



Dollins, E. (2012) 'Leucippe: chasing Achilles Tatius' disappearing heroine'.

*Rosetta* **12**: 35-48.

[http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue\\_12/dollins.pdf](http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue_12/dollins.pdf)

---

## Leucippe: chasing Achilles Tatius' disappearing heroine

Elizabeth Dollins  
*University of Exeter*

### Introduction

Having heard the 'happy ending'<sup>1</sup> of Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, the reader is left asking very many questions, one of which is this: what has happened to Leucippe, the novel's heroine, between the end of the story and the beginning of the narrative,<sup>2</sup> which is chronologically after the events of the story?<sup>3</sup>

The work begins with an unnamed narrator who has been shipwrecked in a storm. He tells how he met Cleitophon in a temple at Sidon, and the whole of the rest of the novel is taken up with Cleitophon's telling of what he calls his 'swarm of narrative' (σμῆνος...λόγων 1.2.2). His story follows the usual plot of a Greek novel: Cleitophon meets Leucippe and falls in love immediately. They leave home to go on a voyage, are separated and go through adventures involving pirates and adulterous characters until finally they are reunited, get married and live happily ever after. However, in this novel it is not clear at all that the protagonists do follow novelistic convention and live happily ever after.<sup>4</sup> Leucippe is absent at the beginning of the novel,<sup>5</sup> and she is not mentioned until she appears in the story that Cleitophon tells to the unnamed primary narrator.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> At the very end of the novel, after going through many trials and adventures, the protagonists are reunited and celebrate their marriage.

<sup>2</sup> Many scholars have tried to address this issue, and there are varying answers to the question from authorial incompetence to a clever take on the novel genre: a novel with an unhappy ending. See, for example, Hägg 1971: 234; Most 1989; Repath 2005 (this includes an excellent bibliography on the question).

<sup>3</sup> The exchange with the unnamed narrator cannot be very long after the events Cleitophon is about to narrate, since the narrator says *καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶ σου τὴν ὄψιν οὐ μακρὰν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς*. ('I can see from your appearance that you are not far from being one of the god's initiates.' 1.2.2).

<sup>4</sup> cf. Alvares 2006: 1.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Whitmarsh 2009: 137.

<sup>6</sup> At the end of the novel the protagonists pray for good fortune in marriage, which adds to the ominous setting at the beginning: *παρήμην οὖν ὡς καὶ συνθύσοντες αὐτῷ καὶ εὐξόμενοι τοῖς*

At the end of the novel, Leucippe and Cleitophon intend to set sail from Tyre for Byzantium.<sup>7</sup> At the beginning, however, Cleitophon is in Sidon, the setting for the narration. Sidon is nowhere near Byzantium, but it is, however, up the coast from Tyre. It is therefore possible that Cleitophon has been shipwrecked *en route* to Byzantium<sup>8</sup> during the storm that is mentioned by the primary narrator at the beginning of the novel,<sup>9</sup> and this storm may explain the absence of Leucippe (through death or being swept ashore elsewhere)<sup>10</sup>, but Cleitophon himself never actually mentions it. If Leucippe and Cleitophon went on a voyage at the end of the novel, then where is she, and why has she essentially been written out of the novel? The aim of this paper is to try to 'find' Leucippe, and to demonstrate that even though she rarely seems to speak, and eventually even disappears, Leucippe has a power in this text. First the tension created by Cleitophon's status as ego-narrator within the fiction that Achilles Tatius constructs will be outlined; this tension is fundamental to the reader's interpretation and understanding of Leucippe's role within that fiction.<sup>11</sup>

### Cleitophon's narration

The fact that Cleitophon is constructed as both narrator and narrated in his tale causes problems of interpretation for the reader.<sup>12</sup> Cleitophon the narrator

---

θεοῖς τοὺς τε ἔμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου γάμους σὺν ἀγαθαῖς φυλαχθῆναι τύχαις. ('Therefore we were present in order to sacrifice together with him and to pray to the gods that both my marriage and his [Callisthenes'] be guarded by good fortune.' 8.19.3). cf. Repath 2005: 164. Puccini-Delbey 2001: 95 argues that *Leucippe and Cleitophon* cannot have an alternative meaning, and that the meaning at the end is 'closed', but this paper hopes to show, in part, that there is a different way to interpret the 'happy' ending.

<sup>7</sup> καὶ διεγνώκαμεν ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ παραχειμάσαντες διελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον. ('And we decided to go to Byzantium after spending the winter in Tyre.' 8.19.3).

<sup>8</sup> He would have sailed along the coast.

<sup>9</sup> ἐνταῦθα ἦκων ἐκ πολλοῦ χειμῶνος, σῶστρα ἔθουον ἐμαυτοῦ τῇ τῶν Φοινίκων θεᾷ. ('Having arrived there after a severe storm, I made sacrifices to the goddess of the Phoenicians for my safe arrival.' 1.1.2).

<sup>10</sup> At 3.5 a storm sweeps various members of the party ashore in different places along the coast of Egypt.

<sup>11</sup> Winkler 1985, particularly chapter 6, is an excellent study of the tension created within ego-narrative.

<sup>12</sup> Compounding this problem is the matter of the primary unnamed narrator to whom Cleitophon narrates his tale. This paper does not seek to address the complexities caused by this particular layer of narrative.

cannot give away too much of what he has learnt in hindsight at points when Cleitophon the narrated character does not know these things: he has to keep up a fiction of restricted focalisation. The presentation of events through a restricted focalisation seems to become a problem for Cleitophon as he proceeds in his narration, and this provokes questions in the reader's mind as to how the narrator knew certain things, and how far s/he can trust Cleitophon's presentation and interpretation of events.

As the novel progresses, Cleitophon (the narrating-I) has an increasingly loose grip on what the narrated-I actually knows at the point at which the action takes place. He seems unable to sustain satisfactorily the fictional restricted perspective of the narrated-I. This problem is demonstrated clearly by Hägg's analysis.<sup>13</sup> He shows that to begin with Cleitophon narrates other people's feelings and experiences as he observes them, or as he gets to know them from other people's reports. It is his experience that is prioritised.<sup>14</sup> However, later on in the text Cleitophon seems to lose control and other people's feelings are narrated as if he were experiencing them. What other people say and do is described by Cleitophon as and when it happens even though he (as narrated-I) cannot possibly know at that point that it is happening: 'the order of narration is not determined by the moment of perception but by the "actual" chronology of the events.'<sup>15</sup> Cleitophon thus increasingly conflates the different perspectives of the narrating-I and narrated-I. Whilst Hägg sees this as a weakness of Achilles Tatius' narrative, it does not have to be. Whitmarsh takes this slippage in perspective as an intentional and cleverly-crafted part of a narrative about initiation into narration,<sup>16</sup> arguing that throughout the novel, Cleitophon (the narrated-I) moves from naivety to knowledge about how to act in and narrate a novelistic text (the position of the narrating-I):

The events of *Leucippe and Clitophon* constitute, for Clitophon, an object lesson in learning how to deal with novelistic narrative. By

---

<sup>13</sup> Hägg 1971.

<sup>14</sup> Hägg 1971: 303.

<sup>15</sup> Hägg 1971: 303. Noted also by Morgan 2007: 105–6.

<sup>16</sup> Whitmarsh 2003.

the time of the *telos* of the narrative, he is initiated (τετελεσμένος) into the wiles of narration, thus creating the Cleitophon we meet at the start as narrator.<sup>17</sup>

For Whitmarsh, the naive Cleitophon is a narrative construct,<sup>18</sup> and the novel constantly confounds what the reader thinks s/he knows about what Cleitophon knows as either narrated-I or narrating-I. It now has to be considered what the implications are for interpreting Leucippe in this web of contrived narrative.

### **Cleitophon's problematic narration of Leucippe**

Whitmarsh argues that Achilles Tatius' narrative destabilises the authority of the narrator by proposing alternative perspectives.<sup>19</sup> Extending this, I shall argue that Achilles Tatius constructs a narrative that encourages the reader to look for Leucippe's original 'voice' by highlighting points at which Cleitophon misunderstands or has the potential to misunderstand her. The reader is put in the position of not knowing whether what Cleitophon narrates corresponds with what Leucippe actually thinks or feels,<sup>20</sup> and this opens up 'gaps' in the narrative, through which the reader can potentially glimpse the 'real' Leucippe. Four instances of these 'gaps' in the narrative caused by the tension created by Cleitophon's self-centred narration will now be explored.

#### *a. Leucippe's reaction to Cleitophon's initial advances*

In order to impress Leucippe and to try to persuade her to be interested in him, at the end of the first book Cleitophon gives a florid account of different 'lovers' in nature. Throughout his speech he says that he keeps glancing at Leucippe to see whether she is listening and whether she is affected by his

---

<sup>17</sup> Whitmarsh 2003: 199.

<sup>18</sup> This is emphasised by the frame at the beginning: 'Achilles underscores the narrational disjunction between Cleitophon the narrator and Cleitophon his self-cited 'fictional' construct: this is the starkest instance in the novel of narratorial distance, irony in its most pungent form.' Whitmarsh 2003: 202.

<sup>19</sup> Whitmarsh 2003: 192.

<sup>20</sup> Morgan 2007: 117-119 demonstrates how Cleitophon forces Leucippe to play the role he has designed for her, and briefly outlines how Leucippe can be read in a different way because of this. See also Morales 2004: 162-3 for Cleitophon wilfully misreading Leucippe.

words. Crucially, Cleitophon says that she ὑπεσήμαινεν οὐκ ἀηδῶς ἀκούειν ('she gave secret signs<sup>21</sup> that she heard [what I said] not without pleasure' 1.19.1). However, this is Cleitophon's reading of the outward appearance of another character's inner thoughts. The verb ὑποσημαίνω encourages the reader to start asking him/herself how Cleitophon can know what Leucippe is thinking. Perhaps he has got it right: Leucippe does find pleasure in his speech and reciprocates his desire, and shows this with the 'secret signs' of a smile. Perhaps, on the other hand, the 'secret signs' are a smile that is misinterpreted as pleasure when in fact it could be a wry smile to herself because Cleitophon is missing the mark with his impressive monologue on love.

The tension between what Cleitophon (as narrated-I) can know and relate about other people, and what Leucippe (who at this point is silent) may actually experience creates the possibility of a different version of the story.<sup>22</sup> The undercurrents that are created here are that Leucippe does not care for Cleitophon's advances or rhetorical display, and that Cleitophon misinterprets or even makes up her reaction. Indeed, she does not actually say anything to Cleitophon for quite some time in the narrative – and when she does so, as will be seen, it becomes another source of misinterpretation for Cleitophon.

#### *b. Leucippe's reaction to Cleitophon's kiss*

Cleitophon concocts a devious plan to make Leucippe kiss him. He chances to see her 'cure' a bee sting on her servant Cleio's hand by murmuring an incantation over it, and he proceeds the next day to pretend that he too has been stung, but on the lip. Leucippe therefore murmurs her spell close to his lip, and he seizes the opportunity to kiss her.<sup>23</sup> There does not seem to be any mutuality: Cleitophon says ἡ δὲ διασχοῦσα, "Τί ποιεῖς;" ἔφη. "καὶ σὺ κατεπάρδεις;" ('She, pulling away, said, "what are you doing? Are you too

<sup>21</sup> 'Secret' translates the sense of the ὑπο- here.

<sup>22</sup> See Morgan 2007: 118.

<sup>23</sup> τότε οὖν κατὰ τύχην μέλιπτά τις ἢ σφήξ περιβομβήσασα κύκλω μου τὸ πρόσωπον παρέπτη· κάγω λαμβάνω τὸ ἐνθύμιον καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλὼν τοῖς προσώποις προσεποιούμην πεπλήχθαι καὶ ἀλγεῖν. 2.7.3.

making a spell?” 2.7.5). It is almost as if she does not understand the kissing act: this ‘what are you doing?’ is not a question that implies ‘you should not be doing that’, but rather a question asked out of lack of knowledge, since it is followed by another question which asks Cleitophon to analyse what the action is (καὶ σὺ κατεπάδεις;). The forceful διασχοῦσα indicates that whatever it means, Leucippe does not like it. Cleitophon is made to narrate this, but is blinded by his desire for Leucippe and cannot see what the external reader can see: that there is more than one way of interpreting what Leucippe says.

At the end of this episode Cleitophon kisses Leucippe once again, and more forcefully. Once again Leucippe’s feelings about this kiss differ from Cleitophon’s.<sup>24</sup> This is shown by the fact that Cleitophon says ἡ δὲ ἠνείχετο, κωλύουσα δῆθεν (‘and she bore it with patience, pretending to prevent me’ 2.7.7). This short phrase hints at a different underlying situation in two ways. Firstly the verb ἀνέχω does not seem hugely positive: it means to bear with patience, to hold out, or to bear up. Read one way, Cleitophon is saying that Leucippe just bore it whilst he kissed her, which hints at her inner state of mind. Secondly, the adverb δῆθεν, when used ironically, has the effect of negating the participle κωλύουσα, implying it is not true, hence the translation ‘pretending to prevent’. Cleitophon’s interpretation of Leucippe’s actions is that she is being flirtatious by pretending not to enjoy the kiss, but it could be that she *is* actually trying to prevent him from kissing her: δῆθεν also has the force ‘in truth’ or ‘really’, so the phrase could be translated ‘she put up with it, but really she was preventing me’.<sup>25</sup> This subtle double meaning of one word means that Cleitophon, without knowing it, has yet again been made to provide the reader with an insight into Leucippe’s true feelings whilst not being able to read them for himself.

The possibility of reading Leucippe’s true feelings into this kissing scene is made stronger by the fact that at the end of the scene, when they are interrupted by the approach of Leucippe’s servant, Cleitophon admits to not

---

<sup>24</sup> See Morgan 2007: 118.

<sup>25</sup> Morales 2004: 210 supports the first reading, that Leucippe is only pretending, and says that this how translators usually read it. She does, however, say that the phrase is imprecise.

knowing how she feels: διελύθημεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἄκων καὶ λυπούμενος, ἡ δὲ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἶχεν ('we broke apart, I unwillingly and with some grief, but I do not know how she felt' 2.8.1). He clearly has no idea what Leucippe is thinking, but his overall narration of her implies that he thinks he does know.<sup>26</sup>

Prior to the kissing scene, Cleitophon calls Leucippe δέσποινα (2.6.2). Her reaction to this can be read two ways. Cleitophon says ἡ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὺ καὶ ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος, ὅτι συνῆκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ "Χαῖρε, δέσποινα," ('she smiled sweetly and showed clearly through her laughter that she understood why I had said "greetings, Mistress.'" 2.6.2). Even though Leucippe smiles, she then says Ἐγὼ σή; μὴ τοῦτο εἶπης. ('I yours? Do not say that'). This raises some questions of interpretation: why does she tell him not to say this? Is it flirting or is it genuine? Leucippe's words, which seem to contradict her smile,<sup>27</sup> can be read more subversively than Cleitophon's interpretation of them (that she reciprocates and is teasing him) allows for. Leucippe's words therefore communicate with the reader without Cleitophon noticing, even though he is the one who narrates them. The phrase ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος performs a function similar to that of ὑπεσήμαιεν at 1.19.1. It encourages the reader to think about what it is Cleitophon is saying and whether he might be mistaken. He implies that he can read Leucippe's body language, indeed that it is clear to him what she means,<sup>28</sup> but at the same time an element of doubt creeps in: she is laughing. Is she laughing because she does understand and reciprocates his desires, or is she laughing at him?

This episode dramatises the tension created by Cleitophon's narration of other people's feelings. Ironically, he identifies this tension by admitting he does not know how Leucippe feels. However, even after saying that he does not know Leucippe's opinion of him and his advances he carries on attempting to seduce her as he has been advised by his friend Cleinias that one should be persistent with women.

---

<sup>26</sup> cf. Morales 2004: 111.

<sup>27</sup> cf. Morgan 2007: 118.

<sup>28</sup> ἐμφανίζω means 'I show forth', 'I make clear', 'I exhibit'.



*c. The elopement*

At the point at which Cleitophon and Leucippe apparently decide to elope, Cleitophon has almost been caught in Leucippe's bedroom by her mother. He is persuaded by his friend Cleinias that he should flee because of this. It is interesting that Cleinias says τάχα δὲ καὶ τὴν κόρην συμφυγεῖν πείσετε: 'and perhaps you will persuade the girl to flee with you' (2.27.2). The word τάχα injects an element of doubt here, and it can be read as meaning that Cleinias knows or suspects that Cleitophon feels more for Leucippe than she does for him. Once again Cleitophon is made to report someone else's speech in a way that leaves ambiguity as to interpretation.

Leucippe does not ask to leave with Cleitophon because of the desire she feels for him, but says ἐξαρπάσατέ με τῶν τῆς μητρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅποι βούλεσθε ('snatch me away from my mother's sight, wherever you wish' 2.30.1).<sup>29</sup> This carries the implication that Leucippe's reasons for running away are not concordant with Cleitophon's.<sup>30</sup> Leucippe's request follows a passage which reports her thoughts and feelings (2.29), but they are all feelings of grief and shame, not of a passionate desire to elope with her lover. Leucippe sees Cleitophon's plan more as a way of getting away from her overbearing mother than as the commencement of a relationship. Once again it is possible that Cleitophon has misread the signs Leucippe sends out, and in effect denies Leucippe the chance to reveal her feelings by glossing over them with a rhetorical showpiece. It is ironic that although Cleitophon is clearly made to report a situation that implies that Leucippe's true feelings are not as he thinks, he cannot see this for himself.

---

<sup>29</sup> Leucippe does not even say this to Cleitophon, but to Satyrus, who is charged with finding out if she wants to leave. He does not get a chance to ask her before she begs him to take her away.

<sup>30</sup> Morgan notes this at Morgan 2007: 119: 'A sceptical reading of [Kleitophon's] account of the episode will leave the reader in doubt that she really was expecting him that night, and the reason she gives for eloping with Kleitophon is not that she cannot live without him, but that her mother's attentions are intolerable.' See also Alvares 2006: 5.

*d. Leucippe's letter*

Cleitophon alone of novelistic heroes marries another woman, Melite, in the belief that Leucippe is dead. However, Leucippe has not died but has become one of Melite's slaves. She recognises Cleitophon and writes him a letter.<sup>31</sup> Throughout the letter she is very accusatory, implying that she has suffered a great deal for Cleitophon but it has had no effect on him. She also asks Cleitophon to send her home. It is interesting that her only mention of any romantic relationship with Cleitophon is when she asks if she has been through everything 'just so I would become to another man what you have become to another woman' (...ἵνα σὺ ὁ γέγονας ἄλλη γυναικί, καὶ ἐγὼ τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ γένωμαι; 5.18.4). She thus implies that she has some attachment to him, but it is not overstated, as perhaps it might be if she felt the same about Cleitophon as he presents himself as feeling about her. On the other hand, she also says that she is still a virgin, and implies that she has saved herself for him, which ties in with the reciprocal romantic relationship Cleitophon presents in his narrative. Morgan argues for the letter actually revealing Leucippe's own perspective because it demonstrates a side to Leucippe that is not one of the roles Cleitophon tries to get her to play: 'this is the voice neither of willing sex-object nor of generically demure virgin.'<sup>32</sup> Leucippe does not have much speech in the novel, and often when she does speak it is to defend her virginity, so in a sense the letter does fit in with the general scheme that Cleitophon has for her. However, it also betrays a sense of her being constructed as wanting to be in control of her own narrative, and not behaving exactly as Cleitophon wishes: she asks Cleitophon for money so that she can buy her freedom and go home to her father. The gnawing question that hangs over the whole portrayal of Leucippe, but especially at this point, is this: whose voice is this? Before this question is answered the metaliterary function that Leucippe performs will be explored because it is vital to the understanding of the way she fits in to Cleitophon's narrative.

---

<sup>31</sup> 5.18.3-6.

<sup>32</sup> Morgan 2007: 119.

## Leucippe's metaliterary function

As well as the elements discussed above, which centre around Cleitophon's suspect narratorial skills, the novel also constructs a deeper layer of narrative that forms a different perspective on Leucippe. This layer invites the reader to think about the portrayal of women in narrative, and how much they communicate without actually speaking. Leucippe is not very talkative for someone who is apparently so eager to flirt, but the way that she is described in the text speaks volumes about her function within it. Leucippe manipulates the text, communicating with the reader from behind and beyond it, and performing a metaliterary function. This function can best be seen in the vocabulary used to describe her.

### *a. ὑποσημαίνω*

To use this word of Leucippe at 1.19.1 (ὑπεσήμαινεν) is significant.<sup>33</sup> The ὑπο- prefix implies that there is an undercurrent of meaning. Whitmarsh says that Cleitophon's speech 'communicates at the subverbal level',<sup>34</sup> and Leucippe 'giving secret signs' means that she has read his subtextual message and is replying on the same level. However, the verb actually functions on a level even deeper than this. It hints at an invitation to read between the layers of narrative to find Leucippe's perspective, which is beneath (ὑπο) the main narrative, but which can be found if the reader searches for it. The verb signifies Leucippe's role as a shifting and ambiguous layer of meaning underneath Cleitophon's narrative, Cleitophon, as Morgan demonstrates, casts Leucippe in two roles in his narrative: that of someone who reciprocates his desires, and that of a generic romantic heroine. Both of these roles are ones that he projects on to her, and not what she actually *is*.<sup>35</sup> ὑπεσήμαινεν demonstrates that there is potentially a different Leucippe lurking under Cleitophon's bluffing narration. This Leucippe is a site of shifting

---

<sup>33</sup> This is the only occurrence of the verb in the novel.

<sup>34</sup> Whitmarsh 2003: 201. See also Whitmarsh 2010: 341.

<sup>35</sup> Morgan 2007: 118.

meaning who communicates with the reader from behind Cleitophon's narrative, which is perhaps why Cleitophon's portrayal of her is not consistent. The reader is far enough removed from Cleitophon's narration of the story to notice the deeper meaning that he cannot see in his own telling of it.

*b. διασχοῦσα*

At 2.7.5 the participle διασχοῦσα is used of Leucippe starting away from Cleitophon's kiss. The verb indicates that Leucippe is trying to get away from Cleitophon, but there is a metaliterary element to it as well. The use of this verb implies that Leucippe is also trying to get away from the narrator. Coupled with the use of ὑπεσήμενεν, which encourages the reader to look for extra or parallel layers of narrative, the metaliterary interpretation is tempting: Leucippe wants to be ambiguous, and does not want to belong to the narrator or to Cleitophon – she does not want to be 'written'. In context the participle underlines her autonomy in metaliterary terms: she is breaking free of her narrator, hinting to the reader that s/he should not accept Cleitophon's interpretation of her.<sup>36</sup> As a site of shifting meaning she is resistant to interpretation as well as to being written. Conversely, Leucippe is the one element of the text that remains consistent (in her inscrutability), and so reveals an alternative narrative perspective that can be found within the text.

*c. Leucippe as a vehicle for the 'hidden author'*

To return to the question posed above: whose voice it is we hear when Leucippe resists interpretation, or when Cleitophon appears to have misread her?

This Leucippe, a site of shifting meaning, and an entity that is difficult to grasp, is a narrative device of the 'hidden author', a construct that the author

---

<sup>36</sup> Exactly the same participle is used of Melite at 5.13.5, and this is the only other instance of the participle: εἶτα διασχοῦσα εἶπεν· “Αὕτη μοι τροφή.”: then, tearing away, she said “this is my sustenance.” This implies that women in this novel are trying to evade being narrated. Their domain is subtextual and off the page.

uses to poke fun at and trip up the ego-narrator.<sup>37</sup> Morgan argues that there is a 'hidden author' function in Achilles Tatius' novel which makes fun of Cleitophon by representing him as confusing life for literature.<sup>38</sup> Leucippe is another vehicle by which this 'hidden author' function winks at the reader over the head of the narrator. Words such as ὑπεσήμαιεν and διασχοῦσα, coupled with the fact that there is always a potential different meaning whenever Cleitophon narrates Leucippe create a layer of narrative behind the one Cleitophon narrate. This is a layer in which it is not at all certain that Cleitophon is in control. Cleitophon is made to narrate Leucippe's evasion of being narrated and her communication with the reader from beyond his narrative without noticing it himself. She is thus, as a device of Achilles Tatius' 'hidden author', an element that is beyond Cleitophon's control.

## Conclusion

There is an alternative storyline lurking beneath Cleitophon's narrative: one that tells a rather different tale to the one Cleitophon wants to tell, and this alternative storyline is one that pushes through Cleitophon's narrative without him noticing. The Leucippe who lurks in this alternative storyline beneath the text is not only a different Leucippe from the one Cleitophon thinks he is narrating, but is also the vehicle by which the 'hidden author' in Achilles Tatius' novel makes fun of Cleitophon, communicating with the reader from behind his narrative. Everything Leucippe says or does is narrated by Cleitophon, but his interpretation of her always leaves potential for another interpretation. As such she has a certain power and manipulates the reader by causing him/her to glimpse the alternative perspective in the text. The irony is that Cleitophon narrates this 'hidden author' and this Leucippe without even noticing, and they peep out through the gaps in his narrative.

The reason Leucippe is nowhere to be seen at the beginning of the novel is, I suggest, that Cleitophon does not have the narrative skill to control her

---

<sup>37</sup> See Conte 1996, especially 21-28 for the 'hidden author' in the *Satyricon*. The 'hidden author' is distinct from the historical author (24); on this see also Morgan 2007: 107.

<sup>38</sup> Morgan 2007.

beyond the end of his story. He introduces her into his narrative, but once she is there he cannot control her as she signals to the reader from behind his back, as it were. Once again, Achilles Tatius' 'hidden author' draws attention to Cleitophon being out of his narrative depth by highlighting the absence of his narrative agent at the very beginning of the text.

## **Bibliography**

Alvares, J. 2006, 'Reading Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* in counterpoint' in Byrne, S., Cueva, E. and Alvares, J. (eds.), 1–33.

Byrne, S., Cueva, E. and Alvares, J. (eds.) 2006. *Authors, authority, and interpreters in the ancient Novel*. Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.

Conte, G. 1996. *The hidden author: an interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*. London: University of California Press.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative technique in ancient Greek romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm: Svenska institutet i Athen.

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge: CUP.

Morgan, J. 2007. 'Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilles Tatius as hidden author', in Paschalis, Frangoulidis, Harrison and Zimmerman (eds.), 105–120.

Most, G. 1989. 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109, 114–133.

Nilsson, I. 2009 *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the poetics of love and the erotics of reading*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M. and Keulen, W. (eds.) 2003. *The ancient Novel and beyond*. Leiden: Brill.

Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S., Harrison, S. and Zimmerman, M. (eds.) 2007. *The Greek and Roman novel: parallel readings, Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8*. Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.

Pouderon, B. 2001 *Les personnages du roman grec: actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen-Jean Pouilloux.

Puccini-Delbey, G. 2001 'Figures du narrateur et du narrataire dans les œuvres romanesques de Chariton d'Aphrodisias, Achille Tatius et Apulée' in Pouderon (ed.), 87–100.

Repath, I. 2005. 'Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: what happened next?', *The Classical Quarterly* 55 (1), 250–265.

Whitmarsh, T. 2003. 'Reading for pleasure: narrative, irony, and erotics in Achilles Tatius' in Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 191–205.

Whitmarsh, T. 2009. 'Desire and the end of the Greek novel' in Nilsson (ed.), 135–152.

Whitmarsh, T. 2010. 'Domestic poetics: Hippias' house in Achilles Tatius', *Classical Antiquity* 29 (2), 327–348.

Winkler, J. 1985. *Auctor and actor: a narratological reading of Apuleius's The Golden Ass*. Oxford: University of California Press.