent comes in a statement at the beginning of Photios’ summary of Damascios \textit{Life of Isidoros}, and is discussed by G. Fowden, op. cit. 49 n128.

\textsuperscript{168}I am indebted to Professor Polymnia Athanassiadi for the points in this paragraph.

\textsuperscript{170}Diogenes Laertius VIII 13; Lamblichos \textit{De Vita Pythagorica} 25.

\textsuperscript{171}In Lamblichos \textit{De Vita Pythagorica} 5 Lamblichos (quoting a ‘Samian poet’) states that Pythagoras was a son of Apollo, and the importance of Apollo for him is made clear in several other places in that work.
More compellingly, perhaps, the importance of absolute chastity and its link with ritual purity in the Aithiopika is sufficiently unusual in non-Christian writing to suggest that it reflects a similar idea in Pythagorean thought, or at least the Iamblichian version of Pythagorean thought.\textsuperscript{172} It is observed in the note on I 8.3 below how few pagan writers use the word καθαρός in connection with chastity. In fact Iamblichos seems to be the only pagan writer apart from Heliodoros who uses the word in connection with chastity in a context which makes it clear that chastity has a general religious importance;\textsuperscript{173} (the quotation from Julian in the note on I 8.3 is not a precise parallel because it refers to the chastity specifically of a priestess). Like Heliodoros, Iamblichos' concern is with chastity, not celibacy.

My feeling is that the religious and philosophical world portrayed by Heliodoros is dependent on the ideas of Iamblichos, and that if more of the work of Iamblichos survived it would be evident that Heliodoros was a follower of Iamblichos, but a follower who was more accommodating to Christian thought than was Julian. Iamblichos De mysteriis also offers the only theological theorizing in a pagan author which could explain the distinction between a good god and a base daimon which was identified in the foregoing chapter.\textsuperscript{174} In that work it is explained that daimones govern the physical being, and tend to degrade, whereas gods are entirely good. It is also clear that celestial bodies are important manifestations of gods, and the sun is frequently mentioned in the De mysteriis. Moreover, an almost technical use of the word ἀντίθεος in Heliodoros is otherwise found (and explained) exclusively in the De mysteriis;\textsuperscript{175} and in this work too Egyptian προφήται are presented as a reliable source of information on religio-philosophical matters: indeed De mysteriis (which is narrated entirely in the person of a προφήτης) and the

\textsuperscript{172}Iamblichos De Vita Pythagorica . . . ὡς άπό μὲν τοῦ συνοικουντός άνδρός ὅσιος ἄτειν οὐθημερόν προσέναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ προσθήκοντος οὐδέποτε. It is possible that for both Iamblichos and Heliodoros the emphasis on absolute chastity had no non-Christian antecedent, but that both were responding to Christian teaching when they expressed such views. M. Foucault (1988 165-175) identifies the Stoic Musonius Rufus as an early, and therefore a key non-Christian thinker who recommended that marriage should be absolutely exclusive; it seems unlikely that Heliodoros was influenced by Musonius except in an indirect way.

\textsuperscript{173}Iamblichos De Mysteriis IV 11: ἐρωτᾷ δὴ καὶ ἄμα ἀπορεῖς μετὰ τούτοις, ὡς μὴ καθαρός μὲν ὄντι εἶ ἀφρόδισιον σῶκ ἐὰν καλοῦντε ὑποκεύσαιεν [sc. the gods], σὺντι δὲ ἄγειν εἰς παράνομα ἀφροδίσια τοὺς τυχόντας σῶκ ὑποκεύσαιν.\textsuperscript{174}v. in particular p50 above.

\textsuperscript{175}v. p23 above. G.N. Sandy TAPA 1982 141-167 draws attention to the fact that when Kalasiris asserts that his work has been hindered by an ἀντίθεος he is using a lamblichan idea. Sandy, offended by the insider’s view of a miracle worker which Heliodoros presents, regards Kalasiris as a charlatan, and as an implausible holy man: this implies that Sandy holds the naïve belief that true holy men and effective magicians are never duplicitous, a belief that a study of the anthropological literature on 'witch doctors' and so on should have dispelled.
Aithiopika are the only extant Greek texts where an Egyptian προφήτης dispenses wisdom in the first person. It is clear from Julian that we have lost important discussions of solar theology by Iamblichos (v. n148), but it is arguable that the supreme god, the θεὸς εἷς described in De mysteriis VIII 2, is to be identified with the sun, who is described as ὁ θεὸς and ὁ εἷς θεὸς in the De mysteriis VII 3, which deals with the sun’s supremacy in the zodiac. 176

III. THE SUN CULT AT EMESA

In respect of Syria, there is a little evidence for the dissemination of the Heliodorean notion of a priest who is also a philosopher. Iamblichos seems likely to have been an Emesene, as already noted. In Damaskios Life of Isidoros, the philosopher Isidoros clearly takes a great interest in local cults (although this may merely reflect the interests of the later Syrian, Damaskios himself), in the Life of Isidoros 177 we encounter a Eusebius who tends a betyl at Emesa and is usually taken to be the father of the Eusebius who was teacher to the Emperor Julian. The lines of Avienus quoted above, seem to support the statement in Damaskios 178 describing a Heliopolitan priesthood which combines devotion to cult, philosophy and a pious lifestyle.

Archaeological evidence for religious life at Emesa (indeed any archaeological evidence for Emesa) is slight. It is probable that the remains of ancient Emesa are buried beneath the buildings of modern Homs. On the raised part of the town, the most likely spot for an important temple, there is a mosque. In both Palmyrene and Phoenician cults there are solar gods, but not in a supreme position in the pantheon. The question of whether the sun was supreme at Emesa could probably be answered by excavation, but there is little prospect of this. The notion of a supreme rôle for a solar god at Emesa is not supported by the surviving dedications by Emesenes and from the region of Emesa. 179

176 Although there is a good case that Heliodoros was influenced by the thought of Iamblichos, the theology of the Aithiopika is not sufficiently developed to allow us to discuss in any detail how it overlaps with the theology of Iamblichos. However, we can say that the theological pattern which can be identified in the Aithiopika is at least consistent with what we know of the theology of Iamblichos. The clearest indication of how the sun and moon probably fit into the overall theological system which lies behind the De mysteriis is given in VIII 3 (264). Here Iamblichos is describing several categories ἑκατέρων of Egyptian gods. The categories concerned with the created world ἑκατέρων are governed by the sun and the moon: ἐστι δὴ

177 Dam. Isicl. 348.
178 Dam. Isid. 342: also quoted above.
179 The crop of pagan dedications from Emesa recorded in the IGLS is very meagre.
Therefore we must depend mainly on the literary evidence. The earliest literary evidence linking Emesa with a cult of the sun is found in accounts of the emperor Elagabalus, who reigned during the years 218-222. The earliest of these are the near contemporary accounts by Dio Kassios from Nicea in Bithynia, and in the Lives of the Caesars written by Herodian. The only substantial later account is the life of Elagabalus in the Historia Augusta. The later Epitomators add nothing to our knowledge of the sun cult. It is not surprising that modern accounts of the cult tend to focus on Elagabalus and the cults he founded at Rome. However the cult may have existed long before the emperor Elagabalus and continued long after him. In any case, the attention we pay to him and to the Roman cult must distort our picture of what was going on at Emesa.

The most detailed literary sources to describe the religious practices of the emperor Antoninus, nicknamed Elagabalus after the god he served, are Dio Kassios (LXXIX) LXXX; Herodian History V 5-8; and the life of Elagabalus in the Historia Augusta, together with a few other references to Elagabalus in that work.

Dio and Herodian are closer in time to the emperor’s reign than the Historia Augusta, and the most reliable. Herodian’s general interest in religious matters has been noted before. In a recent article A. Scheithauer attempts to solve the question of whether Herodian’s account of Elagabalus is dependent on Dio’s by making a detailed examination of the literary construction of the two passages; she concludes that Herodian certainly used Dio, and that he was particularly interested in the information Dio provides about Elagabalus in his rôle as priest of the Emesene sun cult. In fact Herodian’s account contains less expression of horror than Dio’s, and seems to be better informed in religious matters. It is tempting to see it as selection of material from Dio worked up by someone with a good general knowledge of oriental religion. The tradition that Herodian was Syrian is, of course, conjectural.

When Elagabalus’ antics are reported, Herodian (V 5.3-4) goes into more detail than does Dio (LXXX 11). In particular he attempts to be more precise about the appearance of the dress and shows that he (or his source) is capable of making local distinctions concerning its geographical origin. Dio: . . . τὴν ἄδητα τὴν βαρβαρικὴν, ἦν ἐν τῶν Σύρων ἱερεῖς χρώντα. “[He wore] the barbarian garb which the priests of the Syrians use.” Here ‘Syrian’ is probably a more or less generic term for oriental cults. Herodian: ἦν τε ἀντι τὸ σχῆμα μεταξὺ Φοινίκης ἱερὸς στολῆς καὶ χλιδῆς Μηδικῆς. “Its pattern

---

180 e.g. by W. Widmer (1967) p57ff.
181 A. Scheithauer Hermes (1990) 335-356.
was a cross between a Phoenician robe and Persian finery.” H. Seyrig argued that the costume was Parthian, and came to Emesa via Palmyra, with which Emesa, he believed, had close links. Herodian also tells of celebrations and of Phoenician women dancing with cymbals and drums (V 5.9).

Herodian (V 6.2) and Dio (LXXX 9.3-4) both report that the Emperor married a Vestal Virgin. Herodian, but not Dio, says that Vesta is a Roman god and that her servants are bound to remain virgins to the end of their lives; this is information which, for a writer and audience familiar with Roman traditions, it would be redundant to spell out. The explanation which the Emperor offered for his apparent impiety, particularly in Herodian’s version, finds an echo in Heliodoros I 21.1. Dio says, ἐτόλιμπε δὲ καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι ἵνα δὴ καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς παιδεῖς ἐκ τε ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁρχιερέας ἐκ τε ταύτης τῆς ἁρχιερείας γεννῶνται, τοῦτ’ ἐποίησα.” “He dared to say, ‘I did it so that from me as high priest and her as high priestess children worthy of the god might be born.’” Herodian, who lacks Dio’s wish to make everything sound as shocking as possible, says simply, ἄρμόζοντά τε καὶ σφαδόσιμον εἶναι γαμὸν τερείας τε καὶ τερείας.” “[He said] that it was fitting and venerable for there to be a marriage of a priest and a priestess.”

The Emperor also ‘married’ his god to a goddess, with great public festivities. Both this action and his own marriage to a priestess should probably be regarded as ritual ‘sacred marriages’. Dio mentions that the Emperor effected the marriage of the god Elagabalus to the Carthaginian Urania. Herodian adds that the Carthaginian Dea Caelestis, ‘Urania’, was known as Ἀστροφόρχη, and also mentions a previous marriage to Athena. Incidentally, the two marriages, first to Athena, and then to Urania, may be explained by the fact that the Emesene god belonged to a triad, at least, it seems, in the minds of the expatriates who erected an inscription to Elagabalus, and the two other members of a triad of θεοὶ ἐπήκοοι at Cordova in the third century A.D.

---

182 H. Seyrig *Syria* 18 (1937) p7.
183 Noted by F. Altheim (1952) II 269 n71a.
184 Herodian V 6.3-5; Dio LXXX 9.3-4.
185 This interpretation is discussed in RAC IV 996-997; M. Frey (1989) 87ff.
186 This is the supplemented version of the inscription offered in the article by F.F.H.v. Gaertringen et al. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 22 (1923/4) 117-132, in which ‘Nazaia’ is taken to be Urania. 'Επικόσιος ευεργέτας Ἡλίῳ μεγάλῳ Φρήν Ὑλεοφάλῳ καὶ Κυρήνι. Γάρι Ναζαία καὶ τὰς Ἀλλαθ Αουδείσεια καὶ Κυρήν.] ἐπικόσιος θεοῖς εὐεργέταις 
As far as I know the most recent restoration is that by J.T. Milik *Syria* (1967) 301: 
[θεοῖς] ἐπικόσιος 
[πατρόσιος] ευεργέταις 
[θεῷ] Ἡλίῳ μεγάλῳ Φρήνῃ. 
[στοῖ] Ὑλεοφάλῳ καὶ Κυρήν.]
It would be interesting to know whether there is any substance in the accusations of child sacrifice which are made against the Emperor, and if so, what precedent the practice had in the Emesene cult. The possibility of child sacrifice in the third century has generally been treated with scepticism, but M. Frey has collected texts which show that it can by no means be ruled out.

IV. THE EMESENE CULT AND THE AITHIOPIKA

There are two themes in the Aithiopika which may recall what we learn about Elagabalus' cult practices from Dio and Herodian. Both come together in the climax of the tale, in the last few pages of the book. One is human sacrifice, or rather its abolition; the other is the concept of sacred marriage which finds its fulfilment when the hero and heroine are crowned priest of the sun and priestess of the moon and are then married in a highly ritualistic way.

I will discuss the question of human sacrifice first. We saw above that Elagabalus was accused of human sacrifice, and that M. Frey (1989) has shown that we are certainly not entitled to assume that the accusation cannot have been true. In Heliodoros X the hero and heroine, having arrived in Ethiopia, are due to be sacrificed, and the abolition of human sacrifice is the key to the happy ending of the story in their marriage. The way Heliodoros presents it is surprising. Human sacrifice is not presented as the ultimate depravity of a barbarous race, but as the wrong but understandable tradition of an otherwise law abiding, almost utopian, people and king. The practice is discontinued when an omen from the gods is interpreted by the wise, ascetic gymnosophist, Sisimithres, who incidentally, speaks Greek, unlike the Ethiopian laity. In Heliodoros the potential victims are prisoners of war who can be sacrificed only if they are virgins; as it happens they are well-born. The alleged victims of Elagabalus were well-born native youths (that is, native Roman, not native Syrian) whose parents were both still living. Imputations of human sacrifice, both in classical writers and among primitive peoples, are usually accompanied by disgust and made to illustrate the barbarity of the 'other' - neighbours,
The great importance of the theme of human sacrifice in the *Aithiopika*, and the unusual way it is handled, is, superficially, utterly bizarre. It could be explained if the story, in which the introduction of a philosophical perspective sanitizes the religious observance and belief of the pious Ethiopian children of the sun, had some contemporary relevance either to the beliefs of the author’s fellow Emesenes, or to any unsavoury reputation they may have wished to lose. At the very least an Emesene of Heliodoros’ day is likely to have been aware that the famous son of their city, the emperor Elagabalus, had an unsavoury reputation, and if they read Herodian or Dio they knew some of the charges against him.

The second theme which the *Aithiopika* shares with the stories about Elagabalus is that of sacred marriage. When Thyamis, the dispossessed priest turned bandit, wants to marry Charikleia he says that it is particularly appropriate for a priest to marry a priestess (I 21). As we noted above, this is precisely the excuse ascribed by Herodian to Elagabalus when he married the Vestal virgin. We also noted above that Elagabalus’ behaviour pointed to a ritual of sacred marriage, a ritual which is otherwise hardly attested for Syria. In particular the marriage of his god to the Carthaginian ‘Urania’ was regarded as a marriage between the sun and the moon. In fact in Heliodoros a marriage between a priest of the sun and a priestess of the moon is ultimately what happens when the hero and heroine are married.

The hero of the *Aithiopika*, Theagenes, is compared with, and said to be descended from Achilles, himself the offspring of a well known union of a god with a mortal. The reader’s attention is drawn to this sacred union by the hymn to Thetis which is recited at the festival at which Theagenes and Charikleia first see each other; the sacred marriage is emphasized in the version of the hymn which Heliodoros gives us, whereas it is not emphasised in the hymn in Philostratos *Heroicos* upon which this hymn, assuming it is later, is closely modelled. The semi-divine descent of Theagenes is again pointed up when he is cryptically referred to as “goddess-born” (τὸν τε θεός γενέτην) by the oracle.

In the last chapter of the novel Theagenes and Charikleia, having been instated as priest and priestess of the sun and moon at Meroë, sacrifice to their respective gods. They then travel in pomp to the city, accompanied by music and dancing, which was a feature of the rituals of Elagabalus, as it was of other

---

190The claim is made explicitly by Charikles, as Kalasiris tells Knemon at II 34.4.
191Heliodoros III 2.
193Heliodoros II 35.
194Heliodoros X 41.
Syrian rituals. In the city mysterious marriage rites will take place; (τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ γάμῳ μυστικοτέρων κατὰ τὸ ἐστὶ φανδρότερον τελεσθησομένων.) After this hint Heliodoros piously tells no more. The closing sphragis follows.

V. CONCLUSION

In Heliodoros we find an interest in cult practices united with a philosophically sophisticated solar theology in which the sun is the supreme god. When was philosophical theology first absorbed by the practitioners of Syrian cults? The general answer must be that Hellenic philosophy began to influence local cults as soon as hellenism reached their practitioners. This is certainly not to say that there was no syncretistic thinking before the arrival of Greek philosophy. The intellectual framework, however, and international outlook of hellenism stimulated syncretism. On the other hand, both Mithraic ideas and the tendency to view the sun as the supreme deity came very late to the orient. If Elagabalus wished to promote the idea that the sun is the supreme god (which I doubt), then the precedent would surely have come primarily not from a Syrian cult, or from Platonic theology, but from the solar dimension of the imperial cult which went back to Augustus. The use of the title Sol Invictus for the imperial cult shows that it had become linked with that great solar cult, Mithraism.¹⁹⁵

In conclusion, then, there are some grounds for thinking that the cult at Emesa has left a mark on Heliodoros. These are, the way he describes himself in his sphragis; his interest in the idea of a philosopher priest; his strange handling of the topic of human sacrifice; and the prominent position he gives to the Sun as a deity, along with the hint of a marriage between the Sun and the Moon. At the same time there is a lack evidence about the Emesene cult which could link it with the syncretistic tendency and Platonic views hinted at in the Aithiopika, unless Iamblichos, who seems likely to have influenced Heliodoros, was associated with the Emesene cult.

¹⁹⁵The link between the imperial cult and Mithraism has been denied by G.H. Halsberghe ANRW II 17.4 2181-2201. On the positive side see D.W. McDowall (1979) and M. Clauss Athenaeum 68 (1990) 432-450.
INTERPRETATIVE ISSUES

The present commentary is concerned in the main with philological questions. In other words (to state the obvious) it is concerned in the main with issues at the level of the word. It is concerned with the questions, which words should appear in a correct text, and how should a reader interpret them? The philologist who undertakes to endow words with meaning has of course more scope for subjectivity than the palaeographer, whose task is to interpret letters, but his work is less subjective than the task of interpreting texts in their entirety.

Since a critical response is wholly dependent on understanding the words which make up a text it is not surprising that scholars sometimes combine philological enquiry with critical response in a single piece of work. The commentary below where appropriate alerts the reader to critical work on the Aithiopika, but by and large is restricted to philological points: even the broader discussions, like the search for the historical people behind οἱ θηριωτικοί or the collection of words and usages which point to a fourth century date are discussions about the denotations and connotations of words and phrases. As such they should be useful to the reader and critic who approaches the Aithiopika as literary text; they should also be useful to the researcher who treats the text as a document for the history of society, religion, language and so on. In this chapter I suggest some ways in which the philological points raised in the commentary could affect the interpretation of the Aithiopika as a literary text.

In the commentary on 1.1.1 I discuss how the 'framing device' of a picture which the author purports to describe may define the genre of the work in hand as fiction. The point is not perhaps simply that the reader is informed that what he is about to read is only the description of a picture (and therefore is not really factual); the device introduces ambiguity into the reader's perception of the distinction between what is factual and what is not. The reader may wonder, did the picture which Longos, or Achilles Tatios purports to describe

---

196 A recent example of such work on the Aithiopika comes to mind: E.L. Bowie (1995) makes literary critical points which are almost wholly based on fresh philological enquiry. In the second part of this article, for instance, the identification of a verbal allusion to Longos is within the scope of philological enquiry: allusions to Longos are part of the verbal code of the Greek of Heliodorus, and could connote a comparison of the gem which Heliodorus is describing with the text Daphnis and Chloe; the examination of how this interpretation is relevant to the interpretation of the Aithiopika as a whole is literary criticism.

197 The dangers of using an ancient novel as an historical document are made clear, for example, by J.J. Winkler JHS 100 (1980) 155-181; however, the problem is surely that novels have often been used uncritically as historical sources, rather than that any use of a novel as an historical source is, as Winkler implies, a kind of misappropriation of the text.
really exist? and does the author accurately retell the tale which he purports to have heard?

Texts which produce uncertainty about their own truth value, and relative truth value, continue to pose for readers the problem of fictionality. Does Proust speak, or his fictional narrator? In either case, are his memories accurate? A variation on the picture as framing device for a narrative is the use of an introduction claiming a documentary source for what is narrated. This is used by Umberto Eco in *The Name of the Rose*. The author (like Nabokov in *Lolita*) balances his quasi-veracious introduction, asserting that the book is based on a documentary source, with an afterword which is veracious at least insofar as it is written under the name of the author which appears on the title page of the novel. (Heliodoros too places the only sentence for whose veracity he appears to vouch under his own name at the end of the novel.) Eco’s afterword is published as *Reflections on the Name of the Rose*. In it Eco remarks (p32-33) ‘I knew that I was narrating the story with the words of another person . . .’. On the next page Eco compares himself not with another writer, but, teasingly, with a fictional character: ‘. . . and the whole experience recalled to me (I mean physically, with the clarity of madeleine dipped in limeflower tea) certain childish games . . .’ - and even more teasingly, since the action of his novel is filtered through his hero’s memory, he mis-remembers Proust’s narrator’s experience (for whom, precisely, it was the madeleine dipped in thé, not tilleul, which activated the memory).

The author of *Diktys of Crete* too begins by asserting a documentary source. Apuleius in the first few chapters of *Metamorphoses*, and elsewhere in the text, raises the issue of the fictionality of his material in a way which is appropriately confusing. Ancient authors of narrative fictions seem to have raised the issue of fictionality more often than novelists of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, for whose readers perhaps, the generic conventions of prose fiction are, so to speak, taken more for granted. Antonios Diogenes seems, as far as we can tell from Photios’ summary, to have produced, in the *Wonders beyond Thule*, a text in which uncertainty about the relative truthfulness of the material is developed to an extreme degree. Antonios Diogenes, too, used not one, but two introductory epistles to claim (contradictory) documentary sources for his narrative; S.A. Stephens & J.J. Winkler (1995) 103 suggest that one letter was contained within the other. Lucian playfully subverts the practice of producing uncertainty about a text’s truthfulness when he explicitly denies the

---

198 This point is demonstrated by A. Laird (1993) in an article which is in general very germane to the present discussion.

199 J.R. Morgan (1993) thoroughly explores ancient attitudes to fictionality, the techniques of Antonios Diogenes, and the ways in which the issue of fictionality was dealt with in ancient novels.
truth of the *Verae historiae* at the end of the prologue (I 1-4). It is surely this, as much as the outrageous bizarrerie, which interested him in the *Wonders beyond Thule* or some similar work.

There is no such framing device in the *Aithiopika*. However, there are other methods used by authors of prose fiction for creating an ambiguous factuality. Related to the technique of using a framing device for the entire narrative is the way Heliodoros conveys much of the plot in words spoken by characters. J.J. Winkler *YCS* 27 (1982) 93-159 has shown how the device of presenting much of the plot of the *Aithiopika* in the words of Kalasiris makes its truthfulness ambiguous within the context of the text, which is, after all fictional: in other words the relative truthfulness of what Kalasiris tells is ambiguous. In a fictional text, each time the telling of a story is incorporated within another story adds to the reader’s uncertainty about the relative factuality of the material. Moreover, the *Aithiopika* shares with the Odyssey not only a narrative structure, but also the detail that Kalasiris’ story, like Odysseus’ stories told to the Phaiakians, is told because he wants some return (specifically, Knemon has promised to produce Theagenes and Charikleia in exchange for the story). It is not irrelevant that it is to Odysseus that Kalasiris should have sacrificed, as he learns when he dreams of Odysseus: Odysseus is an appropriate patron for Kalasiris, and he should therefore sacrifice to him, just as it is to Hermes, the god of merchants, that Nausikles the merchant sacrifices.

The closest Heliodoros comes to using a framing device for the narrative as a whole is the inclusion of a *sphragis* disclosing his own identity. Here he describes himself as αὐνήρ Φοινιξ: Heliodoros is not given to redundancy of expression, and the preference for the phrase αὐνήρ Φοινιξ (rather than simply Φοινιξ) requires explanation. The phrase is not common in Greek literature, but occurs once in Homer, Od. XIV 288. Here Odysseus, having arrived in Ithaka, is posing as a Cretan. In the midst of his own deception he refers to a (presumably invented) Φοινιξ αὐνήρ who deceived him and stole his possessions. Surely here by his reference to a fictional liar (the Φοινιξ αὐνήρ) described by a fictional liar (Odysseus posing as a Cretan) Heliodoros is drawing attention to the ambiguous status (in terms of factuality) of his own narrative, just as the narrative of Kalasiris is ambiguous in terms of factuality.

The reader’s uncertainty about the relative factuality of all or parts of the narrative is one dimension of what Genette calls ‘mood’, because it is a

---

200 Some of these are discussed in an examination of techniques answering to the general description ‘realism’ by J.R. Morgan (op. cit. 1993).

201 The authenticity of this *sphragis* is almost certain: v. the general discussion of it on p62ff above.
consequence of the reader’s awareness that the story is narrated from a particular perspective. Therefore the narrative is an expression of subjectivity. It is ambiguity about the relative factuality of the narrative and parts of the narrative (rather than the readers’ perception that the text is simply not factual) which characterises a text as fictional. The devices which an author uses to maintain that ambiguity, because they undermine an objective reading, compel the reader to read subjectively. The student of theory who attempts to analyse those devices in a scientific spirit will recognize (cf. G. Genette 1980 137-138) that his analysis does not describe the subjective impression which his text makes on the reader (although the analysis may be useful to a critic who discusses the subjective meaning of a particular text). Ambiguity prompts a subjective reading, but it does not follow that the subjective meaning of the text is ambiguous (although it may be). The story of Knemon in the *Aithiopika* has been shown by J.R. Morgan *JHS* CIX (1989) 99-113 to have the potential to contribute significantly and unambiguously to the subjective meaning of the text.

Against this background - the view that a fictional text, because it is fictional, invites a subjective reading - I make some suggestions about how my philological work may affect the interpretation of the *Aithiopika*. The reader of the *Aithiopika* who accepts my conclusions will read the text with the assumptions that it was almost certainly composed in the fourth century, probably in the third quarter of the fourth century; and that its author had a familiarity with Christian texts which was probably quite exceptional for an author of a non-Christian text, a familiarity which a contemporary reader would probably have spotted easily by the use of distinctively Christian vocabulary. I have noted in passing the Platonic and Pythagorean elements which other scholars have found in the text, and remarked that by the fourth century these two varieties of philosophy are by no means incompatible; and more tentatively, that within the Platonic tradition the philosopher to whom Heliodoros seems to have been closest was Iamblichos. A tentative case is made that there was an Emesene priestly tradition which was under the influence of Platonic philosophy, and it is argued that it is plausible that Heliodoros may have belonged to this tradition.

These assumptions about the provenance of the work are likely to affect the way in which a reader interprets the *Aithiopika*. To some extent this is tied up with the way we interpret the themes of the Greek novel in general, and the relation between the genre and religion. Here my main concern is with ways

---

202 J.R. Morgan (1995) offers a useful discussion of the relation between the novel and religion. Noting the problems entailed in reading the novels as religious texts, he writes, “To me the undeniable similarities between religion and fiction look like independent responses to the same stimulus.”
in which the *Aithiopika* is a distinctive, rather than the ways in which it is a typical Greek novel. An awareness of Heliodoros’ apparent familiarity with Christian literature may draw attention to the way Heliodoros emphasizes, more than the other extant Greek novelists, the importance of *absolute* chastity and the sacramental character of marriage, and may prompt the reader to interpret this as a more central, and indeed didactic part of the author’s programme than it would otherwise seem. It is difficult to detect a detailed theological system in the *Aithiopika*. However, a reader aware of the signs of Heliodoros’ knowledge of Neo-Platonic and theurgic, perhaps specifically Iamblichan, philosophy may be more inclined to recognize in the work an integrated system of values: Hellenic social values and Greek gods are respected; Egyptian thought, however, as represented by Kalasiris, is ‘higher’, and offers a closer approach to a grasp of the realities of the physical and spiritual world; while there exists a still higher, more perfect system of religious and philosophical thought and life to be found in a mythical (or perhaps real) Ethiopia, and by implication attainable by those with the faithful avoidance of corruption and perhaps the exceptional native qualities of the hero and heroine. If the *Aithiopika* is thought to have its origins in a Julianic time and intellectual environment, then reflection on Julian’s theoretical and practical interest in good government and kingship may underline for the reader the importance of the utopian theme in Heliodoros’ portrayal of the Ethiopian king and society.  

---

203 As demonstrated by J.R. Morgan *JHS* CIX (1989a) 99-113 and J.R. Morgan *TAPA* 119 (1989b) 299-320. Compare too the treatment by Morgan (1994b) of the interplay of Eros, Longos himself and the protagonists as authors in *Daphnis and Chloe*, where he comments (p74), ‘The conceit we have been examining emphasizes the factual unreality of the story, but at the same time suggests that the fiction is a channel for a non-factual truth of general applicability.’

204 Of course, an awareness of the influence of Philostratos *Life of Apollonios* could similarly draw the reader’s attention to the use by Heliodoros of the theme of good conduct for a ruler.
COMMENTARY

§1

Bandits arrive at the beach and see a puzzling scene: on the sea, a boat laden with cargo but without crew; on the beach, the aftermath of a party mixed with the aftermath of an impromptu battle; and no victors of the battle in sight.

The opening chapter displays several important elements of Heliodoros' technique. Psellos (Comparison of Heliodoros with Achilles Tatios) was the first to point out that he begins "in medias res"; many critics have followed him in praising this opening scene: in recent decades it has been discussed penetratingly by J.J. Winkler (YCS 27 (1982) 93-158, esp. 95-114). Some of the information which the reader receives comes through the eyes, in effect, of the characters in the plot, in this case the robbers: (on this point see J.R. Morgan GCN 4 (1991) 84-103; in the same article (90) attention is drawn to Heliodoros' deployment of stylistic resources in this chapter.) What the robbers see sets a puzzle for the readers, who wonder, as the robbers do, how the scene is to be explained: this theme is developed by J.R Morgan (1994a). There is no information for the reader in the opening scene which the robbers could not know, and it is not explicit whether the narrator is describing omnisciently, or whether he is describing what the robbers see. This has the effect of effacing the narrator from the reader's awareness.

The strong visual element in this chapter, which is a constant feature of Heliodoros' style, was highlighted by W. Bühler WS (1975) 137-140. He points to the rising sun, the scene which greets the pirates and the rich visual texture. One could also draw attention to the large number of words referring to vision and light, and the use of the words θεάτρον and σκηνή: v. J.W.H. Walden HSCP 5 (1894) 1ff.; v. also P. Neimke Quaestiones Heliodoreae Halle (1889).

The scene described in I 1-2.3 is largely static, and this gives it a painting-like quality which invites comparison with the way paintings are used at the opening of Longos Daphnis and Chloe and Achilles Tatios Leukippe and Kleitophon. In 'The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel' it is suggested (J.W. Birchall GCN VII 1996) that these descriptions of paintings, and the painting-like opening of The Athiopika demonstrate the central importance of phantasia in the novels, and possibly mark the work as belonging to a fictional genre in which the reader will be invited to 'suspend disbelief'.
The painting-like opening of the *Aithiopika* is regarded as producing an effect of reality by D. Maeder in her conclusion (GCN 3) p23. She associates the absence of a person to describe the picture in the *Aithiopika* (by comparison with Achilles Tattos and Longos) with the effacement of the narrator. She regards the opening of Achilles Tatios as containing ‘signaux du genre’ (14-16), and describes ‘un paradoxe qui consiste à la fois à proclamer la fiction et à la déguiser en réalité’. Of Longos she writes, ‘Comme chez Achille Tatius, le tableau est le pivot autour duquel se relaient effets de réel et de création; mais chez Longus, il est surtout un prétexte pour proclamer l’activité créatrice et artistique de l’écrivain’. The paradoxical aims, specific to fiction, which she describes, can with justice be seen in this opening, as elsewhere, in the *Aithiopika*.

For further discussion of the painting at the opening of *Daphnis and Chloe* v. R.L. Hunter (1983) 4-6 with ch.1 n.20; and 38-51, where, among other topics, the importance of ἐνέργεια for ancient narrative is pointed out. To his bibliography in n20 may be added J. Kestner *CW* (1973-4) 166-177; F. Létoublon (1993), 34-36.

R. Merkelbach (1962) p25 points out that ἥλιος, the highest deity in the novel, is mentioned in the first sentence. The reader sympathetic to the possibility of finding cryptic elements in Heliodoros’ text may also note the possible allusion to Athenian titles of Apollo and Artemis in the words ζωστήρ and ἄγρα. For ζωστήρ see Hesychios and Steph. Byz. s.v.; the title was well known in late antiquity because of the importance of Apollo Zoster in Hyperides Δηλωκός λόγος (v. A. Boeckh 1871a, esp. 447-452), the only speech of Hyperides which enjoyed continuing fame. For ἄγρα see LSJ s.v.

1. ἡμέρας ἄρτι διαγελώσης καὶ ἕλιου τὰς ἀκρωρείας κατανυγάζοντος: The meaning of διαγελώσης is elucidated by M.L. West (1966) ad *Theogony* 40-41: . . . γελοῖ δὲ τε δύσιμα πατρός / Ζηνός . . . (“the primary metaphorical meaning is ‘shine’ with reflected light . . .”) The metaphor is usually applied to the sea; for a reader aware of that association the reflection of daybreak from the sea may be brought to mind here. Theophrastos frequently uses διαγελάω of ὅρα and ἄνω, but Heliodoros was the first to apply it to ἡμέρα, in which he is imitated by Procopios *De aed.* 1.41.
1. **ἀνδρες ἐν ὀπλοις ἀποστικεῖς ὁροὺς ὑπερκύψαντες**: In papyrus documents and in Strabo ὄρος in an Egyptian context indicates land just beyond the cultivated land, the slightly higher land which did not receive the inundation. In documents it often seems to mean simply 'the desert', whereas in Herodotus and in Strabo the sense of land at a higher level is always present, (although not, of course, land which is mountainous in our sense). The sense of land at a higher elevation is present here too, as is certainly indicated by ὑπερκύψαντες. We should also bear in mind the metaphorical associations of ὄρος, which in Greek literature was contrasted with the town as a wild and uncivilized place, as R.G.A. Buxton. *JHS* 112 (1992) 1-15 demonstrated.

1. **στόμια τὸ καλοῦμενον Ἡρακλεωτικὸν**: The westernmost mouth of the Nile, called by Herodotus Kanobic, who says that there was a shrine to Herakles on the shore. Diodorus, then Strabo are the first extant Greek authors to give the name Herakleiotic as an alternative for Kanobic. Ptolemy the Geographer is the first to use Herakleiotic exclusively, and Seneca has Herakleiotic, with Naukratic as an alternative. While much of Heliodorus' information about Egypt can be found in Herodotus, Diodorus and Strabo, the choice of the name Herakleiotic may indicate that none of these was his direct source here. In Pliny the Elder the Herakleiotic or Naukratic mouth is not identical with the Kanobic but next to it (V 64). The location of the outlet is no more than a day's walk from Alexandria (about twenty miles according to Ptolemy's co-ordinates): J.R. Morgan (Preface to Heliodorus in CAGN) suggested that Heliodorus expected the reader to notice the absence of Alexandria as an indication of a pre-Ptolemaic date.

1. **τῷ πελάγει τῷ πρώτῳ τὰς ὤψεις ἐπαφέντες**: In Kalasiris' explanation of the 'evil eye', ὄψεις (III 7.5) seems to be used of the eyes rather than of the theoretical process of sight. The same is true of τὰς ὤψεις in the similar passage in Plutarch *Quaestiones conviviales* V 7 / 681E, with which Heliodorus was certainly familiar, as W. Capelle *RhM* 96 (1953) 166-180 showed. Heliodorus' use of ἐπαφήμι in this context is unprecedented: it may be used by analogy with the use of the same verb with words denoting voice or utterance. cf. Synesios *Epistle* 67 (PG p1421): ἐπιβαλὼν τὰς ὄψεις τῷ τόπῳ.

1. **ὡς οὐδὲν ἀγρας ληστικῆς ἐπηγγέλειτο μὴ πλεόμενον**: Translate ‘when the sea, since it was not being sailed, (or, except it should be sailed,) offered nothing in the way of booty for bandits .’ In classical Greek μὴ + participle normally has a conditional sense, and the latter translation, with a conditional sense is attractive here. However, Heliodorus' use of μὴ is looser: of the 38 instances of μὴ with a participle six are conditional and clearly marked as such by εἰ or ἀν in the protasis, or ἀν in the apodosis; and three are in the quasi-conditional expression 'you will do such and such καὶ μὴ
βουλόμενος'; none of the others are clearly conditional in sense. Therefore the non-conditional translation 'since it was not being sailed' must be preferred.

1. ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αἰγιαλὸν τῇ θέξι κατήγοντο: τὸν πλησίον αἰγιαλὸν is 'the shore that was close to them' i.e. the shore of the Herakleiotic mouth of the Nile, not of the sea, which was farther away. The robbers look first at the sea, which is in the distance, then turn their gaze not only to what is closer but also in a different direction. The topography of the scene is discussed in detail in the note on I 5.1 below.

2. ὁλκάς ἀπὸ προμνησίων ὄρμη: The boat is at the shore but still afloat (although said to have run aground at V 27.2 and I 22.4). We are not in a harbour, but in an outlet near the sea, so προμνησίων are probably anchor cables rather than mooring lines (since a boat moored to shore outside a harbour would be vulnerable to on-shore winds). It was common for ancient merchantmen to carry several anchors. We may surmise that often two (stem and bow), and sometimes more, would be used together, (hence the plural). The history of anchors in antiquity is discussed in L. Casson (1971) 50-58.

2. τὸ γὰρ ἄχθως ἄχρι καὶ ἐπὶ τρίτου ζωστήρου τῆς νεώς τὸ ὅδωρ ἀνέθλιβεν: ζωστήρ is first attested in this sense here. It refers to the wales, or extra thick reinforcing planks attached to the outside of the hull. For technical details see L. Casson (1971). The later history of the word seems to imply that the normal waterline would be at the middle of three ζωστήρες: Anna Comnena Alexiades VI 5: αὔται (αἱ ναῦς) δὲ τῇ κοινῷτητι ἐπεπόλαξαν ὅπων ὄδασιν ἀνεξόμεναι, ὡς μηδ' ἄχρι δευτέρου ζωστήρου τοῦ ὅδατος θέαντος, and Du Canges' note ad loc: Theodoros Prodrom. lib. 5. τὸν κατὰ 'Ροδάνθην παγ. 225.

ἐκ δευτέρου ζωστήρου ἄχρι καὶ τρίτου ἔλαιος κατεσκέψαστο ναυτοῖς παξέσιν.


3. ὁ δὲ αἰγιαλὸς, μεστὰ πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφαγῶν: As J.R. Morgan (1978) p.xx points out, μεστὰ πάντα is almost a cliché for introducing vivid descriptions; it is frequently followed by φόνον or other words describing a battle scene. Morgan quotes Julian Or. I 27c μεστὰ δὲ ἦν ἀπαντα σωμάτων καὶ ναυαγίων καὶ ὅπλων καὶ βελών, τῶν μὲν ἄρτι καταθυμιέναν, τῶν δὲ . . . κοινῆσθεμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ κύματος. He regards this passage as the closest verbal similarity between Heliodoros and Julian’s account of the siege
of Nisibis in Or. 1 & 2. A search of TLG shows that no other author has a phrase as close to the present one as Julian’s; that in classical Greek μεστά πάντα is used only by Xenophon and Plato; that several of the imperial writers who use the phrase omit the copula; and that where a verb is given it is usually ἦν or εἶναι. Therefore the text here is not to be doubted, and the construction is ἦν μεστά (rather than supplying a verb such as “they saw” with the clause μεστά πάντα . . . as its object). Prof. Maehler suggested to me that the apparent ‘anacolouthon’ is due to the fact that μεστά πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφηχγόν is a tragic trimeter, complete but for the first anceps (supply <ήν>?), with the caesura in the right place; the line is not found in extant tragedy. For the anacolouthon D. Koraes (1804) compares II 34.3 (ἡ δὲ Ἀ. θυσία etc.). The traditional explanation of anacolouthon of this kind is that the illogical choice of case reflects the thought: the robbers turned their attention to the sea shore; they see with astonishment that μεστά πάντα σωμάτων, and the nominative σίγιαλός is left hanging. For examples see W. Havers, Indogermanische Forschungen 43 (1925) 207-257 where he says: “Die grosse Ausdehnung unseres Nominativgebrauchs in der späteren Gräzität, besonders bei Philostratos und Aelian, ist sehr bemerkenswert.”

4. ἦν δὲ ὁ πολέμῳ καθαρός τά φαινόμενα σύμβολα: The use of καθαρός for a ‘clean fight’ seems to be unparalleled.

4. τὸ γάρ αἰφνίδιον τοῦ κακοῦ τάς χρείας ἐκαινοτόμει: τὸ αἰφνίδιον is found in Polybios and Dionysios of Halicarnassos and throughout the Roman period, this expression does not seem to occur in earlier Greek, where abstract expressions are generally eschewed, except at Thuc. II 61.3: δουλοὶ γάρ φρόνημα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον . . .

καινοτομέω is usually used in a political or religious context, with a bad connotation, so perhaps Heliodoros chose the word to suggest departure from a well ordered world.

5. ο ὃ δὲ δαλῳ κατάφλεκτος: The meaning of κατάφλεκτος is ‘completely burnt’; cf. the Suda, πυρίφλεκτος: . . . ἐφλέγετο γάρ, οὐ κατεφλέγετο δέ. πυρίφλεκτος is classical and poetic. The analogous formation κατάφλεκτος appears to be a hapax.

6. καὶ μυρίων εἴδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικρὸν τοῦ χωρίου διεσκεύαστο.:
For the use of ὁ δαίμων by Heliodoros v. above, p29ff.

7. τὰ λάφυρα δὲ ἀσκύλευτα: Heliodoros delays δὲ until after an article and substantive when he wants to emphasize a strong contrast with a preceding μὲν clause, e.g. I. 19 .. τιμωρίαν μὲν λαβεῖν τὴν τιμὴν δὲ ἀπολαβεῖν.

8. ἐαυτοῦς οὖν νικητὰς ἀποδείξαντες: In classical Greek a direct reflexive with a copulative verb and an adjective or noun predicate is rare. It occurs occasionally with ποιέω “to reckon”. There are no examples with ἀποδείκνυμι before the Roman period. (The classical authors use two nominatives with a passive.) This type of construction, where the predicate is an adjective or a substantive in apposition, often with ἀποδείκνυμι, accounts for many of the occurrences of accusatives of the reflexive pronoun in inscriptions and documentary papyri in the Roman period (e.g. . . . φίλον καὶ ἔνον καὶ εὐεργέτην ἐαυτὸν ἀποδείκνυμι . . . . Foulles de Delphes III. 1. 480. 1.9-10. c. 480 B.C.) It also appears in some Roman period writers (e.g. πικρὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀποδεικνύων ἐχθρὸν . . . Polybios VII 14.3.) Sophistic writers largely avoid it; the construction may reflect the influence of Latin on the language. Where reflexives of this kind occur in classical texts they are normally to be taken as reciprocal. In this passage we must choose between seeing it as an example of the apparent latinity in Heliodoros’ style, or assuming, in view of the lack of parallels (the closest parallel in Heliodoros is perhaps . . . Θροβὴν ἐαυτὴν ὁμολογεῖ . . . V 8.4), that the usage is perfectly classical and therefore the pronoun is to be taken as reciprocal: “proclaiming one another victors . . .” On the whole the former seems more Heliodorean.

§2

The bandits see a beautiful girl tending a wounded but beautiful young man. They wonder whether she is a goddess, but decide she cannot be, and find the courage to approach.

1. ἡδὴ δὲ αὐτοῖς κεκινηκόσιν ἀποθεῖν μικρὸν τῇς τε νεώς καὶ τῶν κειμένων θέαμα προσπίπτει τῶν προτέρων ἀπορώτερον. Κεκινηκόσιν is active for middle (cp. note ad I 18.1). κινέω with this meaning, ‘to move oneself’, is rare even in the middle, but is sometimes used in a military context. cf. Xenophon Historia Graeca II 1.22: Ἀλσανδρός δὲ τῇ ἔποιησῃ νυκτὶ, ἐπεὶ ὅρθρος ἦν, ἐστήμην εἰς τὸς νυῶς ὀριστοποιηθαμένους εἰσβάινειν, πάντα δὲ παρασκευαζόμενος ὡς εἰς ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὰ παραβλήματα παραβάλλων, προεῖπεν ὡς μηδεῖς κινήσοιτο ἐκ τῆς τάξεως μηδὲ ἀνάξοιτο.
On προσπίπτει, F. Barber (1968) notes the transition from the aorists and imperfects of chapter 1 to the present historic. The tense, and the violent motion which this verb implies give a sense of pace as the description moves from the background of the ‘canvass’, the corpses of the slaughtered combatants, to the still more striking central figures.

1. κόρη καθήστα ἐπὶ πέτρας, ὀμηχανόν τι κάλλος καὶ θεός εἶναι ἀναπείδουσα: Sentence asyndeton (as between this and the preceding sentence) is used freely by such writers as the authors of John’s Gospel (esp. in chapter V) and The Shepherd of Hermas, and the ‘inset tales’ in Longos; perhaps it had become feature of simple spoken koine under the influence of Latin; it gives a vigorous directness to didactic or narrative passages. Chariton constantly uses asyndeton to achieve an effect of pace (e.g. I 2.2,3), and makes much use of pseudo-asyndeton (where connection is indicated by a retrospective pronoun or participle). In Longos (e.g. I 13.6), Achilles Tatios (e.g. I 1.3-13) and Xenophon of Ephesos (e.g. I 2.6.) the frequent sentence asyndeton is frequently found in descriptive passages, to sketch in, as it were, visual details. Heliodorus uses sentence asyndeton in the same way, as here, but more sparingly than the other novelists. For the classical background to the use of asyndeton as a stylistic device, see chapter vi in J.D. Denniston (1952).

ἀμηχανόν τι κάλλος: Heliodorus uses a similar expression at II 30.6: ἀγεί με παρ’ ἑαυτόν καὶ δεικνύοσθαι κόρην ὀμηχανόν τι καὶ δαμιόνον κάλλος. It seems to be imitated from Plato. Compare Plato Charmides 155d ἐνέβλεψεν τε μοι τοῖς όρθολυμοῖς ὀμηχανόν τι οὖν καὶ ἀνίγγετο ὡς ἐρωτηθὼν. At Plato Symposium 218e (ἀμηχανόν τοι κάλλος ὁρφής ἐν ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τῆς παρά τοι εἴφορφίας τὰμπολυ διαφερον) the MSS are divided between τε, τοί and τε. The editors of P. Oxy. 843 (2nd century A.D.) read [τε], which, in fact, gives the best sense. We must assume that the text of Heliodorus is right here, he seems to be imitating Plato in his use of this phrase, so his copy of the Symposium probably had the reading τε at this point. Heliodoros elevates Charikleia by alluding to the concept of inner beauty of which Socrates speaks in this passage of the Symposium.

2. δέφη τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔστετο: The laurel is associated with Apollo, prophecy and poetry, but, unlike the bow, is nowhere associated with Artemis, whom Charikleia served as a priestess at Delphi. (Achilles Tatios VII 12.2 is not relevant here.) It is at V 31 that we are told that Charikleia has put it on, with her robe which is said to be from Delphi, so by implication the laurel too draws attention to her Delphic background. Charikleia’s office at Delphi seems to have been fictional (v. G. Rougemont, in MRG (1992) 93-99) so we need not enquire too closely into the authenticity of her attire. Perhaps also, Heliodorus knew that for Romans a laurel branch symbolized victory in battle (e.g. Plutarch Life of Pompeius 41.3): not only does Charikleia here appear to
be the victor in a battle, but it transpires later that by her use of the bow she did
indeed contribute to victory over the pirates.

2. ἥ λοιπῇ δὲ χείρ ἀφροντίστος ἀπηώρητο: ἀπαιωρεόμει is used of
hands and feet in Hippokrates De fracturis. Η Ἑσίοδος Scutum 243 is the only
occurrence of the compound which certainly precedes the 1st century A.D.

3. ὀσπέρ ἐκ βαθέος ὀπνου τοῦ παρ’ ὀλίγον θανάτου κατεφαίνετο: The combination βαθέος ὀπνου is sufficiently rare (Theoe., VII 197; A.P. VII
170 (= Gow & Page 1. 3174) where a child has been pulled from a well by his mother. She watches to see whether he is alive; line
5 continues:

νόμιμος δ’ ὅπ’ ἐλείλεν ὁ νήπιος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ γούνοις
ματρὸς κοιμοθεῖς τὸν βαθών ὑπνὼν ἔχει.

Unlike Theagenes, the child does not recover.

5. καί ἄμα λέγουσα ἡ μὲν τῆς πέτρας ἀνέθορεν: θρόσκω and its
compounds are poetic; prose usage is mainly confined to Herodotos and
Hippokrates:

5. πρηστήρος: The word is discussed in M. Hofinger (1975-1978) s.v. and
West Theogony p390. It is often associated with Typhon, and brings wind,
thunder, lightning and lightning bolts without rain.

5. τῶν μὲν βελον τῇ ἀθρόᾳ κινήσει κλαγξάντων: This recalls the
language used of Apollo at Iliad I 45. By associating the young woman,
Charikleia, with a god it presses home, so to speak, the message of the
foregoing Homeric imagery, for the reversal of rôles in the image from Odyssey
VI (here the bandits flee the maiden just as Nausikaa’s companions fled
Odysseus), as well as being amusing, immediately draws attention to the
commanding position of our heroine, whose resourcefulness and leadership will
be a key feature of her character.

5. χρυσούφως δὲ τῆς ἐσθήτος πρός τὸν ἥλιον ἀνταναγμὸς: Garments called χρυσούφης are Babylonian in Chariton VIII 4.7, and
barbarian in Herodian V 3.6 (concerning Elagabalus). This is one among
several words which denote golden garments in the description of the
procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos by Callixeinos (in Athenaios). We
occasionally read of garments made entirely of gold (Historia Augusta
Elagabalus 23, Pliny XXXIII 63; Suetonius, Caligula, 19), but normally
garments with gold thread decoration are meant. Such garments are particularly
associated with the Eastern provinces, so we should not be surprised that the
Emesene Heliodoros does not apply to them the derogatory epithet ‘barbarian’,
as other writers do, but places them on the supposedly Greek heroine. For the
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5. καὶ τῆς κόμης ὑπὸ τῷ στεφάνῳ βακχείου σοβομένης: βακχείον is never attested as an adverb, but well attested as a substantive. Therefore it must be taken here as a substantive, and this gives a more vivid sense than it would have if it were an adverb. Charikleia’s hair, dressed differently, is described again at III 4.5.

Used of hair, σοβέω is unusual. It occurs at A.P. VI 219 and V 251 (the latter probably post-dates Heliodoros.).

6. ἐδάκρυσεν κτλ.: Lists of words without connectives in Greek are typically found in emotionally charged passages; for parallels, v. J.D. Denniston (1952) chapter vi.

6. Ἀρτεμίν ἡ τὴν ἑγχώριον Ἱσι: Isis came to be seen, like Artemis, as a moon goddess. See the section in the introduction on the solar theology (p29ff), where it is argued that this explains why the bandits seem to regard her as an alternative to Artemis. It is also argued there that the underlying theology of the *Aithiopika* is solar and lunar. The argument cannot be extended to other Greek novels in which the heroine is associated with Artemis. The association is thought-provoking, but cannot at present be explained with confidence. Perhaps the most that can be said is, in the formulation of F. Lé toublon (1993) 39-40, ‘Le costume d’Ar temis, revêtu par plusieurs des héroïnes romanesques, suggère que cette relation de la vie et du théâtre a en Grèce ancienne un aspect religieux (sur la figure d’Artémis et ses liens avec le thème du masque, voir J.P. Vernant, *Mythe et Religion en Grèce ancienne* Paris, Seuil, Libraire du XXème siècle, 1990): tout se passe comme si le passage des jeunes filles à l’âge de femme et du mariage impliquait que la jeune fille incarne la déesse, et comme si les épisodes du roman transposaient des rituels initiatiques, ce que les récits mythologiques concernant Artémis ou Pan suggère aussi.’
7. ἀναλαβόντες οὖν ἑαυτοὺς: ‘recovering’ ἀναλαμβάνω means ‘to encourage’ at Heliodoros V 3.3, and that may be the sense required here, so ἑαυτοὺς could be taken as reciprocal: ‘encouraging one another’. However, the construction with an active verb and a reflexive pronoun (rather than a middle verb) is the normal classical one, used by Thucydides, Demosthenes, Isokrates and others to mean ‘to recover’, so it is best to translate this phrase as ‘recovering’.

7. εἰχον ἑαυτοὺς οὔτε τι λέγειν οὔτε τι πράττειν ἀποθαρροῦντες: Again ἑαυτοὺς draws attention to the reciprocal character of the verb. Nonetheless we may note that the expression is suggestive of the Latin reflexive use se teneo just as ἑαυτοὺς . . . ἀποδεξίαντες (I 1.8) and ἀναλαβόντες . . . ἑαυτοὺς (above) suggest se ostendo and se colligo.

8. τῆς εξ αὐτῶν σκιάς τοῖς ὁφθαλμοῖς παρεμπεσούσης ἀνένευσεν ἡ κόρη καὶ ἰδοῦσα αὕτης ἐπένευσε, πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἀπέθες τῆς χροιάς σκιάς usually means ‘shade’ whereas σκιάσσα means shadow. However, Plato uses σκια for ‘shadow’. It is regularly used for shade or shadow in the context of painting, and the present instance probably alludes to this use: by describing an effect of light here, as he does at I 1.1, Heliodoros underlines the painting-like quality of the description. Hesychios: σκιαγραφίαν· τὴν σκηνογραφίαν ἄνωτο λέγουσιν. ἐλέγετο δὲ τις καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἵωροβος σκιαγράφως ἀντί τοῦ σκηνογράφου κτλ. It shows the refinement of Heliodoros’ appeal to the visual sense of the reader that like a skilled painter, he depicts even the light in a scene which he portrays.

tὸ ἀπέθες τῆς χροιάς: Heliodoros makes us aware of the question of skin colour, which will be an important theme. The bandits in Achilles Tatios are black, and speak a non-Greek language. Heliodoros was influenced by his description of the Boukoloi by Achilles Tatios, and black skin is meant here, as is made explicit at I 3.1, but there is little support in the text for seeing significance in the fact that the bandits are the same colour as Charikleia’s parents turn out to be.

9. σύνες ἀρὰ πόθος ἄκριβής καὶ ἔρως ἄκραφνης κτλ.: The major theme of love is introduced in terms of Charikleia’s striking demonstration of its power to remove her fear of the bandits. ἄκραφνης delicately suggests virginity (cf. Eur. Alc. 1052: ποῦ καὶ τρέφοιτ’ ἀν δομίσαν νέα γυνή; / νέα γαρ, ὡς ἐσθήτι καὶ κόσμῳ πρέπει. / πότερα κατ’ ἄνδρὸν δήτ’ ἐνοικήσει στέγην; / καὶ πῶς ἄκραφνην ἐν νέοις στραφωμένη / ἔσται: 1049-1053).
The girl sees that the bandits are black. She addresses them, but they do not understand. They start to collect booty, but flee when a larger group of bandits comes on the scene.

1. εἰ μὲν εἴδολα τῶν κειμένων ἔστε, φησίν, οὐκ ἐν δίκῃ παρενοχλεῖτε ἡμῖν: The scene has been described in chapter 1, and the reader's curiosity has been aroused. Now, through the first piece of direct speech, the brigands, and, indirectly, the reader receives some information about the background to what they have seen. At the same time the sense of wonder is maintained as Charikleia in her turn is uncertain whether the figures she sees belong to this world; and with her choice of words she at once occupies the ‘moral high ground’.

2. ἡ μὲν ταῦτα ἐπετραγόδει: The reader has suspended belief just as he would in the theatre: the theatrical vocabulary keeps him in this attitude.


2-3. χρυσὸς δὲ καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ λίθων πολυτίμων καὶ σπικικῆς ἔσθήτος, ὅση δύναμις ἐκάστους, ἐκφοροῦντες. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄλις ἔχειν ἐδόκει: The language perhaps recalls the gifts which the Phaeacians deposit on the shore with Odysseus. More pointedly, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄλις ἔχειν ἐδόκει echoes Herodotos I 119.5: ὁς δὲ τῷ Ἀρπάγῳ ἐδόκει ἄλις ἔχειν . . . Like Harpagos, who is about to discover that he has just eaten his son, the robbers are unaware that their satisfaction will be short-lived.

Far eastern silk, and the word σπικικός, seem to have entered the Greek world at the time of Alexander. The fabric was usually wool with silk threads woven in. The Historia Augusta Elagabalus 26, states that this emperor was the first to wear unmixed silk: this is probably not true, but indicates the rarity of pure silk. For the literary references v. Der Kleine Pauly, “Seide”, and for a discussion of the earliest arrival of silk into the Greek and Roman world, and a photograph of reconstituted fabric v. H-J. Hund JRGZ 16 (1969) 59-71.

5. οἱ μὲν ὁμφῆ τὴν κόρην: The girl and the young man with her, whom the reader later learns are Theagenes and Charikleia. Some translators (e.g. Maillon, Bevilacqua) have thought this phrase could mean Charikleia alone, and make the same mistake with τῶν περὶ τῶν Θεαγένην at VII 9.1, although they translate such phrases correctly elsewhere. LSJ and the Spanish Greek Dictionary are unclear on the point and consequently misleading (LSJ περὶ C.2; SGD ὁμφῆ III.1). If we read, for instance, that οἱ περὶ Πλεκτῶνα think...
something, that amounts to saying that Plato himself thought it. However, the
equation is never used in a context where the idea of a retinue is entirely
absent, and there is no case where it unambiguously refers to an individual
alone. The evidence is collected in M. Dubuisson (1977). This dissertation
deals with the point directly and conclusively, and incidentally gives many
examples similar to the present one under the heading of ‘οἱ περὶ X = X and
Y’ and ‘οἱ ἐμπὶ X = X and Y’; this use is common from Polybios onwards.

The young couple in the μὲν clause are contrasted with the bandits in the δὲ
clause, and this curious choice of phrase which gives ἡ κόρη pride of place
reflects the fact that the young man is not yet fully functional, either as an
heroic figure who might be expected to put up a fight, or as a character who
has been properly introduced to the reader.

§4

The bandit chief tries to take the girl, but she insists by gestures that the young
man be taken too. The chief dismounts himself and his companion, and places
the girl and young man on the horses.

2. τῶν ἵππων: This type of genitive is commented on I 7.1 below.

3. καὶ ἢν δόξης ὁὖκ ἐκτὸς: The ὁὖκ should probably be deleted, following
Bekker, so that we can translate "What happened was beyond belief." The
Budé editors say 'corruptum nisi δόξα = laus', which would not make good
sense: Heliodoros is emphasising the paradoxical nature of what happened.
F.T. Richards (1905) proposed to replace ὁὖκ with γοῦν, but this would be the
wrong place in the sentence for γοῦν or σοῦ.

§5

The couple reach the marshland home of the Boukoloi, whose manner of life is
described.

1. παραμειψαντες οὖν ὅσον δῶο στάδια τῶν αἰγιαλῶν, ἐκτραπέντες
εὖθυς τὸν ὄρος πρὸς τὰ ὀρθὰ ἔχωρον τὴν θάλασσαν ἐν δεξίᾳ
ποιησόμενοι, καὶ ὑπερβάντες χαλκόπος τὰς ἄκρωρεις ἐπὶ τινα
λίμνην κατὰ τατέραν τὸν ὄρους πλευρὰν ὑποτείνουσαν ἣπείγοντο:
This statement seems to invite the reader to make a mental map of the area. To
do so the information it gives must be harmonized with the description in the
first chapter of book I, and with the statement about where the boat landed, V
27.7 ἀκτῇ τινὶ κατὰ τὸ στόμιον τοῦ Νείλου τὸ Ἑρακλειωτίκὸν
In fact the last statement adds little because ὀκτή can be anything from a protruding rock to a promontory, and can be in the sea or in a river; while κατά τὸ στόμιον could mean on or near the outlet. So, when the party turn suddenly they put the sea on their right, and they cross the peak of a mound which, as we learn in 1.1, lays above the Herakleiotic outlet of the Nile. As explained in the note on 1.1 the action takes place on the beach of the outlet, which is closer to the mound than the sea. In the approximate, schematic topography which Heliodoros provides παραμείπουντες . . . τὸν αἰγιαλὸν must mean travelling along parallel with the shore of the outlet (whether facing or away from the sea we are not told), and beneath the mound. Since the sea is on their right when they turn away from the outlet it follows that the scene is set on the west of the Herakleiotic mouth.

**EXCURSUS ON OI BOYKOLOI (THE ‘HERDSMEN’)**

2. ΒΟΥΚΟΛΙΑ: The area, located in the region of the western Delta, was probably immediately to the east of Alexandria, but to the west of the Kanobic branch of the Nile, (as it is in Heliodoros: see preceding note). In Heliodoros it is near a Chemmis, in Achilles Tattos near Alexandria, in BGU 625 probably near Alexandria, and the entry in Stephanus Byzantius Ethnica, Ἡρακλειοβουκολία: Αἰγυπτιακὴ συνοικία (Herakleioboukolia: an Egyptian settlement) suggests that the inhabitants, the ΒΟΥΚΟΛΙ are found near the Heracleium which Herodotos the entry in Stephanus Byzantius Ethnica, Ἡρακλειοβουκολία: Αἰγυπτιακὴ συνοικία (Herakleioboukolia: an Egyptian settlement) suggests that the inhabitants, the ΒΟΥΚΟΛΙ are found near the Heracleium which Herodotos and others mention near the Kanobic mouth. Strabo (XVII 19 / 802) says that the entrance to the harbour at Pharos was guarded by βουκόλων λῃστῶν, ‘herdsman’ bandits) who attacked ships trying to anchor.

There is no firm evidence about the location of the Boukolia. There were probably marshes to the west and east of Lake Mareotis (Marea, Maryut), and of Alexandria, which is north of the lake. Around the marshes to the west of the lake now lies the relatively fertile country described in the chapter ‘The Solitary Place’ of E.M. Forster Pharos and Pharillion. Based on the evidence of Stephanus and Strabo, the region to the north-east and the east of the lake is almost certainly to be identified with the Boukolia. The region to the north-east of the lake is the narrow strip of land east of Alexandria between the lake and the sea. In antiquity this was probably marshland extending eastwards to the Kanobic branch of the Nile.

---

205 Herodotos II 113.
206 E.M. Forster Pharos and Pharillion London 1923.
The Kanobic branch silted up during the middle-ages, and Lake Mareotis (and surrounding marshes) became virtually dry. The area to the East of lake Mareotis, although probably marshland in antiquity, was also dry until 1778, when Lake Aboukir was formed. By breaching the barrier between Lake Aboukir and the bed of Lake Mareotis in 1801 the British army, fighting the French, flooded the latter lake, regretfully destroying many more villages. Much of the re-formed Lake Mareotis was drained by the Egyptians during the nineteenth century for agriculture, and Lake Aboukir was drained under British administration at the end of the nineteenth century.

This location for the Boukolia is consistent with the picture in Heliodoros, where too the Boukolia is near, and apparently west of, the Kanobic mouth, where it is subject to the inundation (which did not normally reach as far west as Alexandria), and where it is near Chemmis (the area here proposed for the Boukolia, the eastern-most part of the seventh Nome, borders onto the sixth Nome, called by Herodotos the ‘Chemmite’ Nome).

There was a Boukolic gate in Alexandria. We do not know on which side of the town it was. The earliest attestation of the name ‘Boukolic’ seems to be Herodotos’ βουκολικός στόμα (II 17), although this seems to have been further east than the area of the Boukóloí. (The Boukolic Branch, found only in Herodotos, is usually identified with the Phatmitic mentioned at Diodoros I 33, Strabo XVII 18 and Pliny the Elder V 14, and called Pathmetic by Pomponius Mela. This was probably in approximately the same place as the modern Damietta branch, according to the conventional view, which was apparently originated by J. Ball (1942). Ball’s identification of the Boukolic with the Phatmitic branch is implicitly based on the fact these writers mention seven main branches, of which the other six are identical with the other six Herodotean ones. In view of the constant change in the terrain of the Delta, and of the evidence for an artificial channel apparently unrecorded by the ancient writers, this conventional identification cannot be regarded as more than an intelligent guess.)

---

207. ‘This lake [Aboukir] is of a very modern date, having been formed so late as 1778. A stone dyke, the greater part of which is to this day standing, was the only barrier, which kept out the sea from a plain much below its level. This was broken down by the fury of the waves in a violent gale, and the water, rushing in with impetuosity, destroyed several villages, and formed the present inundation. The kalisch or canal of Alexandria divides it from the site of lake Mareotis, which was almost everywhere dry, having no communication with the sea.’ (T. Walsh (1803) 81-82).
208. Ibid. 114-115.
209. The evidence for the seventh and sixth Nomes of lower Egypt is collected by W. Helck (1974).
210. V. Calderini 1, p. 105; also, ibid. s.v. τά βουκόλια, 2, p. 62 and οἱ βουκόλοι, 2, p. 63.
211. V. A. De Cosson (1935) 84.
In many ways the most useful discussion of the area of the Boukoloi of the *Aithiopika*, though out of date in the light of recent advances in literary theory and Egyptology, is that given by E. Quatremère (1811) I 224-243. There were lakes and marshes in many places along the coast of the delta and western Egypt. Many have now disappeared (v. A. Bernand (1970) 102-116). Butzer, in the article ‘Delta’ in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, describes the rows of small islands which geological research shows would have lain just above the lakes of the lower Delta in pre-dynastic times. Unfortunately he does not comment on how far such terrain is likely to have survived into the late period, or extended to the region between Lakes Mareotis and Edku, which, as proposed above, may have been part of τὰ βουκόλια.

Modern descriptions of the marshes in the western Delta are difficult to find. In the description by J. Lozach (1935) 228, the general type of landscape described by Heliodoros is recognizable, although Heliodoros was writing at a time when Lake Mareotis and the surrounding marshes were fed by the Kanobic branch of the Nile, rather than flooded by the sea as today, and therefore he describes a marshland which is not reedless and saline like that described here, but suffused with fresh water: “. . . pour peu qu’on se dirige vers les lacs de Basse-Egypte, on a tôt fait d’atteindre des régions où la vie se fait plus rare, disparaît même, terres de solitude et de misère.

Elles forment une large bande qui s’étend au nord et à l’est de la région cultivée, jusqu’aux lacs, presque jusqu’à la mer, dont ne les séparent que quelques kilomètres de dunes. Pendant la crue et durant l’hiver, ces terres se trouvent abondamment baignées par l’eau du Nil; elles constituent même des annexes des lacs, avec lesquels on peut les confondre. Mais dès que l’évaporation a fait disparaître la plus grande partie des eaux, elles ne forment plus que des plaines idéalement plates, sans aucun relief, au sol brun ou blanc, couvert d’une couche de vernis qui craque sous le pas et scintille au soleil. Une végétation saline de petites pousses chétives, d’un gris sale, peuvent seules y subsister; aucun arbre ne rompt le cercle monotone de l’horizon.”

Dio Kassios, Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros call the inhabitants of τὰ βουκόλια the βουκόλοι. A variety of evidence links the Western Delta with cattle grazing, although unlike the fictional bandits of the *Aithiopika*, Egyptian herdsmen tend to be thought of as pallid, with bald or shaven heads, and effeminate (v. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, s.v. “Hirt”). The Boukoloi may or may not be connected with the apparently non-Egyptian herdsmen depicted in some Middle Kingdom tomb paintings of marshes in the Delta. The figures in question have generally been lumped together because they are non-

213 A.B. Lloyd (1975-88) vol. II p370 provides a starting point for references to such tomb paintings and the speculations of editors about what they represent.
Egyptian in appearance, and always in scenes of marshes. However it should be observed that they include at least two distinct types, one with a mop of fuzzy hair and one with long straight hair with a bald patch at the front, often with a tuft of hair at the front or a goatee beard or both. The suggestion that they are simply Egyptians whose unkempt appearance is intended to represent old age is difficult to accept.

The Egyptian name of the seventh Nome is written with a harpoon sign, and of the neighbouring sixth Nome as a bull combined with a sign which means either ‘of the mountain’ or ‘foreign’ (the correct interpretation of the sign in this context is disputed.) We do not really know the extent of the region called τά βουκόλια, or whether it extended into the sixth nome, but we may presume that local people would associate the sign of the bull with the name, even if there was no adequate etymological justification for doing so.

In fact βουκόλος here, and in other place names, is not primarily a reference to the bovine element in the Egyptian name for the sixth Nome, or to the tradition of cattle-rearing in the western Delta. It is a translation of the Egyptian word ‘3m, and probably means ‘Semitic’. The Demotic word for βουκόλος is ‘3m, Coptic ΑΜΕ. This is guaranteed by the fact that εἰς τὰ βουκόλια in Athanasios Life of St Antony §49 (PG 26.913) is rendered in the Coptic version214 as ΕΝΑΜΗΓΕ. It is likely that the Egyptian version preceded the Greek, because ΑΜΕ is not the normal Coptic word for βουκόλος, whereas βουκόλος would be the normal translation of ΑΜΕ; because in Egyptian place names containing the article are common, whereas in Greek they are not;215 and because in Xenophon of Ephesos (III 12) the inhabitants of the same area are called ποιμένες (presumably an alternative translation of ‘3m).216

Broadly speaking, in Old and Middle Egyptian ‘3m means Asiatic, Semite or Canaanite, often in their rôle as enemies of Egypt, and is taken to be derived from the Semitic נב (‘The Nation’, ‘The People’). In Coptic ΑΜΕ means ‘herdsman’. It is usually assumed,217 though not certain, that ‘3m and ΑΜΕ are the same word whose meaning developed, rather than two similar but distinct words. Indeed, the place names in Greek documents Μάγδωλα τῶν

215 βουκόλια without the article at Heliodoros I 5.1 is exceptional and probably anomalous.
216 The way Heliodoros introduces the name βουκόλια (I 5.2 βουκόλια μὲν σύμπας κέκληται πρὸς Αιγυπτίων ἐ τόπος) suggests that he or one of his sources knew that βουκόλια is a translation of an name in the Egyptian language.
217 e.g. by A. Sharff, Μανερός = ΜΑΝΕΡΨΟΥ, ZAS 72 (1936) 43-44.
βουκόλων (Μάγδολος is a Semitic name; for other place names showing this form see ḫlḏ in P. Levy (1876)) and τὸν ἱερεὺς τὸν βουκόλων (so these ‘herdsmen’ had their own priest) suggest that βουκόλως as an element in place names derives ultimately from Middle Egyptian (attested up till the eighteenth dynasty) ‘3m = Semite, rather than the Coptic ἀμέ = herdsman. Many Jews were found, as a matter of fact, also in the probable area of τὰ βουκόλως; elements which are probably Semitic can be detected in the religions of the Delta. It is possible that βουκόλως is a reference to a cattle cult rather than to an agricultural pursuit. Admittedly, however, the normal meaning of ‘3m in Demotic documents is ‘Herdsman’; it is discussed by G.R. Hughes (1952) 46. The identification of the word is established by W. Spiegelberg (1906).

The black skin attributed to the Boukoloi by Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros, if this was a feature of the historical Boukoloi, is a difficulty for the view that they were from groups of Libyan or Semitic origin (unless we believe, as is possible, that at least some Libyans of the early centuries A.D. were, or were regarded as, black). Egypt used mercenaries also from the south of Egypt, ancient Ethiopia, at least some of whom are likely to have been black. There is nothing improbable about Ethiopian mercenaries, once discharged from military service, turning to banditry in the North-West Delta. On the other hand, J.J. Winkler (1992 9-16), arguing that the bandits in Lollianos dressed in white and black to play on their potential victims’ fear of ghosts, shows that bandits and ghosts were often linked as terrors of the night, and that ghosts were sometimes thought of as black in the Greek and Roman world; perhaps this is why Chariklea imagines the bandits may be ghosts when she first sees them. Therefore, their black skin may be a fictional feature attributed to the Boukoloi to emphasize their fearsomeness, or a disguise used by historical bandits.

It is also possible that the historical βουκόλως were descendants of the section of the Machimoi who occupied the same region, the Hermotybies of Herodotos II, who, having lost their ‘official’ military employment, had turned to banditry. Part of the problem of the identity of the Machimoi is of course the question of what determined the distinct identities of the Hermotybies and the Kalasireis. W. Struve (1936) presented an attractive case for making an identification between the Hermotybies, the ‘3m.w of the Petubastis story of P. Krall and the βουκόλως of the Roman period who feature as bandits in the Greek novel.

---

218 Heliodoros I 3.1.
219 The descriptions of the black skin of the Boukoloi in Achilles Tatios III 9 and in Heliodoros certainly suggest that their skin was naturally black; the persistence of Boukoloi in the tradition of the ancient novel leaves open the possibility that the assertion that they were black was first made in a different form, and was re-interpreted to refer to their natural skin colour by Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros.
220 published by W. Spiegelberg (1910).
Indeed if the Hermotybies, traditionally barred from other trades, had lost their military status before or during the Ptolemaic period it is not difficult to believe that they degenerated into banditry.

The military capacity and independent spirit of the historical Boukoloi are attested by the fact that they revolted from the Romans in A.D. 172-173. If they can be traced back as far as the Hermotybies, then there is a case for linking them with the revolt which Inaros started against the Persians in the same region in about 460 B.C. On the other hand Inaros and his people are called Libyan by Thucydides. Thucydides makes an observation on the character of the marsh dwellers of the Western Delta at I 110.2: “Egypt again came under the King’s rule, apart from Amurtaios, the king in the marshes. This is because they were unable to catch him on account of the size of the marsh, and because the marsh dwellers (οἱ Ἐλευσιναί) are the most warlike of the Egyptians.” The place and its inhabitants were still perceived as rugged in the time of Heliodoros. In the following passage from Jerome Vita Hilarii 43 (=PL 23.52-53) the saint retires to a ‘secret garden’ in the Bucolia, (the work is securely dated to before A.D. 392 by its mention in Jerome De viribus illustris 135): qui cum revertisset, cupienti rursum ad Aegyptum navigare, hoc est, ad ea loca, quae vocantur Bucolia, eo quod nullis ibi Christianorum esset, sed barbara tantum et ferox natio, suavit ut in ipsa magis insula ad secretiorem locum conscenderet.

The earliest mention of bandits in the region is that quoted by Strabo from Eratosthenes. The mention by Eratosthenes gives an early Ptolemaic date, which is consistent with the view that the bandits were Hermotybies who had lost their military employment under the Ptolemies. Herodotos does not mention bandits in his description of the Delta, and implies (but does not strictly speaking state) that the Hermotybies retained their military employment under the Persians. Robbers in the area are also mentioned in Caesar, and in a fictional context by Xenophon of Ephesos. In view of the association of the Western Delta with cattle rearing, the name Βουκόλοι may have been taken to mean ‘herdsmen’ in the Roman period, and its etymological meaning may have been forgotten.

The Βουκόλοι may appear in the Inaros cycle of Demotic tales. In Der Sagenkreis des Königs Petubastis the young priest fighting against the Egyptian army is helped by thirteen ‘3m who come from ‘Pr-dw’, 'land of

\[221\] Dio Cassios LXXI 4.  
\[222\] Thucydides I 104ff.  
\[223\] Strabo XVII 19.  
\[224\] Caesar De Bello Gallico III 122.3.  
\[225\] Xenophon of Ephesos III 11.  
reeds' or 'land of papyrus'. The references are given in the vocabulary under '3m and Pr-dwf. Spiegelberg takes '3m to be Arabs and 'Pr-dwf' to be the area to the south of Suez. However, elsewhere in Demotic '3m invariably means 'herdsman'; we simply do not know whether in Demotic it can also mean 'Semitic'. In any case it is now clear that it could refer to these Boukólores who, unlike ordinary herdsmen, could very well be mercenaries, and who come from a land of reeds in the Western Delta. This provides an alternative explanation to Spiegelberg's which he discusses op. cit. p8-9.

The bandits are called βουκόλοι in Achilles Tatios, as they are in Heliodoros. They figure prominently in Achilles Tatios, and he has a digression on them, written in a style usually associated with the geographical writers (IV 11.2-12), as Heliodoros does here. F. Altheim treats the information about them given in Heliodoros and Achilles Tatios as if it had the same historical value as information given in avowedly historical sources, and tries to link Achilles Tatios' account with the attack on the Romans by the Boukóloi described by Dio Kassios LXXII 4. A similar procedure is followed by A. Henrichs in his publication of the fragments of Lollianos. J.J. Winkler emphasized how problematic it is to treat fiction in this way; in any case, the attempt by Henrichs to link the characters in Lollianos with the Egyptian Boukóloi, fictional or otherwise, is very speculative. The attempts by F. Altheim and A. Henrichs to use Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros as parallel primary sources for the historical Boukóloi are incautious, and depend to some extent on the fact that they both place Heliodoros in the mid third century A.D., which date is at best unproven.

On the other hand it seems reasonable to believe Achilles Tatios' claim to come from Alexandria. Therefore it is not likely that he would have needed to depend on a literary source for his information about the Boukóloi: what he did not invent he could discover from first hand knowledge. One could further argue that if Achilles Tatios were Alexandrian, then his first readers are likely to have been Alexandrian too, and it would have been in his interest to avoid the kind of obvious factual errors which readers of fiction could find disturbing. The importance of avoiding obvious inaccuracies would be all the greater if one accepts A. Billaut's argument that geographical digressions, of which this passage is an example, serve the function of adding gravity to the genre of the novel.

---

228 A. Henrichs (1972) p48-51.
231 A. Billaut (1990) 278-284.
Now, there is much in Heliodoros' account of the boukóloi which could have been drawn from Achilles Tatios, and little which could not. In Achilles Tatios they are black, they do not speak Greek, and they call their leader (III 9). Heliodoros' statement, ἐν δὲ τούτοις ὅσῳ Ἀἰγυπτίων λῃστεύκων πολιτεύσεται, ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς ὀλίγης, εἰ ποῦ τις ὑπέρεχε τοῦ ὄδατος, καλύβην πνεύματος (I 5.3) recalls Achilles Tatios . . . νησίων τινές εἰσιν ἀποραθήνειν περιοιμέναι . . . εἰσὶ δὲ τῶν νησίων τινές καλύβας ἔχουσαι, καὶ σύντομοι μεταμιμηται πολυν, . . . (IV 12.6.7). In Heliodoros I 6 the description and the language echo the description and the language in Achilles Tatios IV 12.6-8.

Achilles Tatios, unlike Heliodoros, does not tell us that the boukóloi lived on boats, although he makes much of the juxtaposition of terrestrial and maritime pursuits (IV 12.1) and says, ἐπὶ ταύτας οὖτοι καὶ βαδίζουσι καὶ πλέουσι, (12.5). He tells us that fish are used, but does not mention that the fish are sun-dried, and he does not tell us that the boukóloi cut paths through the reeds, nor that the women spin and weave. Heliodoros' detail about tying infants by the ankle in order to prevent them from falling into the water can also be found in Herodotos' description of the dwellers round Lake Prasias. The detail of sun-dried fish comes from Herodotos' description of the marsh dwellers of the Delta. The conclusion is that Heliodoros, when he wrote his account of the boukóloi, depended entirely on literary material, chiefly Achilles Tatios (or less probably a source used by Achilles Tatios and now lost), and Herodotos.

Altogether, there seems to have been a people around Lake Mareotis (Marea) in the Roman period called '3m w in Egyptian, translatable as boukóloi in Greek. The name suggests Semites, whereas the historical identity of the dominant people in the Western Delta was Libyan, and the black skin of the Boukoloi of fiction in Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros may suggest Ethiopians. It is possible that peoples of all three origins were present in the region, and any or all of them, mixed or separately, may have been brigands. Therefore the question remains whether the fictional Boukoloi are based on a single group of historical bandits, perhaps with a mixture of ethnic and cultural determinants and origins, or whether they are a fictional collation of distinct groups from the same region.

Incidentally, it is sometimes argued (for instance, by A.M. Saracella Maia 24 (1972) 8-41) that the Aithioipika represents a bipartite society, peopled by

---

232 V. note on I 5.3. ἐπιθεοτοσιν below.
233 Herodotos V 16.3.
234 Herodotos II 92.2; sun-dried fish also also eaten by Egyptians. Herodotos II 77.4, and Babylonians, Herodotos I 200.
privileged aristocrats, on the one hand, and servants or bandits on the other, but without much in the way of a middle class, and that this indicates what kind of society Heliodoros himself knew. However, this kind of cast seems to have been a generic convention in the Greek novel. Moreover, the fallaciousness of the argument is clear when one remembers that nineteenth century novels with this kind of cast (E. Sue Mystères de Paris for instance) were produced in a society with a strong middle class, who in fact constituted the main readership for novels.

‘Realist’ movements in modern fiction have not yet, it seems, robbed the public of a taste for representations of ‘low life’ and ‘high life’, and these by and large nourish an appetite for escapism, not realism. In spite of their vein of realism it is surely this escapist impulse which peopled the ancient Greek novels with aristocrats and bandits.

3. ἐπὶ ἀύτῳ μὲν ἀυτοῖς αἰ γυναικεῖς ἑριθεὐόουσιν: They spin and weave, as the translators have seen. LSJ misinterprets this reference and LXX Tobit 2.11 as “serve, work for hire.” (For Tobit 2.11 cf. the translation of the Vulgate, where this verse is 2.19.) The earlier use of the word was less specific (Iliad XVIII 560; Hesiod, Erga 602: v. M.L. West’s note ad loc.) The entry in LSJ is probably influenced by the entries in Hesychios and the Suda for this word, but these reflect gnomic uses and are not relevant here.

The material spun was certainly linen. In a passage about the manufacture of linen Pliny the Elder says “Aegyptio lino minimum firmitatis, plurimum lucri. quattuor ibi genera: Taniticum, Pelusiacum, Buticum, Tentyriticum regionum nominibus, in quibus nascentur.” (XIX 1(2)). Incidentally, Herodotos (II 35.2) tells us that in Egypt weaving is men’s work. A.B. Lloyd ad loc. (1975-88) adduces evidence in support of this claim, but points out that it need not have been exclusively men’s work.

4. καλιάς: This means equally a ‘hut’ or a ‘nest’. Thus the small children struggling to crawl out of the hut conjure up the image of small birds liable to fall from their nest.

4. κατῶν τινα χειραγωγὸν αὐτῷ τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ ποδὸς ἑπιστήματος: χειραγωγὸν is not attested before Plutarch. Eustathios (160.1, ad II. I 589) uses this passage as an example of the figure of speech which entails using one word when another thing is meant (here ‘hand’ where ‘foot’ is meant).
The marshland home of the Boukoloi is described, and its defensibility emphasized.

1. Kai ἐπάρχει τῆς βουκόλου ἄνηρ ἐτέχθη τε ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ: The phrase βουκόλου ἄνηρ is used once in Homer (II. XXIII 845), where it is a paradigm for great strength. Like ὄρος (cf. note on I 1.1) the word βουκόλου frequently connotes the context of wild and remote countryside (e.g. the βουκόλου in Herodotos I 110ff).

2. σκολιάς γὰρ τίνας ἄπραστος τεμόμενοι καὶ πολλοῖς ἐλιγμοῖς πεπλανημένας καὶ σφίσι μὲν διὰ τὴν γνώσιν ῥάστοις τοὺς δ' ἄλλοις ἀπόρους τοὺς διέκπλους κατασκευάσαντες: σκολιός is not in Attic prose. It means ‘curved’ or ‘twisted’ or ‘confusing’, or sometimes, ‘deliberately confusing’ as here; cf. Pindar Pythia I . . . λεύκου ἄκαν υποθεσομαι, / ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοίς σκολιαῖς. The link with ἄπραστος creates oxymoron. Of ἄπραστος Hesychius says: ὅδος τετίμμενη, μὴ ἤχουσα ἐκτροπάς, ἄλλ' εὐθεία. At Nicander Theriaka 478 we read (of fleeing a monstrous snake): φεῦγε δ' ἀξί σκολιήν τε καὶ οὐ μίαν ἄπραστον ἱλλον. Here, however, the οὐ can be taken with the sense of ἄπραστον as well as μίαν: the sense is less contradictory. In our passage, it is clear from διέκπλους late in the sentence that these are channels for boats rather than footpaths.

ῥάστοις: The Budé editors are right to accept Bekker's emendation here, which makes the adjective agree with διέκπλους rather than σκολιῶς, giving a more elegant and Heliodoxian sentence. The hyper-conservative A. Colonna prints the reading of the MSS, ῥάστοις.

2. καὶ τὰ μὲν κτλ.: The μὲν is answered by the δὲ at the beginning of the next section. As T. Hägg (1971) in his discussion On the μὲν / δὲ linking phrases (314-316) notes, μὲν ὁδὸν at the beginning of one section picked up by δὲ at the beginning of the next is frequently used by the novelists to mark a transition from one topic to the next. The transitional use is found equally with μὲν δὴ and μὲν alone, as here (μὲν δὴ . . . δὲ: J.D. Denniston (1954) p258; μὲν ὁδὸν . . . δὲ: p472; μὲν . . . δὲ: the transitional use is not distinguished by Denniston although the usage is common enough in the classical historians). Of the novelists, only Heliodoros and Xenophon of Ephesos follow the classical historians' practice of using this technique to bridge the break between books (μὲν δὴ . . . δὲ: in Herodotos bridges the break between IV-V and VII-VIII; μὲν ὁδὸν . . . δὲ in Xenophon H.G. III-IV, Anabasis II-III; μὲν . . . δὲ in Herodotos VIII-IX, Thucydides III-IV, VII-VIII, Xenophon of Ephesos III-IV, Heliodoros V-VI, VI-VII, VIII-IX).
The Boukoloi are impressed by the girl whom their chief has captured. After dinner the captive couple are put in a hut with a young Greek.

1. καὶ οἱ μὲν τῶν τε ἱππῶν ἀπεβίβαζον τοὺς νέους: A genitive of movement from a place without a preposition is generally a poetic usage, v. Kühner-Gerth vol II pt 2, §421. There is, however, one earlier prose example with this verb: Xenophon, Historia Graeca 1 5.22. Ἀλκιβίαδης δὲ τὸ στράτευμα ἀπεβίβασε τῆς Ἀνδρίας χώρας εἰς Γαύρον.

1. καὶ τὸν λήσταρχον οἴλονει βασιλέα τινὰ ἑαυτῶν προσαπαντῶντες ὑπεδέχοντο. The Boukoloi hail their leader as king at Achilles Tatos III 9, from where Heliodoros probably imitated this detail.

2. ἢ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐμπνεοῦν μετῆρθαι τὸ ἄγαλμα διὰ τῆς κόρης ὑπ’ ἄγροικίας εἰκαζον. Of the classical prose writers only Plato and Aristotle use the word ἄγροικία. Because of the similarity in the language and the situation, this scene, in which the marsh dwellers are confronted with unfamiliar beauty, may remind the reader of the myth in Phaedo 109d, where mankind is said to inhabit τὰ κοίλα τῆς γῆς and is compared to one who lives beneath the sea. ἐκδύεται καὶ ἀνακύψωσι ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης εἰς τὸν ἐνθάδε τύπον, ὡσοπορίᾳ σφίξι, μηδὲ ἄλλοι ἁγκακοῦς εἰη τοῦ ἐωφαικότος.

2. ὁ ἄλλος καὶ καλλίστον τοῦ Χάνει ὅποι τοῦ

2. μόνο: supply αὐτὸ.

3. καὶ τὴν κόρην ἀνδριστον ἀπὸ πάντων διαφυλάττειν: That one recently taken prisoner should be given such responsibility is surprising. By this Heliodorus indicates that Knemón’s Greekness commands the bandits’ respect. On the other hand, as J.R. Morgan has shown (JHS 109 1989 99-113) Knemón’s story gives a thoroughly disreputable picture of Athens and Athenian social life. We get the sense that for Heliodorus Athens, and Knemon, the native Athenian, fail to display the high ideal of Hellenism which Theagenes displays. Knemon’s Greekness nonetheless, not only makes him useful as a Greek speaking guard and interpreter for the prisoners, but also guarantees that he is a far better and more trustworthy character than the barbarian bandits, and that they recognize this.
The captive girl laments; the captive young man remonstrates with her for blaming Apollo for their misfortune; the young Greek in the hut reassures them, and delighted to hear a Greek, they ask him his identity and his story. He is Knemon, an Athenian. We learn incidentally that the captive youths are called Theagenes and Charikleia.

1. oǐ peri tʰn kóρn: This means ‘Charikleia and Theagenes’, not Charikleia alone: see the comment on I 3.5. oǐ ἀμφί. At first Charikleia seems to be soliloquizing, but after her speech Theagenes replies.

1. ἀνακινούσης αὐτῆς, οἵμαι, πλέον τά πάθη τῆς νυκτὸς: The correct reading is οὗτοῖς, sc. oǐ peri tʰn kóρn. This is one of those places where A. Colonna’s charge against the Budé editors, that they favour C too highly, is justified.

2. ἐπὶ τινὸς χαμεόνης κατακεκλιμένη: χαμεόνη and its cognates are restricted to verse before Plutarch, with the exception of Plato Symposium 220d, χαμεύνια.

2. Ἀπόλλων κτλ.: The ‘dramatic’ scene and the vocabulary of this speech are reminiscent of tragedy (λίαν, πικρότερον, ἀγχόνη, etc.). See further J.W. Birchall GCN VII 1996.

3. εἰ δὲ με γνώσεται τις αἰσχρῶς, ἢν μηδέπο μηδὲ Θεαγένης, ἐγὼ μὲν ἀγχόνη προλήψομαι τὴν δίβριν, καθαρὰν ἐμαυτὴν ὀσκέρ φυλάττω: The use of γιγνώσκω for sexual intercourse is not a Greek idiom. Its use in LXX (and subsequently some Christian writers) is influenced by Hebrew (לִיבִּ). Plutarch (Pomp. 36.2; Alex. 21.7; Galba 9; Cato Minor 7; Praecepta gerundae reipublicae 24 / 818 b 9) also uses it thus, probably under the influence of Latin (v. TLL sv. cognosco 1.3.a.b). The only earlier Greek example of the usage is a fragment of Menander (Edmonds 449A, CAF 558), which is quoted by Hermogenes, who uses ἐγνω as an example of a euphemism. Since Hermogenes thought it worthy of comment it is probable, though not certain, that he regarded the usage exceptional and peculiar to Menander. Heliodorus had almost certainly read some Plutarch; he also has usages which we must assume he acquired from reading Christian writers (cf. p20); and there is probably some contamination of his Greek by a knowledge of Latin; this usage could have derived from any of these sources.
The name Theagenes' suggests Theagenes' descent, through Achilles, from a goddess (v. p72). The name is well attested in Greek. The most famous man to bear it was Theagenes the tyrant of Megara. The tyrant's political activities, described by Thucydides I 126, have no obvious connection with the character of our hero. However, Pausanias tells us that Theagenes of Megara was good looking, and famous as an Olympic victor in a foot race (Pausanias I 28.1: . . . εἰδος κόλλαστος καὶ τὰ ἐξ δόξαν ἐγένετο ὁδόκραν ἀνεβάμενος δισέλθουν νίκην Ὄλυμποικήν . . . ). The Theagenes of the Athiopika is described as good looking at Heliodoros III 3.4-8, and, swift-footed like his ancestor, wins a race at IV 4, so the choice of name does not seem to have been accidental.

καθαρός frequently refers to ritual or moral purity in all periods of Greek, but is not used of sexual purity before the first century A.D. It is common in this sense in Christian writers from Clement onwards (for references v. Lampe s.v.); rare in pagan writers, it occurs at Longos III 11.3, Xenophon of Ephesos V 14.4, Achilles Tatos VIII 8.10 and Julian De Mestre Deorum 160c (μὴ ἐκατατομ ἡ καθαραν φυλάττειν τῇ θεό). The eponymous hero of Euripides Hippolytos seems to link the idea of purity with chastity, but καθαρός is not used in the context of chastity in the play.

Anima does however occur occasionally as a term of endearment in a Roman context, and may be included the use of ψυχή here among the examples of possible contamination of the Greek of Heliodoros by Latin (v. p27). Cicero addresses his wife and daughter as animae meae (Ad familiares XIV 18; cf. 14). Juvenal (VI 194) mocks Roman ladies who speak Greek in order to be seductive, and puts into their mouth the exclamation ζωή καὶ ψυχή as a form of address. In the same context Martial has κυρίε μου, μέλι μου, ψυχή μου (X 68.5). Apuleius imitates this line when he makes Psyche say to her mysterious lover “mi mellite, mi marite, tuae Psychae dulcis anima” (V 6.9). Anima is probably a term of endearment in two fragmentary poems from Anthologia Latina: Carmina Epigraphica (ed. F. Buecheler): 92.11 (of a daughter) and 143.1,3 (relation uncertain). It is used to close two or three of the letters preserved among the Vindolanda tablets, by a woman to her female friend: v. A.K. Bowman and J.D. Thomas (1994) no.291.1.12 and note ad loc.
The complete lack of real Greek parallels suggests that Heliodoros' contemporary readers would have found the expression surprising, and may have taken it, like, perhaps, the name of Apuleius' Psyche, to indicate that the author subscribed to a belief about love which was broadly in the Platonic tradition. However, we should probably reject a Platonic interpretation because Demainete uses ψυχή as a term of endearment (according to Knemon, I 9.4), and her love is anything but Platonic.

The punning use of the name Χαρίκλεια in the oracle at II 35.5 to some extent explains Heliodoros' choice of the name. There is no obvious reason why our heroine should share a name with the only other Charikleia in Greek literature, an immoral woman at Lucian Toxaris 13-16. Perhaps Heliodoros had in mind the point made in a testimonium by a Philip of Byzantium, that the name interpreted numerically produces the sacred number 777. The most recent discussion of this testimonium is L. Tarân (1992). Tarân dates the testimonium not later than the fifth century on the grounds that it combines a Christian background with an interest in Neo-Platonism. On this view the intellectual environment in which the testimonium was composed is close to Heliodoros' own, and Heliodoros shows that he was aware of a similar numerical interpretation of the name of the Nile (v. p35 above), so it is credible that he was aware that the name Charikleia represents 777.

Like τὸ θεῖον, τὸ κρείττον and οἱ κρείττονες are used of divinity by both pagan and Christian writers (although in the classical period they are hardly attested as substantives: see below). In both pagan and Christian writers τὸ κρείττον and οἱ κρείττονες are used frequently in connection with God's beneficence, and sometimes neutrally, but in contrast with τὸ θεῖον, never in connection with his anger. (e.g. . . . φιλανθροπία τοῦ κρείττονος . . .

4. θηνείς μὲν εἰκότα παροξύνεις δὲ πλέον ἢ δοκεῖς τὸ θεῖον· οὐ γὰρ ὀνειδίζειν, ἄλλα παρακαλεῖν χρεὼν, εὐχαίρει, οὐκ αἰτίας ἐξελεύθαι ὁ κρείττον: The uses of the more or less synonymous τὸ θεῖον and τὸ κρείττον here seems to be motivated by Heliodoros' practice of varying vocabulary where possible. However the use of TLG to examine the other attestations for the terms suggests that they are not quite synonymous, and the variation here is not random. τὸ θεῖον normally has the sense of a provident but potentially irascible deity: Plato Phaidros 242c . . . ὅς δῆ τι ἡμαρτηκότα τὸ θεῖον. Herodotos I 32: τὸ θεῖον πάν φθονερόν. Clement Paedagogus I 8.68.3: . . . οὐκ ὅργιζεται τὸ θεῖον, ἢ τισιν ἐδοξέν . . .
Heliodoros uses [τὸ] κρείττον in the sense of 'the divinity' at I 8.4; IV 8.6; VIII 9.6; VIII 10.2 (if the addition of the article, conjectured by A. Wifstrand 1944-5 p103, is accepted), X 4.3; X 37.3; [οἱ] κρείττονες in the sense of 'the divinities' at II 26.2; III 16.4; IV 6.4; IV 15.2; V 12.1; V 17.2; VII 11.9; VII 26.9; IX 9.3; IX 12.2; IX 22.2; X 9.7. κρείττονες and κρείττον meaning 'gods', 'god', are rare in classical Greek (Plato and Euripides use κρείττον adjectivally of gods; κρείττονες at Leges IV 718a and κρείττον τὶς at Xenophon Kyropaidia VIII 8.2 may be adjectival, so they are not secure attestations of the substantival use of the words). They become much more common in the fourth century A.D. The neuter τὸ κρείττον in this substantival sense is completely unattested before the fourth century A.D.

The distinction in the use of τὸ θεῖὸν and τὸ κρείττον is easy to demonstrate, but difficult to explain. The fact that it survives in Christian writers strongly suggests that the difference in use outlived any religious concepts in which it had its origins. Therefore it is safe to suppose that Heliodoros was aware of the usual semantic fields of these terms, but that he probably did not know how they arose. We may further state that τὸ κρείττον is not found before the fourth century A.D., and that M.P. Nilsson (1974 p566) was right to include the use of τὸ κρείττον among items of vocabulary pointing to a fourth century rather than an earlier date for Heliodoros.) It is reasonable, but perhaps not safe, to suppose also that τὸ κρείττον was a fourth century coinage, on the analogy of τὸ θεῖὸν, whose semantic field differed only slightly from that of οἱ κρείττονες. The question of why τὸ θεῖὸν and οἱ κρείττονες came to have the sense they did in classical Greek, and what value the statement of Hesychios has s.v. κρείττονος (κρείττονας τοῦ ἱεροῦ οὕτω λέγουσιν. δοκοῦσι δὲ κακωτικοὶ τινες εἶναι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ παριόντες τὰ ἱερὰ συγγένες ἔξοις μὴ τι βλαβεῖσιν. καὶ οἱ θεοὶ δὲ. Αἰσχύλος Αἰτναῖς) must remain open. There is really no evidence to support J.E. Harrison’s view (1903, pp.327,335) that οἱ κρείττονες was applied specifically to the heroized dead.

4. ὡσπὸ τῆς ἑσπέρας: Bekker is surely right to print Koraes’ emendation, ἀκο instead of ὡς (attributed by the Budé editors to unpublished notes by Valckenaer: for their location v. Budé I pLIV). ἀκο + the genitive of ἑσπέρα with or without the article, is common enough in Greek but ὡς + ἑσπέρας or another genitive denoting time is almost unknown; (in Lib. Ep. 364.3 ὡς τῆς ἑσπέρας probably expresses agent, but here a temporal sense is required). ὡςο
+ an accusative denoting times occurs, but a corruption from ὀπὸ τῆς ἐπιπέρας is more probable here on both palaeographical and semantic grounds. Koraes ad loc. asserts that the same error occurs several times in the text. This tends to confirm the view that all our manuscripts depend on an early minuscule archetype where the combination α + π could resemble the combination υ + π. Colonna (1938 XXVIII-XXIX), after presenting a list of the errors found in all manuscripts, argues for an archetype of the ninth to tenth century.

5. τοιαύτην σοι ποριούμαι βοτάνην ἢ διὰ τρίτης ἐνόσει τάς κληγάς: “On the third day it mends the wounds.” ἐνόσω is otherwise completely unattested in this medical sense. There may, however, be a word-play on the more common medical use of ἐνόσω for mixing up herbal preparations. Several herbs were used by ancient, as by modern herbalists to accelerate the healing of wounds; for example, Dioskorides Eup. 154(162) lists medicines suited to the treatment of fresh wounds. Greek medical writers, unlike Knemon, do not specify how many days a herb takes to heal a wound, but the present writer remembers his astonishment at the rapid healing of a minor wound treated with one of Dioskorides’ remedies (aloes) freshly picked from the roadside.

5. συμβολῆς γενομένης: “when a battle has taken place.” This genitive absolute phrase occurs also at Herodotos I 74.2.

6. Κνήμωνα: Κνήμων is the apparently made up name of the main character in the Dyscolos of Menander. It is borrowed also by Lucian (Dialogi Mortuorum 8) and Aelian (Epistulae Rusticae 13-16). One is reminded of the made up names in modern novelists in which the humour and effect depend in part on half recognizable verbal echoes, in this case, perhaps of κνῆμο, κνήμη, κνημός and the like. All these associations of the name and the effect they have on the reader’s perception of Knemon are discussed in detail by E.L. Bowie (1995).

7. τι ταῦτα κινεῖς κάναμοιχλεύεις; τάυτο δὴ τῶν τραγῳδῶν. οὐκ ἐν καίρῳ γένοιτ’ ἐν ἐπεισόδιοι διὸν ὡμῖν τῶν ὑμετέρων τὰμα ἐπεισφέρειν κακὰ: In Euripides Medea when the Chorus tells Jason that Medea has killed his children he calls for the door to be opened. Medea replies τί τάσδε κινείς κάναμοιχλεύεις πολλὰς; (1317). Knemon’s allusion to this moment of high tragedy must be rather tongue in cheek, he draws attention to the allusion with τάυτο δὴ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, which perhaps also refers to the nature of his story. One cannot imagine Theagenes turning something so solemn into a pleasantry. In this way Knemon is already marked out as an amusing but lightweight character. Moreover, ταύτο δὴ τῶν τραγῳδῶν is formulaic: when reporting the words of Charias Knemon produces a quote form Homer and follows it with ταύτο δὴ τῶν ἔπους (I 14.5); whether the reader
attributes the phrase there to Knemon or to his friend Charias, its repetition shows that this is a formulaic way of marking a quotation which gives Knemon’s speech a pedantic edge.

S.A. Naber (Mnemosyne N.S. I 1873 145-169) assumes that Heliodoros has used a Latin version of Medea, presumably because he thought that ταῦτα is a translation of haec (sc. ostia; i.e. Heliodoros failed to recognize that haec stood for haec ostia or some other Latin equivalent of τάσσει πόλας). The idea has the problem that it is unlikely that Heliodoros would have lighted on so unusual a verb as κάναμωκλέως, ‘lever open’, unless he had the Greek version in mind; the change from the literal to the metaphorical use of the verb is striking and rather strange, but it is probably deliberate, rather than due to a laughable oversight, as Naber thought.

In the surface meaning of the dialogue ἐπεισόδιον must have not its usual sense, ‘episode’, but the sense which Pollux IV 108 gives it in his discussion of drama: καὶ ἐπεισόδιον δ’ ἐν δράμασι πρᾶγμα παράγματι συναπτόμενον; Knemon says, ‘It would not be a good time to introduce my troubles to you as a supplement of your own.’ This interpretation is supported by the apparent allusion which Knemon makes with the words τάμα ἐπεισφέρειν κακά (half a iambic trimeter) to E. Hipp. 866-867 ϕεὖ ϕεῦ, τόδε αὖ νεοχύμον ἐκδοχαῖς ἐπεισφέρει θεός κακόν. Here the chorus indicate explicitly that a fresh misfortune has been introduced into the story. Nonetheless, by his choice of word Heliodoros warns the reader that a digression, or ‘episode’, is about to start.

7. δῆγημα: First attested in LXX. In Polybios, where the normal word for ‘narrative’ is δῆγησις, δῆγημα means ‘tale,’ implying a lack of veracity. In the fiction of Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesos it is the normal word for ‘story’.

7. καὶ ταῦτα: ‘and what’s more’ (LSJ οὐτος C. VIII.2.a), an expression favoured by Heliodoros.
Knemon tells how at Athens his stepmother, Demainete, fell in love with him and attempted to seduce him.

This is the beginning of Knemon’s story, which lasts until the end of I 17. Like the Aithiopika as a whole, part of the story (I 14.4-I 17.6) is put into the words of an internal narrator, in this case Knemon’s friend Charias. The story, set in Athens, has attracted critical attention recently, above all in an article by J.R. Morgan (JHS 109 1989 99-113), where it is argued that the story, composed like a miniature novel and set within the Aithiopika, provides a picture of the decadent world of Knemon’s Athens which throws into higher relief the morally elevated world of the main characters of the Aithiopika, and of their behaviour. Most contemporary specialists rightly regard Morgan’s thesis as fundamental for our interpretation of this episode, and of the Aithiopika as a whole; from time to time in the commentary below supplementary points are made which may corroborate his view. T. Paulsen (1992), whose entire thesis emphasizes the tragic features of the Aithiopika, discusses Knemon’s story (85-102); in harmony with his general perspective he regards Knemon’s character as essentially tragic. The intrigue, however, as well as Knemon’s name, seems to owe to more to New Comedy than to any other genre, although the extent to which Knemon’s story is indebted to tragedy is considerable.

1. Ἀρίστιππος: The only historical character Heliodoros may have had in mind was the pupil of Socrates, Aristippus of Cyrene. He was a byword for luxurious living, as E.L. Bowie (1995) points out, so the associations of the name would suit Heliodoros’ purpose in portraying Athens as decadent (v. J.R. Morgan JHS 1989 99-113). There was a biography of him by Diogenes Laertios (Lives of the Philosophers II 8.). At Plato Phaedo 59c he is away at Aigina. He also appears in Strabo (XVII 837), Plutarch (Dion and Brutus 19, Moralia II 330c), Xenophon Memorabilia (II i 3.8) and elsewhere.

1. τὸ γένος Ἀθηναῖος: Both A. Colonna and the Budé editors follow CBA in omitting μὲν after τὸ. It is not clear whether μὲν is more likely to have been interpolated or omitted in error. Prof. Maehler advises me that he prefers τὸ μὲν γένος because Knemon seems to be telling his story in normal, colloquial Attic. On basis of the absence of any significant argument on the other side I would tentatively accept this latter reading.
1. γύναιον ἀστεῖον μὲν ἄλλ' ἄρχέκακον, ὄνομα Δημαινέτην: Homer (II. V 63) is the only attestation of ἄρχέκακος before the first century A.D. It is applied to the ships which Meriones built for Paris; in being told of Demainete’s arrival we are reminded by this word of Helen’s fateful arrival in Troy. The name Demainete, perhaps borrowed from Lucian Philopseudes 27, sounds enough like a cognate of μισόμοια to seem appropriate for a woman who becomes mad.

2. τῇ τε ὀρᾷ τὸν πρεσβύτην ἐπαγομένη καὶ τάλλα ὑπερθεραπεύοουσα: ὀρᾷ, as often in Heliodoros, means ‘youthful beauty’. The only other attestation of ὑπερθεραπεύοσα is a listing in Pollux IV 49 (ed. Bethe I 215), among words which can be used to insult a sophist. It was probably added by a copyist, possibly from this passage. Neologisms with ὑπερ- occur in all stages of the Greek language. Perhaps translate ‘flatter excessively’, or with Morgan, ‘she . . . lavished attentions on him’.

2. τέχνην: The vocabulary highlights Demainetes’ cynical attitude to love as J.R. Morgan (JHS 1989 99-113) observes. Thisbe uses the same word of Arsinoe’s trade, which is effectively prostitution, below in I 15.5.

2. σαγγνευθεῖς: ‘ensnared’; a σαγγήνη was a dragnet for fishing or hunting, and this is a metaphor from hunting for seduction. The verb σαγγνεύω is principally memorable for its use in Herodoros VI 31 for the Persian tactic of clearing a country of people using a line of soldiers hand in hand, and that is its first attestation. That technical sense is itself metaphorical, as Herodian makes clear by introducing the verb with ὅπερ when he uses thus. A semitic origin for the word was posited by O. Szereményi JHS 94 (1974) 149, but of course this does not imply that Herodotos would have regarded it as a loan word, and beyond suggesting that it was ‘un-literary’ in Classical and Archaic Greek we cannot explain why it appears in our texts in a metaphorical sense long before it appears in its literal sense. However the military sense is not relevant to the interpretation of the present passage. The literal meaning of the word is ‘to catch in a net’ (of fish, first in Philo Mos. I 93; of animals, first in Plut. Mor. 52C), and its use here implies the metaphor of hunting, which is common enough in an amatory context. The hunting metaphor used of women, and the idea of a woman (or rather, a female vampire) ensnaring a man is found in Philostratos Life of Apollonios IV 25, and in LXX Eccl. VII 26 a woman’s heart is called σαγγήνα (καὶ εὕρισκον ἑκὼ πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον, σὺν γυναικα, ἣτις ἐστὶν θηρεύσας καὶ σαγγήναι καρδία αὐτῆς, δεσμοὶ αὐτῆς,).
4. νῦν μὲν παιδίου νῦν δὲ γυναικῶταν ὅνομαξουσα καὶ αόθις κληρονόμου καὶ μετ' ὀλίγου ψυχῆν ἐκυτῆς ἀποκαλούσα: Demainete calls Knemon alternately by respectable and disreputable names. By calling her step-son κληρονόμου she not only casts herself in the rôle of parent, but perhaps means to indicate that, assuming Aristippos will leave her his property, she will leave it to him in turn. An alternative explanation is that Heliodoros remembers that under Athenian law a woman could not inherit property; in this case, when she addresses Knemon as 'my heir' she would presumably mean that she hopes that Aristippos' household will continue to support her after his death and when Knemon has become head of the family. However, the fist explanation is simpler and more natural, and in view of Heliodoros' lack of interest in law (v. on I 13.2 below) it is probably safe to assume that he had overlooked that Athenian women could not inherit property.

§10

Knemon, returning from the Great Panathenaia, finds his father out. Demainete propositions him and is rebuffed. She accuses Knemon to his father, saying that when she upbraided him for loose living, he, having discovered that she is pregnant, kicked her in the stomach.

1. Παναθηναῖα τῶν μεγάλων ἀγομένων, ὅτε τὴν ναῦν Ἀθηναίοι διὰ γῆς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς πέμπουσιν, ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἐφεβεύον: The convention of lovers making their first contact at a festival is one of the novelistic devices imported by Heliodoros into his description of the morally debased world of Knemon's Athens and contributes to the way Knemon's story resembles a 'novel within a novel'. For an interpretation of Knemon's story as a 'novel within a novel', displaying novelistic conventions like this one in a perverted form, v. J.R. Morgan (JHS 1989 99-113). The references for this literary convention are given in Gow *Theocritus* ad II 66; W. Headlam and A.D. Knox *Herodas* (1922) ad I 56 (40-41).

At the Panathenaia the peplos which was presented to Athene was attached like a sail to the mast of a boat, which was paraded through the streets. Our rather limited sources for the ceremony are collected and discussed by H.W. Parke (1977 39-40, n(19); the only extant source from which Heliodoros could have derived this detail is Pausanias I 29.1.

ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἐφεβεύον: Athenian citizens became ἐφηβοι at eighteen years of age. The locus classicus for the institution at Athens is Aristotle *Res Publica Atheniensium* 42. Other sources are conveniently collected and discussed in A. Boeckh (1874a).

For the form of the chlamys see F.B. Tarbell CP 1906 283-289, P.M. Fraser (1972) II 26 n64 and S. Lattimore A.JA 1975 87-88. The evidence for the shape of this garment is far from conclusive, but Tarbell's interpretation seems reasonable. This is a copy of one of his diagrams.

Whether or not Heliodoros knew what a chlamys looked like, he certainly knew that it was worn by the Athenian Epheboi. See the references under ἐφηβεύων (below). An attractive ἐφηβος wears a chlamys at AP XII 78 (= Gow and Page 4442-5):

εἰ χλαμύδ' εἶχεν Ἰερώς καὶ μῆ πτερὰ μηδ' ἐπὶ νότων τόξα τε καὶ φαρέτραν, ἄλλ' ἐφόρει πέτασον ναὶ <μόρ> τὸν ὁμήρον ἐφηβὸν ἐπόνυμα, Ἀντίοχος μὲν ὑν ἄν Ἰερώς, ὁ δ' Ἰερώς τάμπαλιν Ἀντίοχος.

2. Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θησεύς: Read Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θησεύς. This is Colonna’s emendation and few would dissent from it; there is a defence of it in A. Colonna Atti della Academia delle Scienze di Torino, 1982 p38. “... il testo tradizionale ὁ νέος Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θησεύς ὁ ἐμός è servito da palestra di esercitazioni d’ ogni tipo, fino alle recenti proposte di R. Merkelbach (Heliodor I. 10 Seneca und Euripides in „Rhein. Mus., 100, 1957, 99-100), di W.G. Arnott (Three Conjectures in „Philologus„, CIX (1965) 308-310), di R. Rocca (Eliodoro e due „Ippoliti„, euripidei, in „Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina„, I, Perugia 1976, 25-31), è quali hanno mostrato di ignorare che nel 1951 io avevo (La Chronologia dei Romanzi greci. Le Etiopiche di Eliodoro, in „Il Mondo classico„, XVIII. 1951, p157, n.28.) mediante un preciso raffronto del luogo eliodoreo con Filostrato, Vita Apoll. VI. 3, tratto la conclusione che lo scrittore aveva qui seguito (come molte altre volte), tanto nelle linee dell’ episodio, quanto nelle espressioni, l’esempio filostratico, e che pertanto il testo della Vita Apoll. ἐστεφανώσθηκε αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ πρὸ Ἰππόλυτον τὸν Θησέως rendeva assai plausible in Eliodoro la presenza di una frase, ὁ νέος Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θησέως, corrotta facilmente nella tradizione in ὁ νέος Ἰππόλυτος ὁ Θησεύς.”
Demainete compares her position to that of Phaedra in Euripides’ Hippolytos. The comparison may place Demainete in a more sympathetic light. There are several echoes of Athenian tragedy in Demainete’s story, but the general narrative (as distinct from Demainete’s own words) gives no reason to suppose that Knemon or the author wish to lend their support to the sympathetic view of Demainete’s position which the comparison she makes with Phaidra may imply.

2. εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐστείλα: εἰσὶ δ' ἐν αὐτῇ [ἡ ἀκρόπολις] καὶ ἐστὶα τῆς πόλεως, παρ' ἡ ἐστιούντο οἱ τε κατὰ δημοσίαν πρεσβεῖαν ἡκοντες καὶ οἱ διὰ πράξεων τνα σῖτησεως ἀξιωθέντες, καὶ εἰ τις ἐκ τιμῆς ἀέτειτος ἤν. (Pollux IX 40. ed. Bethe. II 157). In epigraphic decrees concerning personal honours the phrase usually found is εἶναι σῖτησιν αὐτῷ, whilst in literature the usual phrases are ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ σιτείοναι and εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον καλέσαι. Most of the references can be found in LSJ under πρυτανεῖον and σῖτησις. The use of σιτείον.meaned by εἰς seems to be unparalleled; it looks like a conflation of the two phrases mentioned above. We should probably number this amongst the stylistic oddities and novelties with which Heliodorus is continually surprising his readers, and which make it particularly difficult to decide where the text is corrupt.

4. ὁ θαυμαστός φησι καὶ ἐπὶ ἑμίε ἡ νεανίας, ὁ κοινὸς ἡμῶν παῖς ὀν ἐγὼ πλέον καὶ σοῦ πολλάκις ἡγάπησα: εἰς ἑμὲ is probably an equivalent for ἑμοί, but even if it is the meaning is still unclear. Perhaps one could translate “to me he is (still) a youth”, or, ironically, “the youth, who is marvelous even for me.” The Budé editors report εἰς ἑμὲ in all their MSS except A, but Rattenbury, feeling, perhaps, that the expression does not make sense, conjectured καὶ εὔσεβῆς. The expression may make sense if εἰς ἑμὲ stands for the dative ἑμοί, but makes none with a conventional sense of εἰς + accusative: A. Wifstrand (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1944-1945 69-109) p94-96, collects examples which show that εἰς + accusative for dative is common enough by the fourth century A.D., and argues that its use here points to a later date for Heliodoros. Wifstrand does offer some earlier examples of the idiom, including Euripides Bacch. 421-423; Phoen. 1757; Polybios XXX 20.2. In his review of Wifstrand R.M. Rattenbury (CR 60 (1946) 110-111) rather weakly replies that although Wifstrand showed εἰς + accusative for dative to be common, that does not mean that Heliodoros wrote it here. In fact, there is no reason to doubt the transmitted text, and the question mark which Rattenbury placed over this phrase should be removed.
δν ἐγὼ πλέον καὶ σοῦ πολλάκις ἡγάπησα: ‘whom I have loved more than I have loved you,’ or ‘whom I have loved more than you have’? Since both subject and object are explicit, and the pronouns expressing them are adjacent and in the only possible order, the word order leaves the choice of interpretation perfectly ambiguous, as does the context. Both possible meanings are truer than Aristippos realizes, and their ambiguity gives Demainete’s words a double irony.

4. παρακελευομένην μηδὲ πρὸς ἑταϊρας ἔχειν τὸν νοῦν καὶ μέθας: Here again the Budé editors have preferred the reading of C. The accusatives ἑταϊρας and μέθας of the majority of the MSS are more likely to be right, because the normal construction of τὸν νοῦν ἔχειν is with πρὸς + accusative or with dative with no preposition.

4. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα δῶσα περὶ σε τα κάμε περιύβρισεν αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν: The οὖν of C and A is wrong; the Budé editors (but not A. Colonna) print it because of their over-fondness for C, but it is out of place. Prof. Maehler suggested to me that it was included by someone who thought that τὰ μὲν ἄλλα begins a new sentence.

§11

Knemon’s father, Aristippos, has him flogged. Demainete plots, instructing the slave girl Thisbe to have an affair with Knemon. Thisbe persuades Knemon that Demainete is unfaithful to his father, and promises to help Knemon catch her in the act.

1. ταῦτα ως ἡκουσεν: ως as a temporal conjunction, frequent in Heliodoros, is mainly Homeric and Herodotean. The effect of its use here is well summed up by a comment on it in Schwyzer-Debrunner (II 665-666): “Die Schattierung des unmittelbaren zeitlichen Anschlusses („sobald als,” bes. mit Verben der Wahrnehmung) hängt damit zusammen . . .” The following asyndeton indicates the emotional urgency of Aristippos’ response. The omission of a word for the direct object of ἔκαστον and so on, such as εἰμὲ, adds to the compression of the style and the consequent impression of haste. This type of omission does not constitute one of the rhetorical figures recognized by the ancient theorists; some modern theorists (e.g. Kühner-Gerth II §597b) include it in their analysis of Brachylogy, or ‘stylistic brevity’.

2. ως: v. note on I 11.1 ταῦτα ως ἡκουσεν.

3. Θεσβη παλισκάρτον ἦν: The sentence asyndeton indicates that a new story is beginning; compare the opening of I 10.
3. Θισβή: Attested first in the Homeric catalogue of ships (II. II 502) as the name of a town in Boiotia, the use of Θισβή as a personal name in literature is explained by several later authors: e.g. Pausanias (Teubner text) IX 32.2: πλέοντι δὲ ἐκ Κρεῦσιδος οὖν πελαγίῳ, παρά δὲ αὐτὴν Βιοτίαν πόλις ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιῷ Θισβή. There follows a description of the town, then (ib. IX 32.3): Θισβήν δὲ λέγουσιν ἐπιχώριον εἶναι νύμφην, ἄφι ἡς ἡ πόλις τὸ ὄνομα ἔσχηκεν. Dionysios of Halikarnassos Comp. 16.102 explains why the toponym came to be used as a girl's name: εἰ γὰρ τις ἔρωτο ὄντιν' οὖν ἡ ποιήσαν ἡ ρητόρων, τίνα σεμνότητα ἡ καλλιλογίαν ταῦτ' ἔχει τὰ ὄνόματα ὁ ταῖς Βοιωτίαις κεῖται πόλεσιν Ἰρία καὶ Μυκαλασοῦ καὶ Γραία καὶ Ἑτεωνὸς καὶ Σκόλιος καὶ Θισβή καὶ Θυκηστός καὶ Εὐτρῆσις καὶ τάλλα ἐφεξῆς ὅν ἡ ποιήσας μέμνηται, οὐδεὶς ὅν ἐπείνει οὖν ἤμιν' οὖν ἔχειν. However Θισβή as a personal name is not exclusively a literary fiction. The story of Pyramus and Thisbe is told at Ovid Metamorphoses IV 55ff. F Bomer (1976), in his commentary, notes ad loc. that Thisbe became a popular name for slaves after the time of (and so presumably under the influence of) Ovid, as several Latin and Greek inscriptions show. The relevance of the story for the reader’s response to the choice of the name Thisbe here is discussed by E.L. Bowie (1995).

3. καὶ ἡ πολλὰκις πειρώντα μὲ ἀπωσαμένη τότε παντοίως ἐφείλκετο βλέμμασι σνυθμασιν: The use of σύνθμα in an amatory context is unusual; the meaning here is ‘signals’, what we might call ‘body-language’ rather than ‘pre-arranged signs’ or ‘epistolary codes’, as the word means elsewhere. The former meaning is more natural here, and is the meaning the word bears in its other occurrences in Heliodoros (III 5.2; IV 21.2; V 4.7; V 11.1; IX 11.4; IX 18.1; X 15.2.)

4. μὴ γνωσθεῖν παρά τῆς δεσποίνης: “lest she be found guilty in the judgement of the mistress.”

4. μοιχᾶται: μοιχάμενοι is preferred by Christian writers, μοιχεῦω by pagan. μοιχάμοι is found in LXX, and Matthew and Mark, who also use μοιχεῦω. It presumably entered the Septuagint and the gospels from the koine and passed thence into Christian writers. The only classical occurrence is the present participle in Xenophon Historia Graeca I 6.15. The form μοιχάμοι is probably Doric, and Xenophon puts it into the mouth of Kallikratidas, the Spartan admiral, as J. Wackernagel (1907) 7-9 points out in his detailed discussion of the two forms. Attempts to distinguish their meanings are fruitless. Linguistic usage which is typically Christian is not uncommon in Heliodoros (v. p20).
5. καὶ μήν . . . καὶ μήν . . .: This combination of ‘particles’, described by J.D. Denniston (1954) as ‘Progressive’, occurs in the text six other times. The repetition emphasizes how Thisbe moves on from point to point as she draws Knemon into her plot. Kalasiris uses the same καὶ μήν combination when he is stringing along Peloros, in order to involve him in his plot (V 31.3). In two other places (III 6.3; VII 16.3) the meaning is also, in effect, ‘now the next point in the argument is . . .’, and the combination is used twice (I 14.2; III 1.1) when the speaker says words to the effect ‘please do not stop now, and fail to complete the story which you are telling me.’ (μήν, like μέν of which it is a strengthened form, could be described as a conjunction, or ‘particle’, which leads the mind forward to what follows; this is very often a later clause or a reply introduced by δέ or ἀλλὰ. J.D. Denniston (1954), who regarded the primary function of μέν and μήν to be emphatic (p359), tends to obscure their forward looking sense by quoting those clauses where he took μέν and μήν as simply ‘emphatic’ without giving their context; however, his choice of the term ‘progressive’ for καὶ μήν is appropriate.)

§12.

Thisbe advises Knemon that Demainete’s lover is in her room, and Knemon bursts in brandishing a sword, but finds his father there. Aristippos pleads for mercy, Knemon in surprise drops the sword, and Demainete accuses Knemon of trying to attack Aristippos.

2. καὶ εἰσδραμῶν ποῦ ποτὲ ὁ ἀλιτήριος ἕβων ὁ λαμπρός τῆς πάντα σωφροσύνης ἐρώμενος: ἐρώμενος can only be taken as passive: ἐρώμενος cannot be the participle of ἐρωμαί, which would be ἐρώμενος, but only of ἐρω, which is never deponent. The choice of mood emphasizing Demainete’s tendency (in Knemon’s view) to take the initiative in sexual matters; Heliodoros frequently uses the active of women, both in Knemon’s story, and of Charikleia. Sometimes Heliodoros seems to use the ‘wrong’
voice, but ἔρωμενος meaning 'beloved' is so common in Greek literature that we cannot justify giving it an active meaning on these grounds.

2. μὴ γίνοι τὴς ὀργῆς ὀλος: 'Do not be full of...γίνομαι followed by an adverbial expression for a feeling is far from common. With genitive used adverbially: Plutarch Phokion 23(752): ὅτε καὶ φασὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἐλπίδος μεγάλης γενομένην ἐορτάζειν εὐαγγέλια συνεχός καὶ θεεὶ τοὺς θεοὺς... Plutarch Timoleon 3 (237): ξητοιμένου δὲ στρατηγοῦ... eἰς ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ἀναστάς ὀνόμασε Τιμολέοντα τὸν Τιμοδήμου, μῆτε προσίδοντα τοὺς κοινοὺς ἐτι μῆτε ἐλπίδος τοιαύτης γενομένου ἢ προαράσσειος... Dio Kassios LXI 4.4: τῆς τε ἐπιθυμίας ἐγίνετο... With preposition + noun as an adverbial phrase expressing feeling: Plutarch Flamininus 16 (378): ἐν ὀργῇ γεγονότον διὰ τὸν γάμον... The use of the verb with the reflexive pronoun is not really a parallel (e.g. Sophokles O.C. 659-660: ἀλλὰ ὁ νοῦς ὅταν ὁ αὐτοῦ γένεται... Jebb gives other examples ad loc.). We cannot tell whether the present sense developed from it or arose independently.

3. ἐγὼ δὲ ὡσπερ τυφώνι βληθεὶς, ἀδὸς ἀπόπληκτος εἰστήκειν. In Roman period Greek, and in Latin, typhon can mean simply 'whirlwind' (as occasional appearances of the plural show). Whether it completely lacks the sense of a proper name here (and at Achilles Tatios I 12 ὡσπερ τυφώνι βεβλημένος) is ambiguous. Although both editors of Achilles Tatios and Heliodoros have traditionally printed it with a lower case initial letter, one should not lose sight of its personal connotations. The simile (similitudo, παραβολή) is reminiscent of that at II 6: ὡσπερ ὅπο πρηστήρος τῆς ὄνεος βληθέντες. The idea of a person being struck by τυφών and πρηστήρ is found at Aristophanes Lysistrata 974: <μιαρός> δῆτ' ὃ Ζεῦ ὁ Ζεῦ... eἰθ' αὕτην ὡσπερ τοὺς θεούς μεγάλο τυφῷ καὶ πρηστήρι... ἐξυπνεύσεις καὶ ἐξυγγογγύλας / οἴχος ζέραν (972-976). The Egyptian god Seth is identified with τυφών, apparently because Seth was a god of the tempest (v. ‘Contentions of Horus and Seth’ 16.4 in A. Gardiner (1931) p26, where, however, E. Bresciani (1969) p355, and others, are right to prefer the translation ‘howls’ to Gardiner’s ‘thunders’ for the Egyptian hrw). It is likely that Heliodoros, who knew that Typhon was another name for Seth (cf. IX 9.5), would also have been aware of the metaphysical character which Plutarch ascribes to Typhon in Egyptian thought: Τυφών δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ παθητικόν καὶ τιτανικόν καὶ ἔλογον καὶ ἐμπληκτόν, τοῦ δὲ σωματικοῦ τὸ ἐπίκηρον καὶ νοσώδες καὶ ταρακτικόν ἀνωρίας καὶ δυσκρασίας καὶ κρύψιν ἥλου καὶ ἀφανισμοὶς σελήνης, ὅταν ἐκδρομαὶ καὶ ἀφηνασμοί [καὶ] τυφώνος καὶ τούνομα κατηγορεῖ τὸ Σῆ, ὁ τῶν Τυφώνα καλοῦσαν (On Isis 49 (371B)). J.J. Winkler (1990 p95, n48) notes the appropriateness of the invocation of Typhon in spells designed to bring about discord, and the discord which arises now between Knemon and his father makes Typhon similarly appropriate here.
The form of the simile, using a participle agreeing with the subject of the main clause, is unusual, but does have classical antecedents (e.g. Xenophon Anabasis VI v.31: ἐνετέθην οἱ πολέμιοι ἵππεῖς φεύγουσι κατὰ τοῦ πρανοῦς ὀμοίως ὅπερ ὅκε ἵππεον διωκόμενοι.

αὁδὸς ἀπόπληκτος εἰστήκειν: A touch of characterisation: a similar phrase (τρόμῳ συσχεθεὶς ἁχανῆς εἰστήκει) is used of Knemon by the narrator at II 5.4, when he finds Thisbe dead. Knemon is rendered almost visibly helpless by events. This perhaps supports the characterisation of Knemon as a coward, which is discussed (and questioned) elsewhere (p152).

The adjectives are proleptic. (It would be wrong to say that the verb is effectively the equivalent of the copula εἶναι, since Knemon does literally stand still.) In poetic language two or more adjectives are frequently combined without conjunctions to build up a complete picture, even where the subject is not particularly emotional; here, nonetheless, the asyndeton may mark emotion. J.D. Denniston (1952) chapter vi analyses asyndeton. He says on p100, "In a long list of co-ordinated words . . . copulatives are more frequently omitted than inserted. . . . But in the great majority of cases, the stylistic significance of asyndeton is unmistakable." (Some students when they look up the treatment of asyndeton between adjectives in Kühner-Gerth may be puzzled by the statement in II p341-342, "Aber nicht gehören hierher die §405, 3 [the discussion of proleptic adjectives] angeführten Beispiele." What seems to be meant are the couple of examples in §405, 3 where one adjective is proleptic and the other is not.)

Groupings of adjectives in α- privative are particularly frequent, and can be regarded as a distinct stylistic device. It is very likely that Heliodoros meant to use this device here, relying on the false etymology (recorded in the Etymologicum Magnum) of αὁδὸς > ἀ + ὁδός. G. Meyer (1923) 104-106 gives many examples from tragedy. His view of the figure is expressed on p5: 'So macht z.B. die Tragödie besonders häufig Gebrauch vom α- privat. in speziellen Sinne. Es wird nicht einfach der im Simplex enthaltene Begriff negiert wie etwa in einem ἀδός = ἀνδός: sondern das neu gefühlte Synthese.' The juxtaposition of the adjectives underlines that Knemon was both αὁδὸς and ἀπόπληκτος at the same time, and to this extent the case Meyer makes for seeing a synthetic concept is valid here; at any rate the juxtaposition produces an effect of emphasis. The phenomenon is also discussed by N.J. Richardson (1974) ad I.200; D. Fehling (1969) 235-241; and E. Fraenkel 1950 ad Agamemnon 412. Further examples are Bacchylides Dithyramb 19.23; Pind. O. 2.82; II. I 99, IX 63; Od. XV 406; Soph. Ant. 339; Demosth. IV 36, XXV 52; [Bacchyl?] Fr. 60.10 (restored). (I am grateful to Professor Maehler for drawing my attention to the references given in this paragraph.)
3. τὴν Θίσθην περιέβλεπον οὖκ οἶδ' ὁπως ἐαυτὴν ὑποστείλασαν: The connection of this sentence with the preceding and following ones is asyndetic; the three clauses together form a kind of 'rising tricolon', and together with the word asyndeton in the first clause (cf my note on I 12.3 αὐξο· ἀπόπληκτος εἰστήκειν) express Knemon's state of shock. The printed (and probably correct) reading of περιέβλεπον is reported by the Budé editors in CPBZ; they favoured the first of these MSS, and A. Colonna the last, so it got into both texts (whose editors relied heavily on stemmatics) in preference to the περιβλέπων which avoids asyndeton.

4. ὡς ἐπιβουλεύσει· ἄν καὶροῦ λαβόμενον: Thus the Budé editors emend the correct ἐπιβουλεύσειε/-σειεν (without ἄν) of the MSS; Koraes emends to ἐπιβουλεύσειε, which is possible but unnecessary. Prof. Maehler points out to me that the optative ἐπιβουλεύσειε in oratio obliqua after προηγόρευν stands for αὖτον ἐπιβουλεύσειε, ("I warned you: he was plotting") whereas the optative + ἄν, giving a potential sense ("he might possibly . . .") is much too weak for Demainete.

§13

Aristippos takes Knemon to court. At the accusation there is such uproar that Knemon has no chance to defend himself.

Courtroom scenes like the one which occupies this chapter, sometimes including speeches, are a feature of the Greek novels (the following survey is intended to be complete; courtroom scenes in the novel are also discussed by M. Fusillo (1991) 76-81). In Chariton in particular the cases involve some legal oddity which makes the speeches more interesting than they would be if they were just miniature versions of private speeches from the Attic orators. We may assume that the speeches would therefore be appreciated best by trained rhetors interested in technical forensic problems. At Chariton I 5 the defendant invites his own condemnation. A speech of this type is referred to but not reported at Achilles Tatios II 34. Full length examples of this type of speech, known as a προσαγγελία, are extant (e.g. Libanios Or. XII; XXVI). At Chariton III 4 the trial is investigative rather than adversarial. In V 4-8 the hearing is before the Persian King in Babylon. The king, and not a jury, is to decide the case, as we would expect, but the presence and interest of the public at the case is emphasized. The king must decide to which man Kallirhoe (whom he loves also himself) belongs; the trial is adjourned for her to be produced, although she is neither plaintiff, defendant or witness - she is in effect an exhibit. The legal problem is whether a woman bought with money can be a lawful wife. All three of these cases involve an unexpected revelation,
in the first two in the shape of an intervention from a member of the audience who knows the truth.

There is a rustic equivalent of a courtroom scene at Longos II 15-16. The closest thing to a courtroom scene in Xenophon of Ephesos is the laconic report of a hearing before the prefect (ἀρχηγός) of Egypt at IV 2.

The courtroom scene at Achilles Tatios VII 7-12, like Chariton I 5, contains both a προσώπογραφία and an intervention by someone not directly involved in the case. Achilles Tatios VIII 8-11 includes a point for a decree to be read which is not reproduced in the text, thus giving it the appearance of an authentic forensic speech. J.J. Winkler, in his translation of Achilles Tatios (CAGN 263 n65), suggested that the speeches of Kleinias (VII 9) and that of Sopator (VIII 10) reflect in their styles Atticism on the one hand and Asianism on the other. There is no evidence that rhetorical training covered the composition of speeches in miniature such as we have in the novels, where the speeches are on the whole shorter than those in Thucydides, let alone full length published speeches. (Progymnasmata were exercises for elements in speeches rather than entire speeches in miniature.) Nonetheless the inclusion of speeches in the Greek novels is clearly a product of a tradition of rhetorical training, at least in part.

It is possible, but not demonstrable, that these trial scenes owe their inclusion in the novel in part also to influence of vernacular or popular Hellenistic literature. The courtroom scenes in the Acts of the Apostles are not directly comparable, and there are no such scenes in the Apocryphal Acts, or in the Egyptian storytelling tradition. However, the fragmentary Acta Alexandrinorum consist largely of trial scenes; their literary and historical status is debated. In his collection of these texts with commentary H.A. Musurillo (1954) discusses the similarities between the Acta and the Greek novel (ibid. 252-258, esp. 257). He supposes that the Acta were influenced in their tone by largely unrecorded Hellenistic Kleiliteratur, he implies that the Greek novel shared this influence, a view which gains support from the thesis of J.N. O’Sullivan (1995) that the novel had its origins in a Hellenistic oral storytelling tradition.

The courtroom scene here in I 13, in this ‘novel within a novel’ is the only conventional one in the Aithiopika. The ‘show trial’ in Heliodoros VIII 9 contains no speech, and ends with the miraculous survival of the condemned heroine. (In both these points it resembles the much shorter hearing in Xenophon of Ephesos IV 2.) Therefore it should probably be regarded as derived at least in part not from the motif of the courtroom scene but from the motif of miraculous survival of capital punishment, in this case, of judicial burning. The courtroom scene at X 10-12, with Chariklea’s defence (X 12) is
seamlessly woven into the fabric of the narrative, without a clear beginning and end, and to that extent the motif is thoroughly reworked.

1. ὡς εἰχον δεσμῶν ἐπὶ τὸν δήμον ἦγε: At Athens the δήμος met as the popular assembly (ἐκκλησία). The picture Heliodoros gives of Athenian legal process is a compound of fiction and anachronistic detail. Sometimes δήμος is used metaphorically for the assembly itself, for the first time at Plato Republic 565b. At the time of Solon the Athenian court, called the Heliaia, seems likely to have been identical with the popular assembly. However, by the second half of the fifth century (the precise date is not known) jury courts had taken over its function. Although these were regarded as representing the δήμος it is very doubtful whether the word δήμος could refer to them, particularly in view of the clear distinction made by Pollux (VIII 63) between the δήμος (i.e. the Assembly) and the jury (δικαστήριον): ἐφέσεις δὲ ἐστὶ, ὅταν ἀπὸ βουλῆς ἐπὶ δήμον, ἡ ἀποδίκαιοτέρων ἡ ἀρχώντων ἡ δήμοτῶν ἐπὶ δικαστήρι, ἡ ἀπὸ δήμου ἐπὶ δικαστήριον . . . On the other hand the number of voters Heliodoros gives indicates a jury court rather than the whole assembly. We lack evidence for size of jury courts, but an approximate indication is given by Lysias (XIII 35): ὅ δὲ δήμος ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ ἐν δισχίλιοις ἐψήφισε, and by Plutarch Perikles 32. κρίνεσθαι δὲ τὴν δίκην ἐγραψεν ἐν δικασταῖς χιλιοῖς καὶ πεντακοσίοις. The romantic fiction of the plaintiff's direct appeal to the δήμος on the following day, without committal proceedings or other legal process is all part of Heliodoros' idealised picture of Athenian democracy, which contrasted with the relatively bureaucratic legal system of the Roman provinces. Therefore it belongs to a legendary Greek past which features in several of the Greek novels, and contributed to the creation of a sense of Greek cultural identity in the novels, a theme discussed by S. Swain (1996) 109-113. It is of course possible that Heliodoros set this vignette of 'democratic' legal process in Knemon's tale because he regarded it as a decadent part of that legendary past: by contrast, the crowd in Chariton I 5 and III 4 are on the side of right, although not formally judging the case, but here their credulity leads to a miscarriage of justice.

1. οὐκ ἐπὶ τοιαύταις μὲν ἐξήκνειν ἐν Ἀθηναίοι τῶν ἀνέτρεφον ἔλεγεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ γῆρως τούτῳ βακτηρίαι ἔσεσθαι: The metaphorical use of βακτηρία to mean 'support', also found at VII 14.7, is almost unparalleled in Greek. The Latin baculum, which became an equivalent for βακτηρία in Christian writers, is occasionally used in this sense, but not before the fourth century. It occurs in the Acts of St. Sebastian, (PL 17.1019-1058, §2.7 p1024) (whose attribution to Ambrose is uncertain, but which can hardly be earlier than the fourth century): o filii, meae baculus (sic) senectutiis. It occurs also in the vulgate, Tobit 10.4: baculum senectutis nostrae, solutum vitae, (based on Tobit 5.23 in LXX, where the Greek is ῥάβδος), and
Euchenius *Formulae* I ed. C. Wotke p8. Heliodoros had probably encountered this phrase in Christian Latin, or a Greek equivalent using βασιλεῖα.

1. εἰς τοὺς φράττορας καὶ γεννήτας εἰσαγαγών: φράττορ is reputed to be the later form of φράττηρ (s.v. LSJ). The editors have decided not to restore the older form here, although they do so frequently with classical authors where the MSS read φράττηρ. It is possible that Heliodoros would have encountered this ‘later’ orthography in his copies of classical authors, even where it does not appear in our printed editions, and there is no reason to emend it.

**γεννήτας:** LSJ distinguish γεννήτης, ‘begetter’, and γεννήτας, ‘at Athens, members of a γένη.’ The spelling with -νν- is supported by the inscription they quote (IG II 596). The accentuation is uncertain and the word is not noticed in the surviving works by Herodan. The accentuation given by LSJ has the support of Hesychios, and of Harpokration (now datable to the second century A.D.: see the introduction to the edition by J.J. Keaney, Amsterdam, 1991). Therefore it should probably be accepted.

The notice about γεννήτας in Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* (Fr 2(3)) is taken by H.T. Wade-Gery (1958) p89 to refer to the time before Theseus. However the institution was still alive in the fourth century B.C. This is the entry in Harpokration (ed. Keaney): (Γ5) Γεννήτας: οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους κοινωνοῦντες, διημεῖνον γάρ ἀπάντων τῶν πολιτῶν κατὰ μέρη, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα καὶ μέγιστα μέρη ἐκαλοῦντο φυλαί, ἔκαστη δὲ φυλὴ τριχῇ διήρητο, καὶ ἐκαλέϊτο ἐκαστὸν μέρος τούτων τριτῶς καὶ φρατρίᾳ. πάλιν δὲ τῶν φρατριῶν ἐκάστη διήρητο εἰς γένη λ’, ἐξ ὅν αἱ ἱεραίς αἱ ἐκάστοις προσήκουσαν ἐκλήπτουσα. ἔστι δὲ παρὰ πολλοῖς τῶν ῥητόρων τοῦνομα, ὡς καὶ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Εὐβολίδην ἔφρεσε (57.23,24 al.). Ἰσαίας δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ Ἀπολλοδόρου κλήρου (7.13) τοὺς συγγενεῖς γεννήτας ὁμόμασεν· οὐχ οἱ συγγενεῖς μεντοι ἀπλῶς καὶ οἱ εἰς αἵματα γεννηταὶ τε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους ἐκαλοῦντο, ἀλλ’ ἐως ἀρχῆς εἰς τὰ καλοῦμενα γένη κατανεμηθέντες. οὕς νῦν γεννήτας καλοῦσιν.

In fact Harpokration, quoted above, seems to have misunderstood Isaios, (although if τοὺς συγγενεῖς γεννήτας ὁμόμασεν in Harpokration is a corruption of τοὺς γεννήτας συγγενεῖς ὁμόμασεν he could have been referring to 1.1: . . . καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἄγαγάν εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἀπέδειξε καὶ εἰς τὰ κοινὰ γραμματεῖα ἐνέγραψε . . .) This speech by Isaios is the only place among the extant Attic orators that we find a possible source for the phrase in Heliodoros. At 13 Isaios writes . . . καὶ εἰς τοὺς γεννήτας καὶ εἰς τοὺς φράττορας ἐνέγραψε . . . , and at 15 . . . ἤγαγε μὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς γεννήτας τε καὶ φράττορας. Apart from this, Demosthenes Κατὰ Νεαίρας 63 has the phrase . . . ἐπειδὴ ἐισήγην [με] εἰς τοὺς γεννήτας . . .
1. πολίτην ... ἀποφήνας. Read καὶ τοῖς νόμοις. The classical expression is invariably πολίτην ποιεώ. The Budé editors are certainly wrong to accept the emendation κατὰ τοὺς νόμοις. The manuscript reading καὶ τοῖς νόμοις, unlike the emendation, is an expression which has some support in the orators. (Isokrates Panegyρίδος 105: ... πολίτας ὄντας νόμω ...; Εὐαγόρας 54: τὸν δὲ δίὰ πολλῶς καὶ μεγάλας εὐεργεσίας νόμῳ πολίτην ἐπετρεπτό.)

2. πατραλοίας: v. following note.

2. προσαγγέλω τούτων, αὐτόχειρ μὲν αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐξόν: It is not clear with what Knemon is charged: assault? attempted murder? The prosecution is brought privately by Aristippos although it is for a capital offence, as becomes clear, and this suggests that Heliodoros had in mind classical Athenian rather than Roman law. If Knemon was guilty of assault then it is unlikely that under Athenian law Aristippos had the right to kill him. Perhaps the scope of the right, attested in our sources, of an Athenian householder to kill thieves or adulterers caught in the act could extend to a case of the present kind; the right is discussed by S.C. Todd (1993) 244. If the case was one of attempted murder then as far we know jurisdiction belonged exclusively to the courts, and could not be undertaken by the householder. Nor do we have any evidence that a man who was attacked had the right to kill in self-defence; it is logical that suppose that he had, but whether Aristippos could have argued that he had such a right before Knemon struck, or after he was disarmed is a matter for speculation. Aristippos accuses Knemon of being close to πατραλοία. The use of this word in Plato and Aristophanes (especially Av. 1337ff) suggests that it was in classical Athens a common term of abuse, but not a legal term describing a specific crime. Here, however, ‘parricide’ does seem to be the most natural translation, as it does at Philostratos Life of Apollonios IV 26; if it means ‘parricide’ Aristippos says that Knemon would have committed parricide had he not dropped the sword, implying that the charge was attempted parricide.

It is possible that behind Aristippos’ assertion of his right to kill Knemon lies the idea of patria potestas, which gave a father ins vitae necisque under Roman law. This was almost unique to Roman law, as Gaius (Institutes I 55) noted, and is so striking that it would not be surprising to find a novelist alluding to it. However, the ins vitae necisque was certainly not part of the Roman law of Heliodoros’ time. The latest evidence which we have for it being in force is the statement of Dio Kassios (XXXVII 36 4) that some fathers killed sons who had been involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy. Several statements in Justinian Digest XLVIII indicate that the right was suppressed
during the principate. Neither would Knemon have been guilty of attempted murder under the Roman law of Heliodoros' day: Roman lawyers were concerned to determine the intention of a defendant, and the opinion at Justinian *Digest* ed. Mommsen II 819 1.5-11 holds that if an armed man strikes no blow then an intention to kill cannot be established, so on this view Knemon would not be guilty of attempted murder, even if his mistake in taking Aristippos for an adulterer were overlooked. We know as little about the right to kill in self-defence under Roman law as under Athenian, but it seems most unlikely that Aristippos could have argued that he had the right to kill Knemon in self-defence after Knemon had dropped his weapon.

In short, Aristippos’ claim, like the legal procedure (v. note on I 13.1 ὡς εἶχον . . .), seems to be part of an impressionistic picture of a legal system of the legendary past, perhaps incorporating the concept of patria potestas as well as adapted details culled from the Attic orators. The lack of legal clarity suggests that Heliodoros had little interest in legal matters. This contrasts with Chariton (v. p118 above), and it is likely that for Chariton rhetorical education included the study of forensic oratory and how to argue points of law, whereas for Heliodoros, working at a time when Roman law was dominant, and the when the study of law had become divorced from the study of Greek rhetoric, legal issues were neglected in a rhetorical education.

4. ὁ γραμματέας προσελθὼν ἦρώτα στενὸν ἐρώτημα: Harpokration says that the functions of the γραμματείς are described by Aristotle in the *Ath. Pol.* In that work γραμματείς are referred to in the prytaneion, the boule and the courts. There is a passage of several chapters describing the courts which begins as follows (§63): τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια [πρ]νη[ρὴς]ίν刁 οἱ ἐννέα ἀρχοντες κατὰ φυλάς, ὁ δὲ γραμματεῖς τῶν θεσμαθετῶν τῆς δεκάτης φυλῆς. The passage describing the activities of the γραμματείς is lacunose, but it is clear from it and from the statement of Harpokration that he had custody of all written documents, and would read them out when required. It is very unlikely that he had the prerogative to question the defendant which Heliodoros ascribes to him here. On γραμματείς v. RE VII 1710.


5. διεξειροτόνουν: Harpokration: (Δ 45) Διαχειροτόνια: διάκρισις τῆς χειροτονίας ἐν πλῆθε γινομένης: Δημοσθένης ἐν τῇ τῷ Κατά Τιμοθέατος (59.5) καὶ ἐν τῷ Κατ' Ἀνδροτίωνος (22.9).
There is a divided vote and Knemon is condemned to exile, and he goes to Aigina. After three weeks his friend Charias arrives with news of Demainete's death. He tells how after Knemon's departure Demainete became still more lovesick.

1. Τῶν δὲ ψήφων διακρινομένων οἱ μὲν τῶν θάνατον καταχειροτονήσαντες ἦσαν εἰς ἐπτακοσίους καὶ χιλίους, οἱ μὲν καταλεύσαι οἱ δὲ εἰς τὸ βάραθρον πέμψαι κρίναντες, οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ εἰς χιλίους, δύο τι καὶ τῇ ὑπονοίᾳ τῇ κατὰ τῆς μητροίας δόντες φυγῇ με εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἔζημωσαν:

καταχειροτονήσαντες is explained by Harpokration (K28): καταχειροτονία: ἐθος ἢν Ἁθήναις κατὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ κατὰ τῶν συκοφαντῶν προβολὰς ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ τίθεσαν· εἰ δὲ τις καταχειροτονηθείη, οὗτος εἰσήγητο εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, ἔστι δὲ πολλάκις τούνομα παρὰ τῇ Δημοσθένει ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Μειδίου (21.8/991) καὶ Ἑπείρου ἐν τῷ Ἑπέρ Χαιρεφίλου περὶ τοῦ ταρίχους (F187J). διεξήλθη δὲ περὶ τῆς χειροτονίας καὶ θεώραστος ἐν δ' τῶν Νόμων.

ἐπτακοσίους καὶ χιλίους . . . χιλίους: On the numbers in the jury, ν. above on I 13.1 τῶν δήμων.

tὸ βάραθρον . . . φυγῇ: The Suda: βάραθρον· χάσμα τι φρεατώδες καὶ σκοτεινὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῆ, ἐν ὧν τοὺς κοκουργοὺς ἔβαλλον· cp. RE II 2853.
The details are not historically accurate: for the classical age there is little evidence for the means of execution at Athens, and none that it was by throwing the condemned person into the barathron. Exile seems not to have been an alternative penalty, but an option open to the accused before the verdict was passed. Both of these points are discussed by D.M. MacDowell (1963) 110-129.

eἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς: The usage is almost exclusively of the fourth century and later, and almost exclusively Christian. It is found in literature, in papyri and in inscriptions. In literature it is common in Eusebios, Athanasios, Basil, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssea and Epiphanius. Documentary references can be found in F. Preisigke (1925-1931) (but not in the revision of this work by E. Kiessling and H.A. Ruprecht, from which Byzantine references have been silently dropped) e.g. P.Oxy. LV 3803 i.10, (411 A.D.) SB XVI 12946,16 (474 A.D.). Inscriptions containing the expression can be difficult to date but none can be firmly dated before the fourth century. Examples of the expression in datable inscriptions are found in H. Gregoire (1922) no.322,51 (459 A.D.); 220(2) 1.9 (c.536 A.D.). The expression is never found in documents or in
inscriptions where the context is clearly not Christian. In papyri, but not in inscriptions or literature, ἐπὶ τὸ διηνέκες occurs with the same meaning: e.g. P. Lond. V 1735.9 (6th century).

There follows a complete survey of the ten occurrences of the expression which do or may precede the fourth century. Ignatios Ep. to Philippians 9.4 (but the authenticity of the work is seriously in doubt) N.T. Heb. 7.3; 10.1,12; This is probably the earliest appearance of the phrase, and perhaps its source for later writers. Translation of the O.T. by Symmachos (late 2nd century) Psalms 47.15; 88.30 (where the other translators have εἰς τὸν οἶκον). P.Ryl. II 427 fr.24 (restored); fr. 27 (a fragmentary carbonized roll; for the late 2nd-early 3rd century date v. P.Ryl. II 427 in the index of G.M. Parassoglou (1978)). Appian Bell. Civ. I 4.15 (ἐς, not εἰς). Aretaios, De cur. acut. morb. II (Corp. Med. Gr. vol. II liber VI) 2.15. (ἐς, not εἰς; for the late 2nd century date v. Aretaios in RE).

1. ἐξηλαυνόμην ἐστίας τε πατρίδας καὶ τῆς ἑνεγκούσης: The Suda defines ἡ ἑνεγκούσα as πατρίς: ἡ μὲν πατρίς. (Hesychios has the same definition in the accusative.) Of course the word order here shows that the expression is substantial, and the first meaning, (where πατρίς or πόλις is implicit, and must be supplied), is the one we have; Heliodoros used it frequently in the context of exile. The use of the word to mean ‘homeland’ is almost exclusively a fourth century one. There are two occurrences before the fourth century, in both of which the reference to a place of birth is made explicit: Plutarch Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander 854C; Ailios Aristides On Demosthenes 10. The other occurrences, in many of which, like the present instance, the reader is expected to understand that the reference is to a place of birth, without this meaning being made explicit, are almost all fourth or early fifth century, with a few later and none earlier. Therefore the idiom is not attested before the fourth century. The following list of attestations of this idiom is complete to end of sixth century: Heliodoros I 14.1; II 4.1; 23.3; 25.4; 29.5; 30.1; III 11.5; 14.4; 15.3; 16.5 bis; IV 9.2; 12.3; 19.7; 19.8; VI 2.3; VII 14.7; VIII 3.7; 7.8; 16.4; 16.6; 16.9. Libanios Ep. 282; 472; 534; 733; 872; 947; 950; 1229. Or. 2.66; 11.1; 11.50; 11.272; 35.8; 38.20; 49.17,18. Himerios 27.33. Themistios περὶ φιλίας 292d 7. Sopater δικάρεις ζητημάτων. Asterios Homily 6.1. Synesios Ep. 32; 58; 73 bis; 94; 103. Catastases 2.3. Gregory Naz. Ep. 65.3. Basil Ep. 75; 96; 165; 166; 320. John Chrysostom PG 49.35,214; 50.691; 51.270; 52.644; 53.371; 63.616. Theodoret passim. John Lydus De magistratibus 172,244; De ostentis 57.

2. τὸν δὲ τρόπον εἰσαύθεις ἥκουσθε: The device of the story teller declaring that he must stop because his listeners need sleep, and being persuaded to continue, is of course imitated from Od. XI 330-384. Heliodoros uses a more sophisticated variation of this device in V 1-2. There Kalasiris tells
Knemon that he must break off the story for sleep; perhaps the reader expects him to be prevailed upon to continue, but in fact almost immediately, while it is still night, the events of the plot overtake Knemon, the ‘internal audience’, and take the reader back to the direct narration (rather than Kalasiris’ story). This seamless transition maintains the reader’s interest during the switch from the indirect to the direct narrative.

2. καὶ μὴν προσεπτρίψεις γε ἡμᾶς: Translate ‘so now, you too are going to add to our afflictions’. Where γε does not go with another connective it is to be taken with a noun, adjective or pronoun, and in the rare cases where it follows a verb it does so because that verb has no explicit subject, and is to be taken with the implicit subject (rather than the action of the verb). Since it is an enclitic conjunction the key to understanding it is to ask, to what does it relate the word it follows, and what is the character of the relationship? (The importance of the first part of the question is underestimated by some modern writers, perhaps because they have dropped the classical term coniunctio in favour of ‘particle’.) The general sense of the present phrase is: καὶ μὴν = ‘so now, (here comes something new)’ (v. on I 11.5 καὶ μὴν); προσεπτρίψεις γε ἡμᾶς = ‘you too, (quite apart from all the others who have caused us problems), are going to add to our afflictions’.

2. ἔγω μὲν ὡς εἰσχων εὔθυς μετά τὴν κρίσιν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ κατέβην: Perhaps the familiarity of the opening of Plato Republic led Heliodoros to suppose that the choice of this verb for going to Piraeus had a colloquial ring in an Athenian context, although there is no other evidence that it did. Like the characters in the Republic Knemon is taking the first step on a great adventure.

The εὔθυς in C but not the other MSS is pleonastic with ὡς εἰσχων, and must be a gloss; the Budé editors mistakenly print it because of their excessive love of C. In the phrase εὔθυς ὡς εἰσχε at I 9.1 εἰσχε makes best sense if it is taken with περιτυχὼν (the periphrastic construction consisting of εἰσχω + an aorist participle). Therefore it is a false parallel which gives no support to εὔθυς here, but which may have suggested it to the ‘corrector’ of C.

4. ἀλλὰ σφόζοιο μὲν ἔφην ὁ Χαρία: Translators have understood this as a greeting: if they are right we may be almost certain that Heliodoros knew Latin. σφόζεω / σφόζου are found in Kallimachos and occasionally throughout the imperial period as a valedictory expression, ‘Farewell’, and the optative is used in the same way, although less often. However, in the extant Greek literature the verb is never used in a greeting, at the beginning rather than at the end of an encounter, unless that is how it should be interpreted here. The definition of σφόζου is given in a scholium to Odyssey XIII 39: χαίρετε δ’ αὕτοι· ὅτι οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀριστοτασθαί τὸ χαίρε ἔλεγον, ὥσπερ νῦν τὸ σφόζου φαμέν. B. M. (i.e. Ambrosianus B99; Venetus 613. Quoted from Scholia
Vetera in Hom. Od., ed. Dindorf.) The use of σφιοιοιοι to mean ‘Farewell’ is not found in published documentary papyri.

There are three possible interpretations here: 1) σφιοιοιοι is not strictly speaking a greeting or a ‘Farewell’; after hearing what Charias says about Knemon’s affairs, Knemon should out of politeness ask his friend about his own affairs, but in his impatience passes over this expectation with a cursory σφιοιοιοιοι, ‘I hope you are well,’ and asks to hear more about Demainete. 2) Knemon when he says σφιοιοιοι does mean ‘Farewell’, but goes on to say in effect, ‘but wait a minute, tell me more.’ 3) σφιοιοι here means ‘greetings’ or something like that, and either Heliodoros departs from normal Greek usage, whether through ignorance or otherwise, or our evidence gives too incomplete a picture of normal Greek usage. If this third option is right then the probable explanation is that the Greek of Heliodoros here has been ‘contaminated’ by familiarity with the Latin salve. There are several other instances in Heliodoros of apparent contamination by Latin: cf. p27. σφιοιοι is used by Heliodoros also at V 22.5 for ‘may you be safe’ and at V 2.10 where the meaning could equally be ‘may you be safe’ or ‘farewell.’ There is no certain support in Heliodoros for σφιοιοι as a greeting or a ‘Farewell’, but there are other examples of usages which appear to be influenced by a knowledge of Latin, and the translation of σφιοιοι as salve, ‘greetings’, is probably right.


4. οὖ παντάπασιν . . . ἐκλέλοιπεν ἡμᾶς ὡς δικὴ καθ᾽ Ἡσίοδον: Koraes and others quote Hesiod Works 175-264, where Aidos and Nemesis depart. It is just possible that in the fourth century there were extant works of Hesiod which are now lost, and a closer parallel for these words may have been found in one of them. However, it is more likely that Hesiod is here used mistakenly for Aratos. Aratos 133-134, δὴ τότε μισήσας δικὴ κεῖνον γένος ἄνδρών / ἐπαθεὶς ὑπουργάνη, follow in 132 a verbal allusion to Hesiod Works 405, and by a lapse of memory could easily have been attributed to Hesiod. Ammianus
Res gestae twice tells us that Julian was fond of repeating this idea, so the emperor perhaps gave it some currency with his contemporaries, among whom we should probably count Heliodoros: XXII 10.6, et aestimabitur, ... ut ipse [Julianus] dicebat assidue, vetus illa Iustitia, quam offensam vitii hominum, Aratus extollit in caelum, imperante eo reversa ad terras ...; XXV 4.19. The same idea is found in Hyginus De astronomia II 25 and Ovid Fasti I 249.

5. εἰς ἄγρον τινα καὶ ἐσχατιάν ἐαυτὸν ἀπάκισε. This comparison of Aristippus with Laertes (whose retirement is described at Od. I 188-193), and by implication, of Knemon with Odysseus, imparts a mock-grandeur to the situation, just as the echoes of tragedy give the story of Demainete a mock-tragic tone. ὃν θυμὸν κατεδαφίζεται is quoted from II. VI 202.

6. τὴν δὲ εὐθὺς Ἑρινὺς ἡλικοῦν: It is the impious whom the Furies pursue, and the reminder of their pursuit of Orestes, murderer of his mother, in the Eumenides, would hardly be lost on Heliodoros’ first readers. ἔλαυνος is used of the Erinyes at Aischylos Eumenides 210, 421, 604.

6. ἐβόα νόκτωρ τε καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέραν: νόκτωρ is the usual alternative to μεθ’ ἡμέραν in Greek (e.g. Euripides Bacchae 485), so it is probable that the Budé editors are right to prefer it to the variant νόκτα which A. Colonna prints.

6. παιδίον γλυκύτατον, ψυχήν ἐαυτῆς ὀνομαζούσα: It would be better to punctuate, if at all, with a comma also after παιδίον (although no editors punctuate thus), as is clear when we compare the phrase with I 9.4 νῦν μὲν παιδίον νῦν δὲ γλυκύτατον ὀνομαζούσα καὶ σύνθες κληρονόμοι καὶ μετ’ ὀλίγον ψυχῆν ἐαυτῆς ἀποκαλοῦσα. Demainete, omitting κληρονόμοι which is not relevant in the current situation, moves from the more or less respectable appellation παιδίον to the risqué γλυκύτατον and then to the frankly outrageous ψυχήν ἐαυτῆς, a term used to express Theagenes’ feelings for Chariklea at I 8.4 (there is a discussion of ψυχή as a term of endearment in the commentary ad loc.).

6. παραμυθεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐπιρροώναι: The Budé editors are wrong to emend the τε of the MSS to δέ, since the μὲν of αἱ γνώριμαι ... μὲν ἐθαύμαζον is answered by η δὲ ... ἔλεγεν. Prof. Maehler pointed out to me that the three verbs ἐθαύμαζον ... ἐπήνουν ... ἐπειρώντο form a tricolon.

6. καὶ οἶνον ἐγκείσθαι τῇ καρδίᾳ κέντρον ἄγνοεῖν τὰς ἄλλας ἔλεγεν: The Budé note reads, “ἐγκείσθαι codd.: expreff ἐγκείσθαι (Salmasius).” This is clearly right, but since ἐγκείσθαι is in all the MSS, the editors are right to consign the correction to a note, rather than to print it in the text and lay
themselves open to the charge that they are correcting a mistake which could go back to the author’s autograph (if there was one).

§15

Charisias tells how Demainete blamed Thisbe because Knemon’s exile, which she had helped to procure, only made her plight worse. Thisbe, hoping to save her skin, pretends that Knemon is in hiding near Athens with the flute girl Arsinoe. Thisbe proposes to persuade Arsinoe to let her, Thisbe, take Arsinoe’s place in bed with Knemon, but in fact to send Demainete, whose passion would thus be satisfied.

2. βαρύμηνώσαν: *Hapax legomenon* formed from the adjective βαρύμηνις

2. περιμανής: The adjective is completely unknown, except in Plutarch, who has it nine times, and περιμανός once. This is good evidence, if it were needed, that Heliodoros knew Plutarch, and that his use of Greek was influenced by that of Plutarch. There is a verb περιμαινομαι which occurs only at Hesiod *Scmout* 99.

4. συντεύξεσθαι ποτε ὑπελθόντι: A. Colonna is right to print the δ’ after ποτε which is omitted from one MS (P) according the Budé apparatus, and, surprisingly, from the Budé text.

5. ἀλλοτριάν μὲν ἄλλ’ οὖν γε πατρών εὐνήν ἡσχόνετο: The μὲν is picked up by the ἄλλ’ which begins the next sentence. This is not syntactically parallel, and is only loosely adversative; the general sense of the μὲν . . . ἄλλα here is ‘This, on the one hand is true . . . but (let us not forget) this further point is also true.’ J.D. Denniston (1954 21-22) finds this ‘progressive’ ἄλλα particularly common in Hippocrates; he treats an example preceded by a clause with μὲν (p6, Hp *Gland*. 8) as if it were unique, but in fact there are further examples among the references he gives for the places where he saw μὲν as merely emphatic (with no relation with what follows). For instance, if one continues the quotation he gives (p361) from Od. VII 259 this turns out to be a μὲν . . . ἄλλα combination with a similar sense: ἔνθα μὲν ἐπτάτεσσες μένον ἐμπέδου, ἐμιαμα δ’ αἰεὶ δάκρυσε δεύεσκον, τὰ μοι ὁμβροτο δῶκε Καλυπςό πάντ’ ἄλλ’ ὅτε δὴ ὀγδοῖν μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἐτος ἡλθε, καὶ τότε δὴ μ’ ἐκέλευσεν ἐποτρύνομαι νεεσθαι. Ζηνός ὑπ’ ῥγγελίνης, ἥ καὶ νόος ἄτραπετ’ αὐτῆς. Denniston’s treatment of ἄλλ’ οὖν γε is good. *In ἄλλ’ οὖν (not found before Aeschylus) ἄλλα bears one or other of the shades of meaning expressed by the simple ἄλλα: while οὖν adds the notion of essentiality or importance. Very frequently γε follows at a short interval, denoting that the idea is to be
emphatically accepted in a limited sphere' (p441-442); he regards the direct juxtaposition of γε to ἀλλά' οὖν as post-classical.

6. «... ἀλλ' ὁ γλυκεῖα Θίσβε τίνα λόσιν ὑνόμαζες;» «φάδιαν ὁ δέσποινα» ἐφη ...: This is the punctuation of the Budé. A. Colonna and earlier editors place φάδιαν in Demainete's question, not Thishe's answer. The Budé punctuation has Thisbe giving, in effect, a one word reply, as she does at I 15.7 where she replies with the single word μεγάλα. The latter answer seems rather odd Greek, and no parallel in drama can be found for μεγάλα as the answer to a question (although μέγα, and multum/multa as one word answers are occasionally found in Greek and Latin New Comedy). However, since there are no grounds for doubting the reading it can be used as a parallel to support the punctuation which gives her a one word answer, φάδιαν, in the present instance too.

6. Ἀρωσινόν: The name, like that of Thisbe, is the name of a town, or rather of several towns as well as of several historical and mythical persons (v. RE s.v.), and of a girl celebrated in epigram (Anthologia Graeca VI 174). There is no obvious reason why Heliodoros chose the name, although a potentially significant association of the name with a story in Antonios Liberalis 39 is discussed by E.L. Bowie (1995) 276-277. Like Teledemos (v. on I 16.1 below) Arsinoe is also a name of a minor character in the House of Atreus (in one version it is the name of the nurse who saved Orestes, Pindar Pythian XI 17), so perhaps the name was chosen to help to create the tragic or mock-tragic atmosphere of the episode of Demainete.

7. μεγάλα: sc. ταῦτα.

7. γνωρίμην: The Budé apparatus reports "γνωρίμην μΤ : -ον ΖΑ." The Budé prints the former, A. Colonna the latter. Colonna is right: a corruption from a two to a three termination declension for an adjective is in harmony with the development of spoken, and some written Greek, and therefore is a more likely copyists error than a corruption in the reverse direction. Besides, Heliodoros is normally conservative in this matter, and in fact has αἱ γνώριμοι at I 14.6.

8. δεύτερος ... πλοῦς: This metaphor for a second attempt using alternative means is rather common in classical Greek, as the examples in LSJ s.v. πλόος 3 show.

8. οἱ δὲ τύχης ὅν βούλει, μάλιστα μὲν εἰκὸς σχολάσαι τὸν ἔρωτα τῶν Ἕρωτα, which is certainly the subject of σχολάζω, is a personification, and should be printed with a capital letter, since the subject of this verb is always a person (or, rarely, a place), and never an emotion.
8. Kόρος γάρ ἔρωτος τῶν ἑργῶν τὸ τέλος: It is safest to take ἔρωτος as a personification, since it must be taken thus in the previous clause (v. the preceding note).

8. ἐνακομείνειν: The compound is common in the writers of the fourth century, and later; it is extremely rare earlier, and rare in non-Christian writers. Particularly common in John Chrysostom and Basil, it is also found in Orbasios, Nemesios, Eusebios, Gregory of Nysséa, Gregory of Nazianzenos, Athanasios, Didymus Caecus, Theodoret and pseudo-Macinos. Before the fourth century it is attested only in the following places: it is in the printed texts of Ailian Nat. Anim. XIV 23 (end), but appears in Hercher's 1864 Teubner in the list of mutationes, so is presumably a conjecture found in none of the MSS; it appears also twice in Clement; once each in two works doubtfully attributed to Origen (Selecta in Psalms PG 12.1536; Fr. in Psalm. 1-150 ed. Pitra 125,4,5,7); in Acta Joannis 71.2 (2nd century); and once in Soranos (Corp. Med. Graec. IV) Gynaecorum 1.61.3 (The Trajanic date is based mainly on the entry for Soranos in the Suda.)

§16

Demainete agrees to Thisbe's plan. Thisbe then clandestinely tells Aristippos that Demainete is having an affair, and promises to help Aristippos catch her in the act.

1. Τελέδημον: Heliodoros may have chosen this name to add to the tragic atmosphere of the story of Demainete generated by the implicit comparison with Phaedra in Euripides Hippolytos and the allusion to Orestes in Aischylos Eumenides (v. on I 14.6 Ἐρινύες above): Teledamos was a son of Agamemnon and Klytaemnstra; Pausanias mentions that he had a grave at Mycenae (II 16.6). The only other literary antecedent of the name is the Argive Teledamos listed by Demosthenes (De cor. 295) among those who betrayed their fellow citizens to Philip for profit.

5. εἰ γάρ ταῦτα οὕτως ἐπιδείξεις φησίν ὁ Ἀρίστιππος: σοι μὲν ἐλευθερίας μισθόν ἀποκείσεται: The emendation of Koraes (1804), ἐλευθερίας, is attractive, but the manuscript reading ἐλευθερίας does not really need to be emended. This emendation was printed by Bekker, but not by Colonna or the editors of the Budé. The latter omit it from their apparatus. Normal Greek usage is for the word defining μισθόν to be in the same case as (i.e. in apposition to) μισθός. The defining genitive of the MSS reading seems unparalleled in Greek. Heliodoros follows conventional usage at III 18.1 (quoted by Koraes (1804)) and IV 8.6; also, a nominative is used in reply to the
question, 'what will be the μισθός?' at II 23.3 and VII 23.4. Heliodorus seems to have known Latin (v. p27), so it is possible that the construction here is modelled on a common construction of the Latin word *praemium* (TLL x p.720, sv. *praemium* appendix); the closest Latin parallels give enough support to the MSS reading to justify an editor in printing it, and placing the emendation in the apparatus, not the text: Sisenna Fr. 43, in T. Peter (1916) p282, "serulum eius praemio libertatis inductum magno cum tumultu conventum in populum produxit armatum."); Justinian *Digest* ed. Mommsen II 469 I.27, "Macrinus libro tertio ad Sabinum. qui ob necem detectam domini praemium libertatis consequitur, fit orcinus libertus."

5. ὡς πάλαι γε σμύχωμαι ἐν ἐμαυτῷ: σμύχω is an Homeric word which means "to burn, to smoulder". (The definition of σμύχω by Apollonios and Hesychios as ἀπαυάσιο is presumably based on an erroneous gloss on II. XXII 411.) The verb is used metaphorically of love by Moschos (II 4) and Theocritos (κατασμύχω III 18), but the extension of the metaphorical use of words denoting heat or fire to emotions other than love seems to have been predominantly a Christian phenomenon (cf. πυροκαύομενη at II 9.1, discussed above, p18). The use of σμύχω and its compounds for emotions is, with the exceptions of the examples already given, restricted to Christian writers of the fourth century or later (although medical writers use them for fever). ὠποσμύχω, διασμύχω and σμύχω are used of emotion by Gregory Nyssenus, Gregory Nazianzenus, Athanasios and Basil (always in the active where the subject is personal).

§17

_Thisbe led Demainete to Arsinoe’s bed, as planned, then led Aristippos into the bedroom, shouting that Demainete’s lover had escaped. Aristippos led away Demainete, who preempted punishment by jumping to her death. Aristippos, realizing Knemon is innocent, was trying to get him recalled from exile at the time Charias left Athens, and Charias knows no more._

Demainete, who effected Knemon’s conviction by deceit, becomes herself the victim of deceit. On this morally satisfying note the story set in Knemon’s Athens ends, and the reader is returned to the situation of the main characters of the *Aithiopika._

1. ἡδη δὲ ἐσπέρας οὔσης ἀναλαβοῦσα ἤγεν οὐδ’ συνετέτακτο: Although both A. Colonna and the Budé print this, which is the reading of all the MSS reported, Rattenbury wanted to emend to ἡ δὲ or ἡ δὲ ἡδη. The change of subject really does need to be indicated, and one of Rattenbury’s suggestions
should have been adopted: perhaps the second could have been corrupted more easily than the first, and is thus slightly preferable.

2. τὸν ᾿Αφροδίτης: The only occurrence of this rare expression which certainly precedes the fourth century is Achilles Tatios VIII 16.1. It is argued that Heliodoros was familiar with Achilles Tatios (in the excursus on the Boukoloi, p97f) so he may owe this phrase to him. The following list of the other attestations is complete: Heliodoros IV 18.5; Xenophon of Ephesos I 9.9 (a conjectural reading without manuscript authority); Diogenes Laertios Vitae VI 69 (the third century date is far from certain). Scholia in Lucian ed. H. Rabe 35.2 p164; Libanios Or. XVIII 179; V 29; Themistios Or. XIII (Ἐρωτικός) 177a 7.

Ellipse of a noun, where an article is followed directly by a dependent genitive, is not common. Schweyzer-Debrunner II 117, list it under ‘Adnominalen Pertinentiv’; examples may be found in Kühner-Gerth I §403 p269f.

2. τοῦ μὴ γνωρισθήναι αὐτὴν: There is another example of a final clause of this type without ἐνεκα at I 24.2: v. note ad loc.

3. πίνει δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἐν γειτόνων: Read ἐκ γειτόνων. Here (and at V 22.2) the MSS have ἐκ γειτόνων, and the Budé editors have adopted this unnecessary emendation of S.A. Naber Mnemosyne N.S. I (1873) 145-169; 313-353. ἐν γειτόνων is attested in Lucian, Athanasios (once), Themistios (once), and Synesios (once). ἐκ γειτόνων, used adverbially with οἰκέω and similar verbs, is attested in several times in John Chrysostom, Eutropios, Theodoret, Sozomenos. In addition, the phrase οἱ ἐκ γειτόνων and similar phrases is attested in some of these, and in Basil, Athanasios, Eusebios, Synesios, Palladios, and Libanios. Neither ἐκ γειτόνων nor ἐν γειτόνων are ever used adverbially in the context of hospitality except here and Heliodoros V 22.2. Therefore the MSS ἐκ γειτόνων is at least as likely as Naber’s emendation, and is among the lexical usages which support a fourth century date for the Aithiopika.

Thyamis, the bandit chief, has a dream about Isis which he interprets to mean that he will marry Charicleia.

1. καὶ ἄμα ἐδάκρυεν κτλ.: For the idea of crying for one’s own grief when hearing of another’s, cf. II. XIX 301-2, and C.W. Macleod (1982) 4-5; 5 n1.

1. ἐπιπέτας: In classical writers the aorist of ἐπιπέτασα is ἐπεπτάμην. The disappearance of the middle voice from the living language led to progressively more inconsistency in the use of voices in Hellenistic Greek literature, particularly in the future and aorist tenses, with middle forms used where one would expect active and vice versa; v. A.N. Psiniris 1897 §§1478-1486. The many places where Heliodoros has apparently used the wrong voice are listed by F. Barber (1968).

2. Θάμις: This is the name of a river: Thucydides I 46.4-5, ἐκ δὲ καὶ Θάμις ποταμός, ὄριζαν τὴν Θεσπρωτίδα καὶ Κέστρινην, ὅπως ἅ ἄκρα ἀνέχει τὸ Χειμέρινον, οἱ μὲν ὅπως Κορίνθιοι τῆς ἱπέρου ἐνταῦθα ὁμίζουσαν τε καὶ στρατόπεδον ἐποίησαντο. It is difficult to explain why Heliodoros named the leader of the bandits after a river, apart from the name’s martial association from Thucydides. As a personal name it is found nowhere except here, and Nonnos XXVI 181, where it is the name of the leader of the Kuraco tribe (who have something in common with the Boukoloi in that they fight from small boats), and Nonnos XXXII 186, where Thyamis is a warrior.

A few of the dreams are not significant for predicting the future or directing action; these might be described as ‘wish-fulfilment’ or ‘fear-fulfilment’ dreams. Artemidoros discusses such dreams at I 4; in IV prooemium he calls such dreams ἐνόπνωα to distinguish them from significant dreams, ἱπνοι. Macrobius (Comm. I 3.2) preserves the distinction (the Latin equivalent of ἐνόπνωα is insomnia pl.), but the words for dreams seem to be used indiscriminately by the novelists, and by Synesios De insomniis. An example of a ‘fear-fulfilment’ dream is perhaps the dream that Knemon has of being
pursued by the bandit Thermouthis (Heliodoros II 20.4). A 'wish-fulfilment' dream is Longos II 10.1. These dreams are a way in which the novelist can communicate the state of mind of the dreamer. They are rare in the novels.

The majority of dreams in the novels are significant ones. Dreams which predict the future, or guide the dreamer (rather than reflecting the dreamer's current thoughts) are described by Artemidoros as ὅνειροι. All of the dreams in Longos apart from the one quoted above are explicitly communications from the Nymphs. The divine origin of significant dreams is probably behind the description of the dream in the present passage as ὅναρ . . . θεῖον (I 18.3); (Heliodoros is telling his readers that the dream is significant - to describe it as θεῖον simply because Isis appears in it would be uncharacteristically redundant for our author.)

Many dreams in the novels have meanings which are transparent. Either the dreamer sees a person or god who gives a message, as when Odysseus, unmistakably identified by the context and his appearance, upbraids Kalasiris for failing to sacrifice to him (Heliodoros V 22.1-3); or the meaning, though visual, is explicit. For example, at Longos I 7.2 the symbolism of the Nymphs handing Daphnis and Chloe to a boy who is obviously Cupid, and who touches them both with the same arrow, is clear enough.

G.W. Bowersock (1994) in the chapter 'The Reality of Dreams' (77-98) complains (90-91) “Although Artemidoros devotes considerable attention to the appearance of deities in dreams he has no interest at all in the advice that they may give.” This is because such advice does not need interpretation. If the advice is couched in oracular language then it must be interpreted as would any other oracle, and the interpretation is outside the scope of oneirocriticism. Artemidoros says that when a medical treatment is communicated in a dream it is to be interpreted literally (IV 22). He also says that gods always tell the truth, but that they speak in riddles more often than they speak plainly (IV 71).

In the novels the gods speak plainly in dreams more often than they speak in riddles. In Heliodoros there is one other dream (besides the present one) which contains a riddling communication. This is where Kalasiris appears independently to Theagenes and Charikleia on the same night (VIII 11.2-3). S. Bartsch (1989) in her chapter 'Dreams and Oracles' (80-108), discussing Achilles Tatos and Heliodoros, emphasizes that “. . . it is the very incorrect interpretation that sets in motion the events in the narrative that will eventually lead to the fulfilment of the dream or oracle's deeper meaning, or that of an
earlier dream or oracle.” (85); her approach is anticipated in the concise note of J.R. Morgan (1978) ad. IX 25.1.

There are three dreams in Heliodoros with allegorical symbolism. When Charikles dreams that an eagle from Apollo snatches away Charikleia (IV 14.2) Kalasiris understands the dream, but Charikles misunderstands it, particularly after Kalasiris’ deliberately misleading interpretation. Charikleia dreams that her eye is put out (II 16.1-2). Her initial interpretation is contradicted by Knemon who offers the interpretation of this symbol which is found in Artemidoros (I 26), that is, that it indicates the death of a parent. This is the only one of the interpretations suggested in the text which could be regarded as being fulfilled in the narrative, in that the death of Kalasiris is the death of a surrogate father, as J.J. Winkler (YCS 1982 114-117) argues.

The dream of Thyamis in the present passage (also discussed in detail by J.J. Winkler YCS 27 1982 117-118) contains both a direct communication from the goddess and a symbolic element. The description of the temple and its furniture, if it is not ‘background colour’ otherwise foreign to dreams in the novels, is symbolic. We cannot be certain that interpretation of the details which Artemidoros gives is the one Heliodoros had in mind, but it does fit the situation perfectly. The relevant passage in Artemidoros is II 39 (ed. Pack 175, 8-16):

σάραπις καὶ Ἰσις καὶ Ἀνουβις καὶ Ἀρποκράτης αὐτοῖς τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ μούστρα Καὶ πάς ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος καὶ τῶν τούτων συννάων τε καὶ συμβώμον θεῶν παραχάς καὶ κινδύνους καὶ ἀπειλὰς καὶ περιστάσεις σημαίνουσιν, ἐξ δὴ καὶ παρὰ προσδοκίων καὶ παρὰ τὰς ἐλπίδας σωζούσιν· ὅει γὰρ σωτηρεῖς <εἰναι> νεοχρήσμον εἰς τὸν θεοί τῶν εἰς πάντα ἀφυγμένοι καὶ <εἰς> ἐσχάτον ἐλθόντων κινδύνον, τοὺς δὲ ἡδή εἰς τοὺς τοιούτους ὑντας αὐτίκα μᾶλα σωζοῦσιν. In the narrative, after great difficulties and mortal danger Thyamis eventually regains his rightful priesthood.

It was argued by S. MacAlister in a seminar at the Institute of Classical Studies, London (8 Feb. 1996) that many dreams in Greek novels, this one included, are interpreted by the characters as allegorical, but subsequently turn out to have represented the future in a direct, non-allegorical way (in other words, they turn out to be dreams of the type that Artemidoros called theorematik). The dream of Persinna that she has a daughter is a particularly clear example of this device (Heliodoros X 3.1). It was argued that the present dream turns out to be theorematik when Thyamis is inducted as priest of Isis in Memphis (VII 8.7-9.1). No induction ceremony is described, but since MacAlister demonstrated that other dreams are used in this way in the Greek novel the argument is credible.
The dream of Thyamis is among the many dreams in the novels which occur after a night of sleeplessness (Heliodoros I 18.4; II 16.1 II 20.4; Chariton II 9.6; IV 1.1; VI 7.1; Achilles Tatiós I 6.5-6.). The sleeplessness indicates the dreamers' agitation. We cannot tell what significance, if any, it has for the interpretation of the dream. Artemidoros appears to promise a discussion of sleeplessness (I 10, ed. Pack 19, 19), but none is preserved.

2. ὅπο τινῶν ὀνείρατων πεπλανημένων τεταραχιμένος: The same verb, and the genitive form ὀνείρατων (rather than the more usual ὀνείροι) are used by Herodotos, VII 16.2, for dreams: ἐνοπνία γὰρ τὰ ἐς ἄνθρωπος πεπλανημένα τοιαύτα ἐστι οἶα σὲ ἐγὼ διδόξο, ἔτεσι σὲν πολλοίσι πρεσβύτερος ἐών πεπλανῆθαι αὐταὶ μᾶλλα έωθαί [αἰ] όψεις [τῶν] ὀνείρατων, τὰ τις ἡμέρης φροντίζει: Here Artabanos is telling Xerxes that his dream discouraging the expedition to Greece is misleading, perhaps this influenced Herodotos when he chose to use πλανάω (which in the active means ‘to lead astray’), although the general point is a distinction between dreams which are sent by a god and those which are merely wandering around. In the wider context the dream warned Xerxes of the misfortune which awaited his expedition, but he could not fully understand or heed it (as Artabanos' dream makes clear, VII 17.2). By this allusion Heliodoros hints more about the future of the plot than Thyamis and the other characters can know.

Heliodoros refers to the same dream as ὀνείρατα (here), τὸ ὀνόρ (I 19.1, I 30.4), and τὸ ἐνοπνίον (I 23.2): although he knew something about the system of dream interpretation described by Artemidoros, there is no indication that he was familiar with Artemidoros' technical vocabulary. Here, as often, Heliodoros varies his vocabulary apparently for no other reason than that he regarded variation as stylistically desirable.

3. καθ’ ὅν γὰρ καιρῶν ἀλεκτρυνώνες ἄδουσιν, εἰτε (ὡς λόγος) κτλ.: In spite of the ὡς λόγος the explanations for the crowing of the cocks are not among those found elsewhere in Greek and Roman literature, which are collected under ἀλεκτρυνών in D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson (1936). The closest parallel with the present passage is Sophokles Electra 17-18: ὡς ἡμίν ήδη λαμπρόν ἡλίου σέλας /έωα κινεῖ φθέγματ’ ὀρνίθων σαφῆ... The alternative natural and divine explanations for the crowing of cocks is an expression of uncertainty of a kind common in Heliodoros. J.J. Winkler (YCS 1982 121-129)catalogues such ‘amphibolies’, discussing this one in detail; he regards amphibolies as of key importance in Heliodoros' narrative strategy: his argument is too subtle to summarize here. J.R. Morgan (1978 lxi-lxxix, and 1982) suggests that expressions of uncertainty in Heliodoros contribute to ‘realism’ in as much as uncertainty is appropriate to the narrator of real historical events, but not to the presumably ‘omnipotent’ novelist.
Thyamis calls a meeting of his bandits, and tells Knemon to bring Theagenes and Charikleia. He announces that he would like to marry Charikleia, but will ask her permission first.

1. λάφυρα τὰ σκύλα σεμνότερον ὑνομάζων: 'Calling the σκύλα "λάφυρα"' (The note in the Budé seems to get it the other way round, which cannot be right, as the article with σκύλα shows.) Hesychios λάφυρα τὰ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων ζώντων λαμβαδέονα, τὰ δὲ τεθνεότα των αὐτῶν, σκύλα. (The definition is repeated in the Etymologicum Magnum.) This distinction, which is probably the result of a desire for tidiness on the part of the lexicographers, is not generally observed at any period, but a lexicon like Hesychios is probably the source of the statement in the present passage. Before the imperial period both words are found exclusively in tragedy. It is true that σκύλα primarily means 'arms taken from the corpse of a defeated enemy', but an examination of the occurrences of λάφυρα in tragedy (Aischylos Ag. 578; Septem 277, 479; Sophokles Ajax 93; Trachiniai 646; Euripides HF 417; Troades 1124, Rhesos 179) reveals only one where the spoil is evidently taken from the living (Aischylos Septem 479).

2. εἰ τι δύνατο αὐτοῖς συμπράττειν: Once again the Budé editors have slipped up by relying too much on the readings of C. The correct reading, preserved in VMZAT, is δύναιτο. For a condition expressing a wish (Theagenes and Charikleia hope he may be able to help them, but cannot be sure) optative is normal even in direct discourse (Kühner-Gerth II p477-480); the present clause is in virtual indirect discourse, and only the optative is possible (W.W. Goodwin (1889) §694-5).

2. οὖ παντάπασι βάρβαρον εἶναι τὰ ἡθη τῶν λῆσταρχον ἐγγυώμενος: The character of Thyamis does in fact turn out to be partly but not wholly barbarous, as Knemon says. Several points about the respective natures of Greeks and barbarians are made or are implied in the Aithiopika. One of the statements about the nature of the barbarian is made in the context of the attempt by Thyamis to kill Charikleia (I 30.6). On the other hand, since the term 'barbarian' is always pejorative in the Aithiopika and the other Greek novels the good features of Thyamis, such as his piety (cf. I 28.1 and note ad loc.) and his bravery in battle (cf. I 32.1-2) are perhaps to be seen as appropriate behaviour for a Greek. Furthermore it is argued at J.W. Birchall (GCN VII 1996) that his eloquence indicates that he is cultured. Moreover, he is the only character in the Aithiopika who is implied to know some Greek without being good at it (I 5.2, I 19.3); this too shows that he is on a borderline between barbarians and Greeks.
3. συνίη γάρ ἢδη τῶν Ἁγιασμών: This is Bekker's emendation for the συνίη (συνίεις τ.) of the MSS. συνίη does not really make sense, and it seems right to emend. Koraes emends συνίη τι, presumably preferring it to συνίη alone on the grounds it is palaeographically easier (although he does not say this.) Prof. Maehler suggested to me that συνίη may have arisen as a result of a superscript variant: συνίη " ^ " copied as συνίη.

4. ἐγὼ γὰρ, ὡς ἦστε, παῖς μὲν προφήτου τοῦ ἐν Μέμφιει γεγονός: προφήτης is used throughout the Aithiopika describe Kalasiris (who turns out to be the father of Thyamis). It was used in Greek literature, and in Greek documents from Egypt, for the highest ranking priests in Egypt.

The basic discussion of the ranks of priest in Ptolemaic Egypt and the Greek names for them is W. Otto (1905,1908) I 75ff. προφήτης was a Greek equivalent for the Egyptian word hm-ntr. We have no pre-Ptolemaic examples of προφήτης used to mean an Egyptian priest, but it does not follow that a Greek writer who uses προφήτης of a pre-Ptolemaic priest is guilty of anachronism. On the equivalence the current state of knowledge is summed up by F. Daumas (1952), 181 n1: "Cf. copte ONT. Les « prophètes » (προφήται) ont existé, semble-t-il, en Grèce bien avant qu'on ait cherché à désigner certains prêtres égyptiens. C'étaient « les interprètes » de la volonté des dieux. Par la suite, ils semblaient, à l'époque hellénistique, avoir surtout désigné des membres assez élevés des clergés orientaux. L'équivalence avec le hm-ntr égyptien vient peut-être seulement de ce que le mot avait perdu son sens trop précis d'« interprète », car il ne semble pas que le hm-ntr ait eu spécialement ce rôle. Mais ce n'est qu'une hypothèse.


προφήτης for an Egyptian priest is found fairly frequently in documents (and is discussed in the Introduction to P. Tebt 291), but the literary attestations are few. There is a passing reference in Synesios De providentia 94D-95A. Porphyry De abstinencia IV 5-8 holds up Egyptian priests as models of abstinence; their devotion, self control and love of learning are praised. At the
end of the passage he identifies the προφήται among the higher ranking priests who alone practice philosophy. The virtues recommended in the De abstinentia are sufficiently close to those of Kalasiris to make it the most likely of the extant sources mentioning προφήται to have prompted Heliodoros to describe Kalasiris as προφήτης. Besides this there are three places where Clement of Alexandria mentions προφήται: μόνος ούτος [Thales] δοκεῖ τοὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων προφήτας συμβεβληκέναι, διδάσκαλος δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς ἀναγράφεται, . . . (Stromata I 14, ed. Stählin 39.23ff). φιλοσοφία τοῖνυ πολυσφελές τι χρήμα πάλαι μὲν ἠκμασε παρὰ βαρβάρους κατὰ τὰ ἑθη διαλόγισμα, ὑστερον δὲ καὶ εἰς Ἑλληνας κατηθέν, προεστησαν δὲ αὐτῆς Αἰγυπτίων τε οἱ προφήται καὶ Ἀσσυρίων οἱ Χαλδαῖοι καὶ Παλατῶν οἱ Εφεσιαί κτλ. (Stromata I 15, 45.21ff). ἐπὶ πάσι δὲ ὁ προφήτης ἐξεισι, προφανεῖς τῷ υδρεῖον ἐγκεκολπισμένος ὁ ἐποντά ὁι ἐκεῖσιν τῶν ἀρταίων βαστάζοντες οὕτος, ως ὁ προστάτης τοῦ οἰείου, τῇ ἱερατικῇ καλούμενα δέκα βιβλία εκμοινθανεί (περιέχει δὲ περί τε νόμων καὶ θεῶν καὶ τῆς ὁλῆς παιδείας τῶν οἰείων), ὁ γὰρ τοῦ προφήτης παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίως καὶ τῆς διανομῆς τῶν προσώπων ἐπιστάτης ἐστιν. (Stromata VI 37.1-2, 449.21ff).

4. ἀδελφό... παρανομήσαντος: The holder of office of προφήτης, which was normally passed from father to son, could enjoy considerable political power and remuneration, and competition for the office did arise. One of the Demotic stories in the so-called Inaros cycle concerns a dispute over the benefice of Amun at Thebes (for text and translation v. W. Spiegelberg 1910 8ff).

5. τὰς μὲν εὖ γεγονότας ὡς συμμάτων καὶ προφήτεις καὶ ... θεραπεύνιας διανέμουν: Read ἀφεὶς not ἀφεῖς. The Budé editors probably read the ἀφεῖς of C here rather than the ἀφεῖς of the other MSS partly because of their liking for C, and partly because they wanted the tense to be the same as that of the parallel διανέμουν at the end of the sentence. Their preference for C can be set aside. Moreover, a difference of tenses can be defended on the grounds that διανέμουν describes a continuous relationship with the captives, whereas the action of ἀφεῖς, ‘sending away’, is clearly a simple and completed one. On balance ἀφεῖς should be preferred. A similar case, a variant in C to harmonize the tense of two parallel participles is rightly rejected by the Budé editors at I 21.3 (ἐπιστείωσα), there they have presumably noticed that the difference of tense gives greater semantic precision.

6. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὴν πάνδημον Ἀφροδίτην τοῦ προφητικὸν ἀτιμάζει γένος: Πάνδημος should be printed with a capital to signal that it is not simply the adjective meaning ‘vulgar’. The reference here is probably not primarily to Pandemos as a cult title (attested in Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien Erythrai 201, 3rd century B.C.; 32.5; Mylasa I 593.2,
1st century A.D.; and elsewhere). The reference here is probably to the distinction made between the good (Oµpçixioç) and the bad (nàvÔTioç) love in the speech of Pausanias, Plato Symposium 180c-185c: ὅ μὲν οὖν [sc. Ἁρειν ὑπὲρ] τῆς Πανδήμου Ἀφροditῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς πάνδημος ἔστι καὶ ἐξεργάζεται ὅτι ἀν τύχῃ καὶ οὕτως ἔστιν ὑν οἱ φαύλοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔρησιν (181a7-b1). For the mythological background to the title ‘Pandemos’ v. Symposium 180d and K.J. Dover (1980) ad 180d6.

Nonetheless, there were cults which maintained the distinction elaborated in the Symposium, where three distinct forms of Aphrodite were honoured simultaneously, according to Pausanias the Geographer: (of Megalopolis in Arcadia) ἑρείπια δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἀφροditῆς ἦν τὸ ιερὸν, πλῆθν ὅσον πρόσωπο τε ἔλειπετο ἔτι καὶ ἀγάλματα ἀριθμῶν τρία, ἐπικλήσεις δὲ Ὑφράνεια, τῇ δ' ἐστι Πάνδήμησις, τῇ τρίτῃ δὲ οὐδὲν ἐτίθεντο; (VIII 32.2); (of Thebes in Boeotia) Ἀφροditῆς δὲ Ἑρμαῖοις ἐξανά ἔστιν οὕτω δὴ ἄρχεια ὡστε καὶ ἀναθήματα Ἀρμονίας εἶναι φασιν, ἐργασθῆναι δὲ συτὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκροστολίων ὁ ταῖς Κάδμου ναοῦν ἦν ξύλου παροιμίαν. καλοῦσι δὲ Ὑφράνειαν, τὴν δὲ αὐτῶν Πάνδήμην καὶ Ἀποστροφιαν τὴν τρίτην· ἔθετο δὲ τῇ Ἀφροditῆς τῆς ἐκατονμίας ἡ Ἀρμονία, τὴν μὲν Ὑφράνειαν ἐπὶ ἐρωτι καθαρία καὶ ἀπαλλαγμένῳ πόθῳ σωμάτων, Πάνδήμην ἐπὶ ταῖς μίζεσι, τρίτη δὲ Ἀποστροφιαν, ἵνα ἐπηθυμίας τε ἀνόμου καὶ ἔργων ἀνοσίων ἀποτρέψῃ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων πολλά γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἐν βαρβάροις ἥπιστατο ἡ Ἀρμονία, τὰ δὲ παρ’ Ἐλληνικὴ ζῆτητο ἕτεροι μεταμφιβάλλεται, έποια καὶ ὑπερηπον ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀδαμαίδος μητρὶ καὶ ἕς Φαύλοι τε τὴν Μίνω καὶ ἕς τῶν Ῥώκα Τηρέα ἄδεται... (IX 16.3-4).

In the second passage quoted above, and at I 22.3, Pausanias appears to imply that it was Aphrodite Pandemos who led astray Phaidra in the story of Hippolytus. For the reader aware of this idea, the juxtaposition of the story of the Phaidra-like Demainete with Thyamis’ rejection of Aphrodite Pandemos is striking.

Apuleius (Apol. 12) refers to the twin Venuses as a Platonic concept, and calls them vulgaria and caelites. The latter, he says, is restricted to a small number of people. C. Schlam TAPhA 101 (1970) 477-487, sees a reference to Venus vulgaria in the lovemaking at Met. II 15-17 (with Fotis) and 46.19-22 (with the matronae). He writes, “In the interim, the male partner has been transformed. The form of an ass is, however, the perfect expression of Lucius’ sexuality.” (481). Apuleius does not follow Plato in restricting caelites to homosexual love, and the absence of an evidently homosexual meaning to Thyamis’ words here does not preclude Pandemos from being a Platonic reference.

It seems likely that Heliodorus’ treatment of the science of love is influenced by the way similar ideas are presented by Achilles Tatios (v. below on I 26.3).
Achilles Tatios introduces the contrast between κάλλος οὐράνιον and κάλλος πάνθημον (II 36) specifically in a *controversia* about the merits of homosexual and heterosexual love. When a reader compares this with the words of Thyamis where Urania too is heterosexual, Heliodoros' silence about homosexuality, the exclusion of any mention of it from the *Aithiopika*, seems all the more pointed.

7. οὖ τὴς καθ' ἡδονὴν χρείας: The apparatus in the Budé show that Rattenbury supported the conjectural addition of χάριν proposed by H. Richards *CR* 20 (1906) 109-113. χάριν seems to be required, and its visual similarity with χρείας makes it credible that a copyist omitted it. However, there are no MS variants reported at this point, and it is best to keep the suggestion of χάριν in the apparatus rather than run the risk of restoring what *should* have been in Heliodoros' autograph.

§20

*Thyamis explains why he regards Charicleia as a suitable wife for him.*

1. πρῶτον μὲν εὐγενῆς εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ: The sense of εὐγενῆς here cannot be determined precisely. Heliodoros, like Chariton (but not the other extant Greek novelists) is fond of describing his hero and heroine as εὐγενῆς. The words εὐγενῆς and εὐγενεία are favoured by Euripides (but are not common in the other dramatists); rare in Plato, they are much used by Aristotle, who offers a definition at *Rhet.* 1 5.5 based on the wealth, fame and virtue of the ancestors; (for other contemporary definitions, which are similar, v. E.M. Cope (1877) ad loc.) Dio Chrysostom in his *Περὶ δοξαλίας καὶ ἐλευθερίας* distinguishes εὐγενῆς as of birth, and γενναῖος as of quality of character (*Orat.* XV 243B, ed. de Budé II 301 1.25ff). However, in Plutarch and in some of Heliodoros' fourth century Christian contemporaries (e.g. John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzos, Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret) who use the word a great deal, εὐγενῆς is not so clearly defined. More often than not it does entail the idea of good character, as it does here; but it frequently entails also, or only, the idea of good birth, or Greekness, or both.

2. πῶς οὖ τὴν βελτίωνα περὶ αὐτῆς εἰκότως παρίστησι φαντασίαν: τὴν βελτίωνα . . . φαντασίαν in this context can only mean something like 'a picture of her in happier circumstances.' It is tempting to translate φαντασία as 'judgement' or 'opinion' or 'assumption', as some modern translators have. However, the word usually has some connotation of the visual, or at least of perception, and the reader naturally wonders why it has been chosen rather than a more usual word for judgement (such as δόξα); besides, if it meant 'opinion' it would be hard to explain why the comparative βελτίωνα was
preferred (better than what?). Whatever translation is adopted the turn of phrase is an odd one. The psychological realism with which Heliodorus depicts Thyamis’ passion perhaps justifies the reader to think that by using the phrase Thyamis, unintentionally and in contradiction to his professed purity, reveals that he feels the image of Chariklea in his amorous imagination is better than the modest image she presents to the world.

§21

The bandits agree to the marriage. When Chariklea is asked about it modesty makes her reluctant to reply. She refers to Theagenes as her brother.

3. ἐπισείουσα: on the choice of reading v. the note on I 19.5.

§22

Chariklea tells that she and Theagenes are priest and priestess of Artemis and Apollo, and were blown off course on the way to Delos. She agrees to marry Thyamis but asks for the wedding to be delayed until she can go to a shrine of Apollo and lay aside her priesthood.

2. γένος μὲν ἔσμεν ἰονές: The quasi-adverbial γένος lacks the article also at Heliodoros II 34.2; VIII 17.3; Philostratos Life of Apollonios III 20; and Herodotos I 6, Κροίδος Ἡνλυθὼς μὲν γένος, παῖς δὲ Ἄλναττεω, τύραννος δὲ ἑθνέους κτλ. Heliodoros was almost certainly aware that the latter passage was famous for this feature and for its compressed style (some ancient discussions are quoted in B. Rosen Herodotos I Teubner, 1987, ad loc.)

2. οὐμός: Read ὁ ἐμός. οὐμός is the reading of CBT, ὁ ἐμός of VMZA. Elsewhere the MSS have only ὁ ἐμός (I 10.2; VI 13.3; IX 21.2). οὐμός has crept in here because here alone the phrase is preceded by a vowel, and δὲ ὁ ἐμός could be regarded as an unacceptable case of hiatus. It is almost impossible to decide which reading is best. Perhaps ὁ ἐμός is to be preferred on the grounds that the phrase does not offend a conventional definition of hiatus; that a similar sequence of vowels is produced by ὁ ἕλιος preceded by κατι at Heliodoros III 4.8 and by οὐδι at VII 21.2; and, for what it is worth, that the MSS with ὁ ἐμός tend to be more reliable than those with οὐμός. Other attestations for the phrase ὁ ἐμός ὀδελφός: Dem. XLVIII 10, 20; Plat. Euthyd. 297 e 2; Philostratos Life of Apollonios I 31; only the first of these is preceded by a vowel. Other attestations for οὐμός ὀδελφός: Plut. Per. 28.6; Greg. Naz. De vita sua ed. C. Jungck 368; Libanios Decl. XLVII 1.11 (only the first of these is not preceded by a vowel).
4. κλυδώνιον ἄθρόνον ἐμπεσοῦν καὶ ἄνεμος ἐξώστης καὶ λαίλαπες
συμμιγεῖς καὶ προστίρες τὴν θάλασσαν καταγίζοντες τὴν νεάν τοῦ ἐθέλος παραφέρουσι: Read ἄθρόες (v. below). Hesychios, κλυδώνιον
πέλαγος, χείμων, καὶ θόρυβος προγμάτων. This diminutive is popular with
certain fourth century A.D. prose writers, several of whom admitted verse
words, but rare in earlier Greek. There are only four attestations before the
imperial period: Aischylos Th. 795; Ch. 183; Euripides Hecuba 48; Helen
1209. It is probable that the diminutive was used in tragedy metri grata for
κλύδον, and imported into prose by writers who perceived it as part of tragic
vocabulary.

The Budé editors’ preference for ἄθρόον over ἄθρόως is probably right. The
comparison they make with IV 7.7, where the same pair of variants is found,
and they choose ἄθρόον, shows that they take ἄθρόον as an adverb, not an
adjective used adverbially (which would be meaningless at IV 7.7). It is
possible that a scribe changed ἄθρόως to ἄθρόον at IV 7.7 thinking that an
adjective is required, because the word is juxtaposed to ὁγκον, which is
parallel with a noun which does have a qualifying adjective: καὶ ἄπροσπρνον ὁγκον ὑφισταται καὶ τὸν ὁγκον ἄθρόον καθήμεται.
The same explanation would work for the present passage: κλυδώνιον at first
appears to be parallel with ἄνεμος and λαίλαπες, although when the reader
reaches παραφέρουσι it is clear that they are subjects of that verb. On the
other hand, there are many places in Heliodoros where no MSS dissent from
the form ἄθρόον for the adverb (references can be found s.v. in LRG), whereas
ἀθρόως is never the reading of all the MSS, and on the whole it is easier to
assume that Heliodoros utilized only one adverbial form of the word, so
ἄθρόον is correct here and at IV 7.7.

καταγίζοντες is the reading of C: most of the other MSS read
καταγίζουσαι, (-οντος καὶ τ), which was probably in the archetype.
προστήρ otherwise seems only to be masculine. Since C is clearly interpolated
to some extent, if not as much as A. Colonna supposes, it is tempting to take
καταγίζοντες as a correction. Now if there is an apparent mistake of gender
is in the archetype, is an editor justified in correcting it? προστήρ is a rare
word, and it perhaps as likely that Heliodoros got its gender wrong as it is that
a copyist made a faulty ‘correction’. Therefore it is perhaps better to follow A.
Colonna and print καταγίζουσαι, noting the variant of C in the apparatus.

4. ἡγὼμεθα οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄθους, πνεόντος ἡμέρας μὲν ἐπτά νύκτας δὲ
ἰσας: Here again the Budé editors follow C, and A. Colonna follows the other
MSS with . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄει πνεόντος . . . (with no comma). Prof. Maehler
suggests to me that ἄει (= “whichever way it was blowing”, not “continually”,
συνεχῶς) might illustrate the previous sentence - the ship has been abandoned
to η Τύχη. This would make better sense of the choice of connective, οὖν; on the whole ἀεί seems the preferable reading.

5. ὀφέλων: ὀφέλων CB / ὀφέλων VMZAT. The former is classical, and survives into fourth century Christian writing. The latter is comparatively rare in classical Greek, but is the only form used in the Septuagint and the New Testament, and of the two forms, predominates in Christian writing by a factor of almost three to one. In view of the tendency for C to introduce uncalled for 'corrections', and of the other evidence for typically Christian usages in Heliodoros (v. p20) ὀφέλων should probably be preferred.

§23
The crowd approve of Charicleia’s speech, and Thyamis accepts the condition she makes.

2. τὸ ἐνύπνιον: On the dream, and the terms used for it cf. the notes ad I 18.2-5 and I 18.2 above.

2. ἐκοντὶ: Although adverbs in -τὶ are not peculiar to late Greek, ἐκοντὶ does seem to be. There are of course many texts where one could read ἐκοντὶ or ἐκοντὶ equally well. The list of texts where ἐκοντὶ is impossible, and ἐκοντὶ must be read is dominated by Christian writers of the fourth century (undoubted attestations of ἐκοντὶ are fewer than half a dozen). ἐκοντὶ occurs twenty-five times in the following fourth century Christian authors: Amphilochios, Theodoret, Didymos, John Chrysostom, Marcellus, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Orac. Sib. II 66 (?3rd-4th cent.). The earlier places where we must almost certainly read ἐκοντὶ as an adverb are Plut. Mor. 223 D 3; Fab. 5.2; Ps-Lucian Charid. 27; Josephos A.J. three times; Clement Paed. I 80.70; Dio Chrysostom Or. XLVIII 11.

§24
Thyamis orders his men to prepare to march to Memphis, and sends the captives back to their hut. Knemon leaves the hut to seek a herb.

2. καὶ τὸν Θεαγένην εἰς αἰδῶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς ὁμοδίαιτον ἐποιεῖτο: The meaning must be, ‘... he made Theagenes share his table out of respect for his sister.’ εἰς αἰδῶ would be more natural, and it is difficult to see why Heliodorus preferred εἰς αἰδῶ. At Achilles Tatiós I 10.3 (and nowhere else in Greek) the latter has a comparable, though not identical meaning: there it must mean ‘in respect of a sense of shame’. Heliodorus seems to have had Achilles
Tatios in mind when he wrote about Thyamis’ love for Charikleia (v. below on I 26.3), and this may explain the choice of phrase here.

In view of the way Heliodoros alludes to Xenophon Kyropaideia and Anabasis when he writes about Thyamis and his men (v. below on I 27), it is tempting to read ὀμοδίαιτον as an allusion to the Persian term ὀμοτράπεζος which Xenophon uses.

2. αὐτήν δὲ τὴν Ἀριμελιαν οὐδὲ ὅραν τὰ καλλὰ διεγνώκει τοῦ μὴ ύπέκκαυμα γίνεσθαι τοῦ ἐγκεμένου πόθου: A genitive articular infinitive used in a final sense without ἐνεκα is classical, chiefly Thucydidean, but becomes much commoner in Christian writers of the fourth century and later. For bibliography v. Schwyzzer-Debrunner II p372 n8, to which may be added W.W. Goodwin (1889) §798. The most detailed discussion of the construction is in A.N. Jannaris (1897) pp483f., 578f.

§25

Theagenes laments Charikleia’s speech to Thyamis, but she reassures him that she still prefers him. It becomes clear that what she told Thyamis was made up.

2. ἢ τί δὲ: This is what A. Colonna prints, but it seems pleonastic. Read ἢ τί. The Budé editors report that MZT omit the δὲ, but they keep it in the text, probably because they favour the MSS in which it appears (VCBA), especially C. If they were unhappy about the expression ἢ τί δὲ, it would have been better to keep the ἢ of the MSS and print the variant which omits δὲ. The phrase ἢ τί δὲ is unattested in Greek (although reported in D-K II 414 as a conjecture), except at Dexippos (Comm. in Aristot. Graec. 4.2) 13.18, where it is less pleonastic.

3. τοσαύτην ἔχων ἕκ τῶν παρελθόντων τὴν κατε ἐμοῦ διὰ τῶν ἑργῶν δοκιμασίαν: The choice of preposition is surprising: κατά + genitive of a person tends to mean “against”, and the object of δοκιμασία is usually a genitive with τῇ, or more often without a preposition. Nonetheless, κατά + genitive with virtually the same sense as πῇ + genitive, although not found elsewhere in Heliodoros, is classical (LSJ κατά A II 7), so the text need not be suspected.

3. ἢ ἐμὲ> μεταβαλλομένην εὐρήσεις: The addition of the pronoun by the editors of the Budé is pedantic, and the style is more Heliodorean without it. The same idiom, a direct object expressed by a participle alone where ἢ ἐμὲ is implied, is used again by Charikleia a few lines below (πολλάκις μὲν
Charikleia assures Theagenes that she has no intention of marrying Thyamis, but that she made her promise to him only to buy time. She counsels caution.

The reaction of Theagenes to Charikleia’s words, and her elucidation for him of her subterfuge, provide the first indication of their characters. Theagenes’ jealous reaction does not turn out to be typical of him; what does turn out to be typical is his impulsiveness, whereas Charikleia consistently shows caution and foresight. The intensity of their passion for each other is another
characteristic which is sustained throughout the novel, and in the case of Theagenes this sometimes causes his impulsive reactions. Events show that in most instances Charikleia’s caution and forethought have been wise, and Theagenes’ impulsiveness foolish, especially when, as here, it leads to premature despair. These characteristics are reinforced, if not developed, at several points in the novel. Theagenes’ passion and hasty despair come out particularly strongly when he enters the cave and jumps to the conclusion that Charikleia is dead (twice), II 1-4; and still in the cave, he behaves impulsively when he reacts aggressively to the appearance of Thermouthis, while the cautious Charikleia hides (II 13). Kalasiris restrains him from acting on impulse and rushing off to Charikleia as soon as he learns that she loves him (IV 6). She with her foresight overrules Theagenes’ frankly suicidal impulsiveness when they are faced with fresh capture (V 6-7). The same impulsiveness is manifest when he behaves proudly towards Arsake (especially at VII 19); but Charikleia’s good sense is displayed when, overruling Theagenes, she delays revealing that Hydaspes is her father (IX 24). Theagenes uses intelligent subterfuge when he tells Kybele that he and Charikleia are siblings - and his story is only a modified imitation of the fictions he has heard Charikleia tell Thymis at I 22. Theagenes’ unpremeditated and potentially dangerous action has beneficial consequences when he brings the runaway bull under control (X 28-29): to that extent this incident is exceptional. Related to his impulsiveness, perhaps, is the way he is easily impressed by Kalasiris’ mantic shenanigans when he divines he is in love with Charikleia (III 17): Charikleia is much less impressed by such trickery (IV 5), and Kalasiris does not trouble with theatrical magic when he diagnoses her love (IV 10). Theagenes’ impulsiveness is in harmony with his descent form Achilles (stated at II 34.4), whose impulsiveness was of course legendary. Kalasiris, with his cunning, and his propensity for storytelling, has an affinity with Odysseus, and it is natural for the reader to cast about for an Homeric character with whom to associate Charikleia: because of her fidelity and her subterfuge Penelope most obviously presents herself, but Heliodoros never underlines this association as he does for the link between Theagenes and Achilles.

2. περιβαλόνται: This is the reading of VMA, and is right; A. Colonna prints the reading of CBZT, περιλαμβάνεισα, which can mean ‘embrace’, but is not otherwise found in Heliodoros, and is less good.

3. ὁρμῆν γὰρ, ὡς οἴσθα, κρατοῦσας ἐπιθυμίας μάχῃ μὲν ἄντιτυπος ἐπιτείνει, λόγος δὲ εἶχον καὶ πρὸς τὸ βούλημα συντρέχων τὴν πρώτην καὶ ζεύγωσαν φοράν ἐστειλε καὶ τὸ κάτοξον τῆς ὀρέξεως τῷ ἢδεὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας κατεύνασα: The same idea - that intense desire becomes more bearable when its satisfaction is promised - is expressed by Menelaos at Achilles Tatos IV, in a similar context: Leukippe has asked the
general Charmides for a few days' delay before she satisfies his desire when they reach Alexandria. Heliodoros seems to have depended on Achilles Tatios not only for his description of the Boukoloi (v. p97 above) but also for several of the quasi-scientific ideas about love which he uses, especially in his description of the feelings of Thamis for Charicleia. H.G.T. Maehler GCN III 1990 10-11 cites this passage as an example of how Heliodoros, although he follows conventions in his description of the symptoms of love, writes far more convincingly, psychologically, than even his closest forerunner, Achilles Tatios.

6. καλὸν γὰρ ποτε καὶ τὸ ψεόδος, ὅταν ὠφελοῦν τοὺς λέγοντος μηδὲν καταβλάπτη τοὺς ἀκόουντας; Charicleia refers again to a lie which she says is justified by necessity at X 18. The issue of whether lies are ever justified interested the Church Fathers, although there is little discussion of it in non-Christian Greek authors. Charicleia's reference to it, which looks less out of place in the Aithiopika than it might in another of the extant Greek novels, should probably be linked with Heliodoros' evident familiarity with Christian texts (v. p20).

W.S. Mackowiak (1933) points out that there is really no Greek equivalent for the word 'lie' (Lüge), quoting (p48) Leopold Schmidt Die Ethik der alten Griechen II 411, "die berechnete Unwahrheit, den bewussten Irrtum und die von der Wirklichkeit sich entfernende poetische Ausschmückung mit demselben Ausdruck bezeichnet, ohne den darin liegenden Tadel zu nüanzieren." This is perhaps not surprising if one accepts, as J.J. Winkler (1990 107-112; 133-137) alleges, that social relations in Mediterranean countries were (and are) shot through with guardedness and deceit. (Insofar as Winkler has in mind specifically Greece he belongs to the same tradition of ethnographic comment as Heliodoros, for whom Knemon's Athens provided a paradigm for a society of dissemblers.) Mackowiak collects references to passages where lies are interdicted or sanctioned by pagan and Christian Greek writers. Conditional sanctions for lies in patristic writing are few: Mackowiak quotes John Chrysostom PG 48 629-630 and 49 330-331. Origen, and Clement Stromata 1 7.8 use the example of a doctor dealing with patients for a situation where lies may be justified, so they seem to have arrived at this position under the influence of Plato (defence of necessary lies, Respub. 382 c 6-10; doctors need to lie, Respub. 389 b 2-9). Christian writers who interdict lies outnumber those who allow them; the issue is dealt with in particular by St. Augustine in De mendacio, Contra mendacium and Encheiridion 18-22 (all in PL 40).
Knemon runs back with the herb, rushes Theagenes and Charikleia to Thyamis, and announces that he has seen the approach of a horde of enemies.

The battle is marked by a series of allusions to Xenophon *Kyropaideia* and *Anabasis*. Their overall effect is to link Thyamis and his men with Xenophon's barbarians. The log canoes (I 31.2, v. note ad loc.), the παλτός (I 27.3, v. note ad loc.), and the phrase ἐπέρα ἥδη προστούσης marking the end of the battle (cp. X. Cyr. III 2.25, ἔπει δ' ἐπέρα προσήμει) recall the *Kyropaideia* and *Anabasis*. Heliodoros recalls Xenophon's Kyros also with the sacrifice Thyamis makes before battle (I 28.1; cf. e.g. X. Cyr. I 5.6) and the speech he makes to the troops (I 29.5-6; c.f. e.g. X. Cyr. I 5.7-14). If Heliodoros regarded Xenophon's Kyros as a barbarian general who nonetheless had admirable qualities, then this reminder of him is consistent with, and supports, the characterisation of Thyamis.

3. καὶ κράνος τι διασμόντα καὶ παλτόν θῆγοντα: Although διασμὼ is hapax legomenon, διασμόντα is to be preferred to the reading of Τ (διασμήτοντα).

The παλτός was a light spear used by the Persians, and frequently mentioned in Xenophon *Kyropaideia* and *Anabasis*. The word παλτός remained in use during the imperial period, and in most (but not all) cases it evidently refers to a Persian weapon.

Thyamis tells Knemon to hide Charikleia in a cave, then orders a sacrificial victim. It was a man-made cave for storing booty.

1. τὸν δὲ ὑπαπτιστὴν ἱερεῖον ἄγειν προσέτατεν: The detail of the sacrifice before battle underlines the piety of Thyamis: Heliodoros must sustain this side of his character, although he is the chief of a band of barbarian brigands, if his ultimate installation as high priest of Isis at Memphis is to seem a 'happy ending' in the context of the pious values which set the tone of the *Aithiopika*.

The order for a sacrificial victim would probably be out of place in a description of Egyptian cult practice at the dramatic date of the *Aithiopika*, and presumably reflects Greek practice. There is no clear evidence that animal sacrifice took place in Late Period Egypt. Heliodoros leaves the details of the sacrifice vague: to which god was it, and was it to be made in a shrine or
temple? Thyamis is son of Kalasiris, an Isiac priest, so perhaps he is most likely to sacrifice to Isis. It is likely that the historical Boukoloi or other outlaws in the North-West Delta were on the whole not ethnically Egyptian, and they may well have practised non-Egyptian cults, but if they did there is no indication that Heliodoros knew about it. By the historical period in Egypt the sacrifice of a victim (rather than the more usual offering of food) represented the destruction of one’s enemies, and to this extent Thyamis’ action in sacrificing before battle is in harmony with Egyptian thought. However, it is likely that by the time of the New Kingdom, and presumably still in the Persian period when the *Aithiopika* is set, an offering of roast meat would have been used as a substitute for the sacrifice of a whole animal. The symbolism, and the use of substitute offerings, is discussed by H. Kees *NAWG* 1942 71-88.

§29

The cave is described. Knemon places Charicleia in the cave, closes it and leaves. He finds Thyamis addressing his men to stir them up for battle.

In some ways the description of the cave is not very realistic. An opening which connected the deep chamber with the edge of the lagoon and admitted light would in reality probably have exposed the cave to flooding; and the complex of passages which all start at the opening and all terminate at the same inner chamber, and which are, it is implied, confusing for those who do not know them, is perhaps difficult to visualize. However, one does get the impression that the caves and tombs, where people tend to be buried alive, which we find in the Greek novels, have some symbolic value. G.W. Bowersock (1994) posited a link between the idea of a *Scheintod* in a tomb or cave with the gospel story of the entombment and resurrection of Jesus, which, he pointed out, seems to have arisen at about the same time as the genesis of the Greek novel. R. Merkelbach (1962) linked the theme of caves and tombs, and the *Scheintod*, with initiation into mystery cults. When Heliodoros’ ancient readers read the description of this cave, associations with the rites of Mithras and with the Platonic myth at *Republic* VII cannot have been far from their minds, but if Heliodoros was thinking of a specific allegorical or symbolic meaning for the cave, our evidence about his beliefs and those of his contemporaries is not adequate to allow us to identify it. It is however worth noting that Heliodoros has developed the theme further than the earlier Greek novelists by prefacing his cave with a maze, which may well have contributed to its magical or religious symbolism.
2. οἱ . . . πόροι . . . πρὸς μίαν εὐχαρίαν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν πυθμένος συρρέοντες ἀνεστομοῦντο: τὸν πυθμένος is the reading of C; the reading of the other MSS, τὸν πυθμένα makes much better sense. The Budé editors have been misled by their love of C.

3. οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέψειν αὐτῷ συμπλακῆναι τοῖς πολέμιοις ἀλλὰ διαδράσσεσθαι τὴν μάχην: Read διαδρασσαί (see below). If we suppose that Knemon is characterized as a coward, his words here may reinforce that characterisation. When he thinks Charicleia is dead he drops the torch (II 3) - perhaps his fright is a sign of cowardice. At his reluctance to travel with Thermouthis (II.18) Theagenes charges Knemon with cowardice; so does Kalasiris when Knemon is frightened by a crocodile (VI 1).

On the other hand a reader who espouses 'close reading' may point out that in what we are told of the battle Knemon neither shows cowardice, nor does he counsel Theagenes to run away. The charges of cowardice made by Theagenes and Kalasiris are not really supported by the narrative at these points, or anywhere else. His concern about travelling with Thermouthis (who, as we learn, does mean to harm or kill Knemon), and his alarm at seeing a crocodile for the first time can be regarded as no more than sensible caution; and his words in the present passage may be seen as a deceit to calm Charicleia which springs from the same good sense.

διαδράσσεσθαι is the conjecture of the editors of the Budé. It is probably wrong, because it would mean that Knemon says that he is himself going to run away. The required meaning is that he promises not to let Theagenes engage in battle, but to let him run away - in other words, since διδράσκω and its compounds mean 'run away', not 'cause to run away', we need an infinitive of διαδράσκω which will be taken in parallel with συμπλακῆναι, not with ἐπιτρέψειν. Therefore we can reject the conjecture and choose between the MSS readings, which are (according to the Budé): διαδράσσει οἱ Z (σοι AT), σοι is well attested, and makes good sense, so should probably be kept. The usual aorist is strong, and the weak form διαδρασσεῖ (otherwise attested in the printed texts of Socrates the church historian, and John Chrysostom, but not in documents, where the verb is very rare), which has good manuscript authority, is probably the reading of the archetype, and διαδρασσεῖ is probably a scribal correction.

5. ἄν γὰρ ἐν ἔργοις οἱ πολέμιοι, τούτων μὴ διὰ τῶν ὁμοίων σὺν τάχει τὴν ἀμύναν ἐπάγειν πάντακασιν ἐστὶ τοῦ προσήκοντος ὀστεροῦντων: Literally, 'those in whose property are their enemies, for them not to bring up a defence quickly using similar forces is entirely [the act] of men who come later than is required' (or, ' . . . who fail in their duty'). J.R. Morgan in his translation in CAGN seems to take διὰ τῶν ὁμοίων as 'at a
similar speed', which is possible; 'using similar forces' seems preferable because it is less pleonastic.

Thyamis has already shown himself an orator when he addressed his men at I 19.3 - I 21.1; nonetheless, it seems odd that this speech, made to brigands facing attack, contains some of the most complex and difficult Greek in the Aithiopika, and it is tempting to see a touch of comedy in its inappropriately high style.

6. τοσαύτα ἔχειν ἔξεσται ὁσα καὶ νικᾶν περιγίνεται: Read ὀσάκεις for ὀσα καί. Unless it can be shown that νικᾶν can be translated like κρατέω with an accusative object denoting goods seized in battle, it is not possible to make sense of the text as it stands. The emendation ὀσάκεις, proposed by J.R. Morgan (CAGN 376 n30), is the simplest and most elegant to have been suggested and should probably be accepted.

6. οὔδὲ εν σπονδαίς ἐσχε τὴν τελευτήν: εν σπονδαίς is the reading of VMBP, and is followed by the Budé; A. Colonna reads ἔνσπονδον with CZAT. There is no other evidence that ἔνσπονδος can be used of things, rather than persons or animals, (with the possible exception of the Suda s.v.), so ἐν σπονδαίς should probably be preferred.

§30

Thyamis calls his shield-bearer, Thermouthis, who is not to be found, then goes into the battle. The fierce battle is described. Worried that he will be deprived of Charikleia by the battle, Thyamis goes to the cave and kills a Greek speaking woman he finds there whom he takes to be Charikleia.

1. Θέρμονθις: (The Suda, followed by papyrologists, accents Θέρμονθις.) The name is a transcription of the Egyptian T3-rmn-wt.t, Demotic T-rnwte, a harvest goddess with the form of a serpent. The goddess had a long history in Egypt, and is particularly well attested in lower Egypt in the Greco-Roman period, when she was at least partially assimilated with Isis. From her is derived the Coptic month name ΚΑΡΜΟΥΤΕ / ΦΑΡΜΟΥΘΕΙ. For an overview and bibliography of this goddess v. Lexicon der Ägyptologie s.v. 'Renenutet'; monuments are assembled and studied in J. Broekhuis (1971). She is beneficent, so it is most unlikely that Heliodoros knew anything about her when he gave her name to the unsympathetic character which is introduced here.
As a personal name Θερμούθης is well attested in Greek documents from Roman Egypt. As far as one can tell, it is always a woman’s name. Names beginning with the letter Τ are in effect morphologically feminine, and feminine names so often begin with Τ that anyone with even a slight familiarity with Egyptian names would recognize the name as feminine. It is possible that Heliodoros had come across Θερμούθης as a personal name but had not realized that it is feminine; however, it does not seem very probable.

Therefore we must assume either that Heliodoros knew that the name is recognizably feminine, and is playing a game with his readers when he applies it to Thyamis’ shield bearer, or that he simply did not know that Θερμούθης had already been used as personal name, but meant to name the shield bearer after the serpent Θερμούθης just as he named Thyamis after a river.

For readers familiar with Ailian De natura animalium (10.31) the name would recall the description of Thermouthis as a variety of asp in Egypt, associated with Isis, which kills only evil-doers. The literary significance of the name and its associations is discussed by E.L. Bowie (1995).

3. τῶν δὲ τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῆς ἐφόδου τῷ ἀπροσδοκήτῳ: This is the reading of CBPA, and is printed in the Budé; A. Colonna follows VMT, which insert a τε after the first τῷ. The latter gives a use of τε . . . καὶ frequent in Heliodoros; moreover, as J.R. Morgan (1978), passim, noted, Heliodoros liked to create ‘jingles’. The balance of evidence favours the inclusion of the τε.

3. Ἠρετο: A. Colonna, in his 1938 edition (but not in his 1987 edition), prints the η with iota subscript, which is probably just a typographical error.

5. καὶ πολλὰ τὴν θεόν ὡς δολερὰν ὀνειδίσας: Read not τὴν θεόν or τὴν θεόν but τὴν θέαν. The reading of the manuscripts reported by the editors of the Budé is θεόν (P θέαν). The editors emend to θεόν because everywhere else in Heliodoros η θεός is the feminine form of ῥ θεός, with the editors reporting no variants (I 2.6; I 2.7; I 18.4; II 25.2; VII 9.1; X 6.5; X 9.3). Since ονειδίσω is normally construed with accusative of thing and dative of person, it is surprising that the editors have not seen that P is right (or rather that all the MSS are right about the text, and only P is right about the accentuation); i.e. Thyamis objurgates as deceitful not τὴν θεόν or τὴν θεόν, “the goddess”, but τὴν θέαν, “the vision” (i.e. the apparition of Isis in the dream). That what is called τὸ ὅναρ and τὴν ὄψιν in the previous section is now referred to as τὴν θέαν can be explained by Heliodoros’ habit of varying vocabulary simply to avoid repetition of the same word.
5. κλοπεύοντας: This is the reading which the Budé editors report from VMCBPZ and print; otherwise it is found only at Arrian Illyria 15, and once in Eustathios, and if it should be treated as a different word from κλοπεύω (= 'steal') it seems to mean 'plunder'. A. Colonna prints the reading of A, κλοπεύοντας. Neither makes good sense, and it would be better to accept the conjecture of Koraes: κλοπεύοντας, otherwise found in II. XIX, Lexicographers, Scholia, Eustathios (meaning uncertain, LSJ s.v. 'deal subtly, spin out time by false pretences').

5. αὐτός, δήθεν ώς τὸν θέρμουθιν ἐπιζητήσων: The comma before δήθεν in the printed editions should be removed. δήθεν seems always to be post-positive, and to be taken closely with what precedes it. The irony which it expresses here is produced not by the contrast between Thyamis' pretended and actual actions (as the editors' punctuation implies) but by the equally striking contrast between what he does and what tells his men to do.

§31

Thyamis finds Thermouthis, and with Theagenes and Knemon and his other men they face the enemy, but all give back again except Thyamis.

2. σκάφη ἀπὸ μόνου ξύλου καὶ πρέμινον παξέος ἕνός ἀγροικότερον κοιλανόμενα: The shortage of wood in the Delta makes the use of canoes hollowed out from single logs historically unlikely. Such boats are mentioned in other geographical areas several times in Greek literature; if Heliodoros had any one passage in mind when he wrote this, perhaps it is most likely to have been Xenophon Anabasis V 4.11: καὶ ἡκον [the Mossynoikians, a Black Sea tribe] τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ἁγοντες τριακόσια πλοία μονόξυλα καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ τριες ἄνδρας, διὸ οἱ μὲν δυο ἑκάστης εἰς τάξιν ἔθεντο τὰ ὀπλα, ὁ δὲ εἰς ἑνεμε. Such boats are normally called μονόξυλα and the reading μονόξυλος found in C is presumably an attempt to replace Heliodoros' unusual expression with a conventional one. The attempt is not wholly successful, and the printed text, a kind of Heliodorean pun on μονόξυλος, is probably right.

4. ἐνέβαλλεν: This is the reading of the Budé, following VCB. A. Colonna follows MPZAT and prints ἐνέβαλεν. There is little to choose between the two, but the latter is perhaps slightly more appropriate to the action.
§32

Thyamis is taken alive, for which a reward has been offered, but his shieldbearer gets away.

1. εἰς χείρας ὡντων: ὡντων, printed by the Budé, is Bekker’s unnecessary emendation of the ὡντων of the MSS. εἰς ( = sum) can be followed by εἰς (v. LSJ s.v. εἰς 1.2), and ὡντων is more vivid.

1. εἰς γὰρ ὕδωρ εὔπεπλευν ὡντε ἐπέφερεν: The ἐπέφερεν of the MSS is impossible to translate convincingly, and this emendation offered by the editors of the Budé should be accepted.

2. βολῆς ἐκτὸς ἐμπερίᾳ τοῦ νείν ἀναδύνα: “emerging out of range of missiles, using his skill in swimming (underwater)”

§33

We are told that the brigands who took Thyamis were those who had fled from him at the beginning of the story, and that the reward had been offered by his brother Petosiris, who had got by trickery a priesthood which belonged to Thyamis. Some of the bandits guard Thyamis while others search his island for booty, with little success.

2. προφητεῖας: The meaning of προφήτης in an Egyptian context is discussed in the comment on I 19.4.

2. δεδιώσες μὴ καρποῦ λαβόμενος ἐπέλθαι ποτὲ ἢ καὶ χρόνος τὴν ἐπιβολὴν φοράσειεν: The allusion is apt. Demosthenes in Olynthiakos II 10 predicts that the power of Philip will be short-lived because it was obtained by wrongdoing: καὶ σφόδρα γε ἣνθησαν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, ἡν τοῦχ, τῷ χρόνῳ δὲ φοράται καὶ περὶ αὐτὰ καταρρέει. Thus Heliodorus compares Petosiris with the usurper Philip. It is bold touch to turn the phrase of Demosthenes into the active since the active form of φοράω almost always has a personal subject.

3. αὐτῶν: Read αὐτῷ. The MSS which the Budé editors report have αὐτῶν, apart from A which omits the word. The reflexive form is Koraes’ emendation. The Budé and A. Colonna (1987) both accept it. A. Colonna (1938) prints αὐτῶν; he does not report Koraes’ emendation, but notes Hirschig’s αὐτῷ and attributes it to ‘mx. nonn.’, perhaps because he noticed that it is not in Hirschig’s list of variants. Bekker prints αὐτῶν but confusingly omits it from his list of conjectures (mutationes). An alternative to the MSS αὐτῶν is clearly
required, but it is difficult to decide between αὐτῷ and αὐτόν. There are
twelve other occurrences of ἀποκληρώσα τῶν ὀμογλώσσων εἰς τὴν φροντίν ἀποκληρώσας seems to give some support to Koraes’ emendation. In my
view the dative gives a more natural expression, and is more likely from a
palearographical point of view, since an iota adscript copied as such in a
minuscule hand could more easily have been misread as ν, particularly by a
scribe expecting simply iota subscript, than could the breathing have been
mistaken.

3. οἶ δὲ ὑπόλοιποι πρὸς τὴν νῆσον ἔτρακṣαν ὡς τὰ ἐπιζητοῦμενα
ceiμήλια καὶ σκόλα κατ’ αὐτὴν εὖρησοντες, τὴν νῆσον is probably the
best reading. Here the Budé editors print the reading of Z. A. Colonna, who
preferred wherever possible to follow the reading with best MS authority rather
than to risk editing out an idiosyncrasy from the Greek of Heliodoros, followed
VMCBPA with τὸ νησίον in his 1938 edition. In his 1987 edition Colonna
prints τὴν νῆσον. τὴν νῆσον perhaps receives some additional support from
the fact that CBPZAT have the pronoun referring to the island in the feminine,
αὐτήν, although in this context the gender change may be possible as
constructio ad sententiam. VM have αὐτόν. This island is qualified by πᾶσαν
at the beginning of the following sentence (I 33.4), and book II begins ἡ μὲν
δὴ νῆσος. Unless it can be shown that Heliodoros wrote τὸ νησίον in
imitation of some passage in another author, the balance of evidence seems to
favour τὴν νῆσον.

4. εἶ τινα καὶ περιελέειπτο κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαιον ὑπὸ γῆ μὴ
κρυπτόμενα: Read εἰ τι καὶ περιελέειπτο κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαιον ὑπὸ τῇ γῇ
κρυπτόμενον (v. below).

Editors have treated this passage as a crux, unnecessarily. The reading of the
MSS is ὑπὸ τῇ γῇ κρυπτόμενα / κρυπτόμενον. The context is that the
attackers who have burnt the island of Thyamis’ robber band are looking for
the booty. The beginning of the present sentence may be translated, “Thus
running across the entire island and leaving no part unexamined, they came
upon nothing of what they hoped to find, or little; . . .” and then the clause
quoted in the lemma above, which editors want to mean something like “if
there was anything left over, which was not hidden in the cave underground,
[that was all they found.]”. Therefore editors (Hirshig, Rattenbury and Lumb,
Colonna) insert a μὴ somewhere in the clause. If the insertion of μὴ is the right
solution, then the position for it suggested by the Budé seems to be a good
one, although the assumption that μὴ has been omitted by scribal error need
not imply that the τῇ of the MSS should be removed from the text. A. Colonna
inserted μὴ in his 1938 edition (before the ὑπό, which is an unlikely place, if a
μή should be inserted, because it gives hiatus); but, ever anxious to justify rather than emend a manuscript reading, Colonna omitted the μή in his 1987 edition, explaining that the bandits did not penetrate to the innermost part of the cave where Charikleia was hidden: in other words he wants this clause to mean something like “if there was something left over [from the fire because it was] hidden in the cave underground [that was all they found, but not the more valuable things which were in the inner part of the cave, which they did not reach].” The Budé editors report that Amyot added μή before κρυπτόμενον (Budé vol.I pLXIX; they use this example to argue that the marginalia in printed copies belonging to Scaliger and Falkenburg depend on marginalia in Amyot’s copy), but subsequently suppressed it “en l’exponctuant par dessous.”

The modern editors have exacerbated the difficulty by preferring τινα and κρυπτόμενα to the better attested τι and κρυπτόμενον, which allowed older translators to take κρυπτόμενον with σπῆλαιον, so the whole clause reads εἰ τι και περιελέειπτο κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαιον ὑπὸ τῇ γῇ κρυπτόμενον, and means something like, “if there was something left out around the cave which was hidden underground [that was all they found],.” This is the version of the text which has the greatest manuscript authority, and is printed by most editors up to and including Bekker. This version also has the advantage that while κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαιον can mean “around the cave”, it is doubtful whether Heliodoros would have used it to mean “in the cave”, (although “hidden down into the cave” may be just possible for κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαιον . . . κρυπτόμενον); in general it is really no more tortuous than the versions of recent editors, and it should be accepted.
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CONCORDANCE

In the following places readings are recommended in the commentary (and followed in the translation) which differ from the readings of the Budé.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Budé</th>
<th>Birchall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 4.3</td>
<td>δοξῆς οὐκ ἐκτὸς</td>
<td>delevi οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 8.1</td>
<td>ἀνακινούσης αὐτῆς</td>
<td>ἀνακινούσης αὐτοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 8.4</td>
<td>ύπό</td>
<td>ἀπό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 9.1</td>
<td>τὸ γένος</td>
<td>τὸ μὲν γένος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 10.2</td>
<td>ὁ Θησεύς</td>
<td>ὁ Θησέως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 10.4</td>
<td>ἐταίρας, μέθας</td>
<td>ἐταίρας, μέθας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 10.4</td>
<td>τὰ μὲν οὐν ἄλλα</td>
<td>delevi ἄλλα  οὖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 11.5</td>
<td>σκέψαι</td>
<td>κατάλαβε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 12.4</td>
<td>ἐπιβουλεύσαι ἄν</td>
<td>ἐπιβουλεύσειε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 13.1</td>
<td>κατὰ τοὺς νόμους</td>
<td>καὶ τοὺς νόμους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 14.2</td>
<td>ὡς εἶχον εὐθὺς</td>
<td>delevi εὐθὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 14.6</td>
<td>παραμυθεῖσθαι δὲ</td>
<td>παραμυθεῖσθαι τε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 15.4</td>
<td>ποτὲ ὑπελθόντι</td>
<td>ποτὲ δ’ ὑπελθόντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 15.7</td>
<td>γνωρίμην</td>
<td>γνωρίμων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 17.1</td>
<td>ἥδε δὲ</td>
<td>ἥ δὲ ἥδη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 17.3</td>
<td>ἐν γειτόνων</td>
<td>ἐκ γειτόνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 19.2</td>
<td>δύνατο</td>
<td>δύνατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 19.5</td>
<td>ἀφείς</td>
<td>ἀφείς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 22.2</td>
<td>οὖμος</td>
<td>ὁ ἐμός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 22.4</td>
<td>καταγίζοντες</td>
<td>καταγίζουσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 22.4</td>
<td>ἀέτου</td>
<td>ἀεὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 22.5</td>
<td>ὀφελον</td>
<td>ὀφελον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 25.2</td>
<td>ἦ τί δέ</td>
<td>delevi δέ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 25.3</td>
<td>&lt;ἐμεί&gt; μεταβαλλομένων</td>
<td>delevi &lt;ἐμεί&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 25.6</td>
<td>ζηλοτυπίας τῆς ἐφ’ ἡμῖν</td>
<td>τῆς ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ζηλοτυπίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 29.2</td>
<td>τοῦ πυθμένος</td>
<td>τοῦ πυθμένα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 29.3</td>
<td>διαδράσσεσθαι</td>
<td>διαδράσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 29.6</td>
<td>ὡσα καὶ</td>
<td>ὡσάκες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 30.3</td>
<td>τῷ πλήθει</td>
<td>τῷ τε πληθεὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 30.5</td>
<td>τὴν θεόν</td>
<td>τὴν θέαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 30.5</td>
<td>κλοπεύοντας</td>
<td>κλοποπεύοντας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 31.4</td>
<td>ἐνέβαλλεν</td>
<td>ἐνέβαλλεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 32.1</td>
<td>ἱοντων</td>
<td>ἱόντων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 33.3</td>
<td>αὐτῶν</td>
<td>αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 33.4</td>
<td>εἰ τινὰ καὶ</td>
<td>εἰ τι καὶ περιελέειπτο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>περιελέειπτο κατὰ τὸ</td>
<td>κατὰ τὸ σπῆλαίον ὑπὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σπῆλαίον ὑπὸ γῆ μὴ</td>
<td>τῆ γῆ κρυπτόμενον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | κρυπτόμενα | }
**INDEX**

*Index of Greek words and phrases (listed under the key word) discussed; numbers refer to pages.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>οἱ ἄμφι, 89</td>
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<td>ἀναλαμβάνω, 88</td>
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<td>ἀναμολεσία, 106</td>
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<td>ἀντίθες, 23, 67</td>
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<td>ἀπαιρέομαι, 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεφήμι, 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀριστίππος, 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρισίνη, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχέκακος, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶς, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφροδίτης, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀχραντός, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαθὺς ὑπός, 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βακτρία, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βακχεῖον, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βάραθρον, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαρυμπινίσταν, 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαρύτυμος, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βέβηλος, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβηλίδα, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλακεύω, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βούκολα, 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βούκόλοι, 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουθισμός, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γε, 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γειτόναν, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεννήτοι, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γένος, 63, 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γίγνομαι followed by an adverbial expression for a feeling, 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιγνώσκω, 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραμματεύς, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δαίμον, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεύτερος ... πλοῦς, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δήθεν, 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δήμος, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τῶν ὁμοίων, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαγγέλλω, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διασμά, 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διέκπλους, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διεχειροτόνεω, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διήγησι, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διηνεκές, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δέ, 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εαυτοῦς, 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκ γειτόνων, 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκοντί, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκτετρέπται, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐμός / ὁ ἰμός, 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐμπεριπατέω, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνανθρωπεώ, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐναπομένω, 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνάργεια, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνεγκώμον, 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνεφραίνέσθαι, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνθέσιος, 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνώα, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐνσπονδός, 153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπεισόδιον, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιπέτομαι, 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιφορτίζω, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐργον γενέσθαι, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρυθεώ, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρωμένος, 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἠρως, 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐαγγελίζομαι, 22, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
εὐσαγγέλιον, 24
εὐγενής, 142
εὐχαριστία, 25
ἐφηβοι, 110
ξωστήρ, 80, 82

θαυματουργέω, 25
θαυματουργημα, 25
Θεαγένης, 103
Θεοί, 30
Θεοί ἐπήκουσιν, 70
tὸ Θεῖον, 31, 104
Θεῖος, 65
Θεός, 38
Θέρμομυθις, 153
Θίση, 114
Θράσκον, 86
Θύσιμος, 134

καθαρὸς, 83, 103
cαι μήν, 115, 126
κανονισμένο, 83
καὶ ταῦτα, 107
καλία, 99
καταλαμβάνω, 115
κατάφλεκτος, 83
καταχειροτόνεω, 124
κατερθρία, 20
κενοδοξεῖο, 25
κληρονόμος, 110
κλοπέω, 155
κλοτοπεύω, 155
κλυδώνιον, 144
Κνήμων, 106
κρείττονες, 30, 105
tὸ κρεῖττον, 31, 104

λάφυρα, 138
λίαν, 102

μέν, 100
μέν . . . ἄλλα, 129
μέν . . . δὲ, 100
μέν δὴ, 100
μέν οὖν, 106
μέρους μόνον ἢ μέλους, 25
μεστά πάντα, 82
μὴ + participle, 81
μισθὸς, 131
μοιχάμακα, 114
μοιχεύω, 114
μουσουργία, 19

ὀμοδιάσιτος, 146
ὀρος, 81
ὄψις, 81

παλτός, 150
Πάνθημος, 140
παρθενεύειν, 26
πατραλοία, 122
οἱ περί, 89
περιμανῆς, 129
πικρότερον, 102
πολίτην . . . ἀποφήναις, 122
πρηστήρ, 86, 116
προετοιμάζω, 27
προσαγγελία, 118
προφήτης, 67, 139
προμηνήστω, 82
πυρακτομένη, 19

ρυίσκομαι, 19

σαγηνεύω, 109
σαγήνη, 109
σηρικός, 89
σιτείσθαι, 112
σκία, 88
σκολιός, 100
σκῦλα, 138
σμύχω, 132
σοβέω, 87
συμβολῆ γενομένης, 106
σύνθημα, 114
σώζομαι, 126

Τελέθημος, 131
tοφῶν, 116
Τύχη, 56
ὑπερθεραπεύω, 109
ὑποστηρίζω, 27

φαντασία, 142
φόβος τοῦ κρείττονος, 27
Φοίνιξ, 76
φρύταρη, 121
φύντες, 9
φωςτήρ, 27

χαμεύνης, 102
Χαρίκλεια, 104
χειραγαγών, 99
χλαμύς, 111
χρυσόφης, 86

ψυχή, 103

ός as a temporal conjunction, 104, 113
όφελον / ὁφελον, 133, 145
TRANSLATION

The translation is intended to be literal, not elegant, and to contribute to the elucidation of the text. The translation is based on the Budé, except that when the reading of the Budé is rejected in the commentary and an alternative reading is recommended that alternative reading has been translated. Since punctuation in printed Greek texts is on the whole for guidance only, the translation does not necessarily follow the punctuation of the Budé.

I 1 When the day was just beginning to shine and the sun was casting his rays across the mountain ridges, men armed as bandits peering over the desert mound which extends along the outlet of the Nile which is also called the Herakleiotic mouth, and standing there for a little while, let their eyes begin at the sea which lay beneath; and having directed their gaze first to the ocean, when it offered nothing in the way of booty for bandits since it was not being sailed, they were led by the view to the neighbouring shore. 2 On it there were the following things: a ship was moored by its warps, devoid of its crew but full of cargo; and this was detectable even for those at a distance, because the weight forced the water right up to the third wale of the hull. 3 But the shore - everything was full of newly slaughtered bodies, some completely destroyed, others half dead and still quivering in parts of their bodies, indicating that the battle had just finished. 4 The visible signs were not of a clean fight, but mixed up too were the pitiful remains of a banquet which was not auspicious but ended like this; tables still full of comestibles, and others on the ground in the hands of the fallen had become substitutes for arms for some of them (for the battle had happened unexpectedly), and others concealed other men, as they thought, from attackers; wine bowls were overturned, and some were slipping from the hands of those who held them to drink or to use instead of stones, (for the suddenness of the evil had created new uses, and taught them to use cups as missiles). 5 One lay wounded by an axe, another struck by a stone which had been carried there from the water's edge, another one injured by a log, one burnt up by a torch, and each was differently injured; the majority were victims of arrows and archery. 6 The evil power had laid out many images in the small area, polluting wine with blood, setting a battle among the guests, joining killings and drinking, libations and slaughter, and revealing this kind of spectacle to the Egyptian bandits. 7 They themselves stood on the desert mound as observers of these things but were unable to understand the scene because they had [in view] the defeated but saw the victors nowhere; and [they had in view] the glorious victory, but the booty unlooted; and [they had in view] the ship alone, devoid of crew but otherwise intact as if defended by many men and as if rocking in peace. 8 But although at a loss about what had happened they looked to gain and to plunder; so declaring themselves victors they went forward.
II 1 When they had already moved a little away from the ship and from the fallen men a sight struck them which was more confusing than the previous things: a maiden was seated on a rock, an incredible beauty, who convinced one that she was even a goddess, very distressed for those around her but still redolent of a noble disposition. 2 She was garlanded on her head with bay and a quiver was slung from her shoulders and her bow was supported by her left upper arm; the remainder of her arm hung down carelessly. Resting the elbow of her other arm on her right thigh and placing her cheek on her fingers, looking down and watching a youth lying before her, she held her head motionless. 3 He was disfigured with wounds, and seemed to be recovering a little from near death as from a deep sleep, but even in these circumstances he glowed with manly beauty and his cheek, reddening with the blood that was running down it, shone the more by its whiteness. The troubles had drawn down his eyes but the sight of the maiden raised them again to her, and what compelled them to see was the fact that they saw her. 4 When he had caught his breath and gasped rather deeply he spoke softly and said, “O sweetness, have you really survived for me, or are you too a victim of the battle and no more able to keep away from us after death [than in life], but your image and spirit pays attention to my fortunes?” “My salvation” said the maiden “depends on you. Do you see this?” [she said] pointing at a sword on her lap; “It has lain idle so far, kept in check by your revival.” 5 And as she spoke she sprung up from the rock, but those on the desert mound, struck by the marvel and shock of the sight as if by a bolt from the blue, plunged each into a different bush; for when she stood up she seemed bigger and more god-like to them, with the sudden movement of her clanging weapons, her raiment interwoven with gold glinting in the sun, her hair shaking in a Bacchic dance under the chaplet and running down her back to the fullest extent. 6 These things scared them, and ignorance of what had happened scared them more than what they saw; for some of them said she was some goddess, even the goddess Artemis, or the local Isis; others, that she was a priestess inspired by the gods, who had made the great slaughter which could be seen. This is what they perceived, but they did not perceive the truth. She suddenly threw herself on the young man and, draped all over him, she cried, kissed, wiped [the blood], wailed and doubted that she held him. 7 When they saw this the Egyptians changed their mind to other ideas, and said, “How can these be the actions of a goddess, and how could a spirit kiss a dead body so pathetically.” They encouraged one another to be bold and to walk forward to get a clear grasp of the truth. Recovering, then, they ran down to the maiden who was still concerned with the wounds of the youth; and standing there they stayed behind her having neither the courage to say or do anything. 8 With the sound of their step, and the shadow they made falling across her eyes, the maiden looked up again and saw them. She was not a little frightened by the unfamiliarity of their skin colour and of their appearance, which showed by their weapons their character as bandits, but she applied herself entirely to the care of the man who lay there.
This is how real desire and untainted love disdain all sorrows and pleasures which strike from without, and oblige the mind to look towards and incline towards the beloved thing alone.

III 1 When the brigands had moved round and stood facing her and seemed to be about to try something the girl looked up again, and seeing that their skin colour was black and their visage rough she said, "If you are the ghosts of the dead you are not right to haunt us, for most of you died at one another’s hands, and as many as were killed by us suffered by the law of self defence and of vengeance for the assault on chastity. If you are of the living your way of life, it seems, is banditry, but you have come at a good time: release us from the encompassing troubles by the murder with which you are going to completely change the drama concerning us." 2 She made this tragic speech, but they, able to understand nothing of what was said, left them there, and placing their weakness as a strong guard over them, and they set off to the ship and unloaded its cargo, ignoring the other things (which were many and varied), but carrying off, insofar as each had strength, gold and silver and precious stones and silk raiment. 3 When they thought they had enough (and there was so much as to satisfy even a bandit’s greed), they put the plunder on the beach and began to divide it into bundles and allocations, making the division not according to the value of the things each one took but according to equal weight. They were going to take action about the maiden and the youth later.

4 At the same time another robber band arrived with two horsemen leading the unit. When the former [bandits] saw this they neither raised their hands [to fight] nor took any of the booty, so as not to be pursued, but fled as fast as they could run, since there were ten of them and they saw three times as many approaching. 5 And the girl and her companion were already captured a second time although they had never been seized. The bandits, although eager for pillage, nonetheless hesitated because of their lack of understanding of, and astonishment at what they saw. 6 For they supposed that the many killings were the work of the previous bandits, and when they saw the maiden in strange and magnificent garb and overlooking the fearful circumstances as if they did not exist, but wholly concerned with the young man’s wounds and feeling pain at his suffering as if it were her own, they marvelled at her for her beauty and her [noble] disposition, and they were also amazed at the wounded man. He lay, so fine in physique and so large, having a little earlier recovered himself somewhat and been restored to his usual facial expression.

IV 1 So then, after some time the bandit chief approached and put his hand on the maiden and instructed her to arise and follow him. She, understanding nothing of what was said but inferring what he commanded, dragged the young man to herself and would not release him, and bringing up the sword to her breast she threatened to kill herself unless he would take them both. 2 So when the bandit chief understood something by what she said, and understood more...
by her gestures, and moreover anticipated that he would have the young man as an excellent assistant if he survived, he dismounted both himself and his shield-bearer from the horses and he put the prisoners in their place, and instructing the others to pack up the spoils and follow, he himself ran along on foot and held up [the prisoners] in case one of them should slip at all. 3 And what happened was beyond belief: the leader seemed to serve and the conqueror chose to be subservient to the captives. Thus does the impression created by nobility and the sight of beauty have the power to subordinate even the bandit’s nature and to govern the roughest of men.

V 1 Going past the shore for about two stades they turned suddenly so the sea was on their right and went towards the slopes of the mound; and crossing the ridge with difficulty they hurried to a lagoon which lay beneath the other side of the mound. 2 It was something like this. The whole place is called Herds (Boukolia) by the Egyptians. There is a hollow in the land there which receives some overflows from the Nile and forms a lagoon; the depth in the middle is immeasurable, but at the edge it tapers off into a marsh. What shores are to seas, so are marshes to lagoons. 3 Among these any robber element of the Egyptians conducts its civic life, one building a hut on a little land if some should emerge anywhere from the water, while another lives on a boat and has the same thing as a ferry and a dwelling. On it the women spin and weave for them, and on it they bear children. 4 If there is a young child, one rears it first with mother’s milk and after that with the fish from the lagoon baked in the sun. If one notices that it is trying to crawl, by fixing a thong to its ankles one permits it to go as far as the edge of the boat or hut, making the leash on the foot a novel kind of guide for it.

VI 1 And whenever a Herdsman (Boukolos anêr) is born and receives his nurture in the lagoon he considers that lagoon also as his native country. It is suited to be a strong fortification for bandits. Therefore that type of person migrates to it, everyone using the water as if it were a defensive wall and placing the mass of reeds in the marsh in front of them instead of a palisade. 2 For by cutting some winding paths which wander with many turns they also make the passages easy for themselves because they know them but impossible for others, and they have devised a great stronghold so that they might not suffer attack. And this is more or less how the situation at the lagoon maintains the herdsmen who dwell in it.

VII 1 When the sun was already setting the bandit chief and his companions arrived there. They dismounted the young people from the horses and put the plunder in the boats while the great crowd of bandits who had remained on the spot gathered, as each appeared emerging from a different part of the marsh, and received the bandit chief, greeting him as if he were some kind of king over them. 2 When they saw the mass of booty and examined the beauty of the
maiden - something phenomenal - they assumed that some shrines or rich temples had been robbed by their colleagues, and that even the priestess herself had been taken away too; or they even supposed in their rustic ignorance that the statue, itself alive, had been brought in the shape of the maiden. Highly praising the chief for his manly courage they conveyed him to his abode; it was a little island separated some way from the others as a residence for him alone and a few of his companions. 3 When he had been brought there he instructed the majority of them to go home, arranging for them all to come to him on the next day. He himself, left alone with his few usual companions, briefly giving the others dinner and partaking himself, handed over the young people to a certain Greek youth who had become a prisoner with them shortly before so that they could converse. He allocated them a hut close to his own; and he instructed the young man to look after them and to guard the maiden against any kind of assault. He himself, weighed down by exhaustion from the journey and occupied by thinking about the current situation, had turned to sleep.

VIII 1 When silence enveloped the marsh and night advanced to the first watch the maiden and her companion found the absence of people crowding in on them opened the way for lamentation; the night stimulated their sufferings more, I think, because when no sound or sight distracts attention to itself, but it allows an opportunity for one to grieve alone. 2 So wailing a lot to herself the maiden (who lay on a mattress separated, as ordered, from the others) and weeping to the utmost extent, said “Apollo, you avenge yourself too much for our sins and too severely, and our transgression is not equal to your punishment: loss of our families and capture by pirates and the myriad dangers of the seas, and on land already a second kidnap by brigands, and the anticipated troubles are even worse than those we have experienced. 3 When will you put an end to these things? If I reach death unviolated the end is a good one, but if anyone shall know me in a debased way, whom even Theagenes has not yet known, I shall preempt the assault with a noose, keeping myself pure to the point of death, and bringing my chastity as a beautiful funeral offering. No one will be a harsher judge than you.” 4 While she was still speaking Theagenes stopped her, saying, “Stop, my dearest, my soul, Charikleia! You lament reasonably, but you are inciting the divinity more than you think. For it is necessary not to vituperate it but to beseech it, and the supreme power will be appeased by prayers, not accusations.” “You are right; but how are you?” she asked. “More comfortable,” he said, “and better since the evening as a result of the lad’s treatment, which lessened the burning pain of my wounds.” 5 “And by dawn you will have more relief,” said the one entrusted with guarding them; “I will bring you a herb which will heal the wounds in three days. I have acquired experience of its effectiveness, for since they brought me here as a prisoner, if ever one of the subjects of this leader has come in wounded when there has been a battle, he has not taken many days to be cured when using this herb of which I speak. 6 There is no reason for you
to be surprised if I am interested in your problems, because you seem to share
the same fate as me, and moreover I pity you as you are Greeks, since I too am
a Greek.” “A Greek! O gods!” the strangers shouted together with joy. “A
true Greek by race and language; perhaps there will be some relief from our
troubles.” “But what must we call you?” Theagenes said. He said, “Knemon.”
“Would you tell us where you are from?” “Athenian.” “What is your
situation?” 7 “Enough!” he said; “Why are you stirring up and forcibly
opening these matters? In fact, this is from the tragedies. It would not be a
good time to introduce to you my troubles as an episode in your own. Besides,
the rest of the night would not be long enough for telling the story to you, who,
what is more, need sleep and a rest from your many hardships.”

IX 1 When they would not leave him alone but pleaded with him in every way
to speak, thinking that hearing about circumstances like their own would be a
great solace, Knemon began thus: “My father was Aristippos, an Athenian by
birth, belonging to the Areopagos, and to the middle class in terms of wealth.
When it happened that my mother died he was inclined to marry again,
complaining that he was dependent on his son, me, alone, and brought into the
home an urbane but pernicious young woman whose name was Demainete. 2
As soon as she arrived she won him over entirely and persuaded him to do
what she wanted, leading on the old man by her youthful beauty and in other
ways flattering him excessively. She was skilled, if ever a woman was, at
making someone mad about her, and was extraordinarily expert at the art of
seduction, groaning at my father going out and running up to him when he
came in; she complained to him for taking his time, saying she would have died
if he had stayed away a little longer, embracing him with every word and crying
as she kissed him. My father was ensnared by all these things, and had breath
and eyes only for her. 3 At first she pretended to see me as if I were her child,
and in this pretence she convinced Aristippos and would sometimes come up
and kiss me and constantly desired to have the pleasure of my company. I
grew, suspecting nothing of what was really happening, but surprised that she
had a maternal attitude towards me. When she began to come more eagerly and
the kisses got hotter than was proper, and the look, going beyond what was
temperate, led me to suspicion, I was already trying to evade her much of the
time and was pushing her away when she approached. 4 Why should I bore
you by describing the other things at length? the attempts she made, the
promises she declared, naming me now ‘little child’, now ‘dearest’, and again
calling me ‘heir’ then a little later ‘her soul’, and in short, mingling the finest
names with seductive ones and watching to see which ones I responded to
most. Thus with the most honourable appellations she pretended that she was
a mother while revealing by the more unsuitable ones, and that most clearly,
that she was a lover.
X 1 In the event something like this happened. The Great Panathenaia was being held, when the Athenians send the ship overland to Athene. I happened to be an ephebe, and having sung the usual Paian to the goddess and performed the established rites I went to my own home in the costume I had on including the chlamys and the garlands. 2 As soon as she saw me she was beside herself and no longer disguised her love but from naked desire ran up to me and embraced me and said, 'My young Hippolytos son of Theseus.' What do you imagine happened to me, who even now am blushing as I recount it? But it was evening, and my father was dining in the city hall, and so would be going to spend the whole night in this kind of feasting and general carousing, and she came to me at night and tried to obtain something impious. 3 When I resisted in every way, and fought back against every flattery and promise and threat she went, sighing rather heavily and deeply as she left. The wicked woman, waiting only for the night to pass, started on a plot against me. At first she did not get up that day, but when my father came and asked what was the matter she pretended to him to be ill and did not answer the first enquiry. 4 When he persisted, and asked many times what was troubling her she said, 'The youth who is marvellous even for me, the child we share, whom I have often loved more than you (and the gods are my witnesses), perceiving from certain indications that I am pregnant (which I was hiding from you until I should know for sure), watched for your absence. When I gave him the usual advice and urged him to be temperate and not to concentrate on loose women and drinking (and it did not escape my notice that he was so inclined, but I did not tell you in case I should come under some suspicion of being a typical stepmother); when I said these things one to one so he would not be embarrassed, I am ashamed to tell all the other insults he used about you and me, but he kicked me in the stomach with his foot and put me in the state in which you see me.'

XI 1 When he heard this he did not speak, he did not question me and he did not give an opportunity for me to defend myself, but believing that one who was so disposed to me would not lie, as soon as he had located me in some part of the house he struck me with his fist without me knowing why, and calling up the slaves he maltreated me with whips. I did not even have the usual privilege of knowing why I was being tortured. 2 When he had his fill of fury I said, 'But now at least, father, if not before, I should have the right to know the reason for the blows.' Becoming angrier he said, 'Oh, what irony! He wants to learn about his foul deeds from me!' and turning away he hurried to Demainete. She was not yet sated, and started this second plot against me. 3 Thisbe was her maid. She knew how to play the lyre, and was not unattractive. She sent her to me instructing her to love me, would you believe it, and straight away Thisbe loved me. She who had often pushed me away when I tried something began to lead me on in every way with looks, gestures and signals. I foolishly believed that I had suddenly become good-looking, and finally
received her into my bedroom when she came at night. She came again and yet again and after that visited me constantly. Once when I urged her strongly not to get caught by her mistress she said, ‘Knemon, you seem to me to be far too simple a soul. If you think it is a problem for me, a servant and a slave, if I am caught going with you, what punishment would you say she deserves who, claiming to be well born and having a lawful husband and knowing that death is the consequence of the transgression, commits adultery?’ ‘Stop!’ I said, ‘I cannot believe you.’ ‘Well now, if you think it is a good idea I will deliver the adulterer to you red-handed.’ ‘If only you would!’ I said. ‘Well now, I for one want to,’ she replied, ‘both for you, who have been so wronged by her, and not less for myself, who suffer the most dreadful things every day while she exercises her foolish jealousy against me. But be sure you know how to be a true man.’

XII 1 When I promised to behave thus, then she left. Three nights later she woke me as I slept and informed me that the adulterer was inside, saying that my father, called by some sudden necessity, had gone away to the country, but that he, according to an arrangement he had with Demainete, had just slipped in. She said that it was appropriate both to be prepared for vengeance and to make my entry armed with a sword so that the miscreant might not run away. I did as she said, and taking a dagger, with Thisbe leading and clutching a torch, I went to the bedroom. When I got there a beam of light fell from a lamp inside, and bursting in in my fury I opened the closed doors, ran in and shouted, ‘Where is the villain, the excellent beloved of the completely chaste woma-’ As I spoke I went forward expecting to lay hands on them both. My father, oh gods, tumbling out of the bed, fell at my knees and said, ‘O child, wait a moment, pity your parent, spare the grey hairs which raised you. I have wronged you, but I should not be punished with death. Do not be overcome by anger, and do not pollute your hands with a father’s murder.’ He pleaded piteously with these words and others in addition; but I stood helpless and shocked as if struck by a whirlwind. I was looking around for Thisbe and I do not know how she got herself away. I looked around in a circle at the bed and the bedroom, at a loss for what to say and powerless to act. The sword fell from my hands, and Demainete ran up and eagerly snatched it away, while my father, being now out of danger, laid hands on me and gave orders to tie me up, with Demainete strongly egging him on and shouting, ‘Is this not what I foretold, that it was sensible for the lad to be watched, that when he got an opportunity he would hatch a plot? I saw his look, I understood his intention.’ He said, ‘You foretold it, but I did not believe you.’ Then he put me in chains, not permitting me when I wanted to say something of what really happened and to speak.
XIII 1 In the morning, taking me just as I was, in chains, he led me to the people, and pouring dust on his head he said, ‘Athenians, it was not with these kinds of hopes that I reared this individual, but expecting that he would be a support for my old age as soon as it came to me. I gave him a liberal education and taught him the basics of writing, introduced him to the phratries and tribes, registered him among the ephebes, declaring him your fellow citizen in accordance with the laws, and rested all of my fortunes upon him. 2 He then became forgetful of all this, and first abused me with insults, and abused this, my lawful wife, with blows. He finally came at night with a sword, and was very close to parricide, to the extent that Fate prevented him by arranging for the sword to fall from his hand with an unexpected fright. I escaped, and accuse him before you, not wishing, although it is possible under the law, to kill him with my own hands, but leaving everything to you because I think that it is better to exact justice from a son by law than by murder.’ 3 And he cried as he spoke. Demainete too wailed and made it seem that she suffered pain on my account, ironically, calling me the wretch who was going to die justly but before my time, set against my parents by the spirits of vengeance. She was not lamenting, but rather bore witness by her laments and in truth reinforced the accusation by her cries. 4 When I thought a chance to speak would be given to me the clerk stepped forward and asked a specific question: whether I approached my father with a sword. When I said, “I approached, but listen to why I did,” everyone shouted out, and deciding not to allow me a defence, some argued it was best to stone me, others, to hand me over to the public executioner to be pushed into the pit. 5 Amid all the din, and during the time that they were voting about the punishment, I shouted, “Oh step-mother, I am destroyed through a step-mother, a step-mother is killing me without a trial!” What I said reached many men, and a suspicion of the truth came to them, but at that time I was not listened to, for the people were distracted by an unstoppable din.

XIV 1 When the votes were counted those voting for death came up to one thousand seven hundred, some judging it right to stone me, others to send me to the pit. The remainder came up to a thousand - as many who, with some suspicion about my step-mother, would punish me by allowing me to go into exile in perpetuity. Nonetheless this vote prevailed, although it was less than the others all together, because, with them having made a divided vote, the thousand made the largest single section. Thus I was driven from my hearth and my country of birth. Still, Demainete, the enemy of the gods, was not left unpunished. 2 How, you shall hear another time. The present must be taken up with sleep, for much of the night has passed, and you need a lot of rest.” “And so you too will add to our troubles if you leave the wicked Demainete unpunished in the story.” “Well, you may hear,” Knemon said, “since it is so important to you. Directly after the judgement I went down to Piraeus, and finding a ship being put out to sea I made the voyage to Aegina, having found
out that there were cousins of my mother there. I reached port and found the people I sought, and I was living not unhappily at first. 3 Twenty days later, wandering about as usual, I went to the harbour and a small boat had just come in. Standing there for a little while I watched to see where it was from and who it would bring. Before the boarding plank was properly in place someone leapt out, ran up and embraced me. Who should it be but Charias, one of my fellow ephes. He said, ‘Knemon, I bring you good news. You have revenge on your enemy: Demainete is dead.’ 4 ‘Well, greetings, Charias,’ I said, ‘but why do you rush past the good tidings as if they were a piece of bad news? Tell me how she died, as I fear very much that she had an ordinary death and escaped the one that she deserved.’ Charias said, ‘Justice has not entirely deserted us, as Hesiod says. She may seem to have her eyes closed for a little while, delaying vengeance, but she casts her fierce eye on those who are so evil, just as in fact she also pursued the wicked Demainete. 5 I missed nothing of what happened or what was said, since Thisbe, as you know, being a regular companion of mine, told me everything. When the unjust exile was imposed on you your poor father, regretting what had been done, betook himself to a rural and distant place and spent his time there ‘eating his heart out’ (this is from epic). 6 The Erinyes pursued her straight away and she loved you more madly in your absence and did not stop lamenting, apparently on account of your situation, but in reality on account of her own. She shouted “Knemon” night and day, calling you little child, dearest, her own soul, so that even her women friends who visited her were very astonished and praised her for being a stepmother who showed the feelings of a mother, and tried to comfort and restore her. She said that there was no comfort for her trouble, and that the other women did not know what kind of pang was in her heart.

XV 1 If ever she was alone she blamed Thisbe very much for not having served her well, saying, “Eager for tricks, she has not assisted my love, but has appointed herself to deprive me, quicker than words, of the one most dear, and gives me no chance to change my mind.” And it became perfectly clear that she was going to make some trouble for Thisbe. 2 Seeing she was profoundly angry and in her general grief was ready to hatch a plot and not least that she had become crazy with passion and love, she decided to catch her out first and to get in first with a plot against her, while looking after her own safety. Going up to her she said, “What is it, mistress? Why do you wrongly hold you servant girl to blame? I always have been, and even now am obedient to your will; but if things have not gone according to plan that must be attributed to Fate. I am ready, if you instruct me, to work out some solution to the present situation.” 3 “And what solution could be found, dearest,” she said, “with the one who could resolve the present problems out of the way, and the un-hoped for kindness of the judges destroying me? If only he had been stoned, if he had been killed, the causes of my suffering would have died completely at the same time, for the thing of which one despairs is removed from the heart once and
for all, and no longer anticipating something causes sufferers to forget their sorrow. 4 Now I imagine that I see him, I deceive myself into hearing him nearby, I am ashamed when he expresses scorn for the unjust plot; sometimes I seem to meet him stealing up and to have pleasure with him, or even to visit him myself, wherever he is on earth. This sets me on fire, this drives me mad! 5 I suffer justly, oh gods! Why was it I did not treat him well but plotted against him? Why was it I did not plead with him but chased him? He rejected the first attempt but that was natural. He felt a sense of shame about another's bed, or definitely, at least, that of his father; it is possible that with time he would have been persuaded to change to our point of view, having his attitude altered by persuasion. But I have been savage and wild, not as if I loved someone but ruled them, and I have been angry that he did not follow an order and that he contempted Demainete when he is far superior to her in youthful beauty. 6 But, dear Thisbe, what is the solution you mention?" "Easy, mistress," she said, "to most people Knemon departed the city and went out of Attica in obedience to the judgement, but it did not escape my notice, scheming to arrange things for you, that he is hiding here outside the city. You must have heard of Arsinoe the flute-player: he fancied her; after his misfortune the girl took him in, and announcing that she is going away with him she is keeping him hidden with her until she has prepared to travel." 7 Demainete said, "Arsinoe is lucky, with her previous relationship with Knemon and with the trip abroad with him which she now expects; but how does this affect us?" "Very much, mistress," she said. "I will pretend to love Knemon, and I will ask Arsinoe (who is an old friend of mine from our common profession) to take me to him at night instead of her. If this should happen it would then be your place to pretend to be Arsinoe and to visit him as if you were her. 8 I shall make sure that I arrange that he also goes to bed drunk. If you get what you want it is likely that your love will subside, since for many women the passionate impulses are quenched the first time they are tried out; for satiety is the outcome of acts of love; if they remain (and may that not happen!) there will be an alternative route and other counsels. Meanwhile, let us look after the present."

XVI 1 Demainete agreed, and pleaded with her to add speed to the plans. Asking her mistress for one day to be given to her to work things out she went to Arsinoe and said, "Do you know Teledemos?" When she said she did, she [Thisbe] said, "Will you let us in today? I have promised to sleep with him. He will come first, and I when I have put my mistress to bed." 2 Running to Aristippos in the countryside, she said, "Master, I have come to you as my own accuser: do what you want with me. You have lost your son partly through me, who, although I was unwilling, nonetheless share the blame. When I realized that the mistress was not living properly, but was defiling your bed, I was both fearful for myself that something bad might happen to me
sometime if her behaviour was detected through someone else, and I was sad for you, that when you treat your wife the way you do you should in exchange suffer this kind of thing. I shrank from informing you myself, but I spoke to the young master, going to him at night, so that no one would know, and I told him that an adulterer was sleeping with the mistress. He, who as you know had suffered previously at her hands, thought that I meant that the adulterer was then inside. He was filled with uncontrollable anger, and picking up the dagger, and ignoring me when I tried hard to restrain him and to tell him that nothing of the kind was happening at that moment, or supposing that I had changed my mind, went into the bedroom in a frenzy, you know the rest. It is now possible, if you want, for you to defend yourself before your son, even if he is currently in exile, and to punish the one who wronged you both. Today I will show you Demainete lying with the adulterer, and what’s more, in someone else’s house outside the city.”

“If only you would show me this, as you say,” said Aristippos, “you shall have the prize of freedom; but having revenge, I shall perhaps outlive the hateful woman. For a long time I have been smouldering inside, and having a suspicion of the fact I have kept quiet for lack of proof. But what must I do?” She said, “You know the garden where the monument of the Epicureans is: go there by this evening and wait.”

XVII

As she spoke she ran off, and going to Demainete, she said, “Adorn yourself; you should come more gracefully turned out. I have organized everything for you which I promised.” She embraced her and did what she told her. When it was evening she [Thisbe] picked her up and took her to the appointed place. When they got close she told her to stand there for a little while, and she went first and asked Arsinoe to move to another room and to leave her alone, because she said the lad was embarrassed, having just found his strength in Aphrodite’s arts. When she [Arsinoe] had done what she was asked, she [Thisbe] went back, brought Demainete and taking her in she put her to bed and took away the lamp so that she would not be recognized by you, who, ironically, were living in Aegina. And instructing her to fulfil her passion in silence, she said, “I will go away to the youth, and will come and bring him to you. He is drinking with neighbours hereabouts.” Going out, she found Aristippos in the agreed place, and hurried him to tie up the adulterer who was at hand. He followed her, and coming up suddenly he rushed into the room, and finding the bed with difficulty by a little beam of moonlight, he said, “I’ve got you, you abomination to the gods!” As he spoke, Thisbe suddenly slammed the doors as loudly as possible and shouted, “How dreadful, the adulterer has eluded us;” and, “Watch, master, that you do not make another mistake too!” He said, “Do not worry! I have got the wicked woman, whom I wanted most,” and taking her, he led her towards the city. She, when she understood, so it seems, her current circumstances - the loss of what she was hoping for, the dishonour in what was going to happen, distressed at those by
whom she had been caught and furious at those by whom she had been tricked, when she was at the pit in the Academy (you know it well, where the polemarchs offer the ancestral sacrifice to the heroes), then suddenly tearing herself from the hands of the old man she threw herself on her head. So the dreadful woman lay [having died] dreadfully; but Aristippos, saying, “I have a punishment from you even in advance of the legal process,” on the next day imparted everything to the citizen body, and obtaining a pardon with difficulty he went round his friends and acquaintances to see whether by lobbying he could possibly get your return. Whether any of this was achieved I cannot say, for I came here first, as you see, sailing here on some personal business of my own. However, you should expect the people to agree to your return and your father to come looking for you, for this was announced by him.’

XVIII 1 Charias told me this. The sequel, and how I came here or what fortunes I have at times experienced, would need a longer talk and time” At the same time he wept. The strangers wept too, ostensibly at his troubles, but each remembering his own. They would not have ceased lamenting unless some sleep, favouring them as a result of the pleasure of lamentations, had stopped them weeping. 2 And so they slept; but Thyamis (for this was the name of the bandit chief) having lain at rest for most of the night, was disturbed by some stray dreams and was suddenly robbed of sleep and stayed awake, puzzling in his thoughts about the solution. 3 At the time when the cocks crow, whether, as they say, stimulated by the physical sensation of the sun as it revolves above us to address the god, or whether rather, awaking his companions with his own call because of the heat and of the desire to move and to feed, a divine dream something like this came to him. 4 Coming to Memphis, his own city, to the temple of Isis, the whole place seemed to be illuminated by the fire of a torch. The altars and hearths, running with blood, were full of all kinds of animals, and the propylaea and peridromos with men who filled everything with a confused din and hubbub. When he dreamed he came inside the actual sanctuary the goddess met him and entrusted Charikleia to him and said, “Thyamis, I hand over this maiden to you; having her you shall not have her, but you shall be unjust and shall kill the stranger; but she shall not be killed.” 5 When he saw this he was confused, turning over in his mind this way and that what the meaning could be. Once he had given up, he adapted the solution to his own desire. He supposed that the “You shall have and you shall not have” was “as a wife and no longer as virgin;” he imagined the “you shall kill” as “you shall break the maidenhead,” whereby Charikleia would not die.

XIX 1 This is how he understood the dream, with his impulses guiding him thus. At dawn he instructed the most senior of those under him to come, and told them to bring the booty, which he called by the more respectable name of ‘spoils’, into their midst, and he sent for Knemon, instructing him also to bring
him those under guard. 2 When they were being brought they shouted, "So what fate awaits us?" and strongly implored Knemon to assist them if he could at all. He reassured them, and urged them to be optimistic, advising that the bandit leader was not entirely barbarous in his character, but was rather gentle, since his descent was from illustrious men and he had taken up his present life out of necessity. 3 When they had been brought, the rest of the crowd gathered. Thyamis, seating himself on an elevated spot declared the island a parliament, and instructing Knemon to tell the prisoners too what was said (for he already understood Egyptian, but Thyamis did not have an accurate knowledge of Greek), said, "Men and fellow soldiers, you know the attitude I have always adopted towards you. 4 As you know, I was born the son of the high priest at Memphis, and lost the priesthood after the departure of my father when my younger brother, acting illegally, took it away. I fled to you to get vengeance on him and to get back honour, and being considered worthy by you to lead you I have continued until now apportioning nothing more to myself than to the others. If there was a division of goods I preferred an equal portion, or if there was a capture of prisoners I allocated them to the common kitty. I think it is fitting for one who leads you well like this to have the largest share of work but an equal share of the profits. 5 Of the captives, I have selected for us ourselves those men who are going to be most useful by their strength of body, and sold off the weaker ones; of the women, without trying rape, I have released the well born for money, or simply out of pity for their fate, while the inferior ones, whom not only captivity but also habit has obliged to be slaves, I have shared out to each of you as servants. 6 Now I request from you one thing from the booty: this foreign maiden whom, although it is possible for me to give her to myself, I think it is better to receive by common consent; for it would be stupid for me if, forcing the captive to do my will, I seemed to be acting in my own interests while my friends were rather unwilling. 7 But I ask her from you not as a free gift, but offering in return to take nothing myself from the other parts of the booty. Since the priestly caste rejects the common Aphrodite I thought she should be mine not on account of a need for pleasure but of the production of heirs.

XX 1 I want to explain the reasons to you. First, she seems to me to be well born. I use as evidence the wealth that was found with her, and the fact that she has not sunk down in the face of her present circumstances, but derives her attitude from her original lot in life. 2 Then, I assess that her mind is good and prudent; for if, when she conquers everyone with her fine looks, she still disposes those who see her to a respectful attitude of mind with the modesty of her gaze, does she not naturally induce a better assumption about herself? The most important of the points is that she seems to me to be the priestess of one of the gods: and so even in misfortune she thinks it would be terrible and irreligious to put off her priestly garb and chaplets.
XXI 1 So, friends, what marriage could be more fitting than the priestly man taking the consecrated woman?” They all assented, and wished him an auspicious marriage. He resumed the speech and said, “I am grateful to you; but we would be acting properly if we were to enquire what is the opinion of the maiden about this. 2 If it was necessary to make use of the rights of leadership my wishes would be perfectly sufficient for me; for those who can use force consultation is superfluous; but if marriage is what is happening it is necessary for the will of both parties to be in agreement.” And redirecting his speech he asked, “So how do you feel, maiden, about being my wife?” and at the same time he told her to say who they were, and from what families. 3 She, for a long time casting her gaze on the ground and frequently shaking her head, seemed to be forming some speech to express her thought. And eventually, looking straight towards Thyamis, and upsetting him more than before by her beauty (for she had grown more red in the cheek than usual, affected by her thoughts, and her expression had changed to a more animated one) she said, with Knemon translating, “It would be more fitting for Theagenes here, my brother, to speak; for I think that in the company of men, silence becomes a woman and to reply becomes a man.

XXII 1 But since you have turned over the discussion to me and have offered this first indication of kindness by trying to obtain your rights by persuasion rather than by force, and moreover because the whole issue relates to me, I am obliged to depart from my own and from maidens' rules and to answer the question of my conqueror about marriage, and what’s more, in the company of so many men. 2 Now this is our situation. By race we are Ionians, being originally Ephesian and having both parents alive; since the law requires people of such a sort to serve as priests, I was chosen priestess of Artemis and my brother here was chosen priest of Apollo. Since the honour is an annual one and the time had come round we made a religious embassy to Delos where we were going to put on musical and athletic contests and to lay aside the priesthood according to our ancestral tradition. 3 So a ship was filled with gold and silver and garments and the other things which would be sufficient for the contests and the general feast; and we went, while our fathers were advanced in age and stayed at home from fear of the voyage and the sea; but a crowd of other citizens came, some in the same ship and others using their own boats. 4 When most of the voyage had been accomplished a wave which suddenly fell on us and a violent wind and confused hurricanes and lightening bolts which whipped up the sea drove the ship from its course, while the helmsman succumbed to the excessive difficulty and gave up the ship to the force of the weather and allowed fate to steer. For seven days and as many nights we were driven by the wind which blew from all directions, and finally we ran aground on the rock where we were captured by you, 5 where you also saw much carnage: at the feast we held to celebrate our salvation the sailors attacked us, and plotted to kill us for the money, until we beat them with great
trouble and destruction also of our people, while they themselves were both killing and being killed. From all these things we were saved as a pitiful remnant - I wish it had not been so - being lucky among our misfortunes in one thing only, that one of the gods brought us into your hands, and we who feared for our lives have been diverted into considering marriage, which I do not want by any means to reject. 6 For someone who is a prisoner to be thought worthy of the bed of her conqueror exceeds all good fortune; and for one who is dedicated to the gods to dwell with the son of a high priest, soon, god willing, with a high priest, does not seem at all to be devoid of the providence of heaven. I ask one thing, grant it, Thyamis: allow me first to go to a city where there is an altar or shrine assigned to Apollo to lay aside my priesthood and its tokens. 7 It is better to go to Memphis where you can regain the honour of your high priesthood. In this way the marriage would be held more happily because it was joined with victory and would be consecrated in circumstances of success. But if it should be before that, I leave to your judgement; only let my ancestral rites be performed first. I know that you will agree, having been associated with religious observance since childhood, as you say, and respecting our pious duty concerning the gods.”

XXIII 1 Then she stopped speaking and started crying. All the others who were present were in favour and told him to act in this way and shouted that they were ready; Thyamis expressed assent partly willingly and partly unwillingly. 2 Because of his passion for Charikleia he thought that even the present moment was an enormous length of time to delay, but he was charmed by her words as if by a siren, and was compelled to obey; at the same time he made some connection with the dream, and was confident the marriage would take place at Memphis. He terminated the discussion, first dividing up the booty, himself taking many of the best things which the others yielded willingly.

XXIV 1 He ordered them to be ready in ten days time to make the expedition against Memphis. To the Greeks he assigned their former tent. Knemon again shared a tent with them by order, being appointed henceforth no longer as guard but as a companion. 2 And Thyamis provided some more luxurious fare than they had, and Thyamis sometimes also made Theagenes a guest at his table out of respect for his sister. Charikleia herself he decided not to see much, so that the sight of her might not inflame the desire he had and he would be forced to do something different from what had been decided and declared. 3 And Thyamis therefore avoided seeing the maiden, thinking that he would not be able to look at her and remain chaste. Knemon, as soon as they were all out of the way, each one disappearing into a different part of the lagoon, after a short search brought back to Theagenes from the lagoon the herb which he had promised on the previous day.
XXV 1 Meanwhile Theagenes, having some leisure, wept and groaned for Charikleia, not talking to her at all but constantly calling the gods as witnesses. 2 When she asked whether he was lamenting the usual and shared problems or whether he was not suffering some more novel trouble Theagenes said, “What could be more novel or what could be more impious than oaths and treaties being broken while Charikleia becomes forgetful of me and promises her hand to others?” 3 “Be quiet,” said the maiden, “and do not be more grievous to me than my misfortunes; and do not, when you have from past events such a great testing of me through my actions, behave suspiciously because of words which were expedient and spoken for a specific need. Otherwise the opposite has happened, and you yourself seem to have changed rather than finding that I have changed. 4 I admit that it is unfortunate, but nothing is so forceful as to persuade me to change and not be chaste. There is one thing alone, I know, in which I am not chaste: the desire I have had from the start for you. But this is not irregular; for I first gave myself then not as one submitting to a lover but as one being joined to a husband, and I have come this far keeping myself pure and away from intercourse with you, often pushing you away when you have tried something, waiting expectantly for the lawful marriage, if it might happen, which we agreed upon from the beginning and swore on by all the gods. 5 Would you be so foolish as to believe that a barbarian could receive me in marriage before a Greek, a bandit before my beloved?” “So why did you want to make that fine address?” said Theagenes. 6 Pretending I am your sister was very wise, and further, a distraction for Thyamis from jealousy against us and a way of arranging for us to be with one another without fear. I understood that Ionia and the wandering about Delos would be cover for the facts and the truth, and would cause a wandering in actuality in the hearers.”

XXVI 1 “Being so ready to agree to the marriage and to make an arrangement explicitly and to set a time, this I am not able to understand nor do I want to. I pray that I shall sink away rather than see this conclusion to my labours and hopes concerning you.” 2 Charikleia, embracing Theagenes and kissing him a thousand times and wetting him with tears said, “How happily I accept from you the fears about me. From this it is evident that you are not diminishing in desire for me as a result of our misfortunes. But understand, Theagenes, we would not be talking to each other now unless these things had been promised in that way. 3 For as you know, a battle of resistance intensifies the urge of a conquering passion, but a yielding word which fits in with the will checks the first boiling impetus and lulls the sharpness of the appetite by the sweetness of the promise. For, I believe, those who love more crudely regard the promise as the first experience, and supposing from the verbal undertaking that they have conquered they behave more tamely as they depend on their hopes. 4 Now foreseeing this myself I gave myself in word, entrusting the future to the gods and to the spirit which received the task of governing our love. Often one or two days have given much of what provides salvation, and fates provide things
which men did not discover in a thousand counsels. I too am putting off this present moment with schemes, displacing foreseen things with unforeseen. 5 So one must be careful, dearest, as if the invention were a wrestler’s feint, and one must be silent not only to the others but also to Knemon himself. He is kind to us, and a Greek, but a prisoner is going to do a favour more to his captor, if that kind of situation arises. 6 For neither does the length of our friendship nor the bond of kinship give us a secure pledge of his good faith towards us. Therefore if from some suspicion he should ever poke his nose into our affairs, a denial must be made at the first enquiry. Sometimes a lie is a good thing, when it brings advantage to those who speak it and does not harm the hearers.

XXVII 1 While Charikleia was advising these and similar things for the best outcome, Knemon ran up in an enormous hurry and, based on what he seen, announced that there was a great tumult, and said, “Theagenes, I have come bringing you the herb: put it on and treat your wounds. We must get ready for more injuries and equal carnage.” 2 When he pleaded with him to explain more clearly what he meant, he said, “The present is not a time for listening; there is a danger that words will be cut short by actions; but follow with utmost speed, and let Charikleia follow too.” And taking them both along he led them to Thyamis. 3 Finding him wiping out a helmet and sharpening a light spear he said, “You are attending to your armour at a good time; but put it on yourself, and tell the others to. I have seen a host of enemies of a size that I have never seen around us before, and they were such a distance as to be coming into view over the neighbouring ridge. I have come at a run to give advance warning of the approach, not slackening my speed at all but telling as many men as I could on the route here to get ready.”

XXVIII 1 At this Thyamis got up and asked, “Where is Charikleia?” as if he feared more for her than for himself. When Knemon pointed her out staying back by the nearby doorpost, he said to him alone, “Taking her yourself lead her to the cave where also our goods are stored in safety. When you have put her there, friend, and put the cover on the entrance as usual, come to us as quickly as possible. The battle will be our concern.” He instructed his shield-bearer to bring a sacrificial victim so that they could sacrifice to the local gods and in this way would begin the battle. 2 Knemon followed the instruction, and brought Charikleia, who was lamenting a lot and frequently turning towards Theagenes, who was lamenting a lot and frequently turning towards Theagenes, and placed her in the cave. It was not a work of nature like many places round and under the earth which are hollow of their own accord: the bandit’s craft had mimicked nature, and it was an excavation laboriously hollowed out by Egyptian hands for storing booty.

XXIX 1 This is how it was made. It had a narrow and dark mouth which lay beneath the doors of a concealed chamber so that the threshold was itself a
second door to the way down when it should be needed. It [the threshold which was a second door] dropped onto it [the way down] and opened easily. From there it divided into curved tunnels with no pattern. The paths and tunnels to the inner parts sometimes wandered artfully each in its own way and sometimes met one another, intertwining like roots, and running down to the lowest level they opened up into one large area where a dim light penetrated from an opening by the edges of the lake. It was there that Knemon took Charikleia down and leading her with his knowledge of the route he brought her to the end of the cave, strongly reassuring her and promising to visit her by evening with Theagenes, and that he would not let him engage with the enemy but would make him run away. She said nothing but was smitten by her trouble as if by death, and was deprived of Theagenes as if of her soul; leaving her fainting and silent he went out of the cave. Putting on the threshold [which served as a trap-door], and weeping a little for himself because of what he was forced to do and for her because of her fate, that he was almost burying her alive and that he was giving over Charikleia, the brightest thing among men, to night and darkness, he ran off to Thyamis and found him hot for the fight, himself armed magnificently along with Theagenes, and stimulating those gathered around him to a frenzy with a speech. Standing in their midst he said, “Fellow soldiers, I know that it is not necessary to exhort you at length, and that you need no reminder but consider life is always a battle, and besides the unexpected approach of our opponents cuts off any prolixity of speech. Those whose enemies are in their property, if they do not to bring up a defence quickly using similar forces, that is entirely the behaviour of men who come later than they are needed. So knowing that the speech is not about women and children, which alone is sufficient to stir up many men to fight, (for these things are of less account to us and we can get just as many every time we win) but about existence itself and our souls (for a bandit war never ended in dialogue and never had its conclusion in treaties, but the winners must survive and the losers die), so, honing our spirits and bodies let us engage the enemy.”

XXX 1 Saying this he looked around for his shield-bearer and repeatedly called him by name, Thermouthis. When he was nowhere around, he uttered many threats and hurried to the boat at a run. The war had already broken out, and it was possible to see at a distance that those who lived in the outermost parts near the inlet of the lagoon had been taken. The attackers had burnt the boats and huts of those who had fallen or fled. When the fire spread from them to the neighbouring marsh and consumed in great clumps the abundance of reeds there, a fiery glow, indescribable and unbearable, came to the eyes, and a roaring noise came to the ear. Every image of war was vividly seen and heard, the local people engaged in the fight with all their energy and strength, but the others very much had the advantage by their number and by the unexpectedness of the attack, killing some on land and submerging others in the lagoon together with their boats and together with their dwellings. From all
this there rose to the sky a confused din of men fighting by land and in boats, of men killing and being killed, reddening the lagoon with blood and mixing together fire and water. When Thyamis saw and heard this the dream came to his mind in which he saw Isis, and the whole temple filled with torches and sacrifices, and he thought that those things were what was happening now. He interpreted the dream in the opposite way to before: that ‘having he will not have her’ [would be fulfilled] with her being taken away by the battle, and that ‘he will kill and will not wound’ [would be fulfilled] by a sword and not in Aphrodite’s way. He severely criticized the vision as deceitful, and thought it a terrible thing if another man should become master of Charikleia. He told those with him to wait a little, saying that staying on the spot and hiding around the island they should do battle when necessary and conceal the entrances through the surrounding marshes, for it would be desirable to resist the host of the enemy this way; while he, going as if to seek Thyamis and to pray to his patron gods, and permitting none to follow, went in a frenzy to the room. The barbarian character is difficult to restrain where it has an urge. If one despairs of his own salvation he is likely to destroy first everything he holds dear, whether in the foolish belief that they will be with him after death or whether to remove them from the grasp and insults of the enemy. As a result Thyamis, forgetting everything he had in hand and moreover surrounded by enemies as if by nets, in the grip of love and jealousy and rage went to the cave as quickly as he could run and jumping down shouted long and loud in Egyptian and encountering there somewhere near the mouth a woman a woman addressing him in Greek he went to her, guided by her voice, put his left hand on her head and drove the sword through her chest beside her breast.

XXXI 1 She lay in a sad state, shrieking pitifully as she died. He ran back and replacing the threshold [which served as a trap-door] and gathering on it a little mound of dust said with tears, “This is my bridal gift to you.” When he reached the boats he found the others already planning to flee because they saw the enemy were at hand, and Thermouthis who had come and was dealing with the sacrificial victim. Upbraiding him and saying that he had already performed the best of the sacrifices, he and Thermouthis got into the boat with the rower as a third person; the lagoon boats which are crudely hollowed out of a single log, of one thick tree trunk, cannot carry more. Theagenes went away in another boat with Knemon, and they all did likewise, each in a different boat. When they had gained a little distance from the island, sailing around more than sailing away, they stopped rowing and turned the boats sideways on so as to receive the enemy face to face; only coming close, and not withstanding the tumult all the others fled as soon as they saw it; and some could not cope with the war-like din. Theagenes and Knemon withdrew, although for the most part they did not give in to fear. Only Thyamis, partly because he was perhaps ashamed of running away, and perhaps unable to bear to outlive Charikleia, threw himself among the enemy.
XXXII 1 When they were already hand to hand someone shouted, “Here is that Thyamis! Everyone guard him!” And suddenly the boats came round to a circle and held him in the middle. He resisted, wounding some with his spear and killing others, and it was more than marvellous what happened: not one of them attacked or struck him with a sword, but each devoted his whole energy to taking him alive. 2 He resisted with the utmost vigour until he was deprived of his spear when many attacked at once; he also lost his shield-bearer, who had fought by him with distinction and, as it seems, was wounded at the right moment and giving in to despair threw himself into the lagoon, and using his skill at swimming emerged out of reach of missiles and with difficulty he swam towards the marsh. What’s more, no one thought about pursuing him, 3 for they had already taken Thyamis, regarding the capture of one man as a complete victory. Although they were diminished by losing so many friends they rejoiced more at honouring the living killer than they grieved at losing their own men. 4 And this is how gain is more important to robbers than their own lives, and the name of friendship and kinship has its limit set at one thing, profit. That is how it was for these robbers.

XXXIII 1 They happened to belong to those who ran away from Thyamis and his companions at the Herakleiotic outlet. Angry at the loss of other people’s possessions and feeling distress at the removal of the booty as if it were their own, they collected together the rest of their own men at home, and similarly summoned the surrounding villages on the basis of a promise of a similar and equal share of what they looted, the leaders decided on an attack, and were attempting to take Thyamis alive for the following reason. 2 He had a brother Petosiris at Memphis. He had taken the benefice of the high priest, by a plot, from Thyamis, against the ancestral custom, since he was younger. When he learned that his elder brother was leader of a robber band he feared that he might find an opportunity and attack sometime, or even that time would find out his plot; at the same time he realized that he was under a suspicion with the populace that he had killed Thyamis, who had vanished, and sending word to the bandit villages he proclaimed a great quantity of money and pasturage for those who should bring him alive. 3 Captivated by this the robbers, who even in the heat of battle did not let profit escape their minds, when someone recognized him, took him alive with many deaths. They conducted the prisoner by land, choosing half of them to guard him, although he severely castigated their apparent kindness and railed at captivity more than death. The rest of them turned to the island, hoping to find in it the goods and booty they sought. 4 When they had run all through it and left no part unsearched they found nothing of what they hoped, or a little, if there was something left out around the cave which was hidden underground. Setting fire to the tents, when evening was already coming on and making them frightened to stay on the island, (because of a fear of ambush by men who had escaped [them in the battle]) they went away to their own people.
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p83 ad 4. τὸ γάρ ... 1.2 Dionysios of Halicarnassos ἀποδείξαντες ζένον καὶ εὐεργετὴν Heliodorean, ἀμήχανον ἕρωτήσαν, ὀρών Hesiod Scutum 243 Theocr. VII 65 ἀποδείξαντες οὗτο σκιουράφας οὗτος ἀκτή preceeding jussqu'à A. Billault A.M. Scarcella χώρας ὦσω παρὰ σφίσι, Dionysios of Halikarnassos ἀποδείξαντες ζένον καὶ εὐεργετὴν Heliodorean, ἀμήχανον ἕρωτήσαν, ὀρών [Hesiod] Scutum 234 Theocr. VIII 65 ἀποδείξαντες οὗτο σκιουράφας οὗτος ἀκτή preceeding jussqu'à A. Billault A.M. Scarcella χώρας ὦσω παρὰ σφίσι

p102 ad 2. ἐπὶ ... p103 ad 4. 1.12 χαμεύνης κυριέ μου τὸ θεῖον. p104 ad 4. 1.9 φιλανθρωπία p104 ad 4. 1.16 δυνάμειος τὸ κρεῖττον genitive p105 ad 4. ὑπὸ 1.3 Aelian p106 ad 6. 1.3 παράγματι p107 ad 6. 1.15 trimiter p107 ad 6. 1.19 διηγήσεις genitive p107 ad 6. 1.19 Θεσεύς p107 ad 7. διήγησις 1.2 Materiali Materiale p109 ad 2. σαγηνινθείς 1.18 i quali p110 ad 2. 1.4 'Ιππόλυτου di una frase, ó νέος p111 ad 2. 1.4 αὐτή Materiale Materiale p111 ad 2. 1.4 Θεσεύς Materiali i quali p111 ad 2. 1.4 'Ιππόλυτου di una frase, ó νέος αὐτή p112 ad 2. 1.1 Όγχυστος Ογχυστος p112 ad 2. 1.17 σωφροσύνης mood emphasizing Dio Cassius p113 ad 3. Θεοβιθή 1.11 developed or arose from it independently p114 ad 2. 1.12 mood emphasizing Dio Cassius developed or arose from it independently
p116 ad 3.1.23  ω  ἐντεῦθεν
p117 1.3  ἐντεῦθεν
p117 1.29  häufig
p117 1.33  ἀπόπληκτος
p120 ad 1. ὡς . . . 1.11  ἐφεσίς ὁ ἐστὶ, ἀποδιαίτησιν ἤδημου
p120 ad 1. ὡς . . . 1.12  ἀποδιαίτησιν ἤδημου
p120 ad 1. ὡς . . . 1.13  ἀποδιαίτησιν ἤδημου
p121 ad 1. εἰς .1.18  Γεννήται 
p121 ad 1. εἰς .1.22  ιεροσύναι
p121 ad 1. εἰς .1.23  ἐκληροῦντο, ἔστιν
p121 ad 1. εἰς .1.31  γεννήταισι
p122 ad 1. 1.5  
Panegyricos
Catalanian
Momsen
dominant, and when
Τιμοφέατους
Philippians
Aretaios, De cur. acut.
χαίρε
Vetera
expects
πατρόκλουν
of the shades of meaning
sphere, regards
ράδιαν
copyists
Gregory of Nazianzenos
Themisios
Rohdes
Jnnaris
ονειροι
tός
Artemidoros (126), that is that
εξ ὅν
νευονυσμένοι
εἰσίν
genitive, ονειροι
πεπλανηθηθα
J.J. Winkler (YCS)
‘omnipotent’
λαμβανόμενα
to much
Greek. Furthermore
Aithiopika to describe
prêtres égyptiens. C’étaient
proφηται
oudeς  Χαλάδαιοι
udreioν  τυχη με τυρωπων
oυτω  Θρακις Τηρεα αξιεται...
and 10.19-22
Kroiskeς η Αυδος  εμπεσον
Read οθρων  καταγιζοντες
the accent has been omitted
perι, or more often
genitive
ειμε  ειμε
μηδεν  μηδεν
Isidoros
when, as here it leads to
Theagenes
H.G.T. Maehler GCN III
επσερας  Αθιοπικα
Athiopika
ēn σπονδαςις
τον
δηθεν seems always
editors (Hirschig,
D. Koraes
A. Billault
Athiopika
Polifonia ad Eros
P.J. Rohdes
Delphs
A.M. Saracella

move δε, 84 from
at itself, but it
circumstance
clutching a torch
the completely chaste woman?

delevi άλλα
ευθυς bis
after διηνεκες to
προετοιμαζω
χαμεύνη

move δε, 84 from
after δαιμων
προετοιμαζω
χαμεύνη
drama concerning us. 2
to itself, it
circumstances
lighting lamps
complete chastity?
understood, so it seems, do you feel, maiden about I am your sister Being so ready I am not able to understand nor do I want to. I pray that they were such a distance if to seek Thyamis battle) they went
understanding, so it seems, do you feel, maiden, about I am your brother But being so ready I was not able to understand nor did I want to. I prayed that they were at such a distance if to seek Thermouthis battle), they went