

Citation style

Kanavou, Nikoletta: review of: Manuel Baumbach / Manuel Sanz Morales (eds.), Chariton von Aphrodisias, Kallirhoe. Kommentar zu den Büchern 1-4, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2021, in: Exemplaria Classica, 26 (2022), p. 302-310, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v26.7422>, downloaded from Website



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

MANUEL BAUMBACH, MANUEL SANZ MORALES, *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe. Kommentar zu den Büchern 1-4*, Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2021, 332 pp., ISBN 978- 3-8253-5038-3.

This is the first volume of a detailed commentary on Chariton's novel *Callirhoe*; it covers books 1-4, while a second volume is envisaged on books 5-8 (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 11). There is no doubting the great scholarly significance of this project. With the exception of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, which has received three full commentaries in recent years (J.R. Morgan's in 2004, M.P. Pattoni's in 2005 and E.L. Bowie's in 2018), the Greek romances have not fared too well in terms of commentaries. Detailed commentaries are a desideratum, as they can summarise and make approachable the great amount of recent research on the so-called 'canonical' novels (Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*), which increasingly centers on the individual character and significance of each member of the 'canon'. *Callirhoe*'s significance lies in its place in the chronology of the genre (it is believed to be the earliest work of the romantic 'canon'; one scholar even suggested that Chariton invented the romantic genre)¹ and in its peculiarities of plot, narrative technique and characterisation (especially its pseudo-historical setting and psychological interest).² The project of Baumbach and Sanz (who is also the editor of Chariton's most recent text)³ promises to provide the scholarly community with a full, up-to-date commentary on a vital specimen of Greek novelistic literature.

The volume opens with an informative introduction ('Vorbemerkungen'), which touches on the history and development of *Romanforschung*. The authors do not discuss the features of the romantic 'canon', apparently assuming a readership already familiar with the ancient novel as a field of research (but some of these features are mentioned in the course of the commentary and even in footnotes, e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 86 n. 75). The authors stress the intertextual focus of their commentary.⁴ In a commentary on one of the Greek novels, this approach must acquire a special degree of openness and inclusivity, given the fluid character of

¹ Stefan Tilg, *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford-New York 2010.

² See further Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 70, 76-7, 191-2.

³ Manuel Sanz Morales, *Chariton of Aphrodisias' Callirhoe: A Critical Edition*, Antike Texte, Band 2, Heidelberg 2020.

⁴ For a definition of this approach, we may quote Martin West: 'When I was writing my first commentary (on Hesiod's *Theogony*) Stefan Weinstock asked me if it was to be "insular" or "continental". He meant, would it be the sort of commentary that seeks only to elucidate the particular work which is its object, or the sort that reaches out in all directions and is full of material relevant to other authors in which related things occur ... I think that in the event I leaned towards the continental.' (M.L. West, "'Forward into the Past': Acceptance Speech for the Balzan Prize in Classical Antiquity, 2000", in Patrick Finglass *et al.*, eds., *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford 2007, xxiv).

the generic definition of ‘novel’ (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 10-11). The commentary’s interest in intertextual allusions further corresponds to the inclusion in Sanz’ edition of an extensive *index fontium* (but the commentary also refers to possible influences of Chariton’s novel on later literature, not just to its sources).

The next chapters of the ‘Einleitung’ elaborate on particular topics, such as the author and his provenance, date, title, textual tradition, language and style. The authors discuss in much detail the problem of Chariton’s ‘Historisierung’, which proves difficult, as is the case with all romance authors: Chariton’s questionable link with Aphrodisias can be paralleled with that of Xenophon with Ephesos, Achilles Tatius with Alexandria and Heliodorus with Emesa (however, the authors seem to explore the possibility of a real link between Chariton and Aphrodisias in some places: Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 82 on φιλόπατρις; 114 on τυμβωρυχίαν). As with the novel of Achilles Tatius, the strongest indication of date lies in the papyri, which prove that the novel was circulating in the middle of the second century AD. The authors leave open the problem of the relevant dates of Chariton and Xenophon Ephesius,⁵ but then work from the assumption that Xenophon is later (see Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 74, 271 etc.; he is absent from the *index fontium* of Sanz’ edition). Papyrological evidence also tips the scales in favour of a title that only includes the name of the heroine (*Callirhoe*), and not the hero. The assumption that the textual tradition of the novel included different versions is credible; this is also known to be true for the novel of Achilles Tatius.⁶

The discussion of Chariton’s language and style occupies the largest part of the Introduction (36 out of 50 pages). The last part of this section (‘Stilistische und rhetorische Aspekte’), which is devoted to Chariton’s use of rhetorical tricks, is of particular interest, and it reminds us of the problematic character of the traditional distinction between ‘sophistic’ and ‘presophistic’ (or non-sophistic) novels (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 61 n. 175).⁷ The rich narratological value of the *Callirhoe*’s opening (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 65) bears further testimony to its sophistication. The authors’ hesitation to use Chariton’s language as an indication of an early (1st c. BC) date, like Papanikolaou did,⁸ is justified; they observe that the relatively weak

⁵ ‘Der Roman von Xenophon v. Ephesus könnte – je nach dessen und Charitons Datierung – früher oder zeitgleich entstanden sein’ (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 17 n. 24).

⁶ See Claudio Consonni, “On the Text of Achilles Tatius”, in Shannon N. Byrne *et al.*, eds., *Authors, Authority and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel: Essays in Honour of Gareth L. Schmeling*, ANS 5, Groningen 2006, 115.

⁷ See e.g. Simon Swain, “A Century and More of the Greek Novel”, in S. Swain, ed., *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford-New York 1999, 27-8; Consuelo Ruiz-Montero, “The Rise of the Greek Novel”, in G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 68 (‘pre-sophistic’ does not mean ‘pre-rhetorical’, only less sophisticated); and more recently J.R. Morgan, “Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus”, in D.S. Richter, W.A. Johnson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, Oxford 2017, 389 (‘it does neither Chariton nor Xenophon justice to think of them as barely competent near-identical twins’).

⁸ Antonios Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Roman*, Hypomnemata 37, Göttingen 1973.

atticist features are indicative of a date no later than the early second century, which is in keeping with the papyrus finds. Readers will look forward to chapters on the novel's narrative structure and reception, which are planned for the second volume of the commentary.

The main body of the commentary has a clear, reader-friendly structure: it follows a division of the novel in units that reflect the progress of the story. Discussion is based on the text of Chariton's most recent edition by Sanz (2020); much like Ebbe Vilborg's commentary, which followed from his edition of Achilles Tatius, the commentary under scrutiny discusses textual issues and offers support for editorial choices. But its scope is much broader than Vilborg's: drawing on recent advances in the study of characters⁹ and narrative, it tackles issues of characterisation, plot and narrative technique, poetics, language, as well as echoes of the real world and realia. There are perceptive notes on meta-poetical aspects (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 167-8, 181, 218, 252-3, 272-4, 290; there is special charm in the idea that the name Callirhoe might evoke the 'beautiful flow' of the novel's composition in addition to the beauty of its heroine). Following from relevant discussion in the Introduction, the commentary also details the links between Chariton's work and works belonging to other genres. Homer and New Comedy are frequently mentioned intertexts, the former with respect to quotations, themes and characterisation, the latter in relation to the various intrigues of the plot, the role of servants and the narrative's tragicomic spirit. Historiography and oratory follow suit. The role of relevant quotations and hints meets with a sensible and sober evaluation (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 164). Possible links with the New Testament (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 104, 264) are rightly treated with caution.

An important manifestation of intertextuality in *Callirhoe* concerns the transference of themes (e.g. of the Odyssean theme of the malignant suitors in the pursuit of Callirhoe by such suitors in Chariton's book 1, and by other men later in the novel, Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 276). Intertextuality indeed informs our understanding of the novel's plot and the characters' actions (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 170 on the implications of Callirhoe's mention of *Odyssey's* Alkinoos for her interaction with Dionysios), or cheats our expectations (the use of Homeric diction from Achilles' dream of the dead Patroklos in the context of Callirhoe's dream of Chaireas may suggest that he is dead, but he is not, Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 184). Some passages invite multiple intertextual readings, like the farewell scene of Chaireas leaving for Miletus to recover Callirhoe, which finds echoes in Homer, Apollonius Rhodius and Thucydides (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 223-4). Intertextual allusions are also involved in the rich psychological portraits of the novel's main characters. The authors' observation that these portraits oscillate between genres (tragedy and comedy for Dionysios, epic and tragedy for Callirhoe, Baumbach-

⁹ Koen De Temmerman's study (*Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) is a mainstay in the commentary's references to issues of characterisation.

Sanz 2021, 171, 183, 198-9) is an appealing one. Chaireas' character also moves between two opposite poles: his total jealousy at the beginning of the novel and his acceptance of his wife's second marriage (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 187). The commentary reveals Chariton's characters in their richness and depth (Dionysios' sensibilities, Callirhoe's emotions and cunning, which at times serves dishonesty, and especially Chaireas' weakness, underperformance and lack of self-control; we also encounter the familiar view that Chaireas undergoes some psychological development, Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 91). The novel's psychological interest reaches its peak in book 2; Callirhoe's dilemma, masterfully expressed in her internal dialogue, is richly commented on (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 141ff.). The authors further alert readers to the details of Chariton's narrative art, which combines a 'comic'¹⁰ and a tragic spirit and constantly creates nuances of meaning, employing parallel plots, changes of perspective, cross-referencing, foreshadowing techniques and irony (note e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 210-12, on the complex implications of mythological parallels for the interpretation of Callirhoe's disappearance from her tomb; 254, on the parallel nature of the burials of Callirhoe and Chaireas, which is made explicit by Chariton at 4.1.6; 288 on 4.7.5, a clear reference to parallel plots).

Parallels in the other extant romances are recorded, but the novelistic fragments are somewhat neglected. One fragmentary novel which is mentioned by the commentators (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 263), but which deserved even more attention is the *Babyloniaca* (see N. Kanavou, "Iamblichos' *Babyloniaka*, the Greek Novel and Satire", *AncNarr* 15, 2018, 109-31): its heroine, Sinonis, marries another man before returning to the hero (Rhodanes), like Callirhoe; Rhodanes recovers Sinonis by means of a war, which he leads, like Chaireas; tomb robbery is a prominent theme in both novels.

A final general point concerns presentation, in particular the use of footnotes. For commentary standards, they are unusually numerous, and sometimes long, and attest to the use of a broad range of secondary bibliography. But the content of many could be partly or fully integrated in the main text, while some (e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 149 n. 26 and 143 n. 9) make points that deserved space in the Introduction.

Some remarks on individual commentary entries:

p. 10 n. 6: Regarding fragmentary novels, the authors cite Kussl, but not the more recent survey of Gabriella Messeri, "I papyri di narrativa dal 1893 ad oggi", in G. Bastianini, A. Casanova, eds., *I papiri del romanzo antico (Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 11-12 giugno 2009)*, Studi e Testi di Papirologia N.S. 12, Firenze 2010, 3-41.

p. 27 n. 1: On the language of Achilles Tatius, note also the 2018 thesis by Sonja Mary Gammage, *Atticism in Achilles Tatius: An Examination of Linguistic Purism in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon, University of KwaZulu-Natal.

¹⁰ The notion of 'tragicomedy', on which the authors cite Tilg (Baumbach/Sanz 2021, 250 n. 6), perhaps deserved more explanation in the commentary's main text.

p. 68: Interest in legal matters is a general feature of the romances (see further S. Schwartz, *From Bedroom to Courtroom: Law and Justice in the Greek Novel*, ANS 21, Groningen 2016). References to more specialised bibliography would be useful at places, e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 185 (top) with respect to Attic law.

On the possible relevance of the plot of *Callirhoe* to historical events, see also M. Paschalis, “The Basic Plot of *Callirhoe*: History, Myth and Aristotelian Poetics”, in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis, eds., *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel*, ANS 17, Groningen 2013, 161-77. More comment on the story’s relevance to real-life situations (not just references to previous commentators) would be welcome, e.g. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 220 with regard to slavery, 219 on female participation in the Assembly (and on the verisimilitude of this situation, or lack thereof), 223 on sea travelling habits. Chariton’s loose employment of terms of geography and administration is connected with his unhistorical approach to the story (Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 257 on *eparchos / praefectus*; 261 top on *ergostolos*; 281 on Priene and the term *strategos*).

pp. 72-4 on 1.1.3: The context suggests that all four heroes are remembered here mainly for their association with physical beauty. The proximity between *ὑπερέχον* and the name of the Homeric hero *par excellence* reminds us of the proverbial *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπέροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων* (*Iliad* 6.208).

p. 75 on 1.1.4 (and p. 81 on 1.1.12): Achilles Tatius’ ἔρωσ σοφιστής (5.27.4) deserves a mention here (as on p. 241 on 3.9.4). Chariton’s own τοῦ θεοῦ πολιτευσάμενου (1.1.6) is another parallel.

p. 77 on 1.1.5: The supplement καιροῦ is reminiscent of Achilles Tatius’ equally problematic καὶ γὰρ ὁ καιρὸς ἐπέγει τῶν πραγμάτων τὸ ἄπορον (4.8.6).

p. 79 on 1.1.7: Chaireas’ metaphorical wounds, caused by *eros*, echo the theme of *eros* as warrior, which is also present in Achilles Tatius (e.g. 2.5.2). On 1.1.8: τὸ γὰρ πῦρ ἐξεκάετο can be paralleled with the fire of *eros* burning Melite in Achilles Tatius (5.15.5).

p. 80 on 1.1.10: ψυχὴ εὐφύης is used by Plutarch (e.g. *Amatorius* 750d).

pp. 80-2: Chariton’s wedding scene is comparable to that of Xenophon Ephesius. For Ἔρωσ ἦν δημαγωγός (1.1.12), cf. Ἔρωσ αὐτὸν ὠδήγει (Xen. Eph. 1.8.3).

p. 88 on 1.2.1: I missed a comment on Phthonos as a personification; the authors do comment on the personified Ζηλοτυπία (1.2.5).

p. 103: On the theme of the murderer turned mourner, cf. a story preserved on a papyrus of the 4th c. AD with romance traits (*P. Aktenbuch* pp. 4.18-5.7, on a man who killed his beloved girlfriend).

p. 105 on 1.5.2: On secondary characters with own stories, cf., aside from Heliodorus’ Knemon, Achilles Tatius’ Menelaos and Xenophon Ephesius’ Hippothoos.

p. 108 on 1.6.2: On the possible link between the name Dionysius and the god Dionysos from Ariadne’s story, see also De Temmerman, *Crafting Characters* 60.

p. 113 on 1.7.1: For πειρατήριον συγκροτῶν, cf. Achilles Tatius 5.3.2: ληστῶν ὁμοτέχνων <ὄχλον> συγκροτήσας.

p. 114 on 1.7.5: Tomb robbery is a recurring theme in the ancient romance (cf. Xen. Eph. 3.7-8; Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*); see N. Kanavou, "Legal Narratives from a Late Antique Codex and the Ancient Novel Tradition", *ZPE* 214, 2020, 80-6.

p. 115 on 1.8.1: For δευτέρων ἄλλην, cf. e.g. Oppianus, *Hal.* 3.277 (ἦ καὶ δεύτερος ἄλλος ἐφαπτέσθω καμάτοιο); Galenus, *De methodo medendi* 10.426.

p. 124 on 1.11.4: On the theme of the *locus amoenus*, see further Petra Haß, *Der locus amoenus in der antiken Literatur: Zu Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Motivs*, Bamberg: Wiss. Verl. Bamberg, 1998.

p. 131 n. 210: On Callirhoe's decision to leave her child behind at the end of the novel, see N. Kanavou, "A Husband is More Important Than a Child: The Ending of Chariton's *Callirhoe* Revisited", *Mnemosyne* 68, 2015, 937-55 (the topic will surely be treated in more detail in vol. 2 of the commentary).

p. 134 on 1.13.11: Students of the novels will think here of another ring of great narrative importance: the amethyst ring described by Heliodorus (5.14), which is used by Calasiris as a pledge for Charicleia.

p. 142 bottom: The commentators offer a thorough examination of analogies between events around Chaireas and Dionysios. Regarding reader expectations created by the Homeric connections of Callirhoe's relationships, Dionysios' 'Selbstvergleich mit Menelaos' (2.6.1, 5.2.8) is temporarily misleading, as Callirhoe will end up with Chaireas, not Dionysios. But it is also a feature of the novel's nuanced characterisation technique (see Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 171-2, 182, 289 on the ambivalent presentation of Callirhoe, which includes features from such diverse heroines as Penelope, Helen and Medea).

pp. 143-4: This is a convincing presentation of analogies between the beginnings of books 1 and 2, though I would stop short of identifying a 'weiteres Proömium' at the beginning of book 2, as this part is not styled as an independent introductory section. The start of book 5, usually called 'second prologue', is more deserving of the term.

p. 144 on 2.1.1: The name Φωκῆς is attested perhaps already in the 1st c. AD (see P.M. Fraser, E. Matthews, eds., *The Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* IIIB).

p. 146 on 2.1.6: The hapax-mentioned, experienced lawyer Adrastos has a rather common name. The authors see it as 'speaking', but their 'glaubwürdiger / zuverlässiger' (Anwalt) seems doubtful. If anything, the name alludes to the Herodotean Adrastos, who 'could not flee' (from fate). Cf. the adjective ἄδραστος 'not running away' (of slaves, Hdt. 4.142).

p. 149 on 2.2.1: The generic name Plangon can be read as a nod to New Comedy; its etymological significance is not very noticeable.

p. 152 on 2.2.6: On the link between Callirhoe and Aphrodite, cf. Helen's fraught relationship with the goddess in the *Iliad* (esp. in book 3).

p. 161 on 2.4.5: I missed a comment on the important fight between *eros* and *sophrosyne* (a parallel to the contrast between *pathos* and *logismos* of 2.4.4). References to the term *sophrosyne* in various parts of the commentary (Baumbach-

Sanz 2021, 179 n. 99; 181; 185) could have been combined into a more systematic discussion.

p. 166 on 2.5.3: The term φιλάνθρωπία (rendered in the commentary as ‘Philanthropie’) deserves more comment; it encompasses attitudes deemed as friendly, loving, but also mild (not harsh).

p. 172 on 2.6.2: Callirhoe’s πειθώ could be read as a sophistic hint and as a masculine trait.

p. 178: *eros* as sickness is a standard literary motif. The use of military vocabulary in relation to erotic pursuits goes back to Roman elegy and is continued by Achilles Tatius. See, now, Daniel Jolowicz, *Latin Poetry in the Ancient Greek Novels*, Oxford-New York: OUP, 2021, 153ff.

p. 183 n. 110: Callirhoe may assume a ‘passive role’ on some occasions, but it is worth stressing that she is her own woman more than any other romance heroine (cf. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 193-4 on her initiative – unusual for a woman – to propose marriage to Dionysios).

p. 185 on 2.10.3: For συναγαγοῦσα τὰς ὀφρῦς, cf. the frequent Homeric references to facial expressions involving brows, esp. Zeus’ (*Iliad* 1.528 etc.).

p. 194 on 3.1.4: The death of Dionysios would set Callirhoe free from her suitor but would also deprive her of a protector, hence perhaps her sadness.

pp. 208-9: Chaireas’ discovery of Callirhoe’s empty tomb is indeed a strong potential parallel to the New Testament. Given the fraught issue of the dating of the relevant texts, it is perilous to speak of specific ‘intertextual’ links, but at the same time it is hard to exclude a connection between these two ‘empty tomb’ stories.

p. 225 top: One would expect here examples of accumulation of emotions in Chariton.

p. 228 top: Chaireas prays to Poseidon before setting off to find Callirhoe, but, as readers know, he will not be spared trouble; of course, Poseidon played no positive role in the journey of the most famous seafarer of Greek literature, Odysseus. For Chaireas’ Odyssean qualities, see now further Ch. Fakas, “Reworking a Homeric Model of Heroism. Transformations of the Figure of Odysseus in the Novel of Chariton”, in Ch.-P. Manolea, ed., *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Homer from the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2022, 66-83.

On 3.6.5: It is worth noting the rarity of ὑποβαστάσας, as well as its occurrence in P. Harris 23 (ὑποβαστάσα[ς]), which possibly comes from a lost novel.

p. 232 on 3.7.2: This refers to the violent attack on the ship of Chaireas, anchored at the port of Miletus. Seeking to get rid of his presence, the estate manager of Dionysios, Callirhoe’s new husband, tips the occupants of a neighbouring garrison to attack Chaireas and his party. In the summary of the action provided by Chaireas towards the end of the novel (8.8.1), Phrygians have replaced the Persian troops of the original account of the event (cf. 4.1). Baumbach-Sanz suggest that Chaireas may have identified the troops incorrectly in the darkness of the night; but this would not explain βασιλέως. An alternative possibility is that Chaireas might have wanted to exonerate the Persians here in view of his eventual reconciliation with the King.

p. 233 top section: Does the reader really hope that Chaireas and Callirhoe will get back together, or just generically expect it? The commentators rightly note that Callirhoe's total love for Chaireas at times seems to take second place in the story (cf. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 194-5 on 3.1.4 and 245 on 3.10.4-8).

p. 245 on 3.10.4-8: Resumés / recapitulations have an important narrative function in Chariton (cf. Baumbach-Sanz 2021, 269). They might also be seen as a sign of envisaged oral performance. See S.R. West, "Κερκίδος παραμύθια? For Whom Did Chariton Write?" *ZPE* 143, 2003, 63-9. The tension caused by Callirhoe's suicide threat is undermined by generic expectation that she will make it alive to the end of the novel.

p. 250 and pp. 277-8: Regarding Chariton's use of letters, see also the relevant chapter ("Embedded Letters in the Greek Novel") in P.A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions. The Letters in Greek Literature*, Cambridge 2001, and Ian Repath's chapter in Owen Hodkinson *et al.*, eds., *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden-Boston 2013.

p. 261 on 4.2.3: ἔρωσ τυραννος has Platonic overtones, cf. *Republic* 573b, d (a form of *eros* described as bad and destructive, in opposition to the Socratic *eros*).

p. 263, p. 271: Note that crucifixion was not a type of punishment normally imposed on members of the upper class (cf. Pauli *Sent.* 5.23.1).

p. 265 on 4.2.7: Helen is blamed as a cause of evils for both parties of the Trojan war, not just the Trojans (Homer, Euripides' *Elektra*).

p. 274 on 4.4.2: Cf. 2.4.4 for the contrast between *pathos* and *logismos*.

pp. 276-8: It might be worth stressing the similarity of Leucippe's letter in Achilles Tatius to that of Chaireas: both letters include a description of the sender's torment and an affirmation of the enduring love for his / her partner.

p. 281 on 4.5.6: On seals, see now Antonia Sarri's monograph *Material Aspects of Letter Writing in the Graeco-Roman World, 500 BC-AD 300*, *Materiale Textkulturen* 12, Berlin-Boston 2018.

p. 282 on 4.5.10: A comment on the contrasting emotions *thumos* – *athumia* would be welcome here.

p. 284: The classic *locus* for adultery in classical Athens is Lysias' *On the murder of Eratosthenes*. The exhaustive collection of parallels offered in n. 60 does not reflect a general practice of the commentary.

I have noted several misprints:

p. 31 middle and p. 35 on 2.1.6.4: Spanish 'y' (instead of 'und').

p. 72: '1.1.3-1.1.3'

p. 96 on 1.4.2: first ἔκειτο is surely a misprint.

p. 104 l. 6 from top: 'oft he'

p. 129 top: 'sein tragische Ende'; middle: 'Dionysios Ehefrau'

p. 130 bottom: 'Dionisios'

p. 134: 'Korumbus'

p. 141: 'πάντων ὑπερέχον' should read μειράκιον ... πάντων ὑπερέχον

- p. 142: ‘von Dionysios’ Characters’
- p. 145 top: ‘Chaires’
- p. 154 bottom: ‘Ehemännernie’
- p. 164 bottom: fullstop missing after ‘lesbar’
- p. 173: (1.1.10) comma before opening bracket
- p. 176 ‘als φύσει δε εστι βαρύθυμος’: εστι should be left out.
- p. 180 n. 100: The cross-reference should read p. 149 n. 26.
- p. 196 n. 16: ‘metalierary’
- p. 197 n. 20: ‘berichtet berichtet’
- p. 198: ‘in den wenigen spätere Erwähnungen’
- p. 200 middle and n. 30: Inconsistent references to Aristophanic comedies: ‘Pax’, ‘in den *Vögeln*’
- p. 202: ‘unbegaubigte’ / n. 36 verb missing
- p. 209 n. 54: ‘A.D’ (fullstop missing)
- p. 220 ‘offentlichen’
- p. 222 n. 78: P.Oxy. italics? (cf. p. 154 on 2.3.5)
- p. 231 middle: ‘in Alegnung an’
- p. 235 top: ‘die ... intrigierenden Plangon’
- p. 237 bottom: ‘Eurisakes’
- p. 242 bottom and n. 111: ‘στρατήγμα’
- p. 243: ‘ἀκριβεία’, ‘paraniod lover’
- p. 247 top: ‘bekagt sich’
- p. 252 n. 7: ‘oft he corpse’
- p. 254 top: ‘adressatenbezogenen bezogenen’
- p. 259 middle: ‘wietere’
- p. 260 bottom: ‘Kreon’ (instead of Kleon!)
- p. 262 top: ‘ένθυσιασµόν’
- p. 269 top: ‘Chaireas ... Tritt’
- p. 312 ‘Lendakis’, ‘Λενδάκης’ (instead of Λεντάκης)

The above minor shortcomings by no means hinder the conclusion that we are dealing with a well-researched and careful commentary, which is informative on a myriad of topics and themes and bears testimony to the authors’ deep study of the text in both form and content. Baumbach and Sanz have produced a piece of solid scholarship and are on their way to complete a much-awaited work, which will no doubt prove an extremely useful tool for scholars of Chariton and the Greek novel.

NIKOLETTA ΚΑΝΑΒΟΥ
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
nkanavou@phil.uoa.gr