Classical Quarterly **55.1** 250 265 (2005) *Printed in Great Britain*
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi018

ACHILLES TATIUS' *LEUCIPPE AND CLEITOPHON*: WHAT HAPPENED NEXT?*

At the beginning of Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Cleitophon* the anonymous narrator relates how he arrived at Sidon after a severe storm. While going about the city and looking at temple-offerings, he saw a picture of Europa being abducted by Zeus in the form of a bull. He describes the painting and says that in response to it he had remarked on the power of Eros. A young man, who was standing alone nearby, replied: 'Ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἂν εἰδείην', ἔφη, 'τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών' (1.2.1). This young man turns out to be Cleitophon, the hero, and his very first words suggest that he is not at all happy. The anonymous narrator persuades him to tell his story, and this takes up the rest of the novel. At the end of his narration Cleitophon says that, after the legal proceedings in Ephesus had been brought to a close, he, Leucippe, her father, and his own friend Cleinias left for Byzantium, where he and Leucippe were married. They then went to Tyre, where they attended Cleitophon's sister's wedding. They decided to spend the winter there before returning to Byzantium. The frame is not resumed.

With the critical rehabilitation of the Greek novel it has become normal to consider what were previously regarded as faults in *Leucippe and Cleitophon* as virtues, or at least as intentional effects.[1] However, in the words of Most, 'one notorious weakness has so far resisted redescription: the awkward discrepancy between the romance's beginning and its ending'.[2] This discrepancy has elicited a variety of opinion, one which highlights the perplexing nature of this problem.[3]

* I should like to thank James Hordern and Simon Swain, who read and commented on an earlier draft of this paper, the referees who made invaluable criticisms of that draft, and *CQ*'s anonymous referee, who made several helpful suggestions.

[1] See, in particular, G. Anderson, *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play* (Chico, 1982), ch. 3, and G. W. Most, 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', *JHS* 109 (1989), 114 33. See also below under solutions 6 and 7.

[2] Most (n. 1), 114.

[3] Those who have made comments on this topic include: G. Anderson, 'Perspectives on Achilles Tatius', *ANRW* II 34.3 (1997), 2278 99; S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: the Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton, 1989); M. Fusillo, *Il romanzo greco* (Venice, 1989); M. Fusillo, 'How novels end: some patterns of closure in ancient narrative', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (edd.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton, 1997), 209 27; S. Gaselee, *Achilles Tatius* (Cambridge, MA, 1969); S. Goldhill, *Foucault's Virginity* (Cambridge, 1995); T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm, 1971); R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 1983); B. D. MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe* (Lincoln, NE, 1990); J. R. Morgan, '*Erotika Mathemata*: Greek romance as sentimental education', in A. H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (edd.), *Education in Greek Fiction* (Bari, 1997); Most (n. 1), 114 33; S. Nakatani, 'A re examination of some structural problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *Ancient Narrative* 3 (2003), 1 19; S. Nimis, 'Memory and description in the ancient novel', *Arethusa* 30 (1998), 99 122; B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary Historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley, 1967); B. P. Reardon, 'Achilles Tatius and ego narrative', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London, 1994), 80 96, and in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*

There are in fact four questions which have been raised here:[4]

1. Why is the initial frame, involving the conversation between the anonymous author and Cleitophon, not resumed at the end of Cleitophon's narration?
2. Why is Cleitophon to be found in Sidon at the beginning, when he has left himself in Tyre at the end of his narration?[5]
3. Why does Cleitophon not seem happy in the initial conversation, when his narration has the obligatory happy ending?
4. Where is Leucippe?

I shall outline six solutions, two of which contain several permutations, and, having argued that, while some have their positive points, none of the solutions is entirely satisfactory, I shall then propose my own. This will build on the more modern opinion that Achilles Tatius was a writer of considerable sophistication and examine his purposes in leaving these discrepancies in his novel. Not only will it describe one of the features that makes *Leucippe and Cleitophon* arguably the most innovative, and therefore interesting, of the Greek novels; it will also highlight the attitude that this work displays to the genre as a whole.

SOLUTION 1: 'TEXT INCOMPLETE'

The first solution is to assume that the text is incomplete. This is mentioned as a possibility by Vilborg and Anderson.[6] This would answer question 1, and would seem to be a way of answering questions 2–4. However, there is no evidence that this is the case. This should therefore be a last-resort solution, only to be invoked if it can be found that the end as we have it is not the kind of end we might expect, given the contents of the rest of the novel and the ability and strategy of the author displayed therein.

SOLUTION 2: 'INCOMPETENCE'

Another method of solving this puzzle has been to accuse Achilles Tatius of incompetence. He simply forgot how he had started his novel and failed to finish it appropriately.[7] This solution answers question 1, and can be extended to questions 2–4, for if the author forgot to resume the frame, he would thereby have forgotten to account

(Oxford, 1999), 243 58; R. Scholes and R. Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (New York, 1966); E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XV (Göteborg, 1962); T. Whitmarsh and H. Morales, *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon* (Oxford, 2001); T. Whitmarsh, 'Reading for pleasure: narrative, irony, and eroticism in Achilles Tatius', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Brill, 2003), 191 205; J. J. Winkler, 'Achilles Tatius: *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, 1989), 170 284.

[4] Although it should be noted that in fact only Hägg (n. 3) and Most (n. 1) (see solution 4) have raised them all explicitly, and even then not systematically. Morgan (n. 3), Morales in Whitmarsh and Morales (n. 3), and Whitmarsh (n. 3) also raise all four questions, albeit not as clearly as Hägg and Most, and it is perhaps no coincidence that their brief treatments are those which seem most closely to be approaching my own in solution 7 below. See n. 56.

[5] *Σιδὼν ... Ἐνταῦθα ἥκων* (1.1.1 2), as opposed to: *Καὶ διεγνώκαμεν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ παραχειμάσαντες ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον* (8.19.3). Indeed, as Most (n. 1), 115, notes: 'the romance's very first word is *Σιδὼν* and its very last word is *Βυζάντιον*'. Cf. Nakatani (n. 3), 12.

[6] Vilborg (n. 3), 140, and Anderson (n. 3), 2284, respectively.

[7] This is mentioned as a possibility by Vilborg (n. 3), 10, 140, and Anderson (n. 3), 2284, and is suggested by Gaselee (n. 3), 455, and Scholes and Kellogg (n. 3), 245. The last comment,

for his hero's location and emotional state at the beginning and for Leucippe's absence.

However, if this seems a little far-fetched as an explanation, it becomes ludicrous when it is considered that overall Achilles Tatius takes a good deal of care over the structure of his work. It is true that there are some discrepancies in the novel,[8] but these are positively minor compared with what the author is being accused of here. It is also true that Achilles Tatius finds it less easy to maintain Cleitophon's first-person viewpoint as the novel progresses.[9] But, as Most points out,[10] Achilles Tatius is generally careful to ensure that Cleitophon is able to account in retrospect for things that he could not have been aware of when they were taking place. The most notable example of this is the way in which Cleitophon explains how he knew about Callisthenes' story a staggering six books after it was narrated.[11] This is the point to bear in mind: that Achilles Tatius felt constricted by the form of narration he had chosen, right up until the end of his novel. This surely makes it unlikely that he would have forgotten the fact that he had an opening frame and what its contents were. Solution 2, then, is unsatisfactory, especially given the fact that most scholars now regard Achilles Tatius as a writer of skill, with a clear idea of what a first-person narrative entailed.

SOLUTION 3: 'DELIBERATE DEVICE'

The various guises of this solution claim that Achilles Tatius left his novel open deliberately: the end of the novel as we have it is how he intended his readers to have it. This reformulates question 1 as:

1. (a) Why would Achilles Tatius have wished to leave his novel open, that is, not resume the initial frame?

This is a question that needs to be answered if solutions 1 and 2 are rejected. There are six answers which can be addressed immediately.

bluntly, 'By the end of the story the author has forgotten that he began with his third-person narrator viewing a picture.'

[8] There are two examples of any note cited by Gaselee. The first, *τοῦ πολέμου γάρ, ὡς ἔφην, στρατηγὸς ἦν οὗτος* (2.14.2), is strictly speaking a mistake, since no mention has been made that Sostratus is a general, although it might be reasonable to assume that he was taking an important part in the war against the Thracians (1.3.6), given that: *πολὺς γὰρ ὁ τῆς μητρὸς κλῆρος ἦν αὐτῷ* (1.3.1). The second, *Καὶ γάρ, ὡς ἔφην ἐν ἀρχῇ τῷ λόγῳ, ἐν Τύρῳ ποτὲ ἐγεγόνει περὶ τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλείων ἑορτὴν* (7.14.2), could be thought an inconsistency, for Sostratus did not take part in the sacred embassy to Tyre: he was fighting in Byzantium at the time, as we learn from Panthia's lament over her daughter's supposed loss of virtue: *Οἴμοι, Σώστρατε· σὺ μὲν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ πολεμεῖς* (2.24.2). Hägg (n. 3), 203 4, on the other hand, argues that 'it is more natural to regard this reference ... as being directed to the previous history of the romance'. The remaining inconsistency, that Cleitophon did not say any such thing towards the beginning of his story, is thus less serious.

[9] Reardon (n. 3), using Hägg (n. 3), deals with the question of Achilles Tatius' ego-narrative, its uses and its inherent difficulties, and points out things that Cleitophon could not have known or have come to know. Cf. Morgan (n. 3), 182.

[10] Most (n. 1), 115 16. Cf. Reardon (n. 3), 85.

[11] *Ἄρχεται δὴ λέγειν, ἃ φθάνω προειρηκὼς ἅπαντα ...* (8.17.2), which refers to what he had narrated at 2.13 18. The other example given by Most is *Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ βασάνους ἑαυτὸν ἀγόμενον ἰδὼν πάντα σαφῶς λέγει ...* (8.15.1), where Sosthenes' confession is supposed to provide Cleitophon with knowledge of events beyond that which he could be expected to have.

(a) The responses of Vilborg and Hägg convey this answer:

> the author may have found that it would disturb the narrative to take up the frame story again. [This] possibility seems most probable; as a matter of fact, the ordinary reader hardly feels that something is amiss here.[12]

> [Achilles Tatius] never had a real 'frame-story' in mind at all. He has made use of an epic situation only to get the story going ... Having served this purpose, it is simply dropped and it is questionable whether the ordinary reader ever misses its resumption after 175 pages of first-person narrative.[13]

There is an underlying underestimation of 'ordinary readers' in both of these answers, as if they were incapable of noticing what the scholars themselves had noticed.[14] It is an attempt to answer a question which they have raised, and which has been raised frequently, by claiming that there is no real question. Solution 3a might, by extension, be able to deal with questions 2–4, for if the readers did not notice the absence of a frame-resumption, they might have forgotten what that frame contained. Questions 2–4 would thus not occur to them. But this would surely be to assume an unwarranted degree of incompetence in the readers, especially given that Achilles Tatius himself pays them the compliment of being capable of remembering what 8.17.2 referred to.[15] In fact it seems more reasonable to argue that the readers would be put in mind of the beginning when they reached the end precisely because the frame is not resumed.[16] Moreover, a central problem for this solution is that this extension would also require a level of ineptitude, or at least inconsistency, on the part of the author, which was not permitted in the discussion of solution 2.

(b) A similar solution can be inferred from Nimis's work on the compositional practices of the novelists, in which he argues that the structure of the novels was not necessarily decided before they were physically written down, but that that there was a process of negotiation involved during the writing itself.[17] Nimis, perhaps surprisingly, does not address the problems at issue here in any detail,[18] but a combination of his argument that the painting of Europa and Zeus 'could serve the author as a sort of preliminary outline or heuristic premise'[19] with his general approach would presumably lead to a conclusion similar to that reached by Vilborg, Hägg et al., namely, that the frame is simply a method of getting under way, and that when the end is reached, its relationship to the beginning is unimportant. This then encounters the same fundamental problems as solution 3a.

[12] Vilborg (n. 3), 140.

[13] Hagg (n. 3), 125 6. Cf. Reardon (n. 3), 94, n.15.

[14] We have very little information regarding the novel's ancient readership, but the consensus now is that the evidence points towards the educated élite. See E. L. Bowie, 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), 435 59; S. Stephens, 'Who read ancient novels?', in Tatum, 405 18; E. L. Bowie, 'The ancient readers of the Greek novels', in G. Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Brill, 1996), 87 106.

[15] See n. 11.

[16] See Morgan (n. 3), 185: 'the frame is never closed at the end. The formal incompletion takes our attention back to that introductory scene ...'

[17] See Nimis (n. 3); also id., 'The prosaics of the ancient novel', *Arethusa* 27 (1994), 387 411; id., 'The sense of open-endedness in the ancient novel', *Arethusa* 32 (1999), 215 38; id., '*In mediis rebus*: beginning again in the middle of the ancient novel', in Panayotakis et al. (n. 3), 255 69.

[18] There is a brief mention at Nimis (n. 3), 103 4, with n. 7.

[19] Nimis (n. 3), 104.

(c) Another answer to question 1a is that by having a frame the narrator/Achilles Tatius can disclaim any authority for what Cleitophon says. For the facts that the events of the main narrative are related by another/a fictional character, and that the narrator/Achilles Tatius is merely reporting them, mean that in doing so they are only approving of the entertainment value of those events and not validating them in terms of veracity.[20] The author felt no need to complete the frame, as the desired effect had already been achieved. But this still leaves questions 2–4 unanswered. Three more answers, which may also independently contain some truth, fail in exactly the same regard. The first (d) is that the frame is a *Beglaubigungsapparat*,[21] the second (e) is that the narrator's interest in Cleitophon's story is a device to draw in the reader,[22] and the third (f) is that Achilles Tatius is imitating literary predecessors.[23]

SOLUTION 4: 'THE STRANGER'S STRATAGEM'

As a response to the shortcomings of the above solutions, Most proposes solution 4. He argues that:

> in virtually every such case [sc. 'of smaller first-person narratives embedded within a larger third-person context' in a 'Greek erotic romance'] the first-person narrative is a lament for the misfortunes the narrator has suffered in the past and is still suffering at the time of his narration.[24]

Most then concludes that Achilles Tatius must have been constrained by the same convention that a stranger's autobiographical tale should be one of woe.[25] This solution answers questions 1 and 3, but seems not to deal with questions 2 and 4. Most raises question 4,[26] but does not answer it directly. Its solution might, however, be accounted for in the way in which he tackles question 2. Most argues that:

> Achilles Tatius may even have been trying to conceal the contradiction by precisely *not* returning to the framing situation of the temple of Astarte at Sidon with which he had begun.[27]

And, by implication, the absence of Leucippe would perform the same function. Questions 2 and 4, then, can be subordinated to the other two questions. However, the problem with suggesting that Achilles Tatius added two discrepancies in order

[20] See Hunter (n. 3), 39 40: 'Achilles was perhaps also influenced by the humorous (not to say scandalous) nature of the tale which he has to tell.' Cf. Perry (n. 3), 110 13, and appendix III, at 325 9.

[21] See Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 220: 'the introduction in this case has an authenticating function that gives the "effet de réel"'.

[22] So Hunter (n. 3), 39: 'we should bear in mind . . . the fact that this device calls the reader's attention to the interest and amusement of the story which is to follow, i.e. the interest taken by "the author" in the narrator's story invites the reader's interest in it'.

[23] Hunter (n. 3), 40; Winkler (n. 3), 284; Reardon (n. 3), 94, n. 15; Anderson (n. 3), 2284; Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 220.

[24] Most (n. 1), 118. Two possible exceptions are Xen. Eph. 5.1.2 3 and Long. 2.3 7. Both of these are dismissed by Most, 119 20, on the grounds that the narrators are sufficiently familiar with the narratees for their tales of non-woe not to grate. The idea that the degree of familiarity is central to the question is thus introduced without due emphasis.

[25] Nakatani (n. 3), 13 14, argues that, since the anonymous narrator is an 'ideal listener' and keen to hear Cleitophon's story, the two are not in fact strangers. I am not sure that this would trouble Most overly.

[26] Most (n. 1), 117: 'Where is Leucippe when Cleitophon meets the anonymous narrator in the temple at Sidon? Has Cleitophon lost her yet again?'

[27] Ibid. 119.

to conceal the contradiction between Cleitophon's respective emotional states is that surely the contradiction is only highlighted the more.

Most's general argument, as developed in his Section II,[28] is that it is a feature of archaic and classical literature that someone, specifically a stranger, with a tale to tell had to respect the sensibilities of the listener and put himself at his mercy, as it were, by intimating that he was not as fortunate as that listener. But it seems perverse to argue that writers of the Imperial period should have felt constrained by such a convention. Indeed a ready, more or less contemporary, counter-example to Most's theory can be found in the text of Dio Chrysostom's Seventh Oration.[29] Dio relates how he was shipwrecked on Euboea and met a hunter. He tells him where the deer he has been hunting is. The hunter takes what he wants from the deer and invites Dio to dine with him at his nearby hut. He asks him what had happened and then puts him at his ease (7.1–10). Dio follows him and:

Ὡς οὖν ἐβαδίζομεν, διηγεῖτό μοι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὰ αὐτοῦ πράγματα καὶ τὸν βίον ὃν ἔζη μετὰ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ παίδων. (7.10)

What follows is a charming, famous, tale, which Dio uses to highlight the idyllic nature of rustic existence. There is no hint that the tale is one of woe, and Dio is a prefect stranger to the hunter. In fact Most admits that:

> It is interesting to note that the Greek romances, which arise in the Hellenistic age and flourish under the Empire, continue to retain these Archaic and Classical limitations on autobiographical discourse at a time when they seem somewhat less coercive in reality. This is evidently a generic, and presumably an archaizing, feature of these romances.[30]

The fact that there appear to be no exceptions in the novels at least does not contradict this argument, and Most could argue that other genres are not bound by these limitations in the Imperial period, and thus deal with Dio 7. But he would then need to explain why the novels have this feature, when other, similarly archaizing, genres do not.

Most's theory has run into difficulties of varying severity but, if we accept it, we only create another problem, which is the following, previously unasked, question:

5. Why did Achilles Tatius choose a stranger for Cleitophon to narrate his adventures to, instead of a friend?

After all, there might be no discrepancies if Cleitophon could tell his story to someone with whom he was sufficiently familiar for the restrictions of 'self-disclosure and self-sufficiency' not to apply. In fact, in his concluding paragraph, Most almost suggests this question:

> Speaking before friends and relatives, Cleitophon would likely have praised himself or recounted his good fortune, without doing more than boring or irritating those nearest and dearest to him.[31]

A writer of Achilles Tatius' wit and invention could have written such a scenario, had he wished, and obviated all four discrepancies.[32]

[28] Ibid. 120 27.

[29] The first half of which is not too dissimilar from the novels themselves: see S. C. R. Swain, 'Dio and Lucian', in Morgan and Stoneman (n. 3), 166 80, at 167 72.

[30] Most (n. 1), 133, n. 99. What Most means by 'in reality' is not explained.

[31] Ibid. 133.

[32] As Reardon (n. 3), 94, n. 15, puts it: 'it is hardly likely that Achilles would go to so much trouble in order to end up painting himself into a corner'.

SOLUTION 5: 'THE STRANGER-STRATAGEM'

This solution is my own extrapolation from Most's argument and follows directly on from solution 4 by assuming that the theory behind it is correct. Questions 1 and 3 are answered because Achilles could not resume the frame if Cleitophon's emotional state at the beginning has to be unhappy,[33] and questions 2 and 4, as subordinate questions, are dealt with by Achilles Tatius' desire to 'conceal the contradiction'. The issue now is that solution 5 must answer question 5. Solutions 3a, b, d, e, and f[34] do not help in answering question 5, because having a friend as the narratee would have made little or no difference. There are five possible ways of answering it, the first corresponding to solution 3c.[35]

(a) Achilles Tatius chose a stranger for Cleitophon to narrate his story to, so that the stranger, who is also ostensibly the author, might be distanced as far as possible from the events recounted by Cleitophon. However, no more distance is gained by the author's being a stranger than there would have been if he had been a friend and, either way, Cleitophon himself practically makes a disclaimer on his, and therefore the author's, behalf, for in the very act of protesting the veracity of his story he draws attention to its unbelievability:

'Σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις', εἶπε, 'λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε.' (1.2.2)

And it seems as if the author, given what Cleitophon has said, is prepared to treat his story with a little scepticism, and thereby lets the reader know that he has abdicated any responsibility for its contents:

Μὴ κατοκνήσῃς, ὦ βέλτιστε', ἔφην, 'πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τοῦ Ἔρωτος αὐτοῦ, ταύτῃ μᾶλλον ἥσειν, εἰ καὶ μύθοις ἔοικε.' (1.2.2)

'πάντως δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν.' (1.2.3)

After such an introductory conversation, a friend reporting what Cleitophon had to say could hardly be held accountable for, or be disgraced by, his story.

(b) A similar solution[36] is to argue that the stranger reflects the ignorance of the reader, but there is no reason why a friend should be any less ignorant regarding the adventures Cleitophon goes on to describe, as long as he had not seen him since before they began.

(c) A third way to answer question 5 is to claim that Cleitophon needs to be unhappy for the novel to contain any suspense.[37] Achilles Tatius had him talk to a stranger so that, following Most's theory, he could feasibly not be in the state in which we would expect to find him at the inevitable happy end of a Greek novel. On this solution the author, standing in for the reader, does not know what the outcome will be.[38] In fact he may assume the worst, given Cleitophon's apparent misery. It is, of course, only at

[33] Which it does, because he is talking to a stranger.

[34] That Achilles Tatius needed a way to 'get the story going' (a and b), that the frame operates as a *Beglaubigungsapparat*, that Achilles Tatius was trying to entice his reader, and that he was evoking literary models.

[35] That Achilles Tatius wanted to disclaim authority for the story.

[36] And one which is also similar to solution 3e.

[37] A deliriously happy Cleitophon would not allow the readers even to suspend their anticipation of a happy ending.

[38] Or at least at the time of the original conversation he did not know what the outcome would be.

the end that the author/reader discovers that all is well, and at the same time he realizes that Cleitophon's unhappiness was merely a ploy to enable him to embark on his story, in accordance with normal social conventions. However, Cleitophon would not need to be brimming over with happiness if he were speaking to a friend. He could say something neutral that would not prejudice the end of his story, but which at the same time would not be disconsonant with it. Thus the discrepancies could quite easily have been written out.

(d) Achilles Tatius might have chosen a stranger to add to the character-portrayal of Cleitophon. The proponent of this solution would have to argue that the fact that Cleitophon tells a long, and rather tall, story to a stranger enhances, and is consistent with, the portrayal of his character throughout the novel. Cleitophon is hardly an ideal hero, a fact possibly best summed up by Gaselee's note to 8.1.2:

> The reader, bearing in mind Clitophon's behaviour at his previous meeting with Thersander (V. xxiii.[39]), will by this time have come to the conclusion that the hero of the romance is a coward of the purest water.[40]

If Cleitophon is prepared to bare his soul and tell his most intimate secrets to a total stranger, then the reader would have appreciated just the sort of shameless person that he is. But if Achilles Tatius is prepared to treat his hero in such a way, it must be considered whether there is a wider strategy at work within *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, and so its author's attitudes to the genre in which he was writing need to be taken into account.[41]

(e) The reverse argument, that a stranger is precisely the only kind of person to whom Cleitophon could tell his story, could also be brought into play. Cleitophon, understandably, gives an edited version of his adventures to Leucippe's father, and to Leucippe herself, at the banquet in Book 8,[42] and it is obvious that Achilles Tatius would want him to feel free to give the anonymous narrator, and simultaneously enable Achilles Tatius himself to give the reader, the full story. Therefore Cleitophon could not be allowed to narrate his story to someone who might make even him shy away from giving every detail.

The five parts of solution 5, like the last four parts of solution 3, may plausibly be argued to contain some truth, and it must be stressed that in proposing my own solution I do not want to exclude the good points of those described so far. Nevertheless, by themselves none of the parts of solution 5 escapes from the problem that has in fact always dogged solution 4, and therefore would always have dogged any potential permutation of solution 5, namely that questions 2 and 4 were brushed under the carpet and never satisfactorily answered.

SOLUTION 6: 'ANTICLOSURAL AMBIGUITY'

In his discussion of the ending of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* Fusillo only raises question 1,[43] although in the search for an/the answer he does adduce a fact that has not

[39] Where Cleitophon failed to defend himself against Thersander's attack.

[40] Gaselee (n. 3), 390.

[41] See under solution 7 below, especially n. 45.

[42] 8.5.1 3, especially: *ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μελίτην ἐγενόμην, ἐξῆρον τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς σωφροσύνην μεταποιῶν* (8.5.2), and: *ἓν μόνον παρῆκα τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ δραμάτων, τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Μελίτην αἰδῶ* (8.5.3).

[43] Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), esp. 219–21.

been used as evidence in the discussion so far: the final paragraph of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is extremely rapid. Fusillo concludes that: 'This closural weakness can be adequately explained only with reference to the thematic and structural peculiarities of the entire novel.' That is, Achilles Tatius' novel is an 'ironic and ambivalent pastiche of the Greek novel', and 'Giving such limited space to the crowning marriage does little to celebrate the chaste and faithful couple, while breaking off the narration frees it of organic structure.'[44]

It seems *a priori* a good idea to tie the lack of frame-resumption in with the nature of the contents of the novel. If one of the most important aspects of the novel is that there is significant play with novelistic conventions throughout, it seems reasonable to attempt to solve the problems at issue here with an appeal to this aspect. However, Fusillo does not explicitly address questions 2–4, and to say that 'breaking off the narration frees it of organic structure' does not advance the debate very much further, although it does at least provide us with a starting point.

SOLUTION 7: 'DELIBERATE DISCREPANCIES'

My own solution goes much further than solution 6. I suggest that, allied to the lack of frame-resumption, the discrepancies between the beginning and the end constitute a deliberate device to subvert, or at least endanger, the conventions of the 'ideal' Greek novel. Achilles Tatius not only left his novel open, he also engineered a situation whereby certain factors contained within the unresumed frame are set in strained confrontation with specific details given at the very end of the novel, in order to raise questions about what exactly has happened in the meantime. This would make it the culmination of what is beginning to be seen by scholars as Achilles Tatius' strategy of playing with the generic expectations which a reader would have brought to an ancient Greek novel.[45] The most glaring example is, of course, the sexual infidelity of Cleitophon,[46] and others include the overwrought rhetoric scattered throughout[47] and the triple *Scheintod* of Leucippe. However, the most basic generic expectation is that a Greek novel will have a happy ending, and this makes it the ultimate target for a subversive author. Yet the techniques available to such an author for destabilizing this part of his work are not obvious: he could not kill off either or both of the protagonists, for instance, and still have written something that would belong to the genre it was subverting. Achilles Tatius must remain within the bounds of his chosen genre if he wishes to push against and undermine them. What I maintain is that this is precisely what he achieves by the device of having an unresumed frame.

[44] Ibid. 220. Cf. Bartsch (n. 3), 170; Goldhill (n. 3), 79; Morales in Whitmarsh and Morales (n. 3), xxv–xxvi; Nakatani (n. 3), 14.

[45] Cf. Bartsch (n. 3), 159: 'Achilles Tatius is doing . . . nothing quite so destructive as parody; he is playing, as always, upon the readers' expectations—in this case, some of the expectations they may be bringing with them from other romances.' D. B. Durham, 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CPh* 33 (1937), 1 19, still has many good points, in spite of his chronology, and Anderson (n. 1), ch. 3, is not slow to draw attention to possible elements of humour. See also MacQueen (n. 3), 129 32 and 151 3; Reardon (n. 3); K. Chew, 'Achilles Tatius and parody', *CJ* 96 (2000), 57–70.

[46] Not unparalleled in other Greek novels, of course, but this is a conscious and knowing lapse, in contrast to Callirhoë's desperation and Daphnis' ignorant innocence.

[47] For example, 3.5.4., where Cleitophon prays to Poseidon: *Εἰ δὲ καὶ θηρίων ἡμᾶς βορὰν πέπρωται γενέσθαι, εἰς ἡμᾶς ἰχθὺς ἀναλωσάτω, μία γαστὴρ χωρησάτω, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ἰχθύσι κοινῇ ταφῶμεν.* Nevertheless see S. C. McGill, 'The literary lives of a *Scheintod*: *Clitophon and Leucippe* 5.7 and Greek epigram', *CQ* 50 (2000), 323 6, who does not think that humour is the aim at 5.7, where Cleitophon mourns over what he thinks is Leucippe's decapitated body.

For it seems to me that a reader of the sophistication that Achilles Tatius' novel assumes would ask questions 1 (and therefore question 1a), 2, 3, and 4.[48] As noted above, Most himself runs through the doubts that would enter the reader's mind on completing the novel and draws attention to question 4:

> Where is Leucippe when Cleitophon meets the anonymous narrator in the temple at Sidon? Has Cleitophon lost her yet again?[49]

In a note to this last sentence, Most expresses the implausibility of this possibility, although he does not count it out:

> This is of course hardly likely: but note that it is not in the least excluded by the language of i.3.2.[50]

We might not in fact expect Leucippe to be with Cleitophon, but the important thing to bear in mind is that we do not know where she is, and, more significantly, we are not given the opportunity of finding out. Similarly, there could be any number of ways of explaining why Cleitophon is in Sidon at the start, but by not resuming the frame Achilles Tatius prevents any explanation being given.[51]

One question on which scholars do not agree is whether Cleitophon is actually unhappy in the opening frame or not. Indeed, according to Most the 'fundamental contradiction ... between Cleitophon's character and situation at the beginning and at the end of the romance' has 'apparently not (been) noticed before'.[52] One reason for the failure of so many commentators to spot this contradiction could be that it does not exist. But, as Most points out, Cleitophon's 'very first words' are strong: *Ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἂν εἰδείην*', *ἔφη*, '*τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών*' (1.2.1),[53] and there is no hint at all that he is in the position or mood in which we find him at the end of novel, or in which we would expect to find him, given the likely ending of the novel.[54] Indeed, the anonymous narrator's response implies that Cleitophon's sufferings are seemingly still with him, without any indication that he is better off for the experience: *Καὶ τί πέπονθας*', *εἶπον*, *ὦγαθέ*; *καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶ σου τὴν ὄψιν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς*.' Nor does Cleitophon contradict this; in fact his reply *Σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις*

[48] Morales in Whitmarsh and Morales (n. 3), xxiv xxv, stresses the need for the reader to be alert, and Bartsch's (n. 3) entire thesis is predicated on a reader who is aware of details and capable of recalling and interpreting them. Cf. Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 223, and n. 14 above on Greek novel readership.

[49] Most (n. 1), 117.

[50] Ibid. 117, n. 17. Cf. Hägg (n. 3), 234: 'since the hero, Clitophon, is the one who tells the story, the outcome is guaranteed to the reader at least in one respect –the hero survives. On the other hand, there is absolutely nothing in the account of the initial scene (1.2) that reveals any thing about the *heroine's* fate, whether she is alive and whether the two have been united in marriage.' In fact there is nothing at all in the initial scene about the/any heroine.

[51] If Achilles Tatius had a particular painting of Europa in mind and so the narrator and Cleitophon need to be in Sidon, he surely could have made Cleitophon leave himself in Sidon at the end of his narration, if he had wanted to avoid this discrepancy.

[52] Most (n. 1), 117.

[53] Ibid. 117, with n. 16. Cf. Hägg (n. 3), 234, *ὕβρεις* 'alludes only to the negative effects of Eros on his life'. Nakatani (n. 3), 13, argues, on the other hand, that this does not mean that Cleitophon is 'suffering at the present time'. Morgan (n. 3), 185, asserts categorically that he is 'not happy'.

[54] When I first read this novel, I expected, given Cleitophon's apparent unhappiness here and what I considered the inevitable outcome of the novel, that the narration to the stranger would break off at some stage, possibly towards the end, at which point Cleitophon would go off to the trial, or whatever device the author had in store for the denouement, and he and Leucippe would live happily ever after.

... λόγων' suggests that his tale is still a painful one to tell.[55] At any rate, even if Cleitophon is not explicitly unhappy, Achilles Tatius by no means rules out this interpretation and again raises doubts in the reader's mind, as shown by the diverse reactions to this passage.

Other ways of resolving this dilemma have been considered, and they have all been found wanting. The discrepancies, where they have been explicitly considered by previous treatments, have been seen to be a problem. But a more satisfactory outcome is reached if we credit Achilles Tatius with enough intelligence to have known what he was doing and view the discrepancies in a positive rather than a negative light. He knew full well that his reader, having compared the end with the beginning, would wonder why Cleitophon is in Sidon, why he seems to be unhappy, and where Leucippe is. The author expected his reader to entertain the doubts that these discrepancies involve. There could be any number of ways to explain away these doubts and to account for the initial situation, but the fact that Achilles Tatius does not provide such an explanation only increases these doubts. Cleitophon may well have found that married life is not as blissful as he had anticipated, or he may even have lost his beloved again, something that would be unthinkable in an 'ideal' Greek novel.[56]

The text gives added weight to this interpretation by offering suggestions that the temporal gap between the narrated time at the end of Cleitophon's story and the narrative context is relatively small. The first occurs at 1.2.1, where the anonymous narrator says that standing by him as he looked at the picture of the abduction of Europa was a νεανίσκος. This, of course, is Cleitophon, who states that when his adventures started he was nineteen years old: εἶχον ἔνατον ἔτος ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα (1.3.3). That he can still described as a νεανίσκος, especially after the ten months of adventures which his narration covers,[57] implies that not much time has passed since their conclusion.

A more explicit idea can be gleaned from what the anonymous narrator says in reply to Cleitophon's first words at 1.2.2:

Καὶ τί πέπονθας, εἶπον, ὦ ἀγαθέ; καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶ σου τὴν ὄψιν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς.'

[55] This phrase alludes to Pl. *Resp.* 450a10 b1 'ἃ νῦν ὑμεῖς παρακαλοῦντες οὐκ ἴστε ὅσον ἐσμὸν λόγων ἐπεγείρετε' where Socrates reveals his reluctance to embark on a discussion which he knows will prove controversial and potentially dangerous.

[56] Morgan (n. 3), 185, briefly raises the possibility that Cleitophon 'did not live happily ever after with Leukippe' as part of an argument which deals principally with the hero's character development, or rather lack of it. The implications for Achilles Tatius' place within, and attitude to, the genre which he was straining against are not part of Morgan's chosen remit. Whitmarsh (n. 3), while arguing for the opposite point of view that there is a tension between Cleitophon the (self-represented) naïve agent and Cleitophon the narrator, also asks 'What happened after the end of the narrative?' (202), and his interpretation that Cleitophon is generally pessimistic in his narration certainly facilitates the point of solution 7: that things may have gone wrong in the meantime. See also Morales in Whitmarsh and Morales (n. 3), xxv. It must be noted in addition that solution 7 has the advantage that it makes solution 4 irrelevant. Cleitophon is not unhappy because he is talking to a stranger; he is unhappy because Achilles Tatius is subverting novel conventions. If Most's theory is correct, however, it could be that Achilles Tatius chose a stranger as the narratee rather than someone familiar to Cleitophon in order to facilitate the lack of a logical conclusion. The issue is not that there could be no way in which Achilles Tatius could resume the frame and square the narration's happy end with Cleitophon's unhappiness in the frame: Achilles Tatius knew that by having a stranger as the narratee, Cleitophon would have to be unhappy at the beginning in order to be able to embark on his tale; he himself would have to leave the cursory, but happy, end open, and so cause in the reader the doubts that suggest a situation which he would not expect.

[57] Hägg (n. 3), 76.

The god here referred to is, of course, Eros, who is leading Zeus in the painting. The idea of initiation suggests recent exposure to him, and for Cleitophon not to be far from being an initiate would seem to indicate that his love for Leucippe is not old.[58] Visible symptoms are associated with a love as yet unrequited at 1.7.3, where Cleitophon approaches his cousin Cleinias, announces that he too has become a slave to love, and Cleinias:

ἀναστὰς κατεφίλησέ μου τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμφαῖνον ἐρωτικὴν ἀγρυπνίαν· καί, 'Ἐρᾷς', εἶπεν, 'ἐρᾷς ἀληθῶς· οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου λέγουσιν.'[59]

The fact that the narrator can see that Cleitophon is in love gives the impression that he has not yet come to grips with his emotions, something which would be more fitting for a man who has not yet even won the object of his affections than for someone who has been married for any considerable time. Another passage which may give a more precise indication of the time scale involved, and which reinforces the above interpretation, occurs in Lucian's *Dial. Meret.* 11. Charmides is declining to get his money's worth out of the courtesan Tryphaena, and she tries to get to the bottom of the problem. After finding out that Charmides is in love with a certain Philematon, and establishing that Charmides is crying as a result of his feelings for her, she asks: *Πολὺς δὲ χρόνος ἔστι σοι ἐρῶντι ἢ νεοτελής τις εἶ*; to which he replies: *Οὐ νεοτελής, ἀλλὰ μῆνες ἑπτὰ σχεδὸν ἀπὸ Διονυσίων, ὅτε πρώτως εἶδον αὐτήν*. On this reckoning one would only count as a recent initiate, and an unrequited one at that, for a period of, presumably considerably, less than seven months. It is true that Cleitophon's exceptional ordeals may have left a particularly obvious mark on him, but the fact that he still appears not to be far from being an initiate, and his reaction to being asked to tell his story, imply that he has not yet reached a stage in his life when he can look back on what happened to him without pain. Whatever is causing him that pain, and it is normally assumed to be the trials and tribulations described in his narration, occurred recently.[60]

Another possible indication that the interval between the end and the beginning is not large is meteorological. The last sentence of the novel, which raises question 2, is also relevant here.

Καὶ διεγνώκαμεν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ παραχειμάσαντες ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον. (8.19.3)

Tyre is where Cleitophon leaves himself at the end of his narration and where he plans to pass the winter with Leucippe. At the beginning of the novel we are given basic details about Sidon and a description of its harbour. This has the effect of emphasizing the location of the beginning and of making it more memorable to the reader. We then learn that the author arrived there after a severe storm: *Ἐνταῦθα ἥκων ἐκ πολλοῦ χειμῶνος* (1.1.2).[61] It does not seem too fanciful to suggest that the reader would

[58] Noted by Hägg (n. 3), 126, who is otherwise careful to point out that 'The interval in time between the narrated events and the day of the narration is never specified.'

[59] Cf. the effect of love sickness on the two would be lovers of Theoc. *Id.* 1.37 8: *οἳ δ'ὑπ' ἔρωτος/δηθὰ κυλοιδιόωντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.*

[60] Of course, given his apparent unhappiness here and the absence of Leucippe, it is possible that the *τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος* do not refer solely to the contents of his narration. Indeed Sostratus, in encouraging Cleitophon to tell his story at the banquet which occurs as the novel appears to be nearing its resolution, expects that Cleitophon's sufferings should now be at an end: *ἔπειτα τῶν ἔργων παρελθόντων ἡ διήγησις τὸν οὐκέτι πάσχοντα ψυχαγωγεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ λυπεῖ* (8.4.4).

[61] In itself, of course, a stock epic motif: e.g. Homer's Odysseus being washed ashore on the island of the Phaeacians and Vergil's Aeneas arriving in Africa. Cf. the storm at the beginning of Book 3 of *Leucippe and Cleitophon.*

associate the storm of the beginning with the impending winter of the end. Of course, storms do not always occur in winter,[62] but this connection is not out of the question. If the narrator and Cleitophon are meant to be thought to be meeting during or around the winter which Cleitophon and Leucippe are supposed to be spending in Tyre, and the phrasing of the last sentence certainly does not exclude this, then why is he not there with her, enjoying his first taste of longed-for wedded bliss? And if he did have to journey to Sidon for some reason, why does he spend what must be an excessively long time talking to a complete stranger?

If these factors can be taken as indicating that the beginning of the novel is temporally close to the end, solution 7 is enhanced. For it is even harder to explain, without appealing to this solution, why Cleitophon's emotional state and location should be as they are in the frame, if the happy ending of his narration occurred shortly before. Moreover, his willingness to be apart from Leucippe for long enough to tell his lengthy tale is even more puzzling, if the couple have only recently married. Achilles Tatius does not allow the narrator to resume the frame because he would only ask the questions that the reader himself asks. If such questions were asked in the text, they would require answers, or at least some sort of response; by leaving them to the readers, Achilles Tatius leaves the possible answers to them too.

At this point it is necessary to explore the extent to which Achilles Tatius is being radical by looking at how other Greek novelists end their works and at what futures they give or foretell their characters. Chronology might be argued to be a factor here: *Leucippe and Cleitophon* is now generally regarded as the middle of the five 'ideal' novels, with Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton predating him, and Longus and Heliodorus writing later.[63] Surely one could tell how radical Achilles Tatius is being by comparing his novel only to those that he may have had to hand? On the contrary, the surviving novels and other fragments, along with a potentially large amount of lost material, paint a picture of a number of works that have certain plot characteristics in common and follow certain generic conventions.[64] The most radical author does not need to be the last author, but those authors who follow and who want to write an 'ideal' Greek novel need to raise their game and do something different with the genre. Longus and Heliodorus could hardly have been more subversive than Achilles Tatius without risking having an end-product that was not a Greek novel at all. The facts that Longus wrote a miniature pastoral novel and that Heliodorus produced the longest and most narratologically complicated example of the genre point to authors needing to find a new way of keeping it fresh. Achilles Tatius, for his part, did this by stretching the novel's conventions to breaking point and, as I am arguing here, leaving open the question of whether in fact he has pushed them beyond their limit. And so how Longus and Heliodorus, as exponents within the same genre, end their novels and what questions they may leave

[62] The storm at the beginning of Book 3 occurs several days after the ἑορτὴ προτρυγαίου Διονύσου (2.2.1), which itself would have taken place in the autumn, at least to judge from Longus, *Daphis and Chloe* 2.1 2 (autumn was at its height at 1.28.1: μετοπώρου δὲ ἀκμάζοντος).

[63] See e.g. E. L. Bowie, 'The Greek novel', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 1. *Greek Literature* (Cambridge, 1985), 683 99, at 684; B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, 1989), 5; S. C. R. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford, 1996), 423 5. The dating of Longus, of course, is even more speculative than in the case of the others.

[64] See e.g. Bowie (n. 63); B. P. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton, 1991); N. Holzberg, 'The genre: novels proper and the fringe', in Schmeling (n. 14), 11 28; S. C. R. Swain, 'A century and more of the Greek novel', in Swain (n. 3), 3 35.

are as relevant to this discussion as what we find in Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus.

The *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus is in fact the easiest of the novels to treat, as befits its low literary status and relative unsophistication. The author tells the reader without equivocation that Anthia and Habrocomes will live happily ever after (5.15), spending the rest of their lives together ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες (5.15.3).[65] The situation in Longus is not too dissimilar. Much of scholars' attention has focused on the last chapter (4.40) with its implicit culmination of the theme of sexual violence adumbrated throughout the novel as Daphnis deflowers Chloe on their wedding night. The mention of Lycaenion and the rough singing of those conducting the young couple to the bedchamber (ᾖδον σκληρᾷ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ καθάπερ τριαίναις γῆν ἀναρρηγνύντες 4.40.2) have reasonably been argued to introduce an unpleasant reminder at the very end of the pain which Chloe will suffer at the loss of her virginity.[66] Of more interest here, however, is the previous chapter in which Longus explicitly states that his *Liebespaar* will proceed to have a happy and, at least to them, fulfilling life: καὶ οὐ τότε μόνον ἀλλ' ἔστε ἔζων τὸν πλεῖστον χρόνον βίον ποιμενικὸν εἶχον . . . ἡδίστην δὲ τροφὴν νομίζοντες ὀπώραν καὶ γάλα (4.39.1). The reader is assured that the adventures of Daphnis and Chloe are over and that nothing will come between them.

Heliodorus pursues a slightly different tack. His novel does not end straightforwardly with the anticipated marriage of Charicleia and Theagenes, at least in the sense of having a 'wedding night',[67] and there is no indication that their future will see them together and enjoying a long and happy life. Fusillo argues that this disappoints 'the expectations of the common reader', although he does admit that a more sophisticated reader would not have found this ending unsatisfactory.[68] However, Morgan seems closer to the mark when he argues for the much more positive proposition that all will be well:

> Their story only makes moral sense if they pass the rest of their lives in a happiness so complete and so uniform as to present no purchase for narration. This is in fact a classic closed ending; no questions are left to be asked, the text closes because there is nothing more that could be told.[69]

[65] See Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 217 18, where the simplicity of this ending and its lack of potential complications are only given two paragraphs.

[66] See J. J. Winkler, 'The education of Chloe: hidden injuries of sex' in id., *The Constraints of Desire* (London, 1990), 101 26, at 124 6; F. Zeitlin, 'The poetics of *Eros*: nature, art, and imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin (edd.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton, 1990), 417 64, at 458 9; Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 219.

[67] Heliodorus does not make the marriage process as simple as it could be. At 10.40.2 the Ethiopian priest Sisimithres says: ὥστε ὑπὸ μάρτυσιν αὐτοῖς [sc. the gods] τε τοῖς ταῦτα ἐπικλώσασι καὶ ὑμῖν ἀκόλουθα ἐκείνοις φρονεῖν ἐνδεικνυμένοις ξυνωρίδα ταύτην γαμηλίοις νόμοις ἀναδείκνυμι καὶ συνεῖναι θεσμῷ παιδογονίας ἐφίημι. The spectating army react as if that is the end of the matter, with the implication that it is not (ὡς ἐπιτελουμένοις ἤδη τοῖς γάμοις 10.41.1), before Hydaspes says: Ὦ δέσποτα . . . Ἥλιε καὶ Σελήνη δέσποινα, εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνὴ Θεαγένης τε καὶ Χαρίκλεια βουλήμασιν ὑμετέροις ἀνεδείχθησαν, ἔξεστιν αὐτοῖς ἄρα καὶ ἱερατεύειν ὑμῖν (ibid.). The very last words before the final sentence in which Heliodorus reveals himself as the author, as the people escort the main characters into Meroe, are: τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ γάμῳ μυστικωτέρων κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ φαιδρότερον τελεσθησομένων (10.41.3), which seems to be a rather coy way of referring to the physical aspect of their union. At any rate Theagenes and Charicleia have now been officially united as a couple, which is what the reader expects and wants.

[68] Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 223.

[69] J. R. Morgan, 'A sense of the ending: the conclusion of the Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *TAPA* 119 (1989), 299 320, at 320. Cf. Nimis (n. 17, 1999), *passim* on the resistance to closure exhibited in the novels (which nevertheless do close), and 228 35, on Heliodorus.

The reader can be confident that the protagonists will live happily ever after: there is simply no reason to suppose otherwise.

Chariton, perhaps surprisingly, gives us arguably the most interesting and open ending of any of the novelists other than Achilles Tatius, leaving loose ends while seemingly trying to tie them up.[70] At 8.4.4 Callirhoë writes Dionysius a letter, and Chariton tells us: *τοῦτο μόνον ἐποίησε δίχα Χαιρέου· εἰδυῖα γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔμφυτον ζηλοτυπίαν ἐσπούδαζε λαθεῖν*. This constitutes a stark intrusion of potential violence into the otherwise smooth denouement[71] and implies that she will always have to be careful not to rouse Chaereas' suspicions. The letter itself is sympathetic and tender, but not so affectionate as to make the reader think that she may have chosen Dionysius over her first husband.[72] Nevertheless she does ask him that the son she has convinced him is his (it is in fact Chaereas'): *μὴ λάβῃ δὲ πεῖραν μητρυιᾶς* (8.4.5), which may suggest a touch of jealousy on her part.[73] However, it is the end of Chariton's novel itself that is particularly interesting. For after the triumphant return to Syracuse and the public assembly, the last section of the work, excluding the authorial tag, consists of a prayer by Callirhoë to Aphrodite. She does not reproach the goddess for what she has suffered (it was fated), and finishes by saying: *δέομαί σου, μηκέτι με Χαιρέου διαζεύξῃς, ἀλλὰ καὶ βίον μακάριον καὶ θάνατον κοινὸν κατάνευσον ἡμῖν* (8.8.16). As Fusillo rightly observes, this is both appropriate in terms of the novel's interest in psychology and its focus on Callirhoë, but at the same time it 'lessens (the ending's) optimistic character'.[74] Callirhoë would not feel the need to pray if she was certain the future would be without trouble. Her uncertainty generates at least a small amount of doubt in the reader, who nevertheless can be reasonably sure that everything that is interesting (in novel terms) about these characters, and about Callirhoë in particular, has been told.[75]

Her prayer is paralleled in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*. Having been married in Byzantium, the protagonists and their entourage arrive in Tyre, where they are in time to celebrate the marriage of Callisthenes and Cleitophon's half-sister Calligone. Then we are told, in the penultimate sentence of the novel, that: *παρῆμεν οὖν ὡς καὶ συνθύσοντες αὐτῷ καὶ εὐξόμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς τούς τε ἐμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου γάμους σὺν ἀγαθαῖς φυλαχθῆναι τύχαις* (8.19.3). This prayer gives rise to the same sort of uncertainty as Callirhoë's. Of course, Achilles Tatius cannot tell us that Cleitophon and Leucippe will live happily ever after, for the narrative set-up of his novel would not allow that, but in this novel we do have, uniquely, the narration of post-ending events concerning one of the central characters,

[70] The famous passage at 8.1.4, *Νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι· καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν. οὐκέτι λῃστεία καὶ δουλεία καὶ δίκη καὶ μάχη καὶ ἀποκαρτέρησις καὶ πόλεμος καὶ ἅλωσις ἐν τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ ἔρωτες δίκαιοι καὶ νόμιμοι γάμοι*, refers only to the contents of last book of the novel itself, not to what might happen afterwards, contra Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 215–16.

[71] Cf. 1.4.12, where Chaereas, angered by the false report that Callirhoë is being unfaithful to him, kicks her in the stomach and seemingly kills her.

[72] Even if Dionysius himself might think this—8.5.14.

[73] Perry (n. 3), 137 9, building on B. E. Perry, 'Chariton and his romance from a literary historical point of view', *AJP* 51 (1930), 93 134, at 100 2 suggests that this son becomes the historical tyrant Dionysius, which would also show that Chariton has an idea of his novel's aftermath, albeit (pseudo)historical.

[74] Fusillo (n. 3, 1997), 216 17.

[75] Nimis (n. 17, 1999), 227, goes too far when he says that, 'Her prayer is to step out of the world of the novel . . .. But nothing has happened in Chariton's novel to give us any confidence in such an outcome. The world of the novel resists this kind of permanence and finality.' It is the very fact that the novel is ending that gives us this confidence.

namely Cleitophon.[76] This is the frame. This frame contains the discrepancies, and these discrepancies are made even more worrying by Cleitophon's prayer at the end of his narration. He is in the wrong place, he is without Leucippe, and he does not obviously seem happy. Has his marriage not been guarded by good fortune? We can never know, but the question is an obvious, and generically disturbing, one to ask.[77]

It is not necessary to conclude that everything has gone wrong, that Cleitophon has lost Leucippe, and that the entire world of the Greek novel has been turned upside down; but the possibility remains. Achilles Tatius allows a glimpse of what comes after his novel's obligatory happy, if perfunctory, ending, and it raises the kinds of question which a reader of such a novel might not expect to confront. But this is to underestimate the reader. For a reader who was aware of Achilles Tatius' overall strategy of pushing the genre to its limits would be wary of taking the ending at face value and so would be alert to the suggestion of subversion in this most basic aspect. For Achilles Tatius has pulled off the biggest trick of them all: a Greek novel with a non-happy non-ending.

University of Wales, Lampeter I. D. REPATH
i.repath@lamp.ac.uk

[76] The frame in Longus is not comparable since it contains only the narrator and the anonymous exegete of the painting by which he is inspired.

[77] Nakatani (n. 3), 16 and 17, argues that 'the ending of the novel leaves open ... the possibility of imagining a new adventure of the anonymous narrator'. This is strictly true, but the reader is surely more likely to ask what has happened to Cleitophon between the ending of his narration and the frame we find at the beginning, not what the anonymous narrator, whose character is barely established, might do next.