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The Greek novels vary considerably among themselves in their handling of time. The earliest of them, Chariton’s *Callirhoe*, is already a highly competent work of fictional narrative, but in this respect, as in many others, it opts for a relatively simple approach.

The dramatic date of the fictional narrative is conveyed by the inclusion of historical characters, such as the Syracusan statesman Hermocrates and the Persian king Artaxerxes, but, although one might term this work an attempt at an ‘historical novel’, it does not completely avoid inconsistencies or anachronisms.¹ There is nothing in the narrative itself to correlate it with real chronology, either in terms of historical events or through an internal calendar: the closest it comes to chronological specificity is at 3.5.1, where the Syracusans hesitate to send out their fleet in winter and would prefer to wait for spring, but are overruled by the hero’s impatience to search for his beloved. The narration is *subsequent*, as in all the novels, but since the narrator is fictitiously constructed as a contemporary of the events he narrates, modelled in this as in other respects on the historian Xenophon, it is impossible to tell by how much the act of narration is conceived as subsequent. In a few places the narrator uses the present tense of circumstances and institutions still prevailing in his own time.²

The length of time covered by the *story* is not precisely quantified, but seems to be in the order of two or three years. That covered by the *fabula* is rather longer: an important and recurrent external analepsis looks back to the defeat of the Athenians by the Syracusans under the leadership of the heroine’s father, Hermocrates, possibly some twenty years or so before the story begins; and an external prolepsis looks forward to the return to Syracuse of the heroine’s son, an infant when

---

¹ For the concept of ‘historical novel’ and its applicability to Chariton, including his historical anachronisms, see Hägg 1987.
² 5.1.3, 2.2, 4.5, 9.1; 6.8.6–7.
the story ends, and so perhaps twenty years or so later. The spaces between these limits to the fabula and the beginning and end of the story are left unfilled. Within the time span framed by the beginning and end of the story, no time is left altogether un-narrated, though we are not always told what each of the protagonists was doing in a given period. The narrator frequently gives indications of the beginning and ending of days and nights, but longer, more rapidly narrated, periods are generally left vague. We are told at 3.7.7 that Callirhoe gives birth to Chaereas’ son seven months after her marriage to Dionysius; we shall see shortly how the passage of this time is handled; and at 5.4.4 an adjournment of thirty days before the case brought by Dionysius against Mithridates comes before the Great King passes in a single sentence. But more often the time taken, for example, in journeys is not specified, so that the sum total of the narrative’s chronology remains impossible to calculate.

In terms of order too, Callirhoe is narrated in a relatively straightforward fashion. The primary narrator presents events, for the most part, in their chronological order: the story more or less reproduces the corresponding section of the fabula. The primary exception to a strictly chronological presentation derives from the technical problem of narrating events happening simultaneously in different plot-strands; we shall see that this occasionally requires some temporal back-tracking. Although the work contains numerous prolepses and analepses, both nar- ratorial and actorial, they are, with only a few exceptions, internal ones. The analepses, in particular, generally summarise material already familiar to the primary narratee and rarely introduce significant new information. This is not to say that they are without function for characterisation or dramatic effect.

The one aspect of time which is not simple in this novel is rhythm. We shall see that the narrative is characteristically constructed as a series of scenes strung like pearls on a thread of summary. These scenes broadly correspond to the sections of the narrative designated by the passage of single days and night, and account for nearly ninety percent of the total text.³

Within the broad outlines presented in these opening observations, let us now turn to a more detailed examination of time in Callirhoe.

³ Hägg 1971: 82.
Order

This is a story that begins at the beginning and ends at the end, and delivers information chronologically to its primary narratee, who thus generally knows more than the characters. This disables surprise and suspense, but generates irony. A good example is the sequence towards the end of the novel where Chaereas and Callirhoe are finally reunited: Chaereas does not know the identity of his beautiful captive, but the events leading up to Callirhoe’s capture and presence in Chaereas’ camp have been fully narrated in their ‘correct’ place. It is easy enough to see how an anachronic presentation, with the ‘truth’ about Callirhoe being presented to the primary narratee only in retrospect as it became known to Chaereas, would have worked and what effects it might have produced.

There is, I think, only one major paralipsis that forms an exception to this characteristic mode. Near the beginning of the novel, Chaereas is tricked into believing his wife unfaithful and in a fit of violent jealousy kicks her in the stomach, leaving her apparently dead (1.4.12). The primary narratee at this point is kept fully informed that she is in fact only unconscious. It is only later, however, that the narrator reveals that she was pregnant by Chaereas at the time of the attack (2.8.5). This surprising piece of information is disclosed only at the point where Callirhoe herself realises her condition, and it provides crucial motivation for her decision to marry another man in order to provide her child with a father.

On just a few other occasions, noted in the following section, information is presented for the first time in minor analepses, either narratorial or actorial, again as it becomes known to the characters rather than as it occurs, and thus serves as part of the apparatus of motivation.

Analepses

I noted above that virtually all of Chariton’s analepses are internal ones, but let us begin by noting the one important event from before the beginning of the story that is constantly referred to. This is the defeat of the Athenian expedition by Syracuse under the leadership of Hermocrates. This event is mentioned by the primary narrator in the very first sentence of his narrative, as the defining mark of Hermocrates and hence his daughter Callirhoe.
The Syracusan general Hermocrates, the man who defeated the Athenians, had a daughter called Callirhoe.\(^4\)

Her father’s eminence is so much part of the heroine’s being that she uses it repeatedly at moments of difficulty as a way to assert her identity or point up the reversal of her position: for example, as the tomb-robbers carry her over the sea to Miletus she exclaims:

‘Father, in this very sea you defeated three hundred Athenian warships; a tiny boat has carried off your daughter, and you do nothing to help me.’ \(^{(1.11.2)}\)

Memory of the defeat of Athens is also operative in other characters, as when the Persian King affects to want to take special care of Callirhoe out of gratitude to her father \(^{(5.8.8)}\).\(^3\) Other events prior to the timeframe of the story are mostly disregarded. We are, for example, told nothing of the earlier experiences of the protagonists. Leonas tells the pirate Theron that Dionysius has recently lost the wife he loved \(^{(1.12.7)}\), but their life together and circumstances of her death are never mentioned.

A small number of internal analepses contain information hitherto unknown to the primary narratee. At \(7.1.3–4\), after Dionysius has left with the King to fight against the Egyptian rebels, Chaereas goes to his house. At that point, the narrator reveals that, before he left, Dionysius had instructed a servant to deceive Chaereas into believing that the King had adjudged Callirhoe to Dionysius as the price of his loyalty. This motivates Chaereas’ desperate decision to join the war on the Egyptian side. On an earlier occasion \(6.8.1–2\), the chronologically displaced information that the Egyptians have murdered their satrap, elected a native king, and have already reached Syria and Phoenicia is presented in indirect speech as the contents of a message brought to the King at Babylon. The narrator narrates the reporting of events rather than the events themselves. Similarly the defeat and death of the Egyptian king is made known to the primary narratee only at the point where the news is delivered to Chaereas in direct speech \(8.2.3\). In none of these cases does the new information occupy more than a line or two of the text, and in the last two at least it concerns events that took place in a theatre at some geographical distance from that of the

---

\(^4\) Throughout the translation used is that of Reardon, in Reardon 1989.

\(^3\) Cf. also 3.10.6; 7.2.3, 5.8.
main plot, which it would have been awkward and unnatural to include in its ‘proper’ place.

The remaining internal analepses fall into three main groups: a) major narratorial analepses; b) actorial analepses of a more or less neutral sort; c) lamentations, when characters review their experiences in a highly emotive manner. All three of these groups repeat what has already been narrated.

a) At the beginning of book 5, that is at the exact half-way point of the text, the primary narrator inserts a detailed recapitulation (summary) of the story so far:

How Callirhoe, the most beautiful of women, married Chaereas, the handsomest of men, by Aphrodite’s management; how in a fit of lover’s jealousy Chaereas struck her, and to all appearances she died; how she had a costly funeral and then, just as she came out of her coma in the funeral vault, tomb robbers carried her away from Sicily by night, sailed to Ionia, and sold her to Dionysius; Dionysius’ love for her; her fidelity to Chaereas, the need to marry caused by her pregnancy; Theron’s confession, Chaereas’ journey across the sea in search of his wife; how he was captured, sold, and taken to Caria with his friend Polycharmus; how Mithridates discovered his identity as he was on the point of death and tried to restore the lovers to each other; how Dionysius found this out through a letter and complained to Pharnaces, who reported it to the King, and the King summoned both of them to judgement—this has all been set out in the story so far. Now I shall describe what happened next. (5.1.1–2)

There is a similar narratorial recapitulation at the start of the last book of the novel:

How Chaereas, suspecting that Callirhoe had been handed over to Dionysius, determined to avenge himself on the King and so went over to the Egyptian side; how he was appointed admiral and gained control of the sea; how after his victory he seized Aradus, where the King had placed his own wife for security, and along with her all his train and Callirhoe too—all of that has been described in the previous book. (8.1.1)

Neither of these analepses serves any organic function in the story; they are communications directly between the primary narrator and the primary narratee. The first of them covers events from the beginning of the story to the end of book 4. Although there is clearly some selection and compression of incident taking place, the recapitulation covers the entire narrative so far in a more or less uniform way, with no major omissions, and no additions. The events are listed in exactly the same
order as when they were first narrated, even to the extent of reproducing the slight anachrony caused by the narration of simultaneous events in two theatres. There is no re-interpretation or re-evaluation of the episodes mentioned, and they are viewed from the same external perspective. The second recapitulation is more limited in its scope, and covers only the events of book 7. Here again, however, the order and perspective of the original narrative is reproduced. The major difference between the two passages is that the second combines its analepsis with the text’s most detailed and significant prolepsis (to be discussed below), whereas the first moves only to a short and non-specific prolepsis.

These narratorial summaries are without parallel in our corpus of extant novels. Their phraseology imitates that of the summaries found at the beginning of most books of Xenophon’s Anabasis (which may not be genuine but were already included in the text in antiquity), and thus they may be part of the intertextual construction of this narrator as a fictional Xenophon. On the other hand, it is clear that they also function as structural markers, each drawing a major section of the story to a conclusion and moving it forward to the next stage. Other functions, however, are not excluded. It has been suggested, for example, that these recapitulations indicate that Callirhoe was first published in serial form, or that they are signs of orality (or aurality). Such speculation aside, it is clear that they serve to remind the narratee of the crucial points of the story in order to avoid any incomplete understanding of its climactic moments, the trial at Babylon and the recognition and reunion of the two protagonists.

b) Of the actorial analepses, some are presented in direct speech, and a rather smaller number in indirect speech. An example of the latter is when Phocas is telling Dionysius about the destruction of Chaereas’ ship:

Phocas told him about the sailor who had given him the information—where the ship was from, the purpose of their journey, who was on board; he told him also about his own tactics of involving the Persians

6 The experiences of Callirhoe are followed up to the point where she decides to marry Dionysius; at 3.2.17 the narrative jumps back in time to tell what happened to Chaereas during the same period.

7 Especially the formula en tōi prosthēn logōi dedēlētai (’has been shown in the previous account’) at 8.1.1, X. An. 2.1.1; 3.1.1; 5.1.1; 7.1.1.

8 Most recently in Hägg 1994; S. West 2003.
and about that night—how the ship was attacked and burned, and the crew killed or captured. (3.9.11)

This repeats events narrated in 3.7.1ff. Again the order of the elements of the recapitulation corresponds to that of the primary narrative, and so does quite a lot of the wording. But in this case the events are focalised by a secondary internal narrator, who is ignorant of the fact that Chaereas and Polycharmus were taken alive and not killed. This omission produces a situation where Dionysius wrongly believes that his rival is dead, which is an important causative factor in the development of the subsequent intrigue.9

More frequently these actorial analepses are presented in direct speech, as part of one of the novel’s scenes. One of the first occurs at 2.5.10, when Callirhoe first tells Dionysius about herself:

‘I am the daughter of Hermocrates, the Syracusan general. I had a sudden fall, and lost consciousness; and my parents gave me a costly funeral. Tomb robbers opened my tomb; they found me conscious again and brought me to this place, and Theron gave me to Leonas here in a deserted spot.’ She told them everything else but said nothing about Chaereas. (2.5.10)

Again the order of the elements is the same as in the primary narrative, and no new information or even colouring is added. However, she does omit the central fact of her marriage to Chaereas, as explicitly noted by the primary narrator. The function of this passage, and others like it,10 is to clarify how much of the story a character (in this case Dionysius) knows, and to highlight any gaps or errors in that knowledge.

c) Special mention must be made of the soliloquies, prayers and conversations in which protagonists lament their fates. A recurrent element of these speeches is a tendentious and partial review of the character’s experiences. No new factual material is added, but events which have already been narrated are subjected to new and subjective interpretations. Since the plot-function is not to inform anyone but to express emotion and character, it is natural for a rather freer approach to

---

9 Similar actorial analepses in reported speech at 2.4.3; 6.7.1; 8.1.4, 5.7.
10 2.1.3–4, 8.9; 3.4.6, 13.14; 3.9.1–3, 10.2; 4.3.1–5, 5.8; 5.9.4–5, 10.7; 7.2.3–4; 8.1.16–17, 7.3 ff., 7.9–8.11. The last case is the most extensive, as the protagonists re-narrate pretty well the entire novel to the Syracusan assembly. The plot-function of this is to motivate the festivities with which the story concludes, but in this case the length of the analepsis suggests that the recapitulation is also partly for the benefit of the primary narratee, who now at last can see the unity of the plot.
chronology and even accuracy to be taken. Here is the lamentation of Callirhoe, after she has been sold to Dionysius’ steward. It is obvious that the interpretation of her experiences implicit in this enumeration of them differs from that of the primary narrator and expresses her character in a particularly distressing situation:

‘First you [sc. Fortune] made my lover my murderer—Chaereas, who had never even struck a slave, kicked me and killed me, me who loved him; then you gave me into the hands of tomb robbers and brought me out from the tomb on to the sea, and set over me the pirates, who were more frightening than the waves. My celebrated beauty I was given to this end that the brigand Theron should get a high price for me. I have been sold in a deserted spot and not even taken to a city like any other bought slave—Fortune, you were afraid people might see me and think me nobly born! That is why I have been handed over like a mere chattel to I kn o w n o tw h o m , G r e e k so rb a r b a r i a n so rb r i g a n d so n c em o r e … Truly I am lost to you, Chaereas, separated from you by so vast an ocean! You are mourning for me and repenting and sitting by an empty tomb, proclaiming my chastity now that I am dead; and I, Hermocrates’ daughter, your wife, have been sold this day to a master!’

Prolepses

The vast majority of prolepses in Callirhoe are internal. But just as there is persistent looking back to Hermocrates’ defeat of the Athenians, there is one event beyond the end of the story which is referred to several times: the return of Callirhoe’s son to Syracuse and the greatness he will achieve there. The historical identity of this child is never specified, but Chariton may be trading on his audience’s knowledge of the importance of people named Dionysius in the history of fourth-century Syracuse. In other words, the prominent external analepses and prolepses both serve to anchor the fictional plot more firmly in perceived historical reality.

In addition the novel ends with an external actorial prolepsis, as Callirhoe prays to Aphrodite for a happy life together with Chaereas. Formally, of course, the text offers no sign whether this wish comes

11 Comparable lamentations at 1.8.3–4; 3.8.9, 10.4–8; 4.1.11–12, 3.10; 5.1.4–7; 5.2–3; 10.6–9; 6.2.5–8, 6.2–5; 7.5.2–5.
12 2.9.1ff.; 3.8.8; 8.4.5; 5.15; 7.12.
13 8.8.16: ‘I do not blame you, lady, for what I have suffered; it was my fate. Do not separate me from Chaereas again, I beg of you; grant us a happy life together and let us die together!’
true or not; but the implication of its placing, in conjunction with the generic happy ending, is that the protagonists will share a happy lifetime together after the end of the story, and that the story ends when it does because nothing narratable happens to them again.\textsuperscript{14}

The internal prolepses of this novel fall into six broad categories: a) explicit narratorial prolepses, on various scales; b) narratorial references to the decisions of gods, etc., which carry the implication of certain fulfilment; c) various foreshadowing devices, such as dreams and omens (there are no oracles in this novel); d) actorial prolepses, when characters think, as they often do in this text, about the future; much of what they say is wishful thinking, which nevertheless delineates the paths that the story might take, and is sometimes actually predictive; e) seeds, that is to say, details that will be important in the development of the plot but whose significance is not necessarily immediately apparent; f) intertextual analogues whose parallel to the story provides implicit predictions.

a) A clear example of a simple narratorial prolepsis occurs at 1.6.5 in connection with Callirhoe’s funeral:

\begin{quotation}
And what was done with the intention of paying honour to the dead girl started a train of greater events. (1.6.5)
\end{quotation}

The ‘train of greater events’ begins immediately, as Theron sees the wealth being entombed with the apparently dead heroine and conceives his scheme of robbery, which in its turn leads directly to the separation and adventures of the protagonists. Thus the prolepsis encompasses the whole of the story, but its lack of specific detail gives away nothing beyond the fact that a story is about to happen; the primary narratee must continue reading to form any idea at all of the great events that will come to pass. The positioning of this prolepsis is clearly strategic: the novel appears to have lost its heroine, against all the rules of the genre, within the first few pages; but the prolepsis provides a formal reassurance that this is not the end of the story.

This passage is, however, not typical of Chariton’s technique. Later narratorial prolepses tend to be of a rather shorter range and function to move the story forward into its next episode; we seem to be dealing with the ‘header’ technique, also found in Homer (→) or Pindar (→).

\textsuperscript{14} In a sense, then, all these novels end generically with an external prolepsis: ‘and they lived happily ever after’.
For instance, when Mithridates is perishing of love for Callirhoe, the narrator says:

He would have perished altogether if he had not found consolation in the following way …

(4.2.5)

And then moves directly into the events that brought him the consolation—the discovery of Chaereas among his slaves. On other occasions, the narrator looks forward not to events but to the future of his own act of narration; we are dealing with a cross-reference rather than a prolepsis. This is another technique for moving the story forwards, without disclosing any significant details. We have already seen how the major analepsis at the very centre of the text (5.1.1) turns at its close to such a cross-reference (‘Now I shall describe what happened next’). There is a similar effect at the point when the narrator makes the first major switch between the two story-lines of the central part of the story (3.2.17):

But once more, even on that day, the evil spirit vented his spite. How he did so I shall tell you shortly; first I want to relate what happened in Syracuse during the same time.

(3.2.17)

b) In this last example the narrator’s cross-reference is combined with a statement about divine activity. There is a similar combination in the novel’s lengthiest and most interesting proleptic passage, which occurs at the beginning of the last book, again in combination with a major and explicit analepsis:

But Fortune was minded to do something as cruel as it was paradoxical: Chaereas was to have Callirhoe in his possession and fail to recognise her; while taking others’ wives on board of his ships to carry them off, he was to leave his own behind, not like Ariadne asleep, and not for Dionysus to be her bridegroom, but as spoils of war for his own enemies. But Aphrodite thought this too harsh; she was growing less angry with him. At first she had been incensed by his misplaced jealousy: she had given him the fairest of gifts, fairer even than the gift she had accorded to Alexander Paris, and he had repaid her kindness with arrogance. But now that Chaereas had made honourable amends to Love, in that he had wandered the world from west to east and gone through untold suffering, Aphrodite took pity on him; having harassed by land and sea

---

15 This promise is not exactly fulfilled: in the first place the section of the story occupied with events in Syracuse (the Chaereas strand) is not short; and when the Callirhoe strand is eventually resumed the activities of the ‘evil spirit’ are not mentioned. Nonetheless the prolepsis is not felt or intended as a false one, and its effect is still to move the narrative into a new section.
the handsome couple she had originally brought together, she decided now to reunite them. And I think that this last chapter will prove very agreeable to its readers: it cleanses away the grim events of the earlier ones. There will be no more pirates or slavery or lawsuits or fighting or suicide or wars or conquests; now there will be lawful love and sanctioned marriage. So I shall tell you how the goddess brought the truth to light and revealed the unrecognised pair to each other.

(8.1.2–5)

Here, uniquely in this novel, the narrator gives a detailed and explicit prolepsis of events to come, looking forward over the whole of the eighth book. The narratee is left in no doubt that the story is going to end happily, although the precise mechanism by which it will reach the required conclusion remains the object of some suspense. But we may note that here, in the latter part of the extract quoted, the prolepsis is combined with a cross-reference: we hear not so much of the events themselves as of the telling of them by the narrator. And the first part of the extract concerns the thoughts and intentions of two deities, Tyche and Aphrodite. Although these concern the future and their proleptic truth is implicitly guaranteed, nonetheless the thoughts themselves arguably come in approximately the appropriate chronological place. In this way Chariton contrives to have his cake and eat it: he can exploit the literary effects of prolepsis while formally respecting the strictly chronological order his narratorial persona demands.

It is, then, characteristic that the greatest number of Chariton’s prolepses is associated in some form with divine activity. This technique is employed as early as the first chapter of the narrative, when, after the introduction of the heroine, we are told:

But Eros intended to make a match of his own devising … Eros likes to win and enjoys succeeding against the odds. He looked for his opportunity and found it as follows. (1.1.3–4)

This looks forward to the first encounter and instant inamoration of the protagonists. Later in the story, this kind of prolepsis is used to introduce a plot-twist or move the story on to its next phase. So, for example, when Callirhoe prays at the temple of Aphrodite near Miletus that she should be attractive to no one but Chaereas,

Aphrodite refused her prayer. After all, she is the mother of Eros, and she was now planning another marriage—which she did not intend to preserve either. (2.2.8)

This refers to Callirhoe’s relationship with Dionysius, whom she will reluctantly marry to provide a father for Chaereas’ child. But the last
clause looks much further forward, to Dionysius’ loss of Callirhoe. It seems clear enough that the divine prolepsis, here as elsewhere, inscribes the narratee’s sense of generic propriety: it is unusual enough for a romantic heroine to commit bigamy, but it would be quite unthinkable for her not to be reunited eventually with her true love; without being specific about details and dissipating the narratee’s curiosity, the intrusion of Aphrodite provides a reassuring guarantee that the fiction will ultimately comply with the romantic norms. On the other hand, personified Fortune intervenes to thwart those same generic expectations, as in this passage leading to Callirhoe’s discovery of her pregnancy:

Fortune outwitted her, though; Fortune, against whom alone human calculation has no power. For Fortune relishes victory, and anything may be expected of her. So now she brought about an unexpected, indeed incredible state of things. How she did it is worth hearing. Fortune laid her plot against Callirhoe’s loyalty to her husband.

This passage is in delicate balance with the previous quotation. Neither reveals anything very specific about the way the story will go; but the medium-term threat to Callirhoe’s loyalty to Chaereas has to be read against the longer-term assurance that her second marriage will not survive. These carefully staged and limited glimpses of the future guide the narratee’s expectations and responses.¹⁶

c) Unlike other novels, Callirhoe contains no formal oracles. There is one case of favourable omens from a sacrifice (8.2.9), when Chaereas makes an offering to Aphrodite at Paphos, which both foreshadow and prompt the return of the protagonists and their companions to Sicily. Nor does the novel make use of elaborately predictive dreams. Though its dreams are implicitly god-sent and authoritative, they are often used to motivate action in the short-term rather than provide previews of long-term plotting. Two partial exceptions are provided by complexes where the dream is interpreted within the narrative frame. In the first, Dionysius dreams of his first wife:

‘she was taller and more beautiful—I saw her there beside me as clearly as if I were awake. In my dream it was the first day of our married life;
I was bringing her home after our wedding, from my estate by the sea, and you were singing the wedding song.’ (2.1.2)

This foretells in fact Dionysius’ second marriage to Callirhoe, who also comes to his house from his seaside estate, and surpasses all women in beauty. This interpretation is immediately advanced by Dionysius’ major-domo, Leonas, who has just purchased Callirhoe with the intention that his master should fall in love with her. Similar is 5.5.5, where, just before the court at Babylon goes into session:

she saw herself in Syracuse entering Aphrodite’s shrine, still a maiden; then returning from there and seeing Chaereas and her wedding day. She saw Syracuse all decked out with garlands and herself being escorted by her father and mother to the bridegroom’s house. She was on the point of embracing Chaereas when she suddenly started up from her dream. (5.5.5)

When she tells her servant Plangon of this dream she is told that it is good and will ‘happen in reality’. The prolepsis is double: it both fore-shadows the unexpected reappearance of Chaereas in the courtroom, and looks forward to the return of the couple of protagonists to Syracuse at the very end of the novel, when their first wedding will be as it were re-enacted.18

d) It is difficult to generalise about actorial prolepses in this novel, as many characters think at various moments of their hopes and wishes for the future. The extent to which these cases accurately foreshadow the future varies enormously, as does their authority. So, for example, when Dionysius, after a first rebuff from Callirhoe,

\[\text{did not give up hope of winning Callirhoe over; Love is naturally optimistic, and he was confident that by attention to her he could achieve his desires,} \] (2.6.4)

we can easily see that his hopes are unlikely to come to fruition, because we know of Callirhoe’s unshakeable devotion to Chaereas. So although Dionysius, at the level of character, intends this to be a true prolepsis, at the level of the primary narrator and narratee this is a false prolepsis, more significant as an index of character than as a narratological device. On the other hand, a character’s thoughts

---

17 Unexpected to Callirhoe, that is. The primary narratee knows that Chaereas has come to Babylon with Mithridates, and so is better placed to interpret the dream than the characters themselves.

18 Other dreams, at 1.12.5; 2.3.5, 9.6; 4.1.1; 8.2.9 are harder to classify as proleptic.
about the future can sometimes be used to signal a possible course that the story might take, and so dramatise the issues involved. A good example of this occurs in 2.9.1ff., where Plangon and Callirhoe develop diametrically opposed strategies for the future based on the fact of Callirhoe’s pregnancy: Plangon foreseeing that it is exactly the tool needed to persuade Callirhoe to marry Dionysius, while Callirhoe first considers abortion, and then at length imagines a son like his father who will regain his rightful place in the world and sail back to Syracuse to rediscover his true family. Neither exactly foreshadows the future, though both correctly foresee some elements of it: the point rather is that the conclusion of the second book uses these partial prolepses to delineate a problem which the next book will resolve.

On other occasions, however, the actorial prolepsis serves to predict the future pretty accurately, although one might argue that the primary narratee is not in a position to judge their accuracy, except in retrospect. To take just two examples, both connected with Dionysius. Soon after falling in love with Callirhoe, he is reluctant to take her back to the city, because when people saw her, they would all talk about her, her beauty would enslave the whole of Ionia, and report of her would reach the Great King himself. (2.7.1)

And later, when she has agreed to marry him, he again ponders whether to celebrate a hasty marriage in the country, or do it in style in the city:

‘Even now Rumour is rushing to carry to Sicily the strange news that Callirhoe is alive—tomb robbers opened her tomb and carried her off, and she has been sold in Miletus! Syracusan warships will soon be descending on us with Hermocrates in command, demanding his daughter’s restoration. What am I to say? “Theron has sold her to me.” “Theron? Where is he?” Even if they believe me, am I to tell them the truth—that I receive stolen goods from a pirate? Practice your defence, Dionysius; you may have to plead it before the Great King.’ (3.2.7)

Elements of this passage prefigure the development of the story with uncanny accuracy, before there is ever any suspicion of the Great King becoming involved in the intrigue. But, even once their accuracy is recognised retrospectively, the primary effect is ironic: Dionysius is arguing that a formal wedding in town is less likely to spawn disastrous rumours, but in the end his decision to marry Callirhoe in Miletus produces exactly the results he here attributes to the alternative course of action.
d) Chariton’s novel is not rich in seeds. Here we shall briefly note just one: the temple of Aphrodite near Miletus. The seed is first planted in 1.14, when Leonas is awestruck by Callirhoe’s appearance, because it is local belief that Aphrodite manifests herself in the area. Later, Plangon advises Callirhoe to go to Aphrodite’s shrine to pray, and it is on her second visit there that Dionysius first sees her, and falls instantly in love, and later it is his chosen site for the first attempt to woo her. Because the place holds such special meaning for him, he dedicates there a golden image of Callirhoe, which is duly encountered by Chaereas when he lands by chance in the same locality, and becomes the means through which he learns that Callirhoe has married for a second time.

e) In a broad sense all the Greek novels are built on the foundations of the *Odyssey* and the plots of Athenian New Comedy. These guarantee generically the way that plots will achieve closure. But within the genre of romance, Chariton is particularly adept at exploiting intertextual parallels as a way of controlling the realisation of his text. The insertion of whole lines more or less verbatim from the Homeric poems confirms parallels between Callirhoe and the two Homeric heroines, Helen and Penelope.19 Like Helen, Callirhoe has two husbands, the second in Asia and the first in Greece, who comes to reclaim her. As soon as the pattern is recognised, it provides an implicit prolepsis of the ending of her story: as Helen returned to Menelaus, so eventually Callirhoe is certain to return to Chaereas.20 And like Penelope she remains ambiguously faithful to her husband, despite the existence of other claimants to her hand; here the implicit prolepsis is of return and reunion.

However, Homeric intertexts also provide more explicit and shorter-term prolepses. For example, at 6.2.4, when Artaxerxes is thinking about how he can take Callirhoe for himself, the narrator quotes a line from the passage of the *Iliad* where Agamemnon is confronted with the question of returning Chryseis to her father. The parallels between the two situations—a great king who desires a woman who is in some sense forbidden to him—already hints that Artaxerxes’ passion for Callirhoe

---


20 The parallel is double-edged, however. At 5.2.8 Dionysius ponders on the story of Helen, casting himself in the role of Menelaus. The analogue leads him to fear that there will be some Paris among the Persians, who will steal his wife from him.
will end in much the same way as Agamemnon’s for Chryseis, in other words that he will eventually relinquish her.\textsuperscript{21}

Homer is not the only source of such proleptic parallels. One simple example occurs at 1.6.2, when the apparently dead Callirhoe is compared to the sleeping Ariadne. The comparison speaks to the narratee, who knows that she is merely unconscious, prefiguring her awakening. And in a sense that no first-time reader would perceive, the fact that Ariadne, after being treated badly by her first husband, becomes the bride of Dionysus, foreshadows Callirhoe’s second marriage, to a man named Dionysius.\textsuperscript{22}

**Simultaneity and parallel storylines**

Hägg has calculated that Chaereas and Callirhoe are separated for about eighty percent of the narrative.\textsuperscript{23} After Callirhoe is stolen from the tomb by Theron and his gang, the narrative stays with her until the point where she decides to marry Dionysius, when the narrator wrenches the story back to Chaereas in Syracuse (3.2.17, quoted above). He then narrates what Chaereas has been doing during this time. The same time period (around two months) is thus narrated twice over, but with no repetition of material. This technique, however, is exceptional. The narrative stays with Chaereas until the end of 3.6, and it is in the following chapter that Callirhoe gives birth to her son, seven months after marrying Dionysius. The impression given is that the events centring on Chaereas have taken up those seven months, during which time Callirhoe’s position has been more or less stable. At 4.2.1 there is another transition from Callirhoe back to Chaereas, which indicates that Chaereas’ position has not materially altered since the last time he was the centre of attention.

So Callirhoe was burying Chaereas in Miletus while Chaereas was working in Caria in chains. He was soon physically worn out …\textsuperscript{24} (4.2.1)

\textsuperscript{21} On this see Biraud 1986.

\textsuperscript{22} Allusions linking Callirhoe to Ariadne occur also at 3.3.5; 4.1.8; 8.1.2. The last of these examples (quoted above) finally negates the parallel, and makes the play on the names of Dionysus and Dionysius most obvious.

\textsuperscript{23} Hägg 1971: 140.

\textsuperscript{24} Note that the Greek text here has a simple *men … de* antithesis, without the explicit temporal correlation of the English ‘while’.
The imperfect *eirgazo* (‘was working’) covers a continuous and unchanging state of affairs stretching to when Chaereas was last seen. Now the narrative continues, from the moment the attention leaves Callirhoe, and things start to happen again with Chaereas. Hägg likens the procedure, which is found from Homer onwards, to a relay race: ‘first one person, then the other is responsible for the action narrated, but the same stretch of time is not traversed more than once’.

**Rhythm**

Forty-four percent of Chariton’s text is taken up with direct speech, which finds its characteristic home in ‘scenes’, where the pace of the narrative slows right down, and events are presented almost dramatically, as if playing out in real time. These slower narrative sections, which occupy (on Hägg’s calculation) some ninety percent of the text, are generally meticulously marked by the passage of days and nights. The ‘scenes’ are connected by rapidly narrated stretches of longer time. The alternation of summaries and scenes is what one finds in most narratives, of course, but it is particularly conspicuous in Chariton, as his summaries are very summary and his scenes very extended. This feature of Chariton’s narrative has been subjected to detailed analysis by Hägg and the present treatment can do no more than restate and exemplify his conclusions.

To take just one example, from the point where the narrative switches back to Callirhoe in 3.7.1. The incident where Chaereas’ ship is ambushed and destroyed by the Persian garrison acting on a tip-off from Dionysius’ steward Phocas, although of great importance in the story, is disposed of in fewer than twenty lines of text. A dream of Chaereas appears to Callirhoe, and although some words are spoken, the narration is still brief. As a result of the dream Dionysius is much perturbed, consoles his wife and watches over her ‘for many days’ (3.7.7). Callirhoe’s child is born, and she quickly recovers from the birth (3.8.3). At a public ceremony to celebrate, the pace slows. The text presents Dionysius’ prayer to Aphrodite, followed by Callirhoe’s, a dialogue between Callirhoe and the priestess of the temple about the two strangers who had recently visited the temple. The pace picks up.

26 Cf. also Reardon 1989: 11, for a summary of Hägg’s findings.
again momentarily, as Dionysius becomes jealous, and then slows down for another scene, when he interviews Phocas, learns about the ship, reacts emotionally, interrogates Phocas in detail, and, after corroborating Phocas’ story, tells Callirhoe what he has learned. She laments at length, and the day that began with the ceremony only finishes at the beginning of book 4. This patterning of alternating rapid and slow narration persists throughout the novel, and is clearly designed to throw the story’s emotional climaxes into relief. The scene par excellence of this text is the trial at Babylon, which is presented in great detail, with full presentation of rhetorical speeches on both sides.

Scenes without direct speech are less common. Hägg singles out the narrative of the royal hunt (6.4.1–6), where vivid descriptive details, of the kind lacking from most of the narrative, abound.27 Chariton, however, never completely pauses his narrative for a descriptive excursus.

Frequency

Frequency is not really much of an issue for Chariton’s simply narrated novel: the singulative mode predominates massively. Repetition is confined to the analeptic summaries discussed above. There are one or two cases where Chariton appears to be engaging in iterative presentation, though he does not mark it specifically as such. The clearest example is at 1.11.1–4, which covers the voyage in Theron’s ship from Syracuse to Athens. The voyage itself passes in a line or two, though it takes several days. But in the course of it, Callirhoe laments her fate, in direct speech. The narrative resumes:

While she was lamenting her lot in this fashion, the brigands were sailing past small islands and towns. (1.11.4)

We are hardly intended to assume that her lament lasted the whole of the voyage, or that she only voiced her sorrows once. It is easier to assume that the short speech contained in the text is intended as a representative instance of repeated behaviour, and that a single example is narrated to stand for many.28

27 Hägg 1971: 93.
28 Another possible example of iterative presentation is the account of the thoughts of Mithridates before he departs for Babylon (4.7.2).
Chariton’s handling of time is thus relatively simple, but the apparent simplicity masks an assured competence and sense of effect. His novel offers an informative comparison, in one direction to the more unsophisticated Xenophon of Ephesus, and in the other to the self-conscious non-linearity and complexity of the later novelists.