Em suma, quer se chegue a velho (com saúde, sem assistir à partida prematura de filhos e netos e com uma morte coroada de glória), como Telo, quer se morra jovem, mas no auge da notoriedade, à imagem de Cléobis e Biton, a eutychia do indivíduo avalia-se até ao momento do sopro derradeiro, não para lá deste. Daí que a forma e as circunstâncias em que se finaliza a vida (τελευτεΐν) constituam o factor determinante na classificação do homem como um ser feliz ou miserável.

Paradoxalmente, ou não, a morte constitui-se em Heródoto como o principal critério de felicidade humana.
In recent decades, research on the Greek novels has increased spectacularly. Over the past centuries these novels have been reviled as trivial literature, having nothing to do with the 'Edle Einfalt und stille Gröisse' that might be expected from classical literature. Now however, research is examining the origins of the genre, its literary forerunners, the social climate in which it grew, the (reading or listening) public of the novels, etc. Some scholars even maintain the thesis that the novels cover a whole network of symbolic relations. Increasing activity can also be found in historical research into ancient novels. It is a historical approach which I intend to use here to examine the institutional framework of the first extant novel, Callirhoe by Chariton of Aphrodisias.

**HISTORICAL LAYERS IN CALLIRHOE**

The Greek novel features grand and grotesque adventures, unbelievable events, miraculous rescues and strongly idealized character portrayal, remote indeed from any historical reality, or even from any logical train of thought. On the other hand, one can clearly see that all these are situated in a social context that is familiar to the reader, one in which the reader can 'feel at home'. The reason for this choice of context can easily be found in the fact that '(...) the 'creators' of prose fiction were anxious not to lose their public's attention by losing all traces of recognizable social reality'; on the contrary:

2 In this work, I use the title Callirhoe instead of Chaereas and Callirhoe. The reason has to do with the textual tradition: although the title of the medieval manuscripts is τῶν περὶ χαρίσεων Καλλιρόην (λόγον), the very last sentence of the novel pleads for a title mentioning only Callirhoe. In addition, the fact that Callirhoe is in fact the only 'real' protagonist of the novel, speaks for this possibility. Final proof was offered by the Michailidis papyrus (published in 1955) being more or less 1000 years older than the other material we possess and mentioning the title used here. The longer title could have come into use in the Byzantine period, on the analogy of the novels of Xenophon, Achilles Tatius, Longus and Heliodorus. These novels mention explicitly both the female and the male protagonist in their titles. Cf. Goold 1995, 3-4.

3 Wiersma 1990, 110. More or less the same point of view is presented by Morgan 1982, 222: 'a novelist who wishes to be plausible cannot afford to move very far away from the real world and the way things happen there. The more realistic he wishes to appear, the closer to experience he must remain and the more restraints he must put on his imagination. ... When the term realism is used, then, what is meant is something a novelist does to help his reader delude himself that what he is reading is true.'

What does that mean for a historical approach to Callirhoe? That the novel can be considered a reliable copy of reality? Of course the answer is no. When we search for historical realia or historical processes that lie behind the fictional glamour of the novel's heroes, we have to be aware of some obstacles the author has put in our path. The author writes his novel in complete liberty: he can deform reality, he can exaggerate or minimize, he can banalize or idealize, dramatize or eroticize. He is able to introduce or eliminate in his story, for ideological or other reasons, whatever he wants. Moreover a historical approach can be hampered by the poetics of the author, by his use of irony and by intertextuality. Thus, in using this approach to the Greek novel (i.e. Callirhoe), we must be aware of a series of methodological problems. These have been discussed in many publications in recent years. Throughout this article I will give a few examples of some of these procedures which Chariton adopts to deform reality, but it is not my intention to study them in depth.

I would like to focus on an aspect that is fundamental for any historical approach to Chariton's novel: the historical layers in Callirhoe. Callirhoe shows some of the main characteristics of what modern literary theory would call a 'historical novel'. The author lived between 50 and 150 A.D. but he satiated his story at the end of the fifth century B.C., more exactly between 413 (the Syracusian victory over the Athenian fleet, mentioned many times in the novel) and 407 (the death of Hermocrates, the Syracusian στρατηγός and father of Callirhoe in Chariton's novel). According to some scholars, the reasons for this return to classical ages must be situated in a context of melancholic and nationalistic longing for the days before Roman domination in Greece and Asia Minor, a context of longing for ancient values such as liberty and independence. In this context of melancholic and idealizing nationalism, Athens is regarded as the ideal πόλις symbolizing these values.

Of course this complicates extremely the problematic character of any historical approach to Callirhoe: Chariton wants to draw a fifth century picture, but he doesn't succeed in doing so consistently or according to the
criteria of a modern historical novel\(^7\). Where does Chariton represent the fifth century context - according to his intentions - and where do his words or reasonings reveal that he has in mind the first century world that surrounds him? Where is the author aware of the historical character of his novel, and where does he introduce anachronistic situations, object or ideas? Does Chariton offer us information on his own time, on the fifth century B.C. or on both? Or does he mingle the two chronological layers into one unrecongnizable - and for the historian worthless - entity?

In the novel three categories of historical elements can be distinguished. First of all Chariton succeeds now and then in placing correct fifth century elements in their historical context. Chariton's Syracuse, for example, is - just as it should be - a democratic polis,\(^8\) while Acragas (nowadays Agrigento) and Rhegium (nowadays Reggio di Calabria) are ruled by a tyrannos\(^9\).

More often, Callirhoe is a mirror for first century reality. The first way in which this reality can be discovered is offered by the periodically undetermined elements. These are elements that Chariton adopts from his own time, but which, in their generality or their vagueness, don't disturb the fifth century framework. Let's take as an example the funeral of Callirhoe in the first chapter of the novel (1,6,2 ff.). Chaereas, overwhelmed by anger and jealousy, hits his wife Callirhoe, who falls in a state of apparent death. The next morning she is buried with all the glamour that can be expected at the funeral of Hermocrates' daughter: she is lying on a golden bier and is buried in her bridal dress (νυμφική? έσθήτα, 1,6,2) in the magnificent family tomb of her father (τάφος μεγαλοκριτής Ἐρμοκριτοῦ, 1,6,5). The fact that Callirhoe is buried in her bridal dress is no sentimental invention by Chariton: in the fifth century B.C. as well as in the first century A.D. women were generally buried in a fine attire, and the bridal dress was used for in their generality or their vagueness, don't disturb the fifth century framework. Let's take as an example the funeral of Callirhoe in the first chapter of the novel (1,6,2 ff.). Chaereas, overwhelmed by anger and jealousy, hits his wife Callirhoe, who falls in a state of apparent death. The next morning she is buried with all the glamour that can be expected at the funeral of Hermocrates' daughter: she is lying on a golden bier and is buried in her bridal dress (νυμφική? έσθήτα, 1,6,2) in the magnificent family tomb of her father (τάφος μεγαλοκριτής Ἐρμοκριτοῦ, 1,6,5). The fact that Callirhoe is buried in her bridal dress is no sentimental invention by Chariton: in the fifth century B.C. as well as in the first century A.D. women were generally buried in a fine attire, and the bridal dress was used for recently married or soon-to-be married girls\(^9\). The great family tomb also fits in the picture: burying someone of high birth in such a tomb was quite normal during the classical period as well as during the principate\(^10\).

The second way of discovering the contemporary reality behind Callirhoe is offered by the many anachronisms in Chariton's novel. One example can be found in the hunting scene in which the Persian king Artaxerxes appears in a cloak of Tyrian purple and carries a Chinese bow and quiver (6,4,2). Apart from stressing the wealth of the king, this passage also informs us about trade relations in the Roman empire. A cloak of Tyrian purple is of course realistic for a Persian king in the fifth century B.C., but the Chinese bow and quiver are not. Trade relations with China came into being in the second half of the first century B.C.\(^11\) Since it were the Augustan poets who introduced China in their poetry, because of the exoticism, the possibility of a Greek τόπος creeping into the story can be also rejected: Chariot represents a Parthian first century reality instead of a Persian fifth century one\(^12\).

Following these preliminary explorations, it seems a logical step to examine in what proportion the historical (fifth century) and contemporary (first century) elements appear within a specific domain. I will focus on the institutional realia in the novel. On the institutional level Chariton tries to evoke a framework fitting in the fifth century context. In the following pages I will try to answer some questions regarding this attempt. How does he try to evoke the fifth century situation? To what extent does he succeed? And where and how does he fail? We will see that Chariton offers a lot of institutional information to the modern historian; mostly however, it will be information Chariton has never wanted to offer, information he offers without knowing he does!

Before I can answer these questions concretely, another brief note is necessary. Chariton himself lived in Aphrodisias but his characters in the novel travel from one place to another. The story begins at Syracuse, but the reader straight to Babylon, via Miletus, Cilicia and Syria. The adventures cover an area of almost 3000 kilometres! This implies a many-coloured variety of customs, cultures, languages and institutional realities. Any historically justified research on the institutional realia in Chariton's novel is forced to split up the institutional framework geographically, taking into account the different regions the characters visit. First I will examine the

\(^7\) Tomas Hagg examined to what extent we can call Callirhoe and Parthenope 'historical novels' (Hagg 1987). His conclusion is that certain main characteristics can be found in Parthenope and Callirhoe, but that - of course - these two novels can't be referred to as 'real' historical novels, in the modern sense because 'The kind of historical consciousness needed to recreate a historical past, or to realize the problem at all, simply was not at his disposal' (ibid., 198).

\(^8\) Acragas: ο Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος (1, 2, 4); Rhegium: ὑφὸς τοῦ Πυθιάν ταυτάραν (1, 2, 2). Cf. Voza 1976, 871-872; RE, s.v. Syracusa, esp. sub IV; RE, s.v. Regium, esp. 497-500; Der kleine Pauly, s.v. Rhegion, 1392-1393; Drögelmüller 1969, 68 & 97-98; Linton 1982, 63 & 185-221.

\(^9\) Wesseling 1993, 122.


\(^11\) Goold 1995, 297, n. e.

\(^12\) Baslez 1992, 204.
institutional context of Syracuse. Then follows the institutional framework of the Persian empire and finally that of Egypt.

INSTITUTIONS IN CHARITON

Before conducting the actual analysis of the institutional framework, I will, for clarity’s sake, first indicate briefly the relevant passages in Chariton’s text. What does Chariton actually tell us about institutions appearing in his novel?

In Syracuse the leadership lies in the hands of Hermocrates, the στρατηγός (1,1,1). Apart from the military level, his importance lies mostly in the political field: he summons the assembly (3,4,3), seals the fate of Theron (3,4,16; 3,4,18) and makes decisions concerning the embassy to Miletus (3,4,16-17). His political opponent is Chaereas’ father, Ariston: because of the rivalry between these two politicians, a marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe seems impossible at the beginning of the novel (1,1,3).

The assembly (ἐκκλησία) is summoned three times. The first time it has to decide about a marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe (1,1,11-13). It comes into action a second time when Theron has to be questioned (3,4,3-4) and finally it appears a third time when the two protagonists reach Syracuse after their adventures (8,7,1). The assembly is always summoned in the theatre (1,1,12; 8,7,1) and on two occasions women are present (3,4,4; 8,7,1). The interrogation of Theron is assisted by some οίκεται δημόσιοι, who bring the accused for trial (3,4,7). The άρχοντες also appear in Chariton’s Syracuse, but they act only on the juridical level: they summon the members of the δικαστήριον to judge Chaereas after the ‘murder’ of his wife (1,5,2).

As well as the assembly, Chariton also mentions the council (βουλή): the members of the βουλή and the άρχοντες attend Callirhoe’s funeral (1,6,3), and when Theron confesses his crimes, Hermocrates suggests that two men of the assembly and two men of the council should accompany Chaereas on his way to Miletus (3,4,17).

Next to the theatre, the αγορά also seems a vital centre: there the trial of Chaereas is held (1,5,3) and it is also there that Hermocrates can be found when the two protagonists return to Syracuse (8,6,3). The Δέσποτα also appears as the ‘heart’ of Athens (1,11,5), Miletus (1,13,6; 2,1,6) and Aradus (7,6,3).

Let us now have a look at the Persian empire, within which we distinguish the level of the satrapy and that of the city. Chariton speaks about three Persian satrapies (σατραπεία, 4,6,6; 5,8,8): Caria is the satrapy of Mithridates (4,1,7), and Pharmaces is in charge of Lydia15 (ibid.). Dionysios, the most important man of Miletus and a friend (1,12,6) and slave (4,6,8) of the great king Artaxerxes, stands under the authority of Pharmaces (4,6,1-4).16 Egypt is also a satrapy of the Persian empire: the satrap of Egypt is killed by Egyptian rebels (6,8,2). About other provinces of the Persian empire, Chariton gives no information. The only remark we can make for now is that the three satrapies in Chariton’s novel were indeed satrapies of the Persian empire in the fifth century B.C.17

The satraps are mostly indicated by the usual title of ‘σατράπης’18. Now and then however, the term άρχοντας is used as a synonym (For Mithridates in 4,1,9; 4,5,5; 4,6,4. For Pharmaces in 4,6,1). Once Mithridates is even called a στρατηγός (8,8,2) and ήγεμον (5,6,8). Both terms aren’t unequivocal: στρατηγός is also the term by which Bias of Priene is indicated, and he is not in charge of a satrapy but of a city (4,5,5; 4,5,6; 4,5,8). The same term is used once to refer to the generals of the Persian king (4,7,2). ήγεμον, in turn, is also used to indicate high functionaries in the entourage of the king (5,4,6; 6,8,6).

At a certain moment the satrap Mithridates is planning a rebellion against Artaxerxes. When he is summoned to Babylon to defend himself against the charge of Dionysios, he thinks about taking Miletus, killing Dionysios, kidnapping Callirhoe, and revolting against Artaxerxes (4,7,1). Only the message that Dionysios and Callirhoe have already left for Babylon can stop him from doing so (4,7,3-4). Moreover, the fact that the danger of a rebellion organised by a satrap (i.e. Mithridates) is not unreal becomes clear when Artaxerxes utters the fear that Mithridates might plan such a rebellion (4,6,6-7).

15 Pharmaces’ satrapy is referred to as ‘Lydia’, or as ‘Lydia and Ionia’.

16 In this passage Dionysios complains to Pharmaces about Dionysius’ behaviour and calls Pharmaces his master (ὁ δέσποτα).

17 Egypt was conquered at the end of the sixth century by Cambyses. Briant 1996, 61-66.

18 Cf. 2, 4, 4; 4, 1, 7; 4, 2, 4; 4, 6, 3; 4, 6, 4; 5, 1, 8; 5, 2, 9; 5, 6, 8; 5, 8, 7; 6, 8, 2.
Let us now consider the central Persian authority: Artaxerxes. In Babylon the residence (5,2,2) of the Persian great king is the venue for the trial that is held to investigate what is true of Dioyios' charge against Mithridates. Therefore Dionyios, Callirhoe and Mithridates are summoned to Babylon (4,6,8).

The official title of Artaxerxes is 'Βασιλεύς Βασιλέων' (4,6,3). Many times he is described as a supreme dictator (6,7,3; 6,3,2), who has military (6,8,3-4) and juridical (5,2,3; 5,6,8; 6,1,8) power. Moreover the whole empire is his own domain (6,5,9). Since he is a descendant of 'Ηλιος (6,1,10), he is considered a god (6,7,12) and honoured with the προσκύνησις (6,7,3). But in reality he doesn't act like an absolute dictator: his decisions draw upon the advice of his φίλοι (5,8,6) and although he has supreme juridical power, the trial is conducted by judges (5,4,8).

Even Artaxerxes' wife Statira, who is herself honoured with the προσκύνησις (5,3,3; 6,7,5; 8,5,5), addresses her husband by his title (8,5,9) and kneels before the eunuch when she hears the name of the king (6,7,5).

The entourage of the king at the court of Babylon is described in detail by Chariton. First of all there is the eunuch (εύνούχος) Artaxates, who is described as 'the most important man with the greatest influence on the king' (5,2,2; 6,2,2) and with whom the king has a confidential relationship (6,3,1; 6,4,8).

The personal entourage of the king also consists of a group of nobles, the ὀμοτίμοι, whom Mithridates sees first when he waits for the king (5,2,2). These ὀμοτίμοι appear a second time when Artaxerxes summons them to a meeting about the crisis in Egypt (6,8,4). Then there are the freedmen (οἱ ἐξελευθεροί) of the king, standing around his throne during the trial, together with the ταξιαρχοί and the λοχαγοί (5,4,6). The king is also surrounded by his so called φίλοι, a personal group of advisers. Finally we get a glimpse of the harems, in which queen Statira and the wives of prominent Persians pass their time (5,3,1; 5,9,1). These φίλοι appear a few times. First they give advice to the king when he has read the letter of Mithridates (4,6,5). During the trial they are seated next to the throne of the king (5,4,5). A third time they advise the king to summon Callirhoe to the trial (5,4,12). Finally the king consults his φίλοι after the first part of the trial (5,8,6).

One specific Persian institution that Chariton pays a lot of attention to is the army. In an extended parenthesis he describes the mobilisation of the Persian forces (6,8,6-7). In 6,9,1 he mentions explicitly that no subject of the Persian king may withdraw from mobilisation. In a second elaborate...

---

19 These φίλοι appear a few times. First they give advice to the king when he has read the letter of Mithridates (4,6,5). During the trial they are seated next to the throne of the king (5,4,5). A third time they advise the king to summon Callirhoe to the trial (5,4,12). Finally the king consults his φίλοι after the first part of the trial (5,8,6).

description Chariton describes the way in which the king marches into war (6,9,6).

Finally the bodyguards of the king can also be mentioned. In two passages these bodyguards are mentioned, once directly and once indirectly. Chaereas speaks to Polycharmus about their powerlessness against the Persian king, who has σώματα φυλακαί and προφυλακαί (7,1,9). The second passage is the scene in which Mithridates enters the court room: he is 'δορυφορόμενος ὑπὸ φίλων καὶ συγγενέων', accompanied by a bodyguard of friends and family (5,4,7).

After having considered the institutional framework of Syracuse and Persia, I can complete this brief review by also taking Egypt into account. In contrast to Persian institutions, the Egyptian institutions are almost absent in the novel. After the murder by the rebels of the king, a new king is elected (6,8,2). There is also a kind of military council, that assists this king during his campaigns (7,3,1). It is possibly in this military council that Chaereas becomes the ὀμοτράπεζος of the Egyptian pharaoh (7,2,5).

Following this review, the actual historical analysis of the institutional realia of the respective geographical areas can begin.

THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF SYRACUSE

The democratic character of Syracuse has been discussed above. It is illustrated by the institutions of εκκλησία, βουλή, στρατηγός, ἀρχοντες, ... Acragas and Rhegium, on the other hand, are ruled by τύραννοι. I also mentioned the historical correctness of these situations.

In general the institutional framework of Chariton's Syracuse draws upon the institutions of the classical Greek πόλεις. First of all there is the στρατηγός to illustrate this. Just as it was in fifth century reality, Chariton's Syracusan στρατηγός is the military leader20. The ἐκκλησία, the βουλή...

20 Hermocrates, whose military qualities are indeed stressed continuously by the many mentions of his victory over the Athenians, is not the only στρατηγός. Chaereas is also indicated by that title when a general in the army of the pharaoh (7,4,6; 7,5,10; 7,6,8; 8,2,1; 8,3,11). Also Bias, who takes prisoner the friends of Huginos, is a στρατηγός (4,5,6; 4,5,8) and even Mithridates is referred to once as στρατηγός Καρίας' (8,8,2). For the rest we find the term στρατηγός in 4,7,2 to indicate the generals of the Persian king. The word στρατηγία in 7,2,10 is used to indicate a commander post and the one in 3,4,16 to indicate the military achievement of a general. Three times the flag-ship is called τριήρη στρατηγική (3,5,3; 3,8,4; 4,4,7). Finally also Theron calls himself - figuratively of course - the
and the office of the ἀρχοντες are also inspired by the institutions of the classical πόλις. Finally the οἰκέται δημόσιοι fit in this context as well. Those 'public slaves' enjoyed a greater freedom than private slaves and even received a salary. They functioned as keepers of law and order, as guards or as executioners. Of course, the ἐκκλησία, the ἀρχοντες and the βουλή were also institutions of the Greek or Hellenized city in the Roman empire, but their influence on Chariton's representation will be dealt with later. For now, it will be sufficient to point out that the general contours of the institutional sketch draw upon what Chariton knew about institutions in the fifth century πόλις.

But when we look more thoroughly at the different institutions, it becomes clear that Chariton's representation is not historically correct. I will first focus on the στρατηγοι: in Athens - the city, as explained above, representing the ideologically determined historical return of Chariton - the national defence and the military leadership had been in the hands of ten στρατηγοι: (i.e. one per fyle) since 501. After 487 those στρατηγοι were the only military commanders, operating mostly as a group. In situations of concrete war, the command was occasionally offered to one of them by decree of the assembly; in practice, the στρατηγοι of fifth century Athens were also political leaders of the city. Since Chariton doesn't mention any other στρατηγοι operating with Hermocrates, we could be tempted to think that Chariton sees Hermocrates as one of these 'appointed' στρατηγοι.

Now inscriptions from Priene and Aphrodisias show that the term στρατηγοι was used as a Greek equivalent of the Roman praetor during the

στρατηγοι of the robbers (1, 7, 4) and the same term is used a few times to indicate a leader of military performances (8, 6, 8, 6, 10). Although the term στρατηγοι is used by Chariton mostly as a 'military leader', we shall see that Hermocrates is not only a military leader, but in fact a leader of a whole city. This problem is dealt with in the course of this article.

But when we look more thoroughly at the different institutions, it becomes clear that Chariton's representation is not historically correct. I will first focus on the στρατηγοι: in Athens - the city, as explained above, representing the ideologically determined historical return of Chariton - the national defence and the military leadership had been in the hands of ten στρατηγοι: (i.e. one per fyle) since 501. After 487 those στρατηγοι were the only military commanders, operating mostly as a group. In situations of concrete war, the command was occasionally offered to one of them by decree of the assembly; in practice, the στρατηγοι of fifth century Athens were also political leaders of the city. Since Chariton doesn't mention any other στρατηγοι operating with Hermocrates, we could be tempted to think that Chariton sees Hermocrates as one of these 'appointed' στρατηγοι.

23 Gschnitzer 1988, 171.
24 "... hanno sempre il diritto di presentare proposte in consiglio e in assemblea, trattano in effetti di frequenti con tali organismi e spesso riescono anche a determinarne le decisioni; nelle campagne militari all'estero lontano dalle autorità locali, devono anche prendere continuamente decisioni politicamente importanti e sono non di rado investiti di speciali poteri." Gschnitzer 1988, 171-172.
25 So the critical question is: if Chariton defines Hermocrates as a στρατηγος, but sees the man at the same time as a general political leader rather than as a mere military one, is he aware of the historically correct possibility of such a function, or does he have in mind the contemporary institutional situation of Asia Minor? In other words, does he place the Roman institution of the praetorship in a fifth century Syracusan context without any modification? A definitive answer can't be given: the fact Chariton doesn't mention any other στρατηγοι argues for the latter possibility, but the fact Hermocrates is surrounded by other classical institutions and is bound by the resolutions of the assembly argues for the former one. However we have to conclude that since Hermocrates acts in a way that is neither typical nor noticeably atypical of either a fifth century στρατηγος or a Roman praetor, it is likely that both periods had their influence on Chariton's representation of the Syracusan στρατηγος. Any conclusion that goes any further would be based on speculation.

About the functioning of the council, we aren't informed by Chariton. The assembly, however, is represented in a realistic way in one respect, namely in the importance of its resolutions: it assists at all crucial events at Syracuse. It is not a coincidence that Gschnitzer characterizes the fifth century assembly by 'una omnipotenza dell'assemblea generale, che, attraverso le sue deliberazioni (psephismata), sistema tutte le grandi e le piccole faccende.'

However, Chariton's assembly is characterized by some anachronistic errors. During the interrogation of Theron the ἀρχοντες order a fisherman to step forward to speak (3, 4, 12). According to J. Alvares, such a command represents rather the situation during the Hellenistic period and later, when the right of the people to address the assembly was restricted and controlled. Secondly the presence of women in the assembly was simply unthinkable in the classical period, and reflects first century reality. Finally, assemblies were held in the city's theatre only during the principate.

Since inscriptions in Aphrodisias refer to the institutions of the assembly and
the council, it's clear that Chariton has been influenced by the reality that he could see every day around him. Moreover, that Chariton's readers also assumed a consistent identification between the assembly and the theatre becomes clear in 5,3,4, where Chariton says that the Persian queen Rhogogyne is elected by the Persian women by χειροτονία ‘ώς ἐν θέατρῳ’. Although he could say just as easily what he actually means, namely ‘ώς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ’, he uses θέατρον almost as a synonym for ἐκκλησία!

Before concluding this analysis of the institutional framework of Syracuse, I still have to clear up something about the political rivalry between Hermocrates and Ariston. On the one hand this rivalry between two politicians reflects a realistic situation in the Greek East in the times of Chariton, as well as the fifth century ‘πόλις mentality’, but on the other hand it is overshadowed by the reconciling role of Eros: after all, the political quarrel can’t stop the wedding of Chaereas and Callirhoe after all. This is a good example of the way in which Chariton manipulates a historical reality in function of his erotic-fictional design. The rivalry between Chaereas and the suitors of the surrounding cities also has to be seen in this way: Syracuse did indeed experience many conflicts with surrounding πόλεις, but in the novel the only motive of the suitors is jealousy and passion for Callirhoe! Obviously, Chariton projects the conflicts, known to him as historically justified in a Sicilian context, on the erotic level.

THE PERSIAN EMPIRE AND ITS INSTITUTIONS

Decentralized institutions on two levels: the satrapies and the city

Chariton uses different terms to indicate the satraps of the Persian empire (στρατηγὸς, ὑπαρχός, στρατηγὸς, ἤγεμὼν). Some of these terms (στρατηγὸς, ἤγεμὼν) are also used to indicate other functions than that of satrap. Interpreting these terms, we should be aware of two essential problems: first, there is the question whether of these terms are compatible with a fifth century context. Second, we have to examine whether Chariton actually tries to evoke this context. Or does he simply place the terminology of the first century in it without making any modifications?

Let us start with the term στρατηγὸς. The equivocal use of this term by Chariton finds an echo in what inscriptions from Asia Minor tell us: sometimes στρατηγὸς means ‘commander’ (as in the case of Bias of Priene, who seems to be a chief of the local police), and sometimes the term refers to a kind of governor (as in the case of Mithridates), who can be equated to the praetor from time of Augustus on. The term also receives these two meanings in literary texts, before it is replaced by ἤγεμὼν in the second century A.D. According to a persuasive hypothesis the στρατηγὸς of Priene can be equated to the praefectus vigiliae: for one thing the context allows us to deduce that the scene is playing at night, and for another the nocturnae custodiae praefectus of Apuleius Metamorphoses is identified by Fergus Millar with the νυκτοστρατηγὸς from the inscriptions. Since the function of the praefectus vigiliae was established only at the end of the reign of Augustus, this hypothesis might procure us with a terminus post quem for dating the novel. So, regarding the term στρατηγὸς in the Persian empire of Chariton, we can conclude that this term covers two different contemporary institutional levels: Chariton replaces the provincial level of the principate with the Achaemenid satrapies, and the imperial municipal level might be represented by the στρατηγὸς of Priene.

The term ὑπαρχός is used as a synonym for στρατηγὸς. This use can also be found in Strabo and Herodotus. What Chariton doesn’t seem to know - or doesn’t seem to care about - is that neither term can simply be transposed to the Achaemenid period. Analysis of Xenophon and Thucydides shows that the Persian satrapy is hierarchically structured and that the ὑπαρχός is inferior to the στρατηγὸς. The term also refers to the second in command in other literary texts and according to Ruiz-Montero, it can be equated to the praefectus, legatus or praesides provinciae in the time of Augustus.

---

32 Ruiz-Montero 1989, 118. Cf. also Reynolds 1982, doc. 2, b, 1 & 4; doc. 3, a, 3; doc. 8, 65. Moliné translates with ‘commandant’. (Moliné 1979, ad. loc.).
33 Ruiz-Montero 1989, 118.
34 Chariton tells us that the slaves of Hyginus are indulging too freely in ‘édoíter’ when they are arrested by Bias (4, 5, 3). This is not proof that we’re dealing with nocturnal activities, but it makes it possible.
35 Apuleius, Met. 1, 24-25.
38 Str. 12, 1, 2; 16, 2, 4; Herodotos 3, 70; 3, 120; 4, 166; 5, 20; 5, 25; 7, 6. Ex: Ruiz-Montero 1989, 119, n. 60.
Chariton. But should we see the term ἰππαρχος as a literary reminiscence, or as an echo of contemporary reality? Both options seem to be possible. Anyway, Chariton never mentions the historical hierarchical relation between the σατράπης and the ὑπάρχος; this evidently argues for the latter possibility.

The term ἰγγεμών is more transparent. Inscriptions and papyri reveal that this was the general term to indicate governors in the East during the Roman occupation. An equivalent was the term praeses.

The ambiguous use of terms that we find in inscriptions and literature is clearly reflected in Chariton’s novel. Chariton covers the magistracies of fifth century Persia with the terminology of his own age. This terminology of course still existed but the meaning of the terms changed throughout the centuries, so that their use is not unequivocal. Of course this leads to disguised anachronisms, since the terms themselves don’t seem to be anachronistic in a fifth century context at first sight. The only exception is the term ἰγγεμών, which is an obvious anachronism.

The threat of a possible rebellion by a satrap was real in the Achaemenian empire. Rivalry between satraps and rebellion were regular elements in Persian history. But in the novel the only motive for the whole rebellion is the love of Mithridates for Callirhoe! Similar to the rivalry between the Sicilian cities, Chariton projects elements, in themselves correct, in the evoked context, on the erotic level.

The top of the Persian pyramid: the court of Artaxerxes in Babylon

First we can point out that Chariton’s choice of Babylon as the royal residential city is historically justified: Babylon was one of the capitals of the Persian empire where the king and his court were staying during certain periods of the year. Other residential cities were Susa, Persepolis and Ecbatana. Susa and Ecbatana are each mentioned once (5,1,7) but they aren’t referred to as residential cities.

On the institutional level some institutions refer to the fifth century context of the story. The harem, the όμότιμοι, the φίλοι: everything is attested historically.

The terms ταξίαρχοι and λοχαγοί are regular classical terms to indicate military commanders; a ταξίαρχος is hierarchically situated between the στρατηγός and the λοχαγός. But we cannot assume that Chariton was aware of this historical hierarchy. The terms are used too generally to justify such a conclusion.

The phenomenon of the προσκύνημα is correctly situated at the court of a Persian king, but it is used by Chariton to imply the contrast between the dominated Persians, honouring their king time and again with a slavish προσκύνημα, and the liberty-loving ideals of the Greeks, who consistently refuse to do this. This refusal is in conformity with the attested behaviour of some historical figures and with the clearly archaizing contrast with the ruler cults in Hellenistic and Roman periods. In stressing this Persian phenomenon Chariton wants to idealize indirectly the Greek independence of the classical period.

Although some elements of the Achaemenian period are evoked correctly, Chariton nevertheless makes some striking anachronistic errors. The title Βασιλεύων Βασιλέων, for example, was used systematically to indicate to Parthian king in the time of Chariton; we don’t have any classical source that mentions this term. Moreover an institution of freedmen is characteristic of the Roman period and the presence of the king’s freedmen...
who work their way up to become a political elite that can be present at the trial, is strongly reminiscent of the *familia caesaris* of the Roman emperors of the first century\(^{59}\). Baslez suggests that this interpretation might give us a *terminus ante quem* for dating the novel, because the political influence of freedmen diminished from the second century\(^60\).

Some Persian customs at the court in Babylon. Evoking an exiting atmosphere?

As an addition to our picture of the royal court at Babylon, attention can be drawn to some peculiarities which Chariton considers to be ‘oriental etiquette’.

When Mithridates waits for the king, he is first received by the όμοτιμοι; after that he gives presents to the eunuch and asks to be announced (5,2,2). Giving presents also appears in another paragraph of the novel: after the trial Artaxerxes decides Mithridates has to accept some presents before he can go home (5,8,8).

In themselves, waiting for the great king and the exchange of presents do indeed fit in the historical context of Chariton’s story\(^{61}\). A superficial reading of other relevant passages could lead to the conclusion that the data concerning ‘oriental etiquette’ fit perfectly in Chariton’s Achaemenidian empire. But Chariton simplifies the customs he evokes, and can’t resist representing them from a contemporary point of view. Mithridates, for example, waiting for the king to be received in the royal palace, is - according to Baslez – strongly reminiscent of the *salutatio* of the Roman clientes in front of their patroni\(^{62}\). A second example is the δεξίωσις (6,7,5): while this phenomenon is a solemn sign of personal appreciation and protection in Persian culture\(^{63}\), Chariton simply defines it as ‘philhellenism’ and ‘philanthropy’ (6,7,5). And when our attention is drawn to the striking presence of Persian women in certain circumstances (4,6,2; 5,3,1-4; 6,9,6), Chariton can’t resist clarifying that this presence is due to the ‘γυναιμανια’ which the Persians are characterized by (5,2,6).

Of course the last two examples fit in a context of stereotyping and simplifying the Persians and their customs. This is a tendency that

\(^{59}\) Baslez 1992, 203.

\(^{60}\) Baslez 1992, 203, n. 88.

\(^{61}\) Briant 1996, 316-319.

\(^{62}\) Baslez 1992, 200, n. 27.


characterizes not only the institutional framework but the whole novel. In the case of the δεξίωσις, Chariton rather makes the mistake of basing - unconsciously - his descriptions too much on the contemporary reality instead of on a fifth century reality.

**Persian military institutions: the Persian army**

About the two passages concerning the Persian army, we can be brief: Chariton simply copies the text of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*.\(^64\) Again he relies on historiography to justify his historical ‘setting’.

The references to the bodyguards can be explained just as easily by historiography. Using the verb δορυφορέω to indicate the friends and family of Mithridates, Chariton refers to the δορυφόροι, the personal bodyguard of the Persian king, established by Cyrus and numbering 10.000 lancers\(^65\). The σώματα φυλακάι and the προφυλακάι clearly refer to these ‘Immortals’\(^66\). Basing himself on the historiographers, Chariton succeeds in situating Artaxerxes’ bodyguard in the correct context with the correct terminology.

**THE INSTITUTIONS OF EGYPT**

The only remark which the limited nature of Egyptian institutional *realia* allows to make is one about the king. A fifth century Egyptian king who is *elected* seems most strange\(^67\). Probably we are dealing here with a leader of rebels, whom Chariton indicates - for the sake of simplicity - by the title βασιλεύς.

The appointing of ομοτράπεζοι is a Persian custom\(^68\). Chariton simply puts a Persian institution in an Egyptian context.

\(^{64}\) The first passage (6, 8, 6-7) comes from Xen., *Cyr.* 6.1.30. The second (6, 9, 6) from 4.2.2 of the same work. Ex: Goold 1995, 319, n. a & 323, n. a.

\(^{65}\) Briant 1996, 272-273. The 10.000 are indicated by this term in Xenophon, Herodotus and Plutarch. Exact references in Baslez 1992, 205, n. 5.

\(^{66}\) The 10.000 are indicated by this term in Xenophon and Arrianus. Exact references in Baslez 1992, 205, n. 6.

\(^{67}\) Scarratt 1996, 230.

\(^{68}\) Herodotus 3, 132, 5, 24, 4; Ctesias 41b; Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3, 2, 4; *Cyr.* 7, 1, 30. Ex: Baslez 1992, 205, n. 2.
CONCLUSION

Our initial question dealt with the possibility of using Chariton as a historical source. Preliminarily it was pointed out that, for such an approach, the historical character of the novel is an obstacle that shouldn't be underestimated. However, we can split up the historical framework of the novel into three main categories.

To find an answer to the question of the relative proportion of historical and contemporary elements, I focused on the institutional framework of the novel. In a geographically classified analysis of this framework I tried to find some regularity in the way Chariton presents his 'historical' material. It might be useful to recapitulate shortly the principal conclusions.

As far as the institutional framework of Syracuse is concerned, we pointed out that a first superficial look at the institutions of the city evokes the image of a classical Greek πόλεις; it is this image Chariton wanted to achieve. But when we have a closer look, it quite soon becomes clear that the terminology in Chariton's text was used in the fifth century B.C. as well as in the first century A.D. This leads inevitably to questions such as 'which situation did Chariton have in mind when creating his Syracusian institutional framework?' and 'was he aware of the changes in meaning which the terms had been undergoing in the course of ages?'. In some cases the answer to certain questions can't be given with certainty; on the other hand, certain anachronisms make clear that Chariton projects institutional customs and elements from his own time on the fifth century. The institutional framework as a whole is the one of a fifth century πόλις, but when completing this framework with concrete details, Chariton can't help introducing contemporary elements.

On the sub-central level the Persian magistracy is characterized by a problematic ambiguity that reflects the contemporary institutional reality. To indicate Persian satraps, Chariton uses - apart from οὐρατείς, which he borrowed from the historiographers, and the anachronistic ἠγεμόν - two terms (στρατηγὸς and ὕπαρχος) that present the same problems as those used in the Syracusian institutional context. For various reasons - one of which might be able to give us a terminus post quem - I tend to accept that Chariton applies a contemporary institutional reality in Asia Minor to the Persian empire of the fifth century. To represent the Persian royal court in Babylon, he clearly uses the knowledge that he collected by reading the historiographers, but using the few indications there are, we are able to conclude that Chariton doesn't care about correctness regarding Egyptian institutions. He only uses what is needed in his story. The evocation of the Persian institution of the ὁμοτράπεζοι is based on historiography, but the phenomenon is put incorrectly in an Egyptian context.

What are the regularities we find in the way Chariton uses historical and contemporary material? First, attention can be drawn to the strong erotizing component in his political-institutional representation. The internal rivalry between Hermocrates and Ariston, the rivalry between Chaereas and the suitors from the surrounding cities, and Mithridates' plans to revolt against the authorities in Babylon, echo actual tensions in the πόλεις, between πόλεις, and in the Persian empire. But in the novel the only motive for their existence is love. It is clear that this erotizing component conceals important historical information, manipulated by the author to make it fit in a context of love and adventure...

Apart from this erotizing component, there is also a simplifying and stereotyping component. The representation of Persian customs is especially influenced this way. Examples are the remarks of Chariton on the presumed γυναιμανία of the Persians and the phenomenon of the Persian δέξιοι.

Next to these components, other important regularities can be found. Chariton succeeds in making plausible his historical framework by introducing general institutional elements that evoke the classical period. The general blue-print of his institutional world - with the ἐκκλησία, the βουλή, the ἄρχοντες, the στρατηγοὶ and the οἰκέται δημόσιοι in Syracuse, and the satrapies, the οὐρατείς, possibly the ὕπαρχος, the siting of the royal

Achaemenidian Persia, but a closer look reveals that Chariton simplifies some of them or interprets them anachronistically. The bodyguards of the king are - again according to historiography - denoted correctly with the correct terms in the correct context. The description of the Persian army is also based entirely on historiography, namely on Xenophon's Cyropaedia.

Clearly Chariton has read the historiographers but his institutional knowledge of the Persian empire is limited to the general context. Too often inaccuracy and anachronisms succeed in entering the institutional framework. Persia's institutional fifth century framework is not historically justified.

69 Cf. the words of Baslez: 'utilisant un décor Perse pour la moitié, à peu près, de son roman, Chariton fait preuve de connaissances assez nombreuses, variées et en général exactes, mais l'usage qu'il en fait révèle moins un souci de précision historique qu'un goût de pittoresque'. Baslez 1992, 199.
court, the harem, the προσκήνησις, the ὁμότιμος, the φίλο, the ταξίαρχοι and λοχαγοί, the exchange of presents in Babylon) can in that respect be called 'correct', because Chariton clearly based it on the historiography (Thucydides, Xenophon) to achieve his plausible fifth century reailia. The best example is the representation of the Persian army, copied entirely from Xenophon's Cyropaedia.

This general correctness, however, is undermined by the contemporary influences and anachronistic details with which the framework is filled up with. Think, for example, of the anachronisms concerning the Syracusan assembly (women, theatre, too much power of the ἀρχοντες). The same can be noticed on the level of the more local institutions of the Persian empire: Chariton wants to capture them in contemporary provincial and municipal structures (ηγεμόν, the στρατηγός as a praetor and possibly ἄρχοντες as praefectus, legatus or praeses provinciae, Βασιλεύς βασιλέων, the ταξίαρχοι and λοχαγοί, the προσκήνησις, the ομότιμοι, the φίλοι, the πραγματίνη, the προσκήνησις and the possible terminus ante quern connected with Mithridates). The central Persian authority, the royal court at Babylon and some specific Persian customs are also represented in an anachronistic way, once we leave the generalities and descend to the details and specific reailia (Artaxerxes as Βασιλεύς βασιλέων, the freedmen reminiscent of the familia Caesaris, connected possibly with a terminus ante quern, Mithridates waiting for the king reminiscent of the Roman salutatio).

The value of these undermining elements shouldn’t of course be underestimated. It is in such elements we get a glimpse of Chariton’s contemporary every-day world. Through these elements the careful reader can demask ‘the man behind the novel’, who doesn’t succeed consistently in placing his story in historical times. On many occasions contemporary reality shines through.

The importance of the historical (fifth century) elements lies on another level. Instead of being interesting in the first place in fifth century institutional history, it is rather useful for us to have an idea of what an educated man of the first century A.D. in Asia Minor (Aphrodisias) was able to know about classical history, using the classical historiography. Let us not forget that Chariton calls himself Χαρίτων Άφροδισιευτικος, the secretary of a ρήτορος Αρχαίος, an educated man of the first century A.D. By describing the assembly united, shouting for the marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe, when we see Artaxerxes sitting on his throne in the court room of the royal palace, surrounded by his freedmen, the ταξίαρχοι and the λοχαγοί, when we see the assembly united, shouting for the marriage between Chaereas and Callirhoe, when we see Artaxerxes sitting on his throne in the court room of the royal palace, surrounded by his freedmen, the ταξίαρχοι and the λοχαγοί, then all this has a greater evocatory power than any inscription could possibly have. An inscription presents the truth, the novel presents fiction. But the evocation is incomparable.
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