

**A PURPOSEFUL INFECTION:
LOVESICKNESS AND GENDER IN HELIODORUS**

by

Breanna E. M. Simpson

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 2015

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
(Ancient Culture, Religion, and Ethnicity)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

April 2017

Abstract

This thesis is the first to undertake a detailed examination of lovesickness within Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*. The ancient Greek novels share a central narrative pattern of a young, beautiful, heterosexual couple falling in love, then surviving a series of adventures, kidnappings, and separations, before ending in their reunion and marriage. This pattern is enhanced by the presence of lovesickness, which is identified as a medical ailment which afflicts many individuals within the novels. Building on the work of David Konstan, Katharine Haynes, and Peter Toohey regarding the nature of lovesickness, gender, and desire in the novels, a clear model of lovesickness emerges. This affliction is triggered by eye contact, combines physical and psychological symptoms, alters behaviours, and requires a marriage and sexual consummation to be fully resolved. This pattern is uniform across the victims of lovesickness, regardless of their age, gender, social, or ethnic background, or whether their desire is reciprocated or one-sided. Chapter one identifies and tests the proposed model of lovesickness, and chapter two discusses how lovesickness affects men, focusing on how it influences the central male protagonist's performance of traditionally masculine behaviours like *andreia* and *sophrosyne*. The third chapter focuses on how lovesickness affects women, including the role of beauty in triggering lovesickness, and the juxtaposition of reciprocal and one-sided cases of lovesickness in the female characters in the *Aethiopika*. The fourth and final chapter looks at cases of lovesickness in the novels that fall outside of the central couple, including rival men, frustrated women, and cases of same-sex desire. Drawing on examples from several other Greek novels, this discussion illuminates the importance of the central couple's romance within the narrative. This thesis concludes that lovesickness serves as a narrative device that privileges the model of a young, beautiful, heterosexual couple over other cases of lovesickness, desire, or love within the ancient Greek novel. Lovesickness is shown to influence constructions of identity and performances of particular gendered behaviours, aiding the central couple in distinguishing themselves from their rivals and antagonists as conforming to desirable norms of cultural, social, and sexual behaviour.

Preface

This thesis is the original, unpublished, independent work of the author, Breanna Simpson.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
Table of contents.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication.....	vii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Lovesickness in the Ancient Greek Novel.....	1
1.2 The Diagnosis and Symptoms.....	9
1.3 Testing the Model.....	16
1.4 Lovesickness in a Wider Context within the Novels.....	19
2 Lovesickness in Men.....	23
2.1 Towards a Definition of Masculinity.....	23
2.2 Nature of Lovesickness in Men.....	30
2.3 Negative Influences of Lovesickness on Male Gender Performance.....	34
2.4 Positive Influences of Lovesickness on Male Gender Performance.....	38
3 Lovesickness in Women.....	42
3.1 Lovesickness: Women’s Role.....	42
3.2 Role of Beauty.....	47
3.3 Women as Objects.....	51
3.4 Women as Agents.....	56
4 Other Victims of Lovesickness.....	62
4.1 Other Novels, Other Cases of Otherness.....	62

4.2 Thwarted Women: One-sided Lovesickness.....	64
4.3 Thwarted Men: Rivals and Widowers.....	70
4.4 Same-Sex Relationships: Mutual yet Unapproved.....	75
4.5 Conclusions.....	82
Bibliography.....	86

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the faculty, students, and staff of the department of Classical, Near Eastern, and Religious Studies for their enormous support, generosity, and warmth of spirit in fostering an environment where reading, thinking, and learning can truly thrive. I am lost for words to adequately thank my supervisor, Dr. C. W. Marshall, for his never ending support, positivity, and for encouraging me to believe in myself and my ideas. This thesis would not exist without our fruitful discussions, and his judicious advice. I would also like to thank Dr. Robert Cousland for his good humour, support, and advice on early drafts of this thesis. Many thanks to Dr. Lisa Cooper and Dr. Sara Milstein for their kind support and encouragement over the course of my degree. A special thank you to Dr. Lyn Rae for encouraging me to pursue graduate studies in this field. My thanks to my fellow graduate students, particularly Gillian Glass and Graham Butler for reading early versions of this thesis and providing invaluable suggestions.

I owe a debt of unpayable gratitude to my amazing family for their support, patience, and encouragement, and for listening to endless versions of this. Thank you for telling me to pursue my dreams, and teaching me to think outside of the conventional. Lastly, I must thank Jasper, Sappho, and my army. They made this a joy to write. *Guren glassui*.

For G. S. M., H. G. M., and L. C. M.

1 Introduction

1.1 Introducing Lovesickness in the Ancient Greek Novel

“They sang with harsh, rough voices, as though they were breaking up the earth with forks, not singing a wedding hymn. Daphnis and Chloe lay down naked together, embraced and kissed, and had even less sleep that night than the owls.” -*Longus 4.40*

Taken from the end of Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, this quotation speaks of the typical ending of the ancient Greek novel, a marriage and sexual consummation. The journey to get to this point is long, however, and there are greater dangers than pirates lurking in the murky waters surrounding the young lovers. This thesis examines issues of lovesickness in the ancient Greek novel. Lovesickness is defined as a medical ailment, characterized by a specific pattern of symptoms and behaviours, which directly impacts the outcome of the story in the novels. The primary corpus of Greek novels date from the Second Sophistic, a period spanning the first to third centuries CE, when Classical Greek culture experienced a renaissance in Roman society.¹ I draw on examples from all five novels in this corpus, while focusing primarily on Heliodorus’ *Aethiopika*. The novels are considered a type of romance literature, with romantic themes of love and *eros* dominating the narrative. Each novel focuses on a central couple, a male and female pair of virgin youths of exceptional physical beauty. Early in the narrative the two see each other for the first time and are immediately stricken by debilitating physical and psychological symptoms, a condition commonly blamed on the god Eros.² These symptoms are used to identify

¹ The main corpus of ancient Greek novels is usually identified as those by Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus. See Reardon 2008: 2-3. The Second Sophistic allowed a number of Greek authors to write about Greek culture and ideals, sparked by Roman imperial interest in the high culture of Classical Greece (5-4th centuries BCE). See Reardon 2008: 5-6. All Heliodorus translations throughout this thesis are by John Morgan, see Reardon (ed) *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (2008). References to the Greek novels are by book and section number, following the divisions marked in Reardon 2008. For the *Aethiopika*, this coincides with the section numbers listed in the Rattenbury et al, 1960. All references throughout this thesis to the original Greek text of the *Aethiopika* are taken from Rattenbury et al (ed) *Heliodore: Les Ethiopiques* (1960). References to the Greek for *Daphnis and Chloe* are from Byrne and Cueva, 2005.

² See Heliodorus 4.1-4, 6, 5.2, 6.3, Chariton 1.2, 5.6, Longus 1.8-13, 2.3-7, Xenophon 1.2, 3-5, and Achilles Tatius 2.5.

the affliction of lovesickness that affects many of the characters.³ The *Aethiopika* provides a representative look at the variety of symptoms and behaviours which comprise lovesickness within the novels as a whole, as well as the role lovesickness plays in shaping the story of the central couple's romance and eventual marriage. Lovesickness follows a specific pattern of symptoms and behaviours, regardless of whether the sickness is one-sided or mutual.⁴ This pattern of lovesickness serves as a narrative device used to ensure the marriage of the central couple takes place, privileging their union over any other romantic attachments in the novels.

The *Aethiopika* or *Ethiopian Tale* is difficult to date accurately, but is usually dated to the late-fourth century CE.⁵ It consists of ten books, which follow the adventures of Charikleia and Theagenes, a young, beautiful couple who fall in love with each other at first sight. It opens *in medias res*, in the middle of the story, with a band of brigands coming upon the young couple, who are already in the midst of their journey. They have just been reunited after a number of mishaps, and their love for each other is described by the bandits in the opening passages. The backstory of how they came to be in the straits we find them in is then conveyed to the reader through stories told to the other characters. A series of improbable events such as kidnappings, pirates, and enslavement work to keep the central couple apart for much of the story, offering multiple opportunities for each of them to prove their chastity, fidelity, and devotion to the other.

³ In Heliodorus, the term *nosos*, meaning illness or malady, is used by physicians to diagnosis and describe lovesickness.

⁴ Mutual or reciprocal lovesickness refers to when two individuals, usually the central couple, are each struck with lovesickness for the other.

⁵ Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2012. A 2nd century CE date is suggested by the novel's relation to Juvenal and similarities to Achilles Tatius (late 2nd century CE). The late-fourth century CE date is based on Heliodorus' apparent description of the siege of Nisibis by the Persians in 350 CE. For more on the arguments for the fourth century date, see Bowersock 1994: 48-49, Romilly 1985: 205, and Sandy 1982: 2-3.

Charikleia serves as the key figure of the narrative; an Ethiopian princess exposed as a baby and raised as a Greek by her adoptive father Charikles, she is eventually brought before her birth parents and a recognition scene takes place.⁶ Theagenes follows Charikleia on her journey, serving as both an example of how lovesickness presents in men, and as an object of female desire. Theagenes' role as an object of female desire is emphasized with the introduction of Arsake, an Egyptian queen who falls in love with Theagenes, and provides much of the narrative's conflict. Arsake's one-sided desires for the object of her affections, as well as a juxtaposition between foreign desire and Greek lovesickness, provide examples of the negative aspects of lovesick desire in the novel. These three characters in the *Aethiopika* make up a triangle of lovesick desire, with an examination of their interactions providing a look at the different facets which make up the condition of lovesickness in the novel. Theagenes and Charikleia represent the ideal model of a couple, suffering from mutual lovesickness for each other. Mutual lovesickness is defined as when two individuals, usually the central couple, are each struck with lovesickness for the other. In this case, the sickness is triggered and exacerbated by the couple's inability to possess the other physically, until the end of the story.⁷ Arsake represents the model of unrequited or one-sided lovesickness, where her desire for Theagenes is not returned. One-sided or thwarted lovesickness is defined here as a case of lovesickness where the afflicted individual desires an individual, but the desire is not returned and the illness is not shared by the desired individual.⁸

⁶ Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2012.

⁷ In this thesis, mutual, requited, or reciprocal lovesickness will be used when referring to the lovesickness affecting the central couple, or any couple where the sickness is not one-sided.

⁸ In this thesis, one-sided, unreturned, thwarted, or frustrated are used to refer to a case of lovesickness, or an individual afflicted with lovesickness, where the sickness is not mutual.

It is important here to draw a distinction between mere love or desire, and the medical ailment that is lovesickness. Lovesickness falls under the broader category of *eros* in the novel, a term that is generally used to denote concepts of desire or love. A distinction must be made here between the conception of *eros* as a whole and the concept of lovesickness itself.⁹ I view lovesickness as a specific type of *eros* within the novels, a sickness caused by desire, that has negative consequences for the identities of the characters it afflicts.

Divinity is a complex topic within the novels, and especially the *Aethiopika*.¹⁰ Of the many gods referenced in the novel corpus, Eros appears the most consistently.¹¹ Dowden identifies the Eros of the novels as a “literary and artistic genre figure” rather than a god to be worshiped.¹² This highlights the role of Eros in the novels as an excuse for the first stirrings of desire, following the pattern in the novels of characters “readily attributing what happens to them to the gods.”¹³ Eros the god is frequently invoked by the characters in discussions of desire relating to lovesickness.¹⁴ Discussions of *eros* in relation to lovesickness in the novels can also refer to the concept as an emotion and a plot device, rather than just a god.¹⁵ Konstan argues that

⁹ Konstan 1994: 49-63. The role of *eros* as an emotion or a god complicates this distinction somewhat. For a discussion of erotic infatuation and *eros* being discussed in a medical context, see Toohey 2004: 59-64.

¹⁰ For a discussion of the diversity of gods mentioned in Heliodorus, see Chew 2007: 279-298.

¹¹ See Dowden 2010: 365 for a chart showing how many times Eros, Pan, and Nymphs are mentioned per 100,000 words in each novel. Eros is mentioned the most consistently, 91 times in both Xenophon and Longus and 40-55 times in Chariton and Achilles Tatius. Notably, Eros is mentioned the least in Heliodorus, appearing in the text only five times in every 100,000 words. For a chart of the number and type of words used to refer to the gods in the novels, see Dowden 2010: 366. The most common word used in Heliodorus is *theoi*.

¹² Dowden 2010: 364.

¹³ Chew 2007: 286-87. For a discussion of Eros’ role in instigating “erotic sickness” in Chariton and Xenophon see Whitmarsh 2011: 34-36. For a discussion of an analogous case of lovesickness in Apuleius, see Toohey 2004: 85-86.

¹⁴ For examples of Eros the god being mentioned in discussions of lovesickness see Achilles Tatius 1.2, 1.7, 1.17, 2.1, 2.5, 8.12, Chariton 4.2, 5.6, Heliodorus 2.7, 2.33, 4.1, 4.4, Longus 1.8-11, 2.3-7, 4.38, and Xenophon 1.1-2, 2.1.

¹⁵ Toohey 2004: 60-61. For examples of *eros* mentioned in relation to lovesickness, but not referring to a god, see Achilles Tatius 1.4, 1.7, 1.11, 2.3, 2.34, 5.5, Chariton 2.4, 3.1-2, 6.3, Heliodorus 1.11, 4.10, Longus 1.14, 1.17-19, 1.22, 1.24, 2.8, 3.14, 4.17, Xenophon 1.2, 1.15.

eros is usually used to refer to a form of negative erotic desire, but can act as a motive in the novels to sate that negative desire through marriage, turning it into a positive outcome rather than a negative one.¹⁶ He suggests the novels transform *eros* into a “fully reciprocal passion between equals.”¹⁷ It is clear that *eros* is a very complicated topic, tricky to define and trickier to utilize effectively. The precise relationship between *eros* and lovesickness in the novels warrants further discussion, but for the purposes of this thesis I draw the following distinction between these concepts. *Eros* can refer to both brief erotic desire and a deeper, more debilitating form of erotic desire. Lovesickness in the novels, however, refers to a form of erotic illness. It is diagnosable, follows a specific progression of debilitating symptoms, influences behaviours in certain ways, and requires conjugal sex to be resolved. *Eros* is an emotion and a god, lovesickness is a narrative tool.¹⁸

Toohey argues that lovesickness should be taken “as a product of unconsummated or abnormally frustrated love,” a type of *eros* that is cured by marriage and the subsequent sexual consummation of that marriage.¹⁹ This cure through sexual consummation only works for the central couple, where it neutralizes the negative aspects of the sickness and legitimizes the intimate desire between the young virgins. One-sided lovers suffer purely negative affects from the lovesickness, in terms of the damage done to their minds, bodies, and lives by the sickness, without the benefit of the legitimizing cure. These issues are particularly relevant in the

¹⁶ Konstan 1994: 42, 45.

¹⁷ Konstan 1994: 33.

¹⁸ It should be noted that lovesickness can be described as a plot convention of the story in the novels, as well as a narrative tool of the author, as it is a tool that is utilized across all the extant novels examined in this thesis. This is not to limit our understanding, but to emphasize this crucial function.

¹⁹ Toohey 2004: 61. See also Crewe 2009: 601-2 for a detailed discussion of the importance of marriage in the novels. For a discussion of the central pattern of chaste romance, misadventure, and eventual marriage between the central couples see Cooper 1996: 28-29, Elsom 1992: 213, Montague 1992: 231-32, Whitmarsh 1999: 18.

Aethiopika, where frustrated desire plagues all three lovesick characters in the central triangle.²⁰

Toohey makes a distinction between “violent erotic infatuation,” like that of Euripides’ *Medea*, and passive erotic desire, like that experienced by the characters in the novels.²¹ Toohey also tells us that lovesickness in the novels is a largely non-violent affliction, one which is characterized by depressive behaviours.²² Toohey’s establishment of lovesickness as a depressive illness, one caused by *eros* and characterized by unfulfilled desire, provides a solid base from which to explore the exact nature of lovesickness as a medical ailment. I refine Toohey’s definition somewhat, arguing that lovesickness is not characterized by unfulfilled desire, but rather caused and exacerbated by it.

David Konstan suggests that the novels set a new precedent in ancient Greek literature for the treatment of lovesickness as it is understood by Toohey, a negative and debilitating form of *eros*.²³ Toohey and Konstan argue that lovesickness is transformed from a damaging form of one-sided desire within the novels, into a legitimized form of passionate desire, which can be neutralized through marriage.²⁴ I expand on this argument by suggesting that despite this transformation, lovesickness continues to have a debilitating effect on a victim, compromising their physical and mental health, behaviours, and gender performance. I argue that the

²⁰ The second triangle of lovesick individuals, between Knemnon, Thisbe, and Demainete, is considered in combination with the three main characters.

²¹ Toohey 2004: 57-59.

²² Toohey 1992: 265-67. Toohey outlines lovesickness as sharing symptoms and behaviours with the ancient Greek concept of melancholy (*melancholia*), a depressive state which negatively affected individuals and led to passive behaviour. While Toohey argues that lovesickness is synonymous with melancholy in the novels, I argue that this is in fact not the case, as not all characters exhibiting *eros* within the novel are also afflicted with melancholy. I argue rather that lovesickness only occurs when both melancholy and *eros* are present within a character, with the initial touch of *eros* resulting in a melancholy state of mind. See also Ferrand 1990: 41.

²³ Konstan 1994: 57-58. See also Winkler 1994: 23-26.

²⁴ Konstan 1994: 56-57. Konstan also argues that lovesickness is reinvented within the novels into a passive condition, rehabilitated to express a positive ideal of fidelity and marriage which mitigates the damage the sickness causes. See also Toohey 2004: 59-60, and Perkins 1995: 52-53.

lovesickness demonstrated in the narrative acts as a destructive force, one which is characterized as an illness that influences both the mind and body, negatively impacting the performance of identity within the narrative as a whole.²⁵

I look at lovesickness as a depressive illness characterized by a specific group of physical and psychological symptoms, which affects either both members of a specific central couple, or someone who desires a member of the couple, regardless of whether that desire is mutual or one-sided. These two different types of individuals, those for whom the desire is reciprocated, and those for whom it is one-sided, generally fall into two character types. Those suffering from requited, mutual lovesickness are usually younger, unmarried virgins, aristocratic, have heightened physical beauty, and are identified with Greek culture and values, whether ethnically or by upbringing. Charikleia and Theagenes are a classical example of this model, which is usually represented solely by the central couple in the narrative. This primary couple is always heterosexual, and their story usually culminates in their desire being “legitimated by marriage.”²⁶ Because of their young age, these individuals are also usually still under the influence of their parents, living under their father’s control, or otherwise under the supervision of an older individual.²⁷ For young women, their unmarried state and the fact they are living with their father or another adult guardian would connote their status as a *parthenos*.²⁸ By contrast, frustrated victims such as Arsake are usually of foreign extraction, in charge of their own situation and

²⁵ Djaza 2008: 65-66.

²⁶ Alexander 1998: 251.

²⁷ The age of the central couple is not specifically given, but their unmarried state suggests they are in their late teens to early twenties.

²⁸ Chadwick 1996: 226-27. In the *Aethiopika*, Charikleia lives with her adoptive father Charikles at the time she is struck by lovesickness (3.6-9). For a discussion of the marriageable age of Roman *parthenoi* see Hopkins 1965, and Shaw 1987.

finances or otherwise in a position of power, slightly older, married or previously attached in some way, their physical beauty is not always emphasized, and they are sexually experienced.²⁹ Frustrated victims can also be of a lower social status, such as the maid who falls in love with Knemnon, with their status directly affecting their ability to find a cure for their desires (Heliodorus 1.11). Afflicted individuals in both groups can be male or female, though a higher ratio of those afflicted tend to be female.³⁰ Regardless of whether the love is mutual or one-sided, this affliction continues to influence the behaviour of the sufferers throughout the remainder of the narrative.

Lovesickness serves a distinct narrative function in the novels, by privileging the romantic relationship between the central couple over any other romantic attachments. Anderson argues that Heliodorus employs “narrative engineering” to privilege the reciprocal romance between Theagenes and Charikleia and ensure their marriage and sexual consummation are the clearly intended goals of the story.³¹ Morgan also emphasizes “how Heliodorus’ narrative advances the chaste, reciprocal...love of Charikleia and Theagenes.”³² He points out Heliodorus’ use of other characters as negative foils for the central couple, suggesting plot and characterization function inside the narrative to ensure the desired narrative outcome of a marriage and sexual union between the central couple.³³ In other words, lovesickness serves the deliberate narrative purpose of facilitating the central union in the novel, while simultaneously

²⁹ An example of an individual who does not fit this model of one-sided sufferers, at least in regards to age, is Dorcan and his one-sided love for Chloe (Longus 1.15). For a more in-depth discussion of different types of individuals suffering from frustrated lovesickness, see chapter 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

³⁰ For a discussion of less commonly occurring forms of lovesickness and erotic desire, see Watanabe 2003.

³¹ Anderson 1997: 304-305. See also Morgan 1994: 107-109.

³² Anderson 1997: 304. See also Morgan 1989: 99-100.

³³ Morgan 1989: 100-102. See also Morgan 1994: 107.

ensuring any competing relationships remain one-sided and unfulfilled.³⁴ It ensures that the central couple, after being torn apart by circumstances, will find their way back to each other and finally consummate their relationship. This narrative function can be illuminated through an examination of the nature, symptoms, and results of lovesickness within the novels.

1.2 The Diagnosis and Symptoms

Lovesickness has a long history of being characterized as a medical condition within Greek literature.³⁵ Ancient Greek physicians identify lovesickness as a medical ailment.³⁶ The 2nd century CE Greek physician Galen concluded that lovesick individuals were afflicted by an imbalance of the four humours, rather than any divine affliction.³⁷ In his *Prognostics*, Galen references the efforts of both “sophistic doctors” and the physician Erasistratos in diagnosing an illness that has physical symptoms, a psychological cause, and seems to be triggered by love.³⁸ Galen begins by describing the case of “Iustus’ wife,” a woman “who was wasting away without displaying any diseased part” (Galen 5.6).³⁹ Galen also describes a “woman who was said to lie awake at night, constantly tossing from one position to another” (Galen 5.22). He goes on to conclude that “there was no bodily illness and that the woman was troubled by some

³⁴ While this discussion uses Heliodorus as the key example of lovesickness being used for this kind of narrative function, I argue that lovesickness also serves this same narrative function in a wider context within the other extant Greek novels, including Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Xenophon of Ephesus’ *An Ephesian Tale*.

³⁵ Tallis 2004: 8-12. See also Perkins 1994: 155-57, and Toohey 2004: 23-29. Fragments by Sappho reference some physical symptoms of love such as sweating and trembling, while Plato’s *Phaedrus* describes afflicted individuals as “sufferers” experiencing intense physical symptoms (*Phaedrus* 231c-233b). It should be noted that Plato is discussing homosexual desire in relation to lovesickness in this passage.

³⁶ Tallis 2004: 13. See also Nelson Hawkins 2017: 66-67.

³⁷ Tallis 2004: 12-14. The four humours, or bodily fluids, were phlegm, yellow bile, black bile, and blood.

³⁸ Wack 1990: 9. It should be noted that the case he recounts involved Erasistratos diagnosing a man, Antiochus, rather than a woman. See also Pinault 1992: 68.

³⁹ Translations and Greek text for Galen’s *Prognostics* are from Nutton 1979.

psychological disturbance...her expression and facial colour changed” (Galen 6.7-9). After observing these symptoms, he concludes through observation that her illness is triggered by her love for a man other than her husband, her symptoms worsening when she sees this man dancing and performing (Galen 6.9-10).

Galen uses *eros* to describe the cause of lovesickness, regardless of whether the afflicted individual is male or female. Winkler suggests that *eros* is a purely negative force here, equating the disease of lovesickness with this negativity.⁴⁰ I argue instead the novels represent a shift away from this negative, apparently incurable form of sickness identified by Erasistratos and Galen, as lovesickness is rehabilitated into being useful to the story, rather than detrimental to it. While Galen largely refrains from passing moral judgements on his patients in these passages, the case is identified as an illicit, but perhaps involuntary, extra-marital attachment on the part of an already married woman.⁴¹ Wack argues that Galen’s account emphasizes the afflicted woman’s “embarrassment and secrecy,” with *eros* suggesting a negative form of desire. He describes a clear progression of symptoms, as well as remarking on the relation between eye contact and the start of the illness. Galen does not offer a clear cure, besides the seemingly unhelpful suggestion that the patient should distract themselves by going quail hunting.⁴² While Galen deals with cases of one-sided and apparently illicit sickness, his theories serve as a clear historical template for the diagnosis of lovesickness within the novels. The *Aethiopika* in

⁴⁰ Winkler 1990: 83-84.

⁴¹ Wack 1990: 9. While the accounts of Galen’s diagnosis detailed here relate only to women, there is a long history of men being diagnosed with the same ailment. Galen details several of these incidents in *On Prognosis* (6.11-7.12).

⁴² In his commentary on Hippocrates’ *Epidemics*, Galen has a lengthy passage suggesting male victims of such ailments should be distracted with diverting physical activities, one of which is quail hunting (others are riding, wrestling, and cock fighting). Translations of the passage are from Wack 1990: 8.

particular presents the character of Akesinos, a physician who correctly diagnoses Charikleia with the ailment of lovesickness (*nosos*), a diagnosis which eluded other physicians (Heliodorus, 4.7-8).⁴³ Nelson Hawkins discusses the prestige attached to a physician's ability to diagnose lovesickness correctly:⁴⁴ "The learned physician Akesinos—you must know who I mean" (Heliodorus 4.7). This suggests that Akesinos' presence in the novel normalizes Charikleia's diagnosis, indicating that such afflictions weren't unusual for young women of the time, in literature at least.⁴⁵

Cyrino argues that early Greek poetry presents lovesickness as an ailment which "assaults the lover's body" with physical symptoms, as well as "assailing its victim's organs of thought."⁴⁶ Cyrino suggests that lovesickness results from a "lack of consummation of erotic desire," due to separation or one-sided passion.⁴⁷ This model of lovesickness being caused by the inability to attain the desired individual immediately can also be applied to the novels. Cyrino's model does not explore the nature of frustrated desire fully, something which I expand on in my discussion of the novels. Cyrino also discusses the destructive power of *eros* on the physical body.⁴⁸ I take this further in arguing that lovesickness itself is what is physically destructive, with *eros* merely serving as a cause for the physical symptoms which do the damage. Additionally, the destructive

⁴³ *Nosos* translates as sickness, disease, or malady. It can also refer to a sickness of the mind. The passage also calls the ailment afflicting Charikleia a *pathos* of the *psyche*, or an emotion or passion of the soul. *Pathos* can be used to refer specifically to love affecting the soul. Notably, her desire for Theagenes is described as *eros* in the same passage, and it apparently perceived as part of her *nosos*. For other examples of *nosos* being used to refer to lovesickness see Longus 2.9.

⁴⁴ Nelson Hawkins 2017: 66. See also Pinault 1992: 68.

⁴⁵ Nelson Hawkins 2017: 67. Another example of a physician diagnosing young people with lovesickness occurs in Longus (1.18).

⁴⁶ Cyrino 1995: 2, 8-9.

⁴⁷ Cyrino 1995: 166.

⁴⁸ Cyrino 1995: 166-67.

capabilities also influence behaviours.⁴⁹ This attribution of physical and psychological symptoms to one cause provides a template for considering lovesickness as having the same properties as a disease, with a specific presentation, diagnosis, and treatment. May further suggests that lovesickness is characterized as a psychological illness, one caused by mental and emotional turbulence rather than physical infection. It is an illness frequently misdiagnosed as a physical ailment due to the presence of physical symptoms.⁵⁰ There are clear diagnostic elements available in the form of a distinct cause, a grouping of common symptoms, a grouping of common behaviours, and an eventual outcome, all of which can be used to diagnose a character as lovesick, rather than as simply in love or affected by *eros*.

There are six different physical symptoms which typically characterize those afflicted by lovesickness within the novels. These symptoms include lack of sleep (Heliodorus 1.16, 3.7, 3.18-19, 7.4, 7.9), loss of appetite (Heliodorus 3.7, 3.18-19, 4.4, 4.5, 6.5, 7.9), weight loss (Heliodorus 3.7, 3.18-19, 6.5), a pale or blotched complexion (Heliodorus 1.16, 3.5, 8.13), rapid pulse (Heliodorus 3.5, 6.5, 8.13), and hollow eyes (Heliodorus 1.16, 3.5, 3.7, 3.18-19, 7.4, 8.13).⁵¹ There is no specific or consistent vocabulary used to describe these symptoms in the Greek, but a range of descriptive and evocative phrases. These specific symptoms are present on each occasion in which a character undergoes the process of being suddenly struck by lovesickness, with changes in pulse and complexion usually coming first, followed by lack of

⁴⁹ Cyrino 1995: 165-67. Rather than specifically looking at behaviours, Cyrino argues that *eros* influences thoughts.

⁵⁰ May 2014: 107-108.

⁵¹ Dzaja 2008: 66. See also Biesterfeldt and Gutas 1984: 21, Goldhill 1995: 12-13, Perkins 1995: 53, 156-7, Toohey, 2004: 58-60. For examples of lovesickness symptoms within the other four novels, see Achilles Tatius 1.4-7, 1.9, 4.7, 5.18-22, 5.25, 6.18, Chariton 1.1, 2.3-4, 3.1, 6.3, Longus 1.11-14, 1.17, 1.24, 1.32, 2.8, 4.29, Xenophon 1.3-5, 1.10, 2.5, 3.2, 3.12, 4.8.

appetite and sleep as the illness progresses towards the apparently fatal outcome. This slow decline is shown in the most detail when Charikleia falls sick with love for Theagenes (Heliiodorus 3.7-14). The descriptions of her illness, along with her doctor's careful examination and outlining of the symptoms, highlights both the importance of lovesickness as a largely incurable ailment in the novels, as well as the confusion surrounding the nature of lovesickness even within the narrative itself.⁵² The symptoms are typically described in clusters, when a character, usually female, has progressed far enough in the course of the disease for others to take notice and describe the physical changes they observe.

Lovesickness within the novels also manifests half-a-dozen different depressive behaviours in those it afflicts, largely tied to the physical symptoms listed above. These behaviours include prolonged periods of silence (Heliiodorus 1.9, 4.1, 6.5), restless behaviour (Heliiodorus 2.7, 2.25, 4.1, 6.5, 7.10-12, 7.16, 7.20, 8.16, 9.29), uncontrolled verbal outbursts (Heliiodorus 1.9, 2.1, 2.7, 2.25, 4.1, 7.10-12, 7.20, 8.16, 9.29), depressive moods (Heliiodorus 1.9, 2.1, 2.25, 4.1, 4.7, 6.3, 6.8-9, 7.16), prolonged periods in bed (Heliiodorus 1.9, 4.1, 4.7, 6.8-9), and attempted suicide (Heliiodorus 2.3, 4.7, 6.8-9).⁵³ Like the physical symptoms, these behaviours follow a progression, with periods of silence and restlessness beginning almost immediately, while verbal outbursts and depressive behaviours characterize the lead-up to

⁵² May 2014: 107-11. May discusses the significance of Akesinos' ability to definitively diagnosis a case of lovesickness, suggesting that diagnosing the ailment was difficult according to ancient medical literature, and therefore Akesinos' diagnosis emphasizes his skill as a physician.

⁵³ Toohey 2004: 57-59.

death.⁵⁴ And like the physical symptoms, it is not specific vocabulary that is used, but a range of descriptive and evocative phrases.

While the triggers of a lovesick infection can be various, the progression of symptoms and behaviours are usually initiated by an instance of eye contact.⁵⁵ In cases of mutual lovesickness between the central couple, this is reciprocal eye contact where the victims meet each other's gaze at the exact same moment: "Theagenes has captured your heart at first sight" (Heliodorus 4.11).⁵⁶ In cases of one-sided lovesickness, the eye contact is also one-sided, with the victim being struck by the sight of the physical object they desire, but not themselves being seen by that person (Heliodorus 1.9, 7.4).⁵⁷ In both types of case, the women are often struck by the sight of the men while they are engaged in some form of athletic pursuit or competition. Morales argues that the eye plays an important role in the novels, suggesting it is the window through which beauty is perceived.⁵⁸ It is not merely the eyes which trigger lovesickness in these cases, but the moment the eye makes contact with the desired individual. Each of these moments is emphasized in the narrative, rather than being glossed over quickly. The moment lovesickness

⁵⁴ None of the afflicted individuals appear to actually succumb to lovesickness, even those who suffer from one-sided cases, such as Arsake. For examples of such behaviours in the other four novels, see Achilles Tatius 1.6, 1.8, 2.34, 2.38, 5.5, 5.18-22, 5.25, 8.12, Chariton 2.3-4, 2.6-7, 2.11, 3.1, 5.6, 6.3, 8.1, Longus 1.14, 1.15, 1.24, 3.14, 4.16, 4.29, Xenophon 1.2, 1.5, 1.9, 2.1, 2.3, 3.8-9, 4.8.

⁵⁵ Falling in love at first sight was a common idea in Greek literature. See Wack 1990: 9-10. An example of this is the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, where Perseus is described as falling in love with Andromeda at first sight (Apollod. 2.43-44). For a detailed discussion of this, see Marshall 2014: 167-68.

⁵⁶ For cases of lovesickness being triggered between the central couple by eye contact in the other novels, see Achilles Tatius 1.4, Chariton 1.1, Longus 1.11-15, Xenophon 1.5.

⁵⁷ For examples of one-sided lovesickness triggered by one-sided eye contact in the other novels, see Achilles Tatius 1.9, 7.16, Chariton 2.3-4, and Longus 1.15, 4.11. For a more in-depth examination of these instances in Heliodorus, see chapter 3.2 of this thesis.

⁵⁸ For a discussion of the role of beauty in triggering lovesickness see chapter 3.2 of this thesis. For a discussion of the "erotics of the gaze" in the novels see Cooper 1996: 33. For a discussion of "love at first sight" in the *Aethiopika* see Montiglio 2013: 118-119.

starts is always associated with the victim seeing the object of their desire. Eye contact, mutual or one-sided, is the device through which lovesickness is triggered.⁵⁹

Lovesickness, then, is defined as a debilitating mental affliction initially triggered by a sudden, intense desire for an unattainable individual.⁶⁰ The affliction is identified through a group of progressively debilitating and potentially fatal physical symptoms, which result in the victim exhibiting an altered, depressive pattern of behaviours. This cascade of symptoms is triggered by the sufferer laying eyes on the object of their desire, and then intensified by the need to possess that object physically. This need for possession manifests itself through the desire for physical contact, and it is when this desire is denied, delayed, or thwarted in some way that the progression of the disease occurs. Physical contact alleviates the symptoms somewhat, but the only cure for the illness is marriage followed by consensual consummation.⁶¹ This pattern of lovesickness follows the same manifestation and progression in those it afflicts, regardless of gender, social status, age, or whether the desire is mutual or one-sided.⁶²

This model of lovesickness follows a clear pattern of progression. It is most often present in either young, virginal individuals who mutually desire one another but are kept apart by circumstances, or older, sexually experienced individuals who suffer from one-sided desire for a

⁵⁹ For a closer examination of examples of eye contact triggering lovesickness, see chapter 3.2.

⁶⁰ Unattainable is used here to refer to a denial of immediate possession, where the individual is temporarily or permanently inaccessible, socially or physically, to the afflicted individual.

⁶¹ Both *Arsake* (7.9-12) and *Theagenes'* (4.6) behaviours towards the objects of their desires seems to suggest that consummation must be consensual for it to alleviate the lovesick urges, rather than forced on one party by the other. In *Arsake's* case in particular, only turning her one-sided desire into mutual love would offer a cure. For an example of consummation after marriage being listed as a cure (*pharmakon*) for lovesickness within the novels, see Longus 2.9. The same word *pharmakon* is also used to refer to poison in Longus 1.18.

⁶² Konstan 1994: 43. Konstan discusses "erotic attraction" as "uniform" in the novels, but does not refer specifically to lovesickness here.

younger person. All afflicted individuals' behaviours are, subsequent to the first strike of the sickness, specifically influenced by the sickness. This grouping of circumstances, symptoms, and behaviours allows for a diagnostic model to be constructed and utilized to identify cases of lovesickness within the *Aethiopika*, with a view towards examining the narrative function of lovesickness in influencing both characters' behaviours and the outcome of the plot.

1.3 Testing the Model

My diagnostic model of lovesickness as a mental affliction triggered by mutual or one-sided physical desire, leading to a spiral of debilitating physical symptoms, can be tested through an examination of primary extant sources pertaining to lovesickness, sources that predate the novels. An examination of the following examples, texts that likely informed the approach to lovesickness taken by the respective authors of the novels, enriches the literary context within which to explore the examples in the *Aethiopika*. The works of the archaic Greek poet Sappho offer an excellent example of the form of lovesickness found in the *Aethiopika*. Sappho 31 (c. 600 BCE) characterizes love as a “creeping thing,” insidious and destructive.⁶³ As will be seen with the example of Phaedra in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, this encroachment of lovesick desire is caused by an unquenchable yearning for an unattainable individual, and can be cured only by the love becoming mutual and consummated. Sappho's poem fits the broad lines of the proposed definition of lovesickness, a debilitating disease which addles the mind and wastes the body, triggered by a denied or delayed desire. Cyrino states that Sappho “establishes a definitive poetic

⁶³ This sentiment is argued in Catullus 51, where Lesbia reflects on her beauty and her role as an object of men's desire and love.

catalogue for the symptoms” of erotic infatuation.⁶⁴ These symptoms fit those associated with lovesickness in the novels, aiding the establishment of a clear diagnostic pattern for the affliction striking the characters in the *Aethiopika*.

Another early example of our diagnostic model of lovesickness can be found in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*. *Hippolytus* (428 BCE) presents us with the character of Phaedra, a stepmother compelled to fall in love with her stepson Hippolytus by the goddess Aphrodite (*Hippolytus* 30-40). Phaedra is immediately struck with a physical desire for Hippolytus, which confuses her mind and begins to drive her insane as she attempts to deny that desire. An array of physical symptoms begins to emerge, such as “wasting away in bed,” looking exhausted, her complexion changing (*Hippolytus* 25), and several other physical symptoms that are nearly identical to those present in the case of Charikleia (*Hippolytus* 31, 270-80). This love is like a disease, striking a victim and causing them to waste slowly away. Phaedra’s desire is not returned, and her behaviours rapidly worsen until she succumbs to her “terrible disease of impious passion” and hangs herself, after ensuring her stepson’s destruction (*Hippolytus* 810). Phaedra’s affliction is characterized as a mental confusion which is instigated by desire, and manifests in a fatal progression of depressive physical symptoms and behaviours. Her desires remain one-sided, and therefore the only possible outcome for her is death. This model of a slightly older woman succumbing to one-sided desire fits the model of lovesickness laid out in the *Aethiopika* through the character of Arsake. Toohey argues that Euripides’ play presents a form of lovesickness that intersects with melancholy, while still remaining destructive.⁶⁵ I

⁶⁴ Cyrino 1995: 134.

⁶⁵ Toohey 2004: 55.

suggest instead that Euripides presents a model of lovesickness which sets up the framework for the models of lovesickness found in the novels, but does not yet incorporate the potential for a legitimized cure, leaving Phaedra with no attainable happy ending in sight. This lovesickness serves to drive the plot to its conclusion, both within *Hippolytus* and in the novels.

A third example to consider when examining incidents of lovesickness that influenced the novels is presented in book three of Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* (3rd century BCE). Here Medea is presented as a girl forced to fall in love by Eros. She is struck by the same symptoms as Charikleia is, but, as in the case of Arsake, her affliction is described as "passion" rather than love, possibly due to her foreign identity (Apollonius, *Argonautica* 3.790). This Medea parallels aspects of Phaedra in *Hippolytus*, being struck suddenly by the affliction of passion, then becoming speechless, weak, and listless (*Argonautica* 3.285-300). Medea's mind becomes confused, and her symptoms intensify as she denies her desire for Jason (*Argonautica* 3.640). While Medea's case appears to end more happily than Phaedra's, as the love becomes mutual, she continues to fit the model for lovesickness proposed above, in terms of her affliction, symptoms, behaviours, and the eventual progression of the disease. Medea and Jason's eventual mutual desire offers an earlier parallel to the model of acceptable lovesick desire between the central couples in the novels. The above examples of lovesick cases which predate the *Aethiopika* fit the diagnostic model proposed earlier, with a mental illness being triggered by a

strong, initially one-sided desire, and a progression of physical symptoms ending in either death or physical consummation.⁶⁶

Each case contains elements which differ from those in other examples, while still remaining within the broad parameters of the diagnostic model. One aspect of this is the different reasons for why a character's initial desire remains frustrated long enough for the physical symptoms to progress to debilitating levels. Within the *Aethiopika* the obstacles are a refusal from the male object of desire to return the one-sided affections, or the interference of a parental figure. By contrast, the women in the above examples fight their desire because it is morally distasteful, or artificially triggered by a god. Likewise, the cause of the initial strike of desire varies, from gods such as Eros or Aphrodite, to a more general *eros*, to human machinations. Despite these differences, the basic diagnostic model remains constant through the examples considered here, affecting both women and men in a similar way. The narrative focus placed on women's voices within *Hippolytus*, the works of Sappho, and the *Argonautica*, makes it easier to understand the progression and experience of the disease in women than it is in men. This focus on a woman's experience of lovesickness largely holds true for the novels as well.

1.4 Lovesickness in a Wider Context within the Novels

My investigation of lovesickness within the *Aethiopika* involves three distinct topics of inquiry: how lovesickness affects the central male protagonist, how it affects the central female protagonist, and how it affects individuals outside of the central couple. My second chapter looks

⁶⁶ It should be noted that some characters struck with one-sided lovesickness simply fade out of the narrative after a certain point and are not mentioned again, rather than explicitly dying. An example of this would be Arsake in Heliodorus.

at lovesickness in male characters, my third chapter focuses on lovesickness in female characters, and my fourth and final chapter looks at cases of lovesickness outside of the central, narratively approved couple.⁶⁷ Chapters two and three focus on examples from the *Aethiopika*, while the final chapter seeks to examine lovesickness in the wider context of all the novels, and what these other, undesirable and unapproved cases of lovesickness can tell us about the prevalence of the narratively approved lovesickness shared between the central couples.

The *Aethiopika* offers an excellent opportunity to test and explore the diagnostic model of lovesickness as a debilitating mental illness which follows a progression of physical symptoms and altered behaviours, a progression triggered by a one-sided desire to possess the object of the sufferer's affection. This novel offers a central triangle of three lovesick characters, two young lovers struck with mutual desire but kept apart by circumstances, and one foreign queen struck with one-sided love for the young male protagonist. Lovesickness serves a narrative function, manipulating the characters on a physical, psychological, and behavioural level. The novel uses lovesickness to legitimize the model of a heterosexual, monogamous marriage between two virginal youths of opposite genders who prove their moral worth and chastity by remaining true to each other through hardship and temptation. Victims of the disease who do not fit this model are confined to the fringes. This marks other forms of lovesick desire, such as those occurring between same-sex individuals, foreigners, lower classes, or those sexually experienced, as unnatural, since it is impossible for such individuals to experience the legitimized cure of marriage and sexual consummation. The *Aethiopika* presents a model of lovesickness which is

⁶⁷ For a discussion of the role interactions between central and peripheral figures can serve in creating a narrative in the Greek novels, see Kuch 1996: 209-211.

destructive, but with a purpose, to mold a character into following a desired pattern. This pattern takes the form of a chaste individual, suffering from a mutual case of lovesickness, who fits within their assigned gender role.

An examination of three main points allows several conclusions to be drawn regarding the narrative function of lovesickness in the *Aethiopika*. These points are: the identification of a diagnosable model of lovesickness in the novels, an examination of the ways lovesickness influences the behaviours and actions of both male and female characters within the novels, and an exploration of the different outcomes of that sickness in different cases. The conclusions that can be drawn from these points may also be applied to the wider context of the other extant Greek novels. First, building on Konstan's discussion of *eros* as separate from lovesickness, it is possible to form a picture of lovesickness as a more common and uniform condition in the novels than is usually supposed.⁶⁸ The proposed model for lovesickness as an affliction that is initiated by the sufferer's gaze falling on the object of their desire, leading to a progression of physical and psychological symptoms and behaviours, is grounded in previous scholars' identification of some common symptoms of lovesickness.⁶⁹ I build on these studies by emphasizing the importance of eye contact in triggering lovesickness, and suggesting that the symptoms of lovesickness are identical in each case, regardless of the identity of those afflicted, and whether the disease is mutual or one-sided. Despite the undifferentiated nature of lovesickness within the novels, the outcome of the illness usually privileges the central, heterosexual couple.⁷⁰ The

⁶⁸ Konstan 1994: 31, 57-58.

⁶⁹ Toohey, 2004: 58-60. See also Biesterfeldt and Gutas 1984: 21, Dzaja 2008: 66, Goldhill 1995: 12-13, Perkins 1995: 53, 156-7.

⁷⁰ All of the central couples in the extant Greek novels are heterosexual couples. For a discussion of lovesickness and same-sex relationships in the novels, see chapter 4.1 and 4.4 of this thesis.

illness positively influences the gender expressions and behaviours of the central couple, while also negatively influencing the behaviours of the peripheral characters suffering from the same pattern of lovesickness. These points work in tandem to ensure the desired outcome of a heterosexual marriage between two individuals of similar age, social, cultural, and economic backgrounds. The universality, symptoms, progression, and influences on behaviour culminate in a particular narrative function, with lovesickness serving as a device to ensure the central couple's marriage and sexual consummation takes place.

2 Lovesickness in Men

2.1 Towards a Definition of Masculinity

In the second book of the *Aethiopika*, the young, virile male protagonist falls in love at first sight. He then promptly laments the indignity of “suffering defeat at the hands of a girl” (Heliodorus 2.17). This comparison of the consequences of lovesickness with defeat in combat highlights a connection between the construction of the male protagonist’s performance of masculinity and his lovesick state. As one key factor of an individual’s self-identity,¹ gender in the Greek novels is understood here as a performative identity constructed by the social and political factors of the given period and region.² During the Second Sophistic, elite men were defined by their level of physical and political power, values that persisted into the fourth century CE.³ In classical Greek texts, which strongly influenced Second Sophistic literature, male heroes displayed two main qualities: *andreia* and *paideia*.⁴ *Andreia* is translated as “manly courage,” and was commonly associated with displays of physical prowess in warfare or athletics.⁵ *Paideia* was linked to education, particularly the process of educating a boy in how to grow into an ideal young man. Joy Connolly suggests that *paideia* could involve the teaching of *andreia*, among other proper masculine behaviours.⁶ While *andreia* was also an important value in the Roman

¹ Arnold and Brady 2011: 4-5.

² Lye 2016: 235-36. For more on gender as a performance based on social factors in the ancient world see Berg 2011: 98-99. For the performative nature of Theagenes’ identity, see De Temmerman 2014: 2-3. For a discussion of masculinity being socially constructed, see Williams 1999: 4 and Rosen 1993: xii.

³ The Second Sophistic is a period spanning the first to third centuries CE, when Classical Greek culture experienced a renaissance in Roman society. The intellectual values of this period continued to be felt into Heliodorus’ day, and there is some debate over whether the *Aethiopika* dates to the third or fourth century CE. See Reardon 2008: 2-5, and the introduction 1.1 for more details on this debate.

⁴ Connolly 2002: 291.

⁵ Jones 2012: 94. *Andreia* has many possible translations, including “manliness.”

⁶ Connolly 2002: 287-89.

period, the concept broadened to include both displays of extreme physical courage, and demonstrations of eloquent language or restrained behaviour.⁷ This expanded definition of *andreia* echoes the importance Roman concepts of masculinity place on *sophrosyne*, a kind of self-control exhibited by a hero over his passions and behaviours.⁸ This self-restraint marked a contrast to earlier Greek epic heroes, whose prowess in battle was sometimes marred by outbursts of rage and a lack of inhibitions.⁹ *Sophrosyne* is displayed within the novels in a variety of contexts, including sexual desire, athletic displays, and passion in warfare.¹⁰ This chapter seeks to understand the influence of lovesickness on the central male protagonist in the *Aethiopika*.

The blurring of masculine values occurring in the Second Sophistic highlights the appropriation and retooling of Greek ideals by Roman culture. This appropriation is shown in the broadening concept of *andreia*, as it changed from a display of physical prowess in battle to include displays of athleticism, wisdom, and self-control.¹¹ Meriel Jones views masculinity within the novels as a gender performance, carefully constructed by the authors to present an ideal picture of a masculine hero.¹² This presentation is at odds with earlier readings of the masculine heroes in the novels as passive and ineffectual.¹³ Jones states that a “negative value judgement” was assigned to men in the Greek novels by scholars reading “male protagonists as

⁷ Connolly 2002: 294, 314-15. See also Jones 2007: 123.

⁸ Jones 2012: 154.

⁹ Connolly 2002: 314.

¹⁰ Jones 2012: 153-54.

¹¹ Connolly 2002: 315-16.

¹² Jones 2012: 221.

¹³ Jones 2012: 92. See also Rohde 1960: 356, Andersen 1982: 88, Johne 1996: 178, and Haynes 2003: 81, Jones 2007: 111.

rather weak and passive.”¹⁴ She suggests instead that the heroes display both positive masculine traits, particularly acts of extreme courage, and also those traits identified as undesirable in a masculine hero, traits that are effeminate and passive.¹⁵ Men in the novels, particularly the central male protagonists, act out both negative and positive performances of the masculine values of *andreia* and *sophrosyne*. The purpose for these different gender performances remains unclear.

Understandings of masculinity in the Second Sophistic are complicated by how scholars choose to define the concept of *andreia*. In their definition of *andreia*, Rosen and Sluiter accept the translation of “manly courage,” arguing that this courage is displayed in times of war, when a hero knowingly and willingly faces a form of physical danger.¹⁶ They expand this definition to include rhetorical and other non-physical displays of courage, suggesting that *andreia* is a malleable concept which can be adapted to the particular social values and cultural needs of a given period.¹⁷ While *andreia* is a concept most commonly associated with men, women sometimes also display similar forms of courage.¹⁸ Jones expands on Rosen and Sluiter’s identification of *andreia* as fundamentally linked to the arena of warfare, suggesting that Roman values of endurance, self-control, and “erotic temperance” can also be identified as examples of *andreia* in the novels.¹⁹ However, she fails to remove *andreia* fully from the context of warfare,

¹⁴ Jones 2012: 92.

¹⁵ Jones 2012: 93.

¹⁶ Rosen and Sluiter 2002: 8.

¹⁷ Rosen and Sluiter 2002: 22.

¹⁸ Jones 2012: 106-113. Jones uses “womanly *andreia*” to refer to instances of women behaving in courageous ways, displays similar to manly courage, rather than suggesting that this term was used to refer to both men and women in the texts themselves. However, Charikleia is instructed to behave with *sophrosyne* and *andreia* in Heliodorus (5.29). See Jones 2012: 113. For more on displays of *sophrosyne* by women in the novels, see Chew 2003.

¹⁹ Jones 2012: 95. See also Jones 2007: 112.

reinforcing the idea that “courage in combat” was the epitome of masculine bravery, and therefore the ultimate expression of the male gender performance displayed by men in the novels.²⁰ The prioritization of values such as *sophrosyne* in constructing masculine gender performances in the novels further complicates this definition of *andreia*. Theagenes uses *sophrosyne* to temper extreme *andreia* in combat situations, as “in the heat of combat...when it is most vital to be *sophron*, he [Theagenes] is able to retain clarity of thought.”²¹ This demonstrates a blurring of the two values into one cohesive performance of ideal masculine behaviour.²²

The novel combines displays of *andreia* and *sophrosyne* in three sets of circumstances: combat, athletics, and desire and pursuit of women. Masculinity then is embodied here by the concepts of *andreia* and *sophrosyne* working together in a variety of scenarios involving battle, physical displays, or lovemaking.²³ Lovesickness also contributes to Theagenes’ performance of a masculine identity. Jones argues that the male protagonist chooses to “prioritize love over public displays of masculinity.”²⁴ I propose instead that this prioritization of love is how the performances of masculinity are constructed in the first place. Key performative moments in battle, sport, and love are fundamentally linked to the presence or mention of lovesickness. The majority of these performative moments are related to athletics, which “can be understood as a

²⁰ Jones 2012: 94-95. See also Jones 2007: 113.

²¹ Jones 2012: 147.

²² Jones 2012: 147. Examples of *sophrosyne* being used in conjunction with *andreia* include Heliodorus 8.1, 10.31. The masculinity of the central male protagonist in the *Aethiopika* is built on concepts of *sophrosyne*, on values of moderation and wisdom. See Jones 2012: 147, 156-67. Theagenes demonstrates *sophrosyne* in battle and in sexual situations, and is specifically described as practising *sophrosyne* in his ability to resist Arsake’s sexual advances due to his love for Charikleia (Heliodorus, 8.6). See also Lye 2016: 243.

²³ Jones 2012: 154. See also Borg 2004: 244. For more on the connection between *sophrosyne* and *andreia* see Jones 2007: 114.

²⁴ Jones 2012: 173.

substitute arena [to battle] in which a hero is able to prove his *andreia*.”²⁵ Examples include Theagenes fighting for Charikleia (Heliodorus 10.31-33), and Charikleia speaking out to save Theagenes (Heliodorus 10.34-35).²⁶ Such performances are always grounded in the mention of lovesick desire in the *Aethiopika*, with Theagenes choosing whether or not to perform such acts depending on how it will affect his ability to attain possession of Charikleia. His choice of whether to perform “manly” behaviours or not in a given scenario is determined by what his lovesickness for Charikleia requires him to do. These performances are both positively and negatively influenced by lovesickness, starting with lovesickness causing the young man to behave in a manner contrary to *andreia* or *sophrosyne*, and moving towards a point where lovesickness aids an “achievement of masculinity.”²⁷ This is apparent in the young man’s eventual acquisition of his desired female lover. In the *Aethiopika*, Theagenes’ performance choices, whether negatively or positively influenced by his lovesick state, often seem to be in direct support of the goal his illness is driving him towards, that of securing Charikleia’s physical affections. It is only when the marriage and subsequent sexual consummation of the couple is the intended outcome of the story that lovesickness enhances his performances of masculine behaviours, rather than hindering them. That is, when the lovesickness affects the central couple, the performances of gender are enhanced rather than hindered.

Lovesickness in young men then becomes the primary force upon which performances of manliness are built. Desirable masculinity, defined here as a fusion between ideals of *andreia* and *sophrosyne* expressed by young men in situations involving battle, athletics, or sex and

²⁵ Jones 2007: 124.

²⁶ Other examples of such performances by Theagenes include Heliodorus 1.29-33, 2.1.

²⁷ Jones 2012: 19.

women, becomes an identity to be performed by the young man in his pursuit of the desired woman and their subsequent sexual union. This performed identity is shaped over the course of the story by the young man's lovesickness. This model of performance can be tested through an examination of Theagenes' performance of masculinity in the *Aethiopika*.

The proposed model of masculinity, as a performance directed by lovesickness, first appears in book two of the *Aethiopika*. In this instance, Theagenes chooses to run away and preserve himself for Charikleia, rather than pursue an opportunity to distinguish himself in battle. Book two opens with Charikleia presumed dead, and Theagenes lamenting his own cowardice: "Let this be the end and undoing of all things...Charikleia is dead, and Theagenes is no more. I played the coward, but in vain. In vain did I betray my manhood in abject flight, trying to save my life for your sake, my love" (Heliodorus 2.1). Prior to this lament, a band of brigands have invaded the island where Charikleia and Theagenes had been reunited, and this band sets fire to the island after Theagenes chooses to retreat rather than stand and fight (Heliodorus 1.29-33). This is one of the only times within the novel that Theagenes is presented with an opportunity to display *andreia* in its conventional context, as courage in battle.²⁸ Theagenes describes himself as *anandros*, without courage or cowardly, after choosing to hide instead of participating in the fighting (Heliodorus 2.1).²⁹ However, he specifically identifies Charikleia, and his desire to one day consummate their relationship, as the reason for his behaviour: "Fire has consumed you, no wedding torches did heaven light for you" (Heliodorus 2.1). Theagenes consciously chooses to

²⁸ Jones 2012: 124-25. Jones notes that Heliodorus seems to consciously keep Theagenes from situations that would place him in combat. See Jones 2007: 124-127 for a discussion of the lack of combat scenarios in the *Aethiopika* through which the men could demonstrate traditional displays of *andreia*.

²⁹ Theagenes uses *anandros* (without courage) to refer to the manner of his flight, using *deilos* (coward) to refer to his cowardly nature.

remove himself from a situation that would provide him with a perfect opportunity to display “manly courage” in battle. His choice is motivated by his physical desire for the object of his continued lovesick affections, Charikleia.³⁰ Theagenes performs the identity of an “unmanly coward” instead of enhancing his manly performance with a display of *andreia* in battle, in order to preserve the possibility of eventually possessing Charikleia.³¹ His “cowardly” performance is then immediately undercut by his lament at its failure when faced with her apparent death.³² Jones argues that Theagenes exercises his “*andreia* precisely by fleeing” rather than staying and fighting.³³

While lovesickness is not directly referenced in this scene, Theagenes’ behaviour is indicative of its presence. Theagenes laments being unable to touch and caress Charikleia’s corpse: “Even a last embrace is denied me. I am cheated even of a final, lifeless kiss” (Heliiodorus 2.2). Theagenes is mourning not only his potential bride, but also his inability to receive even a parody of the physical closeness and possession that might have cured him, including the proposed macabre parody of a lifesaving kiss from the object of his desires (Heliiodorus 2.2). In this example, Theagenes foregoes an opportunity to display *andreia* in battle, compromising his own masculinity in the slim hope of enabling his love for Charikleia to be consummated. There are clear indications that this unmanly display is motivated by his lovesickness for Charikleia, which is influencing his mind towards a course of action that is both

³⁰ Theagenes’ continued lovesick state is implied here, as his symptoms have followed the expected pattern, and the designated cure has not yet been achieved.

³¹ Jones 2007: 128. Jones emphasizes Theagenes as choosing to flee for “Charikleia’s sake” and thereby actually reinforcing his own *andreia*, performing the role of *deilia* for noble reasons.

³² Jones 2012: 125. *Deilia* is used here for coward.

³³ Jones 2007: 128.

cowardly and yet necessary, for he “shall not live if [she] is dead” (Heliodorus 2.1).³⁴ As Jones argues, here “love is more important than...displays of masculinity.”³⁵ This example clearly fits the parameters of the proposed model of the young male protagonist’s masculinity being a performance of either *andreia* or *sophrosyne*, which occurs in a situation involving combat, athletics, or the pursuit of women. This performance is either positively or negatively directed by the young man’s lovesick desires, with the objective of ensuring an eventual sexual consummation and cure through the marriage of the central, lovesick couple. Theagenes demonstrates several of the symptoms noted in the introduction as indicative of the presence of lovesickness, including restless behaviour (“he smote his brow and tore his hair”), uncontrolled verbal outbursts (“let this day be my last”), depressive moods, and attempted suicide (“with these words, he looked round for his sword,” Heliodorus 2.1). Theagenes’ performance choice is powered by his lovesickness, as demonstrated by the symptoms he exhibits directly after playing the “unmanly coward.”

2.2 Nature of Lovesickness in Men

Lovesickness, as an ailment, occurs in both men and women within the novels. While the circumstances, symptoms, and behaviours associated with this affliction have similar expressions in both genders, certain distinct differences exist between the nature of lovesickness in men and in women. In the novels, the female characters have both a greater narrative focus and a more developed characterization than many of their male counterparts, particularly with respect to the

³⁴ The text indicates that it is Theagenes’ turning away from battle which is cowardly, rather than his suicidal feelings after finding Charikleia’s body.

³⁵ Jones 2012: 125.

central couple.³⁶ As a result, the cases of lovesickness in women are usually far better documented within the novels than the cases of lovesickness in men.³⁷ This is particularly true when examining the physical symptoms of lovesickness. In *Aethiopika*, descriptions of Theagenes' lovesickness are generally told in conjunction with descriptions of Charikleia's or Arsake's lovesickness (Heliodorus 3.5, 17-19). Male characters who suffer from lovesickness but are outside of the approved central couple are described using the same symptoms and terms, but without the direct reference to a woman's lovesickness being present to define and compare their own afflicted state.³⁸ These characters include thwarted would-be lovers of the female protagonist, and same-sex lovers.

Theagenes' initial infection of lovesickness revolves around Charikleia's own worsening symptoms, and this helps to fully establish the differences between the nature of lovesickness experienced by the man versus the woman in the central, mutually afflicted couple. While descriptions of lovesickness in the novels generally provide more detail in cases afflicting women, there are a greater overall number of descriptions that focus on the illness in men.³⁹ Lovesickness compromises a man's masculine identity, but is an expected right of passage for women in order to prepare them for marriage.

³⁶ Perkins 1995: 46.

³⁷ For an exception to this general rule, see how Clitophon's lovesick state is detailed in Chariton, 1.4-6. It is worth noting that this example is unusual among the novels, in that the story is told from the point of view of the male protagonist, not the female. Another exception comes in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, where the lovesickness of both parts of the central couple is equally well documented (Longus 1.11-1.14, 1.17-1.24, 1.32).

³⁸ For examples of descriptions of male characters who are not part of the central couple falling prey to lovesickness and still experiencing the expected symptoms in the novels see Thyamis (Heliodorus, 2.1-4), Gnathon (Longus, 4.11-12, 4.16), and Hippothoos (Xenophon, 3.2, 8-9).

³⁹ For descriptions from the other novels of physical symptoms of lovesickness in men see Achilles Tatius 1.4-6, 5.18-22, Chariton 1.1-4, 2.3-4, 5.6, Longus 1.17, 1.32, 4.16, Xenophon 1.3-5, 2.5, 3.2. For the same in women see Chariton 1.1-4, Longus 1.14, 1.16, Xenophon 1.3-5, 4.8. (include a complete chart later)

Lovesickness, defined as a physical and psychological ailment which manifests through eye contact and will eventually prove incurable without consummation,⁴⁰ is described in men through a comparison with lovesickness in women. Theagenes and Charikleia, as the central couple of the *Aethiopika*, represent a mutual, reciprocal love. Theagenes and Charikleia fall in love with each other simultaneously, their symptoms mirroring each other from eye contact through to blushing and physical weakness (Heliodorus 3.5). The focus immediately shifts in these passages to emphasize Charikleia's physical symptoms: "But when we reached Charikleia's residence, we entered and found her tossing restlessly on her bed, her eyes moist with love" (Heliodorus 3.7). Descriptions of Theagenes' own illness are not presented until after Charikleia's symptoms have been fully described (Heliodorus 3.17). Theagenes is also suffering physically, tormented with desire for Charikleia: "He said...otherwise he would die, so terrible was the evil that had struck him, so fiercely burned the flames of passion in a heart that had never felt love before now" (Heliodorus 3.17). Both Charikleia and Theagenes previously rejected ideas of desire or marriage, fiercely guarding their own chastity. Once struck with desire for each other they are forced to alter their behaviour by the physical symptoms triggered by their lovesick condition. When confronted with the cause of his condition, Theagenes remains bitter towards women, whose beauty has "exposed the falseness of his pretensions" (Heliodorus 3.17). It is not the breaking of his vow of chastity that bothers him, but rather the fact that his "pretensions," in this instance referring to his professed self-control over his carnal desires and his physical prowess in athletics, have been compromised by his illness: "He wept as he spoke, as if to make it clear that it was only under compulsion that he admitted defeat at the hands of a

⁴⁰ Cyrino 1995: 2, 8-9.

girl” (Heliodorus 3.17). This loss of self-control, of *sophrosyne*, is paralleled in Heliodorus’ account of Kalasiris falling in love: “The constant sight of her proved too much even for me; the self-control I had practiced all my life fell before her assault” (Heliodorus 2.25).⁴¹ Significantly, Charikleia’s revulsion is directed at the sexual act and erotic feelings, rather than men specifically (Heliodorus 3.9-10).⁴² She is described as being “enslaved by passion,” rather than by Theagenes himself. In the young man, the lovesickness is described as a negative experience which compromises his masculine traits, causing him to be “defeated by a girl.” In contrast, the young woman’s illness is treated as something expected, something which women were supposed to go through, rather than something which compromises her identity as a woman.⁴³ In fact, Charikleia’s lovesickness forces her to fit into the ideal model of potential wife and mother, by compromising her ability to “sneer at the merest mention of Aphrodite and marriage” (Heliodorus 3.18).⁴⁴

The difference between lovesickness in men and women in the novels is not primarily one of symptoms or behaviours. Rather it is related to the expected gender roles and power dynamics between the young, heterosexual couple. Lovesickness, its diagnosis, symptoms, and course are primarily charted through Charikleia’s experience of them, in keeping with the prominent position of the female protagonist in the narrative. However, Theagenes’ symptoms and behaviours parallel hers. The difference then is two-fold. First, Theagenes’ sudden illness is

⁴¹ Kalasiris is a former high-priest who fell prey to lovesickness for Rhodopis. Now an old man, he relates the tale of how he fell in love to Knemon in book two, and includes details of his symptoms and behaviours.

⁴² Charikleia is described by Charikles as *misolektros kai anepastos*, as hating the marriage bed and “not-loving.”

⁴³ This is important when considering Nelson Hawkins’ arguments about lovesickness typically influencing a young woman who has gone through puberty, but is still unmarried. See Nelson Hawkins 2017: 66.

⁴⁴ For descriptions from the other novels of physical symptoms of lovesickness in men see Achilles Tatius 1.4-6, 5.18-22, Chariton 1.1-4, 2.3-4, 5.6, Longus 1.17, 1.32, 4.16, Xenophon 1.3-5, 2.5, 3.2. For the same in women see Chariton 1.1-4, Longus 1.14, 1.16, Xenophon 1.3-5, 4.8.

presented as something which compromises his *andreia*, which negatively impacts the activities and behaviours which make him an ideal young man. Charikleia's lovesickness, while equally debilitating, is described as necessary to the formation of her eventual feminine role, that of a potential wife and mother. The second difference involves the power dynamics between men and women represented in the young couple's romance. Longus describes Chloe as bringing her lover Daphnis "back to life" with her kisses (Longus 3.30). Charikleia "defeats" Theagenes with her beauty (Heliodorus 3.17). This creates a power imbalance between the man and the woman in a mutually lovesick couple. The woman has the power to manipulate her illness, using her status as the object of desire to make the man perform particular behaviours. Lovesickness gives the woman an advantage over her male lover, as she is the one with the power to control both of their fates. By contrast, the man is left either to attempt unsuccessfully and violently to steal the power back, as demonstrated by Theagenes' attempted rape of Charikleia (Heliodorus 4.6),⁴⁵ or to follow the woman's direction (Heliodorus 7.19).⁴⁶

2.3 Negative Influences of Lovesickness on Male Gender Performance

Masculinity is performed under three specific circumstances by the young male protagonist: in battle, in athletics, and when desiring a woman. Each of these circumstances presents an opportunity for the male lover to demonstrate either *andreia* or *sophrosyne*. Each time one of these circumstances occurs, the man is presented with a performance opportunity. Whether that opportunity is used or squandered is fundamentally linked to the influence of lovesickness over the man's actions in each scene. Men in the novels are sometimes viewed as

⁴⁵ The fact a man's response to this power imbalance is attempted sexual violence is particularly significant.

⁴⁶ Haynes 2003: 81-83.

ineffectual, effeminate, or even cowardly.⁴⁷ This assessment is largely tied to the predominance placed on the female characters in the story, and relates to the degree of control women have over men through their ability to induce and manipulate the ailment of lovesickness.

Lovesickness influences the traditional power dynamics between the genders in the central couple, and it can be stated that lovesickness is the deciding factor behind Theagenes' response to each opportunity for performing ideal masculine behaviours within the *Aethiopika*. This can be demonstrated using two specific examples, each pertaining to one of the categories which present opportunities for performances of masculinity—specifically warfare and desire for women. The third venue for presenting *andreia*, athletic displays, focuses on positive displays of a performed masculine identity on the part of Theagenes, and will be examined in the next section.

Rosen and Sluiter identify *andreia* as a display of courage in battle.⁴⁸ This is problematic since “at no point does the author involve Theagenes in full-scale warfare.”⁴⁹ The absence of Theagenes from battles is more significant to our discussion than his presence in them. Nowhere is this more apparent than when Theagenes “becomes the coward” and runs away from battle for the sake of Charikleia (Heliodorus 2.1), near the beginning of the novel, but in the middle of Charikleia and Theagenes' journey.⁵⁰ By this point they are already severely stricken with lovesickness, their symptoms made worse by their separation. Theagenes is then presented with an opportunity to perform a masculine behaviour just as his illness worsens in response

⁴⁷ Lye 2003: 82. See also Andersen 1982: 88.

⁴⁸ Rosen and Sluiter 2002: 21-22.

⁴⁹ Jones 2012: 124.

⁵⁰ This is due to the plot sequence in the novel occurring out of order, with the first book opening in the middle of the story, and then telling the previous events in stories and flashbacks.

Charikleia's absence. Theagenes' agonized rantings of the potential cure for his disease being lost to him through Charikleia's death, as well as his lament at being unable to achieve even a parody of the physical consummation that would have relieved his illness, highlight his reason for choosing cowardice over manliness. He does it "for Charikleia," with the intent of staying alive to claim possession of the object of his desire at a later date (Heliodorus 2.1).

Theagenes is "highly conscious" of his own performance in this scene, with his recognition of the choice he is making, suggesting that the performance in this case is Theagenes' lack of *andreia*, his performance of "unmanliness."⁵¹ Theagenes reveals his awareness of his own performance choices to the audience in his lament. Theagenes' performance is not one of "unmanliness," but rather a performance that acknowledges exactly what should constitute manliness, what behaviours must be enacted to achieve a manly performance. By lamenting his choice to avoid combat and forsake an opportunity to display *andreia*, Theagenes is revealing the role lovesickness played in guiding that choice. Theagenes learns of Charikleia's survival moments after his lament, the timing providing him a perfect opportunity to excuse his choice by ascribing it to the influence of lovesickness, the influence of "the divinity," over his behaviour. Lovesickness causes Theagenes to rationalize a negative gender performance choice, in order to ensure the opportunity for more positive performance choices in the future. This enables Theagenes both to preserve his own life, and to excuse his cowardice in doing so, as it is all done "for Charikleia."

⁵¹ Jones 2012: 126.

Theagenes' performance of gender is also negatively presented early in the chronological narrative, shortly after he has fallen for Charikleia.⁵² Theagenes is raving over his lust for Charikleia and talks of taking her by force, but is convinced to maintain his self-control: "Is Charikleia in love with me? Then why are we not already on our way to her?" (Heliodorus 4.6). Theagenes has to be physically restrained, albeit gently, from rushing to Charikleia's side, presumably to consummate their passion. While he only attempts this action after learning his desire is reciprocated, the fact remains that he attempts to abandon all restraint in his pursuit of the object of his desire. In doing so, Theagenes is abandoning his "possession of sexual *sophrosyne*" in his eagerness to possess Charikleia.⁵³ This incident occurs when his illness is still new, and therefore it lacks the self-aware, performative aspect of his retreat from battle. Theagenes' abandonment of *sophrosyne* is acknowledged within the narrative itself by Kalasiris' swift rebuke over his lack of control: "But wait a minute! Our undertaking is not plunder taking" (Heliodorus 2.6). Theagenes is described as "pacing around the temple precinct, talking to himself and apparently quite happy simply to keep watch on the house where Charikleia lived" (Heliodorus 2.6). In playing first the role of creepy stalker, and then potential rapist, Theagenes demonstrates an altered state of behaviour from the young man who lamented "suffering defeat at the hands of a girl." His lovesick state alters his behaviour and causing him to squander an opportunity to demonstrate self-control over his desires.

Both of these examples occur early in the novel, and demonstrate a clear connection between performances of masculine behaviours and the presence of lovesickness. The

⁵² The chronological narrative refers here to the sequence of events in the story as they originally occurred, rather than the order in which they are revealed by the plot.

⁵³ Jones 2012: 154-55.

connection is a negative one, with lovesickness causing Theagenes to fail in his attempts to display *andreia* or *sophrosyne*. In the first example this performance choice seems to be a conscious one, while in the second case, it is censured by Heliodorus in order to emphasize what the correct performance choice should be. In both cases, Theagenes' performance choices are directly influenced by what will allow him to achieve the goal of possessing Charikleia. He is motivated in his unmanly behaviours by a desire to physically possess, and indeed marry, the object of his lovesickness. In this way, the author presents Theagenes as a young man who prioritizes "love over masculinity," while fundamentally linking his masculinity to that love.

2.4 Positive Influences of Lovesickness on Male Gender Performance

While lovesickness often compromises the performance of masculinity in the *Aethiopika*, it also serves to aid those performances on several occasions. The most significant example of this can be found in the context of athletics. Theagenes is presented with many opportunities to show off his athletic prowess.⁵⁴ The focus on athletic events within the novel epitomizes the role of young adults as the central figures of the story.⁵⁵ Before he lays eyes on Charikleia, Theagenes is described as winning "the prize for manhood and beauty" (Heliodorus 3.4). While this refers to his looks, without reference to specific athletic achievements, Theagenes is repeatedly shown to be a very skilled athlete (Heliodorus 4.3, 9.18). His athletic prowess is most in evidence when Charikleia is present, and particularly when he is seeking to impress her or win her: "Who is so insanely eager to see and to be near Charikleia that he could outrun me? Is there anyone else to

⁵⁴ Jones 2012: 124.

⁵⁵ Alston draws a parallel between physical strength and traditional ideas of what constitutes masculine behaviour. See Alston 1998: 205.

whom the mere sight of her can give wings and draw him to her without his feet touching the ground?” (Heliodorus 4.3). Theagenes once again makes a choice to perform *andreia* through the running competition, in order to increase his reputation. Where before Theagenes’ desire for Charikleia caused him to perform an “unmanly” act, here that same desire is used to enhance his manliness. This is shown in relation to his impact on Charikleia, as his enhanced athletic prowess impresses the object of his desire: “Now the maiden could stay still no longer...her soul [was] flying beside Theagenes and sharing his passion for the race” (Heliodorus 4.3). This race occurs when Theagenes is attempting to win Charikleia’s hand in marriage, and his performance of ideal masculine behaviour is working in direct aid of his goal of acquiring her.

The key example of Theagenes performing both *andreia* and *sophrosyne*, in order to possess Charikleia and acquire the cure for his sickness, occurs during the recognition scenes in book ten. While this book provides many opportunities for expressions of “female *andreia*” on the part of Charikleia,⁵⁶ it also reveals the culmination of Theagenes’ masculine gender performance in the novel.⁵⁷ Theagenes displays both *andreia* and *sophrosyne* when fighting the Ethiopian giant in the final book, melding the two masculine behaviours into one final, impressive manly performance.⁵⁸ As he is about to be sacrificed and subsequently separated from the equally lovesick Charikleia, Theagenes makes a conscious choice to engage in combat, in a scenario that enables Heliodorus to blend athletic competition and battle: “Theagenes, who was a lifelong devotee of the gymnasium and athletic endeavor and a past master in the art of combat...was resolved not to come to grips with such a monstrous hulk of a man...but rather to

⁵⁶ Jones 2012: 143. For more on “female *andreia*” see Bassi 2002: 46, and Jones 2007: 115-118.

⁵⁷ Jones 2012: 115.

⁵⁸ Jones 2012: 147.

use skill to outwit brute force” (Heliodorus 10.31). Just as Charikleia is displaying “female *andreia*” in attempting to convince her parents of her love for Theagenes, her lovesick companion is displaying “masculine *andreia*” in order to possess her. Theagenes is again clearly motivated by desire: “I cannot say whether what Theagenes did next was the product of his own innate courage or the inspiration of some god or other” (Heliodorus 10.28). He chooses to engage in combat, to display his “innate courage” in the pursuit of Charikleia, and is ultimately successful. In doing so, he embodies both Roman and Greek ideals of masculine behaviour, using extreme *andreia* tempered with *sophrosyne* to win the day. It is his desire for Charikleia, his masculinity enhanced by his lovesickness, that ultimately allows this performance to be successful. This occurs near the end of the novel, demonstrating the culmination of both Theagenes’ illness, and his gender performance, with his successful performance of *andreia* and *sophrosyne* enabling his lovesickness to finally be cured.

Lovesickness in the *Aethiopika* fundamentally shapes the masculine gender performance of the young male protagonist. By defining masculinity as a performative act expressed by displays of *andreia* and *sophrosyne* in battle, athletics, or pursuit of women, lovesickness in men becomes both a positive and a negative force in the construction of a performed gender identity. In the beginning of the story, lovesickness negatively influences Theagenes’ masculine gender performance, causing him to behave in an “unmanly” fashion in combat and when pursuing Charikleia. As the story progresses, so too does the positive nature of lovesickness’ influence on his masculine behaviours, with Theagenes’ *andreia* in particular becoming more evident as his pursuit of Charikleia is shown to be in line with the intended outcome of the story. The closer he gets to obtaining his desired object through legitimate means the more in evidence his ideal

masculine traits become. Lovesickness then becomes the driving force behind Theagenes' performance of ideal masculine behaviours in the story, just as his pursuit of Charikleia becomes the lens through which those performances are viewed. Theagenes surrenders himself to "defeat by a girl," thereby surrendering himself to lovesickness, and ultimately emerges as a better, more ideal man for it.

3 Lovesickness in Women

3.1 Lovesickness: Women's Role

Ancient Greek novels are unusual in classical literature for their apparent narrative focus on the perspectives and roles of women. The novels were a genre capable of “representing citizen girls as fully realised speaking subjects of love stories.”¹ Female characters are given both a narrative focus and more developed characterization than many of their male counterparts, a situation that is often most apparent when comparing the roles played by the main couple.² In the *Aethiopika*, Charikleia is the main character, with the story of her *nostos* forming the overarching plot.³ It is her lovesickness that is described, treated, and emphasized by the plot, while Theagenes' lovesickness is of secondary importance, significant only in how it affects his interactions with Charikleia and Arsake. Women represent the protagonists of the novels, playing an active role in the plot, while men are relegated to the supporting role of love interest and spouse. It naturally follows then that many of the descriptions of lovesick behaviours and symptoms presented in the novels pertain specifically to female characters. This chapter seeks to understand the influence of lovesickness on the central female protagonist in the *Aethiopika*, as well as exploring how the lovesickness of her rival Arsake acts as a foil for understanding Charikleia's own case of lovesickness.

Genre has a strong influence on the construction of women's characters and identities in the novels, in terms of how concern with romance in the novels shifts the focus to more domestic

¹ Haynes 2003: 29.

² Perkins 1995: 46. See also Egger 1999: 108.

³ Narrative here refers to the story itself, while plot discusses the sequence of narrative events.

narratives.⁴ The novels represent a genre shift in Roman literature towards the “personal over the social,” placing a focus on romance over warfare.⁵ This genre shift may have accounted for the greater emphasis on female characters in the novels, as it allowed the presumably male-authored texts to deal authoritatively and sympathetically with more traditionally female concerns such as love, marriage, and emotional distress, while still maintaining a traditional power divide between men and women.⁶ A model of what represents a traditional feminine gender performance in the novels is difficult to formulate clearly. Charikleia, for example, plays a central role in the story, exhibits skill and courage in combat (Heliodorus 5.32), and speaks authoritatively in public (Heliodorus 10.29-35).⁷ Yet at the same time, her primary goal is to preserve her own chastity until after she is married,⁸ and her episodes of outspokenness (another characteristic of *andreia*) and advising men how they should proceed (Heliodorus 7.17), are carefully constructed as necessary breaches of her own gender norms in times of crisis. Charikleia preserves her chastity until she can possess Theagenes by acting as an instrument of infection, an instrument through which lovesickness is spread. This emphasizes the narrative function lovesickness that serves to ensure that the correct individuals will be infected, with women acting as the primary carriers of

⁴ See Haynes 2003: 44-45 for a discussion of other theories on why the novels focus on female protagonists. See also Fusillo 1996: 304-305.

⁵ Haynes 2003: 25-26, 43. As explored in the previous chapter, warfare and more traditional topics of epic still played an important role in the novels, but were not the focus of the narrative. For a discussion of the unusual prominence and characterization of the women in Greek novels see Wiersma 1990: 110-114.

⁶ Haynes 2003: 4-5. This shift also represented a change in the way *eros* was treated in narrative, whereby it becomes a legitimized union between two young, desirable citizens of equal status, and moving away from more violent representations, which often involved rape, assault, and lewd female characters. See Haynes 2003: 25. See also Toohey 2004: 58-59.

⁷ Jones 2012: 111-113. For more on Charikleia’s unusual intelligence and outspokenness see Johne 1996: 163-64.

⁸ Jones 2012: 113.

that infection. This concept will be explored through a comparison of Charikleia and Arsake's roles as carriers of lovesickness.

Charikleia is a female protagonist, one who both subverts and reasserts traditional ideas of a passive female gender role. Despite her use of outspoken rhetoric, Charikleia continually reminds both the men around her, and the audience, of her traditional role as a woman: "For I think that silence becomes a woman, and it is for a man to respond among men" (Heliiodorus 1.2).⁹ Charikleia's role in writing her own gender identity, and then feeding it to Theagenes and the audience, represents a subversion of masculine power as much as a reinforcement of it.

Arsake is also somewhat problematic within the traditional feminine model, through her prominent position of power without a male consort present, and her attempted possession of Theagenes (Heliiodorus 7.8-9). Arsake's power is carefully dismantled within the story, her lovesickness being used here to emphasize her unstable nature and lack of suitability for a leadership role: "Arsake entertained the leading Persians to dinner...though, truth to tell, it was her meeting with Theagenes that she was celebrating" (Heliiodorus 7.19).¹⁰ These examples begin to highlight the way women are constructed in the *Aethiopika*, as fully realized characters who have immense control and power in the narrative, but who are often still framed specifically as beautiful objects, as objects of male desire.

The construction of female characters in the *Aethiopika* as desired objects is best shown through an examination of how lovesickness influences the female characters' behaviours. Pervo

⁹ De Temmerman 2014: 262. Heliiodorus, through Charikleia, may be making a reference to the funeral oration of Pericles (Thucydides 2.45), where women are advised that the more silent and unnoticed they are, the more virtuous they become. This is significant when considering how notable and vocal some women in the *Aethiopika* are. See also Haynes 2003: 134.

¹⁰ Lye 2016: 237.

argues that women are divided into two categories in the novels, with rivals and antagonists such as Arsake being “bad,” the negative opposite of the “good” heroine.¹¹ While this is a simplistic division, it helps to emphasize the status of Charikleia and Arsake as mirrors of each other, with Arsake serving as a foil for understanding Charikleia’s experience of lovesickness. Charikleia and Arsake are both framed specifically through their desire for a male object, in this case Theagenes. In turn, these women themselves become an object of desire for Theagenes: “He had never felt anything but contempt for...married love...But now Charikleia’s beauty had exposed the falseness of his pretensions” (Heliodorus 3.17). Charikleia is the desirable object which triggers Theagenes’ lovesickness, acting as the desirable object which allows the plot to move forward. Theagenes is struck with the sickness when he “sets eyes” on Charikleia (Heliodorus 3.17).¹² Both male and female characters then are defined by their desire for the other, the beauty of their desired object swaying their behaviours and character. Lovesickness is triggered by eye contact here, following the traditional pattern of the novels.¹³ Women become lovesick through their desire for beautiful men, while men are struck with the illness when they spy beautiful women. In the *Aethiopika*, the damage done by lovesickness to masculine gender performance in men is primarily instigated by women, who are the traditional objects of masculine desire.¹⁴

The idea of women spreading bodily pollution, particularly in relation to erotic desire, as a type of “erotic infection,” can be found in the works of early Greek poets such as Hesiod.¹⁵

¹¹ Pervo 1991: 146-147.

¹² Here Theagenes is recalling his first sight of Charikleia.

¹³ This pattern or narrative sequence begins with love at first sight and ends with the “final reunion” of the central couple. See Fusillo 1988: 21. For more on eye contact triggering lovesickness see the introduction 1.2.

¹⁴ For examples of such damage being caused by same-sex desire, see chapter 4.4.

¹⁵ Cyrino 1995: 95-96.

This idea is emphasized in the novels, particularly Achilles Tatius, where women “ensnare” men, such as the unwitting Leukippe ensnaring Sosthenes (Achilles Tatius 2.38, 5.18-22). Heliodorus also touches on this idea, presenting each instance of lovesickness as being initially triggered by a beautiful individual. These individuals, usually women, are not shown as instigators of the infection, but merely the instruments of infection.¹⁶ If, as I argue, lovesickness can be read as serving a narrative function to ensure the desired outcome of the central couple’s marriage, women in the novels are then constructed as the primary carriers of that infection, using their beauty to catch men’s eyes. In the *Aethiopika*, Arsake and Charikleia are constructed as the instruments through which the infection of lovesickness is spread. This raises the question of whether women are willful or unwitting carriers of lovesickness. It also questions whether female characters who are cast as desirable objects who spread infection to men can transcend that role, and become agents as well as objects. This chapter considers three concepts: the role of beauty in relation to lovesickness, the role of women as objects in the novel, and the role of women as agents in the novel.¹⁷ I explore the ways physical beauty damages the performances of ideal feminine behaviours within female characters, with a particular focus on how this objectification negatively influences Arsake. I also consider how the differences between mutual or one-sided lovesickness influence the different cases of lovesickness in female characters.¹⁸

¹⁶ A good example of this is Heliodorus 5.2, where Thisbe is used as an instrument by Love (Eros), to make Knemon “mad with love” for her.

¹⁷ Women are objects in the sense they act as the desired object that triggers a man’s lovesickness. Women are agents if their infection of men is deliberate on their part.

3.2 Role of Beauty

Each case of lovesickness in the novels begins with two things: eye contact and a mention of extreme physical beauty being present in one or both parties. Eye contact triggers lovesick symptoms. Lack of physical possession, as well as the lack of consummation, leads to the later stages of the disease. Beauty, specifically physical beauty, serves as the lure for eye contact, which then leads to the need for physical possession. To test this hypothesis, let us consider the example of Charikleia meeting Theagenes.

Theagenes and Charikleia's case of shared, reciprocal lovesickness keeps to the proposed model, beginning when they first make eye contact with each other. It is immediately preceded by long passages of description on the extreme physical beauty of both individuals: "But when...rode forth my wise and beautiful Charikleia, then we realized that even Theagenes could be eclipsed, but eclipsed only in such measure as perfect female beauty is lovelier than the fairest of men" (Heliodorus 3.4). Both of the young lovers receive a long passage of description upon their entrance into the procession, with allusions to goddesses such as Athena and Artemis, and detailed descriptions of their lustrous hair and skin. The moment that the pair come together and make eye contact is identified as the moment that love is kindled: "For at the moment when they set eyes on one another, the young pair fell in love with each other" (Heliodorus 3.5). Moments later, when their separation from each other's immediate physical proximity becomes imminent, the first symptom of lovesickness reveals itself. In the form of a complexion change, first a

blush¹⁹ and then colour leaving both their faces: “Then they blushed...and a moment later, I suppose as their passion touched their hearts, the color drained from their faces” (Heliodorus 3.5). The spark of infection has begun. This scenario is common in the novels, but the example of Charikleia and Theagenes presents the opportunity to draw a clear connection between an emphasis being placed on the excess physical beauty present in the characters, and the moment they succumb to the first symptoms of lovesickness.²⁰ Renewed physical contact also acts to strengthen the progression of the symptoms, as Theagenes and Charikleia are physically drawn to each other by the initial symptoms, which then worsen once a kiss has been exchanged: “He [Theagenes] ran on towards Charikleia...unable to control his momentum, he deliberately fell bodily into her arms. And as the maiden presented him with the palm branch, I saw him kiss her hand” (Heliodorus 4.4).

Mentions of physical beauty are also present when Arsake succumbs to lovesickness at the first sight of Theagenes. Upon arrival in Memphis, Theagenes and Thyamis, the eldest son of Kalasiris the former high priest, are selected as leaders to meet with Arsake. Arsake is described first here, as a “tall, handsome [*kalos*] woman,” followed by descriptions of both Thyamis, “a comely [*kariéis*] young man, in the flower of his manhood,” and Theagenes, “a broad-chested, broad-shouldered fellow” (Heliodorus 7.2, 7.3).²¹ The description of Theagenes’ physical features comes only after Arsake has fallen in love with him. Indeed, Thyamis initially appears

¹⁹ Lateiner 1998: 185 argues that these blushes signal the young lovers’ silent acknowledgement that they are unable to escape their pre-destined fate, which is significant when considering the role of lovesickness as a device carefully constructed and utilized by Heliodorus to ensure the desired ending.

²⁰ De Temmerman 2007: 237.

²¹ *Kalos* can be translated as beautiful or fair. *Kariéis* can be translated as beautiful, lovely, or even accomplished or elegant.

to represent one half of the start of a case of mutual lovesickness, before this case of lovesickness is revealed to be one-sided. Morgan touches on the parallelism between Arsake and Charikleia both being struck by lovesickness at the sight of Theagenes, indicating that the establishment of Arsake as a promiscuous woman, rather than a chaste one, accounts for the difference in the intensity of their physical symptoms.²² The same argument may account for the difference between physical beauty's role in the two different occurrences of lovesickness' initial infection. In both cases, beauty is present. Charikleia and Theagenes are described in equally strong descriptive terms, emphasizing the sheer extremity of their physical beauty. In contrast, Arsake is struck by Theagenes' beauty, from the moment she lays eyes on him, but it is not a mutual event. Arsake's handsomeness escapes Theagenes' notice, just as Thyamis' did.

The example of Knemon and Demainete in book one emphasizes the role of beauty in triggering lovesickness, even in cases of one-sided lovesickness.²³ Knemon's description of his stepmother Demainete's inappropriate lust for him provides many parallels to Arsake's predicament.²⁴ Demainete is described as "pretty enough [*asteios*]", but also as a seductress:²⁵ "If ever a woman knew how to drive a man mad with passion, she did, so extraordinarily well versed was she in the arts of allurements" (Heliodoros 1.9). Like Arsake, Demainete attempts to use her physical beauty to induce a lovesick state in the men around her, but instead ends up struck by the condition herself. She describes her step-son as "my young Hippolytus," and begins

²² Morgan 1998: 63. The age difference between Arsake and Charikleia, with Charikleia identified as a virginal girl while Arsake is a married and sexually experienced woman, also plays a role here. For more on how age relates to lovesickness in the novels, see the Introduction 1.1.

²³ Knemon is a Greek man Theagenes and Charikleia encounter in book one.

²⁴ Lye 2016: 242-43. See also Haynes 2003: 119-120. Haynes describes Demainete's lust for her step-son as an example of negative erotic passion, paralleling the concept of unreturned desire having a negative quality that is not inherent in mutual desire.

²⁵ *Asteios* can be translated as refined, elegant, pretty, or clever.

to exhibit some of the first symptoms of lovesickness, including erratic behaviour and an altered complexion (Heliodorus 1.10-11).²⁶ A key difference is revealed in the ensuing scenario, between those who are infected by reciprocal lovesickness, and those who are infected by one-sided lovesickness. Knemon, in his anger, sarcastically refers to his stepmother as a “paragon of chastity,” the same sentiment used to describe the virginal Charikleia, and her vast difference from the sexually experienced Arsake. When the narratively approved couple is struck with “mutual passion,” their beauty is equally emphasized, serving as a positive trigger for their lovesickness.²⁷ In this sense, lovesickness can be seen as undergoing a similar rehabilitation to *eros* in the novels.²⁸ It is turned from an undesirable passion towards an unattainable object of desire, into a narrative device which unites the desired couple in a case of reciprocal lovesickness, with beauty serving as one of the triggers for that passion.

In cases where lovers are affected by reciprocal lovesickness, their physical beauty is emphasized, with that beauty being directly linked with how young and chaste they are. In the case of one-sided victims such as Arsake, the beauty of the object of their desires is emphasized, while their own beauty is downplayed or only mentioned in passing. In cases of narratively approved lovesickness, where the lovers are designed to end up together, their beauty is highlighted as an instigator of their infection. When they see each other, they are struck by that beauty and the symptoms are triggered. Yet in the case of those intended to be viewed as undesirable and condemned to a one-sided infection, their own beauty is damaged by the

²⁶ This is a literary allusion to Euripides' *Hippolytus*, drawing a parallel between Phaedra and her desire for her step-son Hippolytus, and Demainete and her desire for her own step-son Knemon. Like Phaedra, Demainete meets a painful end, this time impaled through the groin by a spear.

²⁷ Konstan 1994: 57.

²⁸ Konstan 1994: 57-58.

extreme physical beauty of the object of their desires. When considering the questions this view raises about the role of beauty as a trigger for lovesickness, it is necessary to consider the damage physical beauty also causes to the construction of characters' identities.

3.3 Women as Objects

While a character's extreme physical beauty can be linked to the subsequent contraction of lovesickness in that individual, we must also consider how physical beauty impacts women in the novels. Despite their prominence within the novels, women's primary role in the narrative continues to be that of a desirable object. Given the connection between beauty and power in the novels, female characters are often allowed a greater degree of freedom by the male authorities within the text due to their noble qualities, which include beauty.²⁹ Women are positioned by the narrative as alluring objects for men. When Charikleia is struck by lovesickness, it is Theagenes that pulls away from her, implying that he is separating himself from the means of infection (Heliiodorus 3.7). His lovesickness is subsequently framed as a surrender to a female, an admission which Kalasiris is quick to refute: "She will not be able to resist...she may be pitiless, she may fight hard against love's dominion, she may sneer...but on your behalf all resources must be mobilized" (Heliiodorus 3.18). These passages suggest that Charikleia is a sexual object to be attained, in order to preserve Theagenes' life and masculinity. As Charikleia is "enslaved by her passion," her more autonomous actions are eroded by lovesickness. In a narrative where Charikleia sometimes has to remind men of proper gender roles, of what she regards as a woman's place, while at the same time assuming masculine roles, lovesickness is used as a

²⁹ Perkins 1995: 54. Perkins discusses the role of beauty in denoting both high birth and suitability for powerful positions in women.

means of weakening her autonomy. Charikleia's symptoms are repeatedly used to provide a counterpoint for her eloquent speech in public contexts, and for her performance of more traditionally masculine behaviours: "Possessed by a frenzy of despair, she untied her hair without inhibition; she tore her dress...there is...no husband beside me...Charikleia is alone and forsaken" (Heliodorus 6.8).³⁰

If one regards the accounts of Charikleia's brief lapses of emotional control triggered by the symptoms of her sickness as examples of how lovesickness controls women's characters, it becomes necessary to consider whether women have any say in this control. Arsake in particular appears to be a slave to desire from the moment she is struck by lovesickness: "Women of quality who have a fancy for young men are apt to become bitter and vindictive if they do not get their own way" (Heliodorus 7.20). While Kybele is threatening Theagenes in this passage, her words perfectly describe the degeneration of Arsake's moral character due to her infatuation with Theagenes.³¹ She turns from a capable ruler of her people in her consort's absence to an easily manipulated figure who thinks only of possessing the cause of her lovesickness.³² Lye notes the gender inversion present in the Arsake episode, with Theagenes becoming an object of female desire, rather than the woman being an object of male desire.³³ I argue that Arsake is indeed designed by Heliodorus to serve as an object of male desire, but proves to be an unsuccessful one, with her primary role revolving around her inability to ensnare the men she desires.

³⁰ For more on Charikleia's eloquent, sophistic style rhetoric see Pernot 1987: 43-46.

³¹ Kybele is described as "one of the chambermaids who were in the habit of abetting Arsake in her love affairs" (Heliodorus 7.10).

³² Lye 2016: 237-238.

³³ Lye 2016: 243. Lye refers to Arsake's interactions with Theagenes in books seven and eight as the "Arsake episode."

Arsake's desire for Theagenes undermines both the narrative goal of a positive, approved consummation between the main couple, and provides an opportunity for Charikleia to challenge gender stereotypes by assuming the role of rescuer to Theagenes. Arsake also presents an example of a woman who is told her role is to be a desirable object in order to infect men, but fails to fulfill this role because her promiscuity makes her undesirable. She is viewed in a negative light due to her promiscuity, particularly as a married woman, and serves both to reinforce the dangers of female autonomy, and to emphasize women's proper role as objects of masculine desire.

The question of what causes women to be viewed as a means of infection is emphasized by Kybele herself, in her confrontation with Arsake. She suggests that a woman should be aware of her power to infect a man with lovesickness, and should use the power accordingly: "When your own approach to your love is so supine, when you really are behaving like a woman...you are not acting like a mistress with power to make the young man do her will" (Heliodorus 8.5). While Kybele is partly highlighting the power dynamics between Arsake and Theagenes, as the woman is in charge and the man is a slave, she also highlights another inversion. She seems to imply that "behaving like a woman," in terms of behaving passively and succumbing completely to lovesick behaviours, is an undesirable and shameful state of being, when compared to ideal model of passive femininity. Kybele represents a foreign point of view here, one in opposition with the desired Greek values in the novel. Thus her statements are intended to sound ridiculous and "foreign."³⁴ Kybele is describing precisely the kind of woman Arsake turns into under the

³⁴ Lye 2016: 236-37. The male gaze refers here to men viewing women as objects. In this context, women perform a passive role for the active male agent.

influence of lovesickness: passive, supine, and an unwitting means of infection. Both types of women, the out-of-control Arsake and the in-control Charikleia, serve not as an unwitting means of infection. Lovesickness controls women in the novel with its debilitating symptoms as surely as it controls men: women, as the primary instrument of infection, have some ability to control the consequences of the infection on themselves and others, even as they are themselves manipulated into such behaviours by the infection itself.

When discussing the nature of women as objects in the novels, it is necessary to discuss the role of the “male gaze”.³⁵ The quintessential example of the male gaze in the novels occurs in Achilles Tatius, the only novel told from a first person point of view.³⁶ In the novel, Leukippe is on display for the male viewer, Clitophon, who is explicitly shown to fall prey to lovesickness due to Leukippe’s extreme beauty (Achilles Tatius 1.4).³⁷ The process of Clitophon falling in love follows the correct pattern of events, a description of beauty followed by eye contact, and then the onset of symptoms. Konstan suggests that this explicit focus on the male viewing the female as an object to be observed both subverts Leukippe’s autonomy, and creates an imbalance of power between the main couple.³⁸ The male gaze, then, refers to an unequal power balance between two people, where one individual, usually male, is struck with lovesickness due to the extreme physical beauty of the other. Lovesickness removes the will of the gazer’s subject, and turns that subject into an object.³⁹ Achilles Tatius again raises the question of women as

³⁵ The concept of the male gaze was first proposed by Laura Mulvey in her work on feminism and film, and has proven influential in understanding the nature of women as objects in both fictional and historical contexts. See Mulvey 1975: 6-18, Finzsch 2008, Zborowski 2011: 13-16,

³⁶ Konstan 1995: 62.

³⁷ Konstan 1995: 62-63.

³⁸ Konstan 1995: 64. See also Fusillo 1989: 192-93.

³⁹ It is worth noting that Andújar suggests that Charikleia does not fall solely into the category of desirable object for the “male viewer.” See Andújar 2013: 140.

unwitting carriers or willful seductresses with a largely satirical passage emphasizing the dangers of beautiful women, who “have the ability to make men fall in love with them” (Achilles Tatius 1.8). This perhaps parallels Kybele urging her mistress to use this exact method on Theagenes, turning her status as an object of male desire into an instrument to induce lovesickness. Arsake’s inability to execute this scenario successfully raises a question about who is the viewer and who is the object in the so-called “Arsake episode” in *Aethiopika* books seven and eight.⁴⁰

Lye discusses the inversion of traditional gender roles in the Arsake episode, where women are shown to consider a male as an “object of desire,” inverting the traditional role of the female as an object of male desire.⁴¹ When considering the male gaze, Arsake’s character can perhaps be viewed as a parallel to Clitophon, who was compelled to fall in love by a woman’s beauty, and subsequently succumbed to lovesickness when denied access to the object of his desire. Arsake undergoes a similar scenario, only the object of her desire is male. Arsake’s position is complicated by the one-sided nature of her desire, as well as her gender. Despite holding a position of power over Theagenes, her desires are shown to be both corrupt and ineffectual, with her inverted role actually leaving her with less power, rather than more: “So now she said: “My love is more intense than ever, and the young man is like fuel to its raging fire. He is cruel and hard-hearted...he rejects my suit utterly and unambiguously” (Heliodorus 8.5). Where Leukippe is subjugated by Clitophon’s gaze, rendered a helpless object, Theagenes maintains his autonomy despite his slavery, leaving Arsake to “play the woman,” in this case as a helpless victim.⁴² Arsake’s continued victimhood appears to stem from the one-sided nature of

⁴⁰ Lye 2016: 239.

⁴¹ Lye 2016: 234.

⁴² Konstan 1994: 64.

her lovesickness. Clitophon's lovesickness is mutual, as the object of his desire eventually also succumbs to lovesickness. Arsake, however, lacks the good fortune of belonging to the central couple. Due to the one-sided nature of her lovesickness, her desire for Theagenes is seen as unhealthy, distinguishing her as a sexually corrupt woman desiring an unattainable man. Since lovesickness has been shown to be a literary device, it is only when the gaze is mutual and the desire is reciprocated, that the objectification of one of the central lovers by the other is rendered irrelevant, and the power balance between the genders is restored.⁴³

3.4 Women as Agents

Lovesickness is a physical illness which is spread primarily through female objects, rendering women the natural carriers of the infection in the story. A distinction must first be drawn here between the instrument of infection and the source of infection. The source of lovesickness in the novels is a complicated topic, as the nature of *eros* is hard to pin down.⁴⁴ Sometimes *eros* is described as a god, sometimes as an emotion. Nevertheless, the sources of lovesickness itself fall into three broad categories: Eros as a god, an idea, or a person. Theagenes and Charikleia fall in love due to Love or Eros (Heliodorus 4.1, 4.4), while Thisbe falls in love with Knemon because his stepmother told her to (Heliodorus 1.11). With this distinction between a source and an instrument in mind, the question of women's autonomy within the story is again raised. In contrast to Arsake, a clear, passive object of lovesickness, Charikleia emerges as an active agent who takes Kybele's advice and uses lovesickness to her own purposes, manipulating the debilitating symptoms of lovesickness to disguise her command of the situation. Charikleia

⁴³ Konstan 1994: 98.

⁴⁴ See chapter 1.1.

manipulates her own lovesickness once she is infected, but had no deliberate hand in her own infection.

The lovesickness displayed by Charikleia is the most well-documented case presented in the novels, and the only case that is diagnosed by a doctor.⁴⁵ The physician Akesinos' diagnosis of Charikleia's malaise allows for a legitimization of Charikleia's passionate desire for Theagenes.⁴⁶ Charikleia is repeatedly praised for the modesty she displays in trying to conceal her symptoms, highlighting her status as a virginal paragon of chastity: "We found her[Charikleia] tossing restlessly on her bed, her eyes moist with love. She embraced her father as normal, but when he asked her what was wrong, she said she was suffering from a headache" (Heliodorus 3.7). It is Charikleia's modesty and self-control which serves to distinguish her lovesick state from other cases, namely Arsake's, marking one character as the heroine and the other as the antagonist.⁴⁷ While Charikleia is suffering from a genuine case of lovesickness, it is her ability to push back the symptoms when necessary and maintain control of a given situation which distinguishes her as an active agent, rather than merely an unwitting victim of the lovesickness caused by her desire for Theagenes.⁴⁸

Charikleia manipulates lovesickness to advance her own interests occurs during her appearance in Hydaspes' court in book ten.⁴⁹ Charikleia breaks her traditional gender role by speaking in a masculine setting when proving her own identity, but it is when Theagenes' life is

⁴⁵ May 2014: 107.

⁴⁶ For more information on Akesinos and his diagnosis of Charikleia's lovesickness see the introduction 1.2. See also Nelson Hawkins 2017: 66-67.

⁴⁷ May 2014: 110.

⁴⁸ Examples of Charikleia succumbing to the symptoms of lovesickness feature throughout the novel, with the most severe examples occurring when Theagenes is absent from her immediate vicinity (Heliodorus 6.8-9).

⁴⁹ Hydaspes is the Ethiopian king, and Charikleia's father (Heliodorus 9.1).

put in danger that she both experiences renewed symptoms and uses her illness to ensure his life is spared: “But Charikleia as she watched was seized with a fit of palpitations...Persinna did not realize the true motive for Charikleia’s request: she took it for a mere infatuation” (Heliodorus 10.29).⁵⁰ It is not until Charikleia has both shown an unseemly display of weeping and emotion and spoken out eloquently that her pleas are heeded, and the true nature of her connection to Theagenes is revealed: “This is my greatest misfortune...even people of intelligence find my words unintelligible...now I am compelled to resort to an explicit and undisguised denunciation of myself” (Heliodorus 10.30). Charikleia’s lovesick condition renders her “unintelligible” to those around her, but it is the very nature of her infatuation with Theagenes that makes it legitimate in the eyes of her parents. In this sense, lovesickness becomes a means for Charikleia to secure what she desires most. Her lovesickness for Theagenes provides the legitimization for her breaking out of her expected female gender role by speaking out in public.⁵¹ Far from being unintelligible, Charikleia displays unusual oratorical eloquence, with lovesickness justifying her autonomy in the scene. Her own desires are also attuned to the broader goals of the story, to have the primary couple come together and legitimize their sickness through marriage, thus providing a cure through sexual consummation. This overlap with the intended direction of the story allows her to maintain both an active role in her own fate, and a positive place in the eyes of the story. In other words, Charikleia is upholding Greek values of modesty and devotion in her pursuit of Theagenes, legitimizing her active behaviours and bold actions as a necessary means to an end.⁵²

⁵⁰ Persinna is Charikleia’s mother, the wife of Hydaspes.

⁵¹ Konstan 1994: 91-93.

⁵² Lye 2016: 256-57.

While I have examined Arsake's inability to escape victimization and objectification in the novel, she can also be read in parallel with Charikleia as an active, autonomous woman. Morgan discusses a "narrative doublet" which links Arsake and Charikleia, namely in terms of the circumstances through which they fall in love with Theagenes.⁵³ Morgan emphasizes the similarities between the two women's symptoms, particularly erratic behaviour, changes in complexion, and tossing in their beds.⁵⁴ He outlines the clear differences as well, noting that Arsake's status as a married woman is denoted by her bed being in her bridal chamber.⁵⁵ The one-sided nature of Arsake's love, and her undesirable nature as a sexually amoral woman, set her apart from Charikleia, despite the story parallels. When she first appears in the narrative, Arsake is presented as a fairly capable leader in her husband Oroondates' absence: "It was nevertheless right and proper to notify his wife, Arsake, before they took action, for it she gave her approval, such soldiers as were to be found in the city would be more inclined to cooperate" (Heliodorus 7.1).⁵⁶ Arsake is afforded a certain amount of respect here, although her disreputable moral character is emphasized immediately: "But the life she led was disreputable: in particular she was a slave to perverted and dissipated pleasure...her crimes included being in part responsible for Thyamis's banishment from Memphis" (Heliodorus 7.2). Arsake's questionable morals are directly attributed to the damage she caused to a man's reputation and character, as well as her autonomous position of power when her husband is away. The emphasis placed on Arsake's sexual promiscuity sets her character up to fail from the very start in her attempts to

⁵³ Morgan 1998: 62-65.

⁵⁴ Morgan 1998: 65.

⁵⁵ Morgan 1998: 65-66. Morgan points to the Greek word *θάλαμος* in the text, indicating a bridal chamber given to Arsake by her husband.

⁵⁶ Lye 2016: 249.

possess Theagenes, as her desires are in direct contravention of the goals of the story, and must therefore be discredited. Arsake is set up as a sexually experienced foreign woman which sets her apart from the virginal Charikleia, despite the direct parallels between their cases of lovesickness, as well as both women's positions of authority in a masculine world.⁵⁷ Charikleia's power is exercised subtly, and largely behind the scenes, through directions to Theagenes on the correct choices to make. Arsake's power however is brazen, arrogant, and out in the open: "Arsake was a tall, handsome woman, highly intelligent and arrogant and proud by reason of her noble birth" (Heliiodorus 7.2).

Arsake's agency is ultimately negated by her lovesick state, rendering her amoral behaviour irrelevant. However, her willful manipulation of lovesickness for her own purposes makes her agency a tricky question to address. Arsake is shown attempting to infect Thyamis with lovesickness, utilizing a set of skills to attempt to transmit infection: "She cast on him eyes of lust and made him signs to hint at her obscene intentions" (Heliiodorus 7.3). This highlights both Arsake's position as a willful instrument of spreading the infection of lovesickness, as well as her knowledge of how the infection process works, using eye contact to attempt to initiate lovesick symptoms. Arsake's agency is again undermined, as her attempts at infection are unsuccessful, and she finds herself instead infected by lovesickness for two different men: "As she looked upon Thyamis and then upon Theagenes, her heart was rent in two, torn asunder by the desire she felt for each of them" (Heliiodorus 7.4). She loses control of herself, and her people, due to lovesickness. This highlights the destructive power lovesickness can have on both

⁵⁷ Lye 2016: 253.

genders, in terms of gender performances and behaviours, particularly when the illness is one-sided.

In couples where the lovesickness is a mutual infection, both individuals' physical beauty is emphasized in equal measures. In one-sided cases, where one individual falls in love with an unattainable object, only the physical beauty of the objectified individual is emphasized.

Lovesickness becomes a tool to be used by Heliodorus to ensure the correct romantic connections are made. Sometimes the characters also attempt to use this tool to achieve their own desire, but whether this manipulation is successful depends on where the story is intended to end up. Charikleia's willful use of her own lovesickness succeeds due to her role as part of the central, narratively pre-determined couple. By contrast, Arsake's attempts to infect others with the disease fail due to her pre-determined role as a frustrated other.⁵⁸ The example of Charikleia manipulating lovesickness for her own purposes shows that her desires were in line with the overarching narrative of the story. When the individual who is struck with lovesickness is part of a case of mutual lovesickness, the infection is a means of bringing about a narratively approved union, the lovesickness running its course to a positive conclusion. Such is the case with Charikleia and Theagenes. By contrast, when it is a case of one-sided lovesickness, as with Arsake, the individual's desires are thwarted by the infection running its course, to ensure the central couple is prioritized over the other cases of one-sided lovesickness

⁵⁸ Arsake succumbs by disappearing from the narrative, rather than explicitly being killed off or dying of her lovesick infection.

4 Other Victims of Lovesickness

4.1 Other Novels, Other Cases of Otherness

In the midst of stricken yearnings for the lover she fears is dead, Charikleia pauses to lament the loss of her female bedfellow: “Now Nausikleia is a bride, and I am parted from her who until this night shared my bed; Charikleia is alone and forsaken” (Heliodorus 6.8). Nausikleia is snared by a “spell of love” cast on her by Charikleia (Heliodorus 6.11), and with her ensnarement any assumptions that might have been drawn about lovesickness being an affliction that only targets the central couple dissolve. Lovesickness serves a narrative function in infecting particular characters, to bring about a particular outcome. This outcome is achieved through the use of lovesickness to manipulate the behaviour of both male and female characters, enhancing or detracting from their gender performances to promote a mutual passion between the central couple. These cases of mutual lovesickness follow a particular pattern of symptoms and behaviours, a progression from infection to resolution. Yet, as we touched on with the case of Arsake in the last chapter, lovesickness does not influence only the central, mutually lovesick couple in the novels. This chapter examines cases of lovesickness that afflict those individuals who fall outside of the central couple, with a view to illuminating how lovesickness both inside and outside the central couple acts as a narrative device that privileges the interests of the central couple, to the exclusion of everyone else. By examining the progression of lovesickness in thwarted men, thwarted women, and same-sex cases, the full meaning of the narrative pattern of lovesickness across the novels will be highlighted.

Konstan argues that the novels are “unique” in “classical love literature” for portraying “*eros* as a fully reciprocal passion between equals.”¹ Charikleia and Theagenes typify this pattern, as a young, virginal, heterosexual, beautiful, mutually attracted couple who eventually “consummate their passion.”² He argues that “*eros* is uniform in the Greek novel...it motivates the meanest villains, male or female, in the same way it does the protagonists themselves.”³ Lovesickness can be seen to follow the same pattern, regardless of whether the afflicted individual’s desire is returned or one-sided.⁴ The infection’s progression can be broken into four main stages: the initial infection point, the progression of symptoms, the altered behaviours exhibited by afflicted individuals, and the outcome of the infection. In this chapter, I examine three groups that fall outside of the narratively approved, mutually afflicted central couple: thwarted women who have a one-sided desire for the male protagonist, rival men who desire the female protagonist, and cases of same-sex desire. Konstan suggests that there is no difference in the motivation for lovesick desire, regardless of who it affects.⁵ I argue instead that each individual’s lovesickness has a different motive and purpose in the narrative, depending on the background, identity, and importance to the story of the infected individual.

When examining cases of lovesickness that fall outside the central paradigm, it is necessary to go beyond the *Aethiopika* and consider several of the earlier extant Greek novels, notably Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Xenophon’s

¹ Konstan 1994: 33, 41. Konstan uses *eros* to refer to the process of falling in love, and experiencing desires and symptoms as a result, the concept which I have described as lovesickness.

² Konstan 1994: 33.

³ Konstan 1994: 41. See also Haynes 2003: 138.

⁴ This similarity of progression is examined in the comparison of Charikleia and Arsake’s experiences of lovesickness in chapter 3.1-4, and will be further supported in the subsequent examples detailed in this chapter.

⁵ Konstan 1994: 45.

Ephesian Tale.⁶ An examination of these novels, in relation to the *Aethiopika*, allows for an exploration of how the three groups exhibit the typical pattern of lovesickness, even though they do not fit the traditional model of young, mutual, heterosexual desire. This discussion also demonstrates how lovesickness acting as a narrative device to ensure a particular outcome can be applied to the extant corpus of novels as a whole. Looking at cases of lovesickness that follow the typical pattern, but are always denied a cure, serves to illuminate the importance of the central couple's marriage and sexual consummation in the story. Lovesickness serves as a device to ensure the proper people get a happy ending, with the other characters own thwarted infections only acting to strengthen the centrality of the primary couple's reciprocal case of lovesickness.

4.2 Thwarted Women: One-Sided Lovesickness

Despite the lack of thwarted male rivals and same-sex romances, the *Aethiopika* offers the reader several examples of thwarted female rivals.⁷ There are several examples of love triangles, involving the mutually lovesick couple and another, frustrated rival, such as Theagenes, Charikleia, and Arsake.⁸ The one-sided nature of Arsake's lovesick desire for Theagenes was explored in the previous chapter, where her role as a foreign woman and therefore an outsider was emphasized.⁹ Lye highlights the parallels between Charikleia and

⁶ Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is thought to be the earliest of the extant Greek novels, dating to the mid-first century CE, followed by Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* in the mid-second century, and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* in the late second century. See Morgan 2008: 5-6. The following translations are used for each novel: Chariton, Reardon 2008, Longus, Hadas 1964 and Gill 2008, Xenophon, Anderson 2008.

⁷ Thwarted is used here to refer to women, or men, who are not part of the central couple and suffer from one-sided lovesickness.

⁸ The example of Demainete's desire for her step-son Knemon is examined briefly in the previous chapter (chapter 3.3), and provides an excellent description of a non-virginal woman falling prey to the usual pattern of beauty initiating lovesickness, followed by debilitating symptoms. See Heliodorus 1.8-11.

⁹ Arsake is described as "a Persian." See Heliodorus 7.20.

Arsake, but also points out the distinctly different reception of their behaviours by the other characters.¹⁰ Haynes identifies Arsake as a “female antagonist,” figures who act as a direct rival to the female protagonist for the male protagonist’s romantic affections, and therefore “pose a threat to the stability of the protagonists’ relationship.”¹¹ She argues that the *Aethiopika* portrays Arsake in a purely negative light, as spiteful and sexually promiscuous.¹² Arsake is shown falling prey to lovesickness for two different men, Thyamis and Theagenes. In both cases, her illness is one-sided and her desires unreturned. An examination of the stages of Arsake’s infection suggests that it is the one-sided nature which accounts for the differences between her experience of lovesickness and that of Charikleia.

Arsake’s desire for Thyamis and Theagenes fits with the model of lovesickness being triggered by the physical beauty of the person who initiates the infection in another individual:¹³ “As she [Arsake] looked upon Thyamis and then upon Theagenes, her heart was rent in two, torn asunder by the desire she felt for each of them” (Heliodorus 7.4). In both cases the triggering of infection is one-sided, Arsake laying her eyes on Thyamis and Theagenes, rather than their eyes meeting. Arsake’s beauty escapes Theagenes’ notice, as he is already blinded by his own lovesickness for Charikleia. Thyamis’ immunity to the infection is more intriguing however, as he is initially set up as a parallel to Theagenes, a young man “in the flower of his manhood...whose character and upbringing were devoid of all unchastity” (Heliodorus 7.2). Just as Theagenes had sworn off women before his initial encounter with Charikleia, Thyamis is

¹⁰ Lye 2016: 235.

¹¹ Haynes 2003: 102-3.

¹² Haynes 2003: 110.

¹³ See chapter 3.2 for a discussion of physical beauty as the trigger for the initial symptoms of lovesickness.

described as having an upbringing “devoid of all unchastity [*sophrosyne*]” (Heliodorus 7.2).¹⁴ Rather than falling prey to lovesickness for Arsake the moment their eyes meet, he remains unaffected. Arsake is not virginal *parthenos* living under her father’s control. She is a married woman, who is described as sexually knowledgeable.¹⁵ Her lovesickness is triggered in the same manner as Charikleia’s, by seeing a beautiful young man for the first time. Yet her inability to conform to the model of “normative female behaviour”¹⁶ embodied by Charikleia, that of a chaste and passive young woman, leads to a failure in spreading the infection to the object of her desire. Arsake is not part of the ideal central couple, so her lovesickness is one-sided.

The progression of Arsake’s illness follows the established pattern, causing physical and psychological symptoms and influencing the behaviours that make up her gender performance.¹⁷ After her initial infection, she is perpetually drawn to the sight of Theagenes: “She was a woman generally addicted to ignoble pleasure, but now her passion was fired as never before by Theagenes’ peerless beauty...all night she lay, ceaselessly tossing from side to side, ceaselessly sighing from the depths of her being” (Heliodorus 7.9). She is plagued by restlessness, insomnia, hollow eyes, and is even described as “like one recovering from an attack of epilepsy” (Heliodorus 7.4). Arsake’s behaviour is also affected. She is restless, and has many verbal outbursts in her attempts to ensnare Theagenes’ affections. We are told that Arsake has had many such passions, but that Theagenes’ beauty acted as a “lightning strike,” rendering the infection unusually severe on this occasion (Heliodorus 7.10-11). Kybele castigates Theagenes for his lack

¹⁴ *Sophrosyne* means self-controlled, chaste, conveying a general sense of having control over sensual desires.

¹⁵ Haynes 2003: 110-111. See also Lye 2016: 235-36.

¹⁶ Haynes 2003: 110.

¹⁷ For a detailed description of the symptoms I identify as associated with lovesickness in the novels, see the chapter 1.2.

of reaction to Arsake's state: "A handsome young man like you...rejects a woman of equal attractions who is dying of love for him...I am here to abet your union...there is nothing at all standing in your way, no wife or bride-to-be here to stop you" (Heliiodorus 7.20).¹⁸ She is initially describing exactly how the lovesickness between the central couple should play out. But as she goes on to emphasize, Arsake is not part of the central union, is not Theagenes' "equal" but rather a "Persian," and more importantly a promiscuous woman who is already married. Arsake is urging Theagenes to abandon the ideals of chastity with her, rather than upholding them (Heliiodorus 7.20). Theagenes' resistance leads Arsake's symptoms to intensify into madness and progress beyond the stages experienced by Charikleia, towards suicide:¹⁹ "Until today she...believed we could bring it to a successful consummation...but the young-man is such a hot-headed...fool that he has rejected our advances, and I know for certain now that Arsake will put an end to her life" (Heliiodorus 7.23). Haynes argues that Arsake's "madness" is triggered by her "abnormally active sexuality" within the narrative, with her lovesickness for Theagenes manifesting only after he rejects her advances.²⁰ Arsake describes Theagenes' beauty as infecting her from the moment she laid eyes on him, and her initial symptoms begin at the start of her appearance in book seven. The intensity of Arsake's symptoms increases in relation to her rejection by Theagenes. This reinforces the idea that a thwarted woman's one-sided lovesickness acts as a mirror for what the female protagonist's fate would be, if her sickness was not a mutual affair.

¹⁸ Kybele is described as "one of the chambermaids who were in the habit of abetting Arsake in her love affairs" (Heliiodorus 7.10).

¹⁹ Haynes 2003: 112.

²⁰ Haynes 2003: 112.

Lovesickness in the “female antagonists,” women whose lovesickness is one-sided, follows the same pattern as lovesickness in women who are part of the central couple, with the exceptions of intensity and outcome.²¹ Egger argues that “marriage is the social backbone of the romances,” a backbone that only applies to the central couple.²² The eventual outcome of the mutual lovesickness shared by the central couple is used by Heliodorus to emphasize this status quo. Both characters are initially infected at the start of the novel, and that infection shapes their gender performance as the story progresses. For the male protagonist, his masculinity is enhanced or curtailed depending on what the situation requires.²³ For the female protagonist, her performance of feminine values, in this case chastity, is preserved by her desire for her mutually lovesick companion.²⁴ Arsake, as an example of a “female antagonist,” threatens the central couple.²⁵ Her lovesickness is one-sided, but still genuine. As the object of her desire is already infected with desire for the intended object, the female protagonist, it cannot be reciprocated. Perkins argues that “the goal of chastity...to restrict the body to those socially approved and designated, is society’s most overt manifestation of its power.”²⁶ For the central female character, chastity is a fundamental part of their gender performance.²⁷ Lovesickness ironically acts to preserve chastity within the narrative, by emphasizing the devotion of the central couple

²¹ Haynes uses the term “female antagonist” to refer to women in the novels who threaten the central couple’s unity by desiring the central male protagonist. See Haynes 2003: 102-115. Cases of one-sided lovesick women who serve as darker mirrors of the female protagonist’s own lovesick state are particularly prominent in Heliodorus, but can also be found in the other novels. A notable case is Melite in Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, who parallels Arsake as a wealthy, independent, married woman who falls for the central male protagonist. See Morales 2004: 220-222.

²² Egger 1994: 260. See also Perkins 1995: 46.

²³ For examples of the central male character’s gender performance being enhanced or hindered by lovesickness, see chapter 2.3-4 of this thesis.

²⁴ Konstan 1994: 46.

²⁵ Haynes 2003: 102.

²⁶ Perkins 1995: 46.

²⁷ Haynes 2003: 16, 70-71.

to each other, and thus preserving “the symmetrical passion of the central couple.”²⁸ The women with one-sided lovesickness fall outside of this “symmetrical passion,” and thus outside of the performance of chastity. They are unsuited for mutual lovesickness, their age, sexual experience, and other differences such as social status setting them apart from the ideal femininity of the female protagonist.

Eros is experienced differently in individuals who do not fit the model of gender, social, and cultural identity represented in the central couple.²⁹ It is more violent and therefore socially unacceptable.³⁰ We have seen that *eros* can be used to refer to lovesickness in the *Aethiopika*, both in reference to the one-sided infection of Arsake, and the reciprocal infection of Theagenes and Charikleia. In this context, one-sided lovesickness is more violent because it is socially and narratively undesirable. Rather than being a different form of lovesickness, the pattern experienced by both types of women is identical. It is only the rejection from the object of their desire, the lovesick individual’s inability to attain a cure, that leads to the illness progressing to an intensity where violence manifests: “She [Arsake] loves him with a love too strong to resist, a love that is not of the ordinary kind, a love that has no cure...[for] that young man is such a hot-headed and hard-hearted fool that he has rejected our advances” (Heliodorus 7.23). The escalation of the infection because of a continued separation or lack of reciprocity also relates to Haynes’ argument that one-sided lovesickness has a negative element which mutual lovesickness

²⁸ Konstan 1994: 68. See also Morales 2004: 153.

²⁹ Konstan 1994: 42.

³⁰ Konstan 1994: 42-43.

does not.³¹ This negative aspect comes from the infection progressing unchecked, after hope of a cure has been denied due to the social, moral, and marital standing of the individuals involved.

4.3 Thwarted Men: Rivals and Widowers

Cases of one-sided lovesickness also occur in men within the novels, usually taking the form of a thwarted rival male who desires the central female protagonist.³² The most extensive example of a rival male being infected by lovesickness for the female protagonist is Dionysius in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. This is the earliest of the Greek novels, and focuses on Callirhoe, who is separated from her husband Chaereas, whom she presumes is dead. She is eventually bought as a slave by Dionysius, who falls in love with her.³³ While the central couple is married at the start of the narrative, rather than the end, the pattern of separation, longing, and desire to preserve their chastity remains. Dionysius is a widower who has recently lost his wife, and is described as a good, kind man (Chariton 2.2). Konstan emphasizes the struggle Dionysius undergoes as he tries to resist his lovesickness for Charikleia, suggesting his failure to resist "is taken not as a sign of an ignoble failure in self-control but as a token of love's universal sway."³⁴ Dionysius' gender performance is of particular interest here, as it mirrors the performance of masculinity put on by the central male protagonists. He is depicted as a man who prizes the values of *paideia* and *sophrosyne*, education and self-control: "Dionysius, you are Greek, you live in a humane community, you are a civilized man—please don't be like the tomb robbers; don't take my country and my family away from me" (Chariton 2.6). Callirhoe is appealing to

³¹ Haynes 2003: 119-120.

³² For examples of rival men in other novels see Sosthenes (Achilles Tatius 5.18-22, 5.25), Dionysius (Chariton 2.3-4, 2.7, 2.11, 5.6-8), Dorcan (Longus 1.15).

³³ Morgan 2008: 17-21. The novel is dated between the first century BCE and the mid-first century CE.

³⁴ Konstan 1994: 33.

Dionysius' position as a man who values qualities of ideal masculinity, but is also identifying him as possessing those qualities himself. Unlike the example of Arsake, Dionysius is not an outsider. His immediate desire and subsequent progressive lovesickness for Callirhoe is ultimately one-sided and unsatisfied.

Dionysius' lovesickness for Callirhoe is among the most detailed cases of lovesickness infecting men in the extant novels. Before he meets her he is intrigued to learn of her beauty. This intensifies when he sees her, mistaking her for Aphrodite: "As for Dionysius, he was wounded; but he tried to cover up the wound, like the well-brought up man he was, who prided himself on behaving properly" (Chariton 2.3). Dionysius is identified as being torn between his lovesickness for Callirhoe, and his "accustomed character."³⁵ There is an interesting reversal of situations here, as Dionysius thinks Callirhoe is a foreign slave, and therefore both unsuitable as an object of lovesick desire and unsuitable for marriage to cure that desire: "Dionysius, you ought to be ashamed of yourself! The most distinguished man in Ionia...and you behave like an adolescent! You fall in love at first sight...and to marry a *slave*" (Chariton 2.4). His self-castigation reveals his confusion over his sudden infection with lovesickness for Callirhoe, who laments her own beauty and the infection it causes in others.³⁶ His symptoms continue to progress steadily. He begins to weep when he realizes "he is not getting what he wants," refuses to be parted from her, and eventually reaches the point of barely eating and contemplating suicide: "Dionysius could no longer suffer his failure to win Callirhoe's love. He had determined to starve to death and was writing his last will and testament...in it he begged Callirhoe to come

³⁵ Jones 2012: 144.

³⁶ Callirhoe's beauty also causes Artaxerxes, the king of Persia, to fall prey to lovesickness for her (Chariton 6.1-3).

to him at least in death” (Chariton 3.1). As with the example of Arsake in the *Aethiopika*, the one-sided nature of his lovesickness causes an increase in the intensity and progression of the symptoms. In a contrast to Arsake’s case, Dionysius displays a form of sexual *sophrosyne* by refusing to take Callirhoe by force: “Don’t *you* [Dionysius] curse yourself! You’re her master, you can make her do what you want whether she likes it or not...Am I, Dionysius, celebrated for my moderation, to force myself on an unwilling woman” (Chariton 2.6). In this same passage Dionysius also rebukes Leonas³⁷ for buying a “girl of noble birth,” with his refusal to attempt to achieve the cure for his illness by force reinforcing his performance of *sophrosyne* (Chariton 2.6). The emphasis placed on Callirhoe’s noble birth also raises the interesting point that his lovesickness is so deep and encompassing because he is falling for an individual of elite status rather than a slave, and therefore taking her by force might not have provided a cure. In any case, marriage to a slave would not have provided the cure desired by the story, of a marriage between a mutually lovesick couple of similar ages and backgrounds. This outcome is rendered impossible not by Dionysius’ status or character, but by Callirhoe’s existing marriage to Chaereas. *Chaereas and Callirhoe* presents the interesting conundrum of two potentially suitable husbands for Callirhoe. Significantly, the potential suitor displaying the clearest case of lovesickness also happens to be the very one who is unsuitable, simply because he didn’t get there first.

The outcome of Dionysius’ lovesickness is once again what separates his condition from other descriptions of both mutual and one-sided cases. The prolonged nature of the lovesickness, and the continued rejection from Callirhoe, eventually prove too much for his self-professed self-

³⁷ Leonas is the controller of Dionysius’ household (Chariton 1.12).

control: “Dionysius’ passion raged fiercely and would not suffer the wedding to be delayed; self-control is painful when desire can be satisfied” (Chariton 3.2). It appears in book three that Dionysius’ lovesickness will in fact resolve the traditional way, with a marriage and cure through sexual consummation, despite the one-sided nature of the illness. However, eventually her true husband returns instead and Dionysius is left to raise the central couple’s son. After his bogus marriage to Callirhoe, no further mention is made of his lovesickness. This is significant, as it is unclear to the reader whether a consummation of their union took place. Regardless of whether he temporarily achieved the necessary cure for his worsening symptoms, Dionysius is effectively sidelined at the end, and the true central couple reassert their union. Like Arsake, Dionysius is outside of the central couple, and his lovesickness is shown as entirely one-sided. His symptoms progress from love at first sight triggered by beauty, to a lack of appetite, insomnia, and eventually attempted suicide. However, Dionysius’ “distinguished Greek lineage” (Chariton 8.8) and his performance of *sophrosyne* render the ending of his case of lovesickness a happier one than most thwarted individuals receive, as his role transitions from rival for the female protagonist’s affections into a guardian for her son: “There is growing up in Miletus one who will be a Syracusan; a wealthy one, and reared by a distinguished man—for Dionysius is indeed of distinguished Greek lineage. We should not grudge him his great inheritance!” (Chariton 8.8). Dionysius serves as a foil for Chaereas, demonstrating that despite the potential suitability of a lovesick suitor, only the initial, authorially intended couple will end up together.³⁸ Not all one-sided cases of lovesickness necessarily end in a negative way.

³⁸ Alvares 2002: 112. Alvares stresses the unspoken rule in the Greek novels of “one mate for life,” suggesting that this singular devotion to the other half of the initial couple is what drives much of the narrative. I argue this devotion is better understood as lovesick desire.

A second case of a thwarted rival experiencing feelings of lovesickness for the female protagonist is Dorcon's attraction to Chloe in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. This case lacks the complicated context surrounding Dionysius and Callirhoe, and serves as a good foil to test our pattern of lovesickness. A pastoral novel thought to be written in the second century CE, *Daphnis and Chloe* follows the Greek novel pattern of a young, beautiful couple falling prey to mutual lovesickness and eventually getting married.³⁹ The novel discusses the illness and symptoms of love at length, giving detailed descriptions of the central couple falling prey to mutual lovesickness (Longus 1.11-14, 1.17-19). It also discusses the "cure" for lovesickness: "There is no medicine for Love, no potion, no drug, no spell to mutter, except a kiss and an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies" (Longus 2.7). This cure is framed in a story that discusses a man's lovesickness directed at a female object of desire. There is no mention made of marriage in the story, only consummation. Despite this, Daphnis and Chloe both resist "lying down together," apparently due to their sexual inexperience and modesty (Longus 2.9). The novel also offers examples of one-sided lovesickness, for both the female and the male protagonist.⁴⁰ The thwarted rival in this case is Dorcon, a "cowherd" who "knew about love" (Longus 2.15). He falls "immediately in love with Chloe" upon first meeting her, and his sickness progresses as time goes on. A beauty contest takes place between Daphnis and Dorcon, where Chloe must pick the winner and reward him with a kiss. Dorcon makes a case for being stronger and a better provider, and he suggests that Daphnis doesn't live up to the ideal form of manliness within the novel (Longus 2.16). Dorcon loses the contest, and his symptoms worsen

³⁹ Gill 2008: 285-86.

⁴⁰ The example of Gnathon's desire for Daphnis will be explored in the next section.

accordingly: “Now Dorcon had been cheated of his hopes twice...he decided to make a physical assault on Chloe when she was on her own” (Longus 2.20). Dorcon is eventually mortally wounded by pirates, taking a final kiss from Chloe as the sight of her ignites “a little of the fire of his former love” (Longus 2.29). While Dorcon’s symptoms deviate somewhat from the established pattern, his death arguably cutting short the progression before suicide is attempted, his final words to Chloe parallel Dionysius’ final wish in his will, when he thought his sickness would remain unreturned: “Chloe, I shall die soon...kiss me while I live and mourn for me when I die” (Longus 2.29). Dorcon does not fit the model of a virginal youth of god-like beauty which Daphnis embodies, the beauty contest proving him to be a poor imitation of the male protagonist. While his lovesickness for Chloe follows the same pattern as that of Daphnis, it remains one-sided and therefore ends tragically. Chloe’s clear choice, motivated by her own lovesickness, indicates that the suitability of Daphnis over Dorcon has little to do with lovesickness itself, but rather who is set up in the story to be more suitable to experience a mutual case of the affliction, rather than a one-sided one.

4.4 Same-Sex Relationships: Mutual yet Unapproved

Attempting to argue that the encounters between Nausikleia and Charikleia in the middle of the *Aethiopika* represent a case of same-sex desire and lovesickness is difficult.⁴¹ Their interactions are brief, the references fleeting. Both are preparing to marry men. Yet Charikleia

⁴¹ This point in the narrative, Charikleia and Nausikleia are both unmarried, and of similar ages. Hubbard suggests that same-sex desire among women in ancient Greek literature usually occurs between “girls equal in age and status, all unmarried maidens on the verge of sexual availability.” See Hubbard 2014: 141. See also Haynes 2003: 132. Discussions of the potential desire expressed by Charikleia for Nausikleia are largely absent from current scholarship on the novel. For a brief discussion of women desiring women and female sexuality in late antiquity, see Gorman 2001: 416-425.

uses the same breath to lament the loss of her female bedfellow as she does to lament her missing betrothed (Heliodorus 6.8). Examining the language and circumstances surrounding the interactions between Charikleia and Nausikleia will help to illuminate the complex nature of lovesickness when it occurs outside of the central couple. Their case, as well as other cases of lovesick desire between same-sex individuals, highlights one very important fact that has not yet been considered: cases of lovesickness that occur outside of the central couple are not necessarily automatically one-sided merely because of that fact. None of the corpus of five extant Greek novels contain a clear depiction of same-sex desire between women.⁴²

The Greek novels “promote female rivalry over female friendship.”⁴³ Charikleia and Nausikleia appear to defy this trend, as for brief moments in book six they are nearly inseparable on a “continuum of closeness”:⁴⁴ “Now Nausikleia is a bride, and I am parted from her who until this night shared my bed” (Heliodorus 6.8). At this point in the narrative Charikleia is lamenting her separation from Theagenes, experiencing symptoms of insomnia, restlessness, and melancholy in his absence. That these symptoms coincide with Nausikleia leaving her bed is notable, as is the age of the individuals in question. At the time of Charikleia’s lament, they are both unmarried *parthenoi* still residing under their fathers’ control, which fits with Hubbard’s model of female “homoerotic bonds” usually occurring between “girls equal in age and

⁴² Morales 2008: 49. Morales discusses a later Greek novel, Iamblichus’ *Babylonian Affairs*, of which only a ninth-century summary exists. This novel does “dramatize same-sex female relations,” notably even alluding to a sort of marriage taking place between the two “desiring” women. For a copy and discussion of this text, see Wilson 1994: 104-113, and Stephens and Winkler 2014: 179-245.

⁴³ Morales 2008: 50. See Haynes 2003: 124-6 for a discussion of female friendships present in the earlier Greek novels, notably *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.

⁴⁴ Morales 2008: 49-50. Morales quotes Rich in arguing that female same-sex desire should be measured in the novels on a “continuum of closeness,” measured by how physically and emotionally connected they are.

status...unmarried maidens on the verge of sexual availability.”⁴⁵ Charikleia plays matchmaker for Nausikleia and Knemon, observing his one-sided love and arranging with Nausikles for a union to be formed:⁴⁶ “A lover is quick to discern another who has fallen pretty to the same passions as himself; many signs had already led Charikleia to suspect that Knemon was enamored of Nausikles’ daughter” (Heliiodorus 6.7). In this case the “woman’s feelings are not important.”⁴⁷ Charikleia’s matchmaking serves to neutralize any potential lovesickness present between her and Nausikleia, the possible symptoms of which are impossible to untangle in the face of her desire for Theagenes. Even after her marriage, Nausikleia’s feelings for Charikleia are stronger than those for her new husband: “Nausikleia...pleaded incessantly with her father to be allowed to join the throng, for the modesty she felt as a newly wedded bride was outweighed by the spell of love that Charikleia had cast on her” (Heliiodorus 6.11).⁴⁸

The eventual marriage of both women to lovesick men negates any relevance of lovesickness existing between them, as such an infection would not serve a purpose in the narrative. Charikleia is already part of a mutually lovesick couple, and Nausikleia is paired off with Knemon. Boehringer argues that “female homoeroticism” is often rendered irrelevant within the ancient context as the women who experience it are themselves “irrelevant.”⁴⁹ In the case of Charikleia and Nausikleia, their interaction is brief, and any desire existing between them is negated before it ever has a chance to become observable, never mind relevant.

⁴⁵ Hubbard 2014: 141-42.

⁴⁶ Haynes 2003: 132.

⁴⁷ Haynes 2003: 132.

⁴⁸ It should be noted that the term *philos* is used to refer to Nausikleia’s love for Charikleia, a noun which can mean love or friendship, and does not have the erotic connotations of *eros*.

⁴⁹ Boehringer 2014: 160-61.

The *Aethiopika* is the only novel that contains no apparent mention of physical or sexual attraction between men.⁵⁰ Due to this, to explore more fully the nature of lovesickness in relation to same-sex desire within the novels it is necessary to examine two earlier novels, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale*. Each of these novels presents a case of lovesickness manifesting in same-sex desire between men, one case one-sided and one case mutual. While male same-sex desire was somewhat acceptable in certain circumstances in ancient Greece, particularly fifth-century Athens, it was less widely accepted in the Roman period.⁵¹ Same-sex desire between men was socially problematic in the Roman world primarily for the man being penetrated, the *cinaedus*, as "a man who actively penetrates and dominates others, whether male or female, is still a man."⁵² Skinner argues that when juxtaposed with the "union of man and wife," the social limitations of same-sex desire render it unfeasible in practice.⁵³ This concept is important when considering the reasons that cases of lovesickness between individuals of the same sex have a much darker outcome than those experienced by their opposite sex counterparts, even if the same-sex desire is mutual.

We first examine a one-sided case of lovesickness that appears in *Daphnis and Chloe*, and parallels the story of Dorcon desiring Chloe. Only this time, it is Daphnis who is the object of unreturned lovesickness.⁵⁴ Gnathon first glimpses Daphnis in book four, long after Daphnis

⁵⁰ Watanabe 2003: 7. Watanabe describes the *Aethiopika* as the "only surviving novel that does not contain any mention of pederasty."

⁵¹ Williams 1999: 63. See Lear 2014: 117-118, for a discussion of homosexual behaviours in Rome. He notes that such behaviours were approved in adolescent males, but only when the passive partner was a slave or prostitute. See also Lear 2015: 130, and Skinner 2005: 272.

⁵² Gleason 1995: 65. *Cinaedus* refers to a man who is anally penetrated, and is therefore acting in a submissive and effeminate manner.

⁵³ Skinner 2005: 272-73.

⁵⁴ Doody 1996: 49.

has been infected with lovesickness for Chloe.⁵⁵ He is described as a young man who knew only how “to eat and to drink till he was drunk and to have sex when he was drunk” (Longus 4.11).⁵⁶ He is sexually experienced, and is struck by Daphnis’ beauty.⁵⁷ He pursues Daphnis forcefully, but is physically rejected (Longus 4.12). Descriptions of Gnathon’s desire are brief, but he exhibits restless behaviours that intensify in relation to his prolonged rejection by the object of his desire. His final performance of attempting suicide in the face of Daphnis’ rejection parallels cases of unreturned lovesickness for the opposite sex, such as Dionysius and Arsake:

“Gnathon...was still more inflamed by what had happened at the goat pasture, and thought that life was not worth living if he didn’t get Daphnis” (Longus 4.16). Gnathon’s particular case of lovesickness is doomed to be one-sided by the comic, wastrel nature of his character, his desire for an individual who is already lovesick for another, and his positioning as displaying an “untamed form of desire” that is “suppressed” in favour of a heterosexual union.⁵⁸ Konstan stresses that Daphnis’ rejection of Gnathon’s sexual advances as unnatural does not necessarily constitute a moralistic condemnation of homosexuality on the part of Longus. It is rather than Gnathon is the wrong sort of person to experience a reciprocal case of lovesickness, for reasons beyond the fact he is a man desiring another man.

⁵⁵ Gnathon is presented as a comedic figure, a parallel to similar lazy, wastrel men in Roman satire. See Doody 1996: 49 for a discussion of Gnathon’s comic nature, and the significance of his name, which means mouth or jaw and denotes him as a hungry mouth, as a parasite.

⁵⁶ For a discussion of Gnathon’s character type, a parasite and wastrel, see Doody 1996: 49-50, Konstan 1994: 29-30.

⁵⁷ Konstan 1994: 29. A particular emphasis is placed on Daphnis’ beauty by Gnathon, adding strength to the idea that beauty serves as the means of infection causing Gnathon’s lovesick desire for Daphnis.

⁵⁸ Egger 1994: 260. See also Konstan 1994: 29.

Another example of same-sex desire in the Greek novels is Hippothoos and Hyperanthes in Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale*.⁵⁹ This novel focuses on the central couple, Anthia and Habrocomes. In their misadventures, they encounter a bandit named Hippothoos, who recounts his lovesick desire for a boy, Hyperanthes (Xenophon 3.2). His story is unusual in many respects, not least of which is the fact that the love between the pair is mutual: "Hyperanthes would let no one near him because of his relationship with me" (Xenophon 3.2). Alvares suggests that Hippothoos serves as a parallel for Habrocomes,⁶⁰ and it may be inferred that by extension, the tale of his desire for Hyperanthes is also a mirror for the central, heterosexual couple's mutual lovesickness. He first encounters Hyperanthes, a "beautiful youth," wrestling in the gymnasium (Xenophon 3.2). This parallels Charikleia and Arsake falling in love with Theagenes while he is performing *andreia* by participating in athletic pursuits.⁶¹ They approach each other, fall mutually in love, and cure their symptoms with "kisses and caresses" (Xenophon 3.2). It is notable that their mutual symptoms abate only after a verbal contract of promises has taken place, followed by a sexual union. Their relationship mirrors those of the central couples, as their consummation comes only after they have reached a mutual agreement, and "promised everything" to each other. There is also an obstacle presented to their union, as Hyperanthes is basically kidnapped by a man experiencing one-sided desire for the already claimed youth: "For a long time we were together, passionately in love, until some evil spirit envied us" (Xenophon

⁵⁹ Anderson 2008: 125. The novel is usually dated to the second century CE.

⁶⁰ Alvares 1995: 394.

⁶¹ Watanabe suggests that the reference to the gymnasium indicates their relationship follows the pederastic model. See Watanabe 2003: 5. However, Alvares argues that the relative similarity in their ages precludes this possibility. See Alvares 1995: 394.

3.2).⁶² Hippothoos and Hyperanthes' mutual desire follows the same pattern as that of the central, heterosexual couple, and yet the ending is very different. Hyperanthes eventually drowns, and Hippothoos mourns his death, weeping over his corpse and erecting a grave to him, once again paralleling the male protagonist's mourning for their desired object.⁶³ Since Hippothoos and Hyperanthes' lovesickness occurs between two men, it must be "doomed" by the narrative.⁶⁴ Hippothoos' masculine performance is damaged by his desire for Hyperanthes, as his mourning forces him into a life of banditry.⁶⁵ He eventually finds another love in Cleisthenes, whom he adopts as a son, legitimizing their relationship in the eyes of society, but allowing his homosexual desires to be fulfilled.⁶⁶ Kytzler notes that Hippothoos and "his boyfriend" appear to achieve a happy ending at the conclusion of the novel, mirroring the central couple's ending with a legally binding contract and a presumable consummation.⁶⁷ However, this happier reading is at best an interpretation of the text, and at worst wishful thinking that is largely unsupported by the actual words.

In the three cases of same-sex desire we have examined, the pattern of lovesickness is similar to the pattern observed affecting the central couple.⁶⁸ In each case the lovesickness has a "doomed" outcome, due to the unsuitability of the individual infected with it. Hopwood suggests

⁶² Significantly, the same phrase, "loving each other deeply," is used by both Hippothoos and Anthia to describe their mutual passion for their beloved. See Jones 2012: 191.

⁶³ It should be noted that for the central male protagonist, this mourning is usually false or premature. See Chariton 1.6-7, Heliodorus 2.3.

⁶⁴ Haynes 2003: 152.

⁶⁵ Jones 2012: 187. See also Alvares 1995: 395-96.

⁶⁶ Jones 2012: 197. It could be ventured that Hippothoos' adoption of Cleisthenes represents a parody of a heterosexual, legal marriage.

⁶⁷ Kytzler 1996: 343.

⁶⁸ It can be argued that these same-sex cases serve as foils for their heterosexual counterparts, following the same pattern of one-sided lovesickness in the case of Gnathon, and the same pattern of mutual, reciprocal sickness with Hippothoos. See Richardson 2014: 488-89.

that “homosexual *eros* is problematized” in the novels, as it frequently manifests in characters on the periphery of the story, who are in some way unsuitable for a mutual union.⁶⁹ This could also be said to apply to cases of same-sex lovesickness in the novels, where the afflicted individuals are forever denied the central couple’s happy ending due to the gender of the object of their desires.⁷⁰ Whether it is due to their social or ethnic background, their moral character, their sexual experience, or their sexual preferences, each of the infected individuals does not fit the model of identity and behaviour followed by the central couple.⁷¹ Because they do not fit this model, their lovesickness has a different, more negative outcome.

4.5 Conclusions

Several conclusions about lovesickness in the novels can be drawn from examining cases of lovesickness that fall outside of the central couple. Thwarted lovesickness in women, in rival men, and both thwarted and mutual lovesickness in same-sex couples all follow the established pattern of lovesickness. In each example examined, it is clear that cases of lovesickness that fall outside of the mutual lovesickness between the central couple in a novel serve as foils for that central case. That is, they are subverted by the events of the story in order to advance the resolution of the central couple’s affliction. Each case reaffirms the importance of the central couple in the narrative, by highlighting the key difference between the lovesickness of the central

⁶⁹ Hopwood 1998: 199.

⁷⁰ Happy ending is used here to refer to the marriage and sexual consummation afforded only to the central couples in the novels.

⁷¹ This model is of a young, beautiful, virginal individual who falls in love with an “equal” and works to preserve their chastity until their eventual marriage and cure.

couple and any other case of lovesickness in the novels. That is, that the central couple's lovesickness is curable.

Perkins argues that chastity, an aspect of *sophrosyne*, is the central theme of the Greek novels, that it “acts as the actual embodiment of social control.”⁷² If chastity may be exchanged for lovesickness, and society for narrative, this same model can be used to explain the various outcomes resulting from being infected with lovesickness in the novels. These outcomes are dependant on what category an afflicted individual falls into. Those inside the central couple, who fit the model of Greek, young, virginal, and beautiful, are infected by lovesickness to ensure their eventual marriage and sexual consummation. Anyone outside that model, due to background, character, or simply timing, suffer from an infection that does not result in a cure. Their misfortunes, the threat of their one-sided lovesickness, or the tragic outcome of their reciprocal lovesickness in the case of Hippothoos, reinforces the emphasis placed in the novels on “symmetrical passion.”⁷³ Lovesickness within the other categories examined in this chapter represent “asymmetrical” relationships, ones which can have no resolution because they do not fit the desired model, a model which emphasizes equality and mutual feeling.⁷⁴ Konstan emphasizes the prominence placed by the Greek novels on the central couples' equality, in terms of age, sexual experience, and social and ethnic background.⁷⁵ This equality is instrumental in the successful resolution of lovesickness within the central couple. Those who are infected with lovesickness for someone who is not their equal, who is greater or lesser than them in any of

⁷² Perkins 1995: 46.

⁷³ Morales 2004: 153.

⁷⁴ Morales 2008: 48.

⁷⁵ Konstan 1994: 1-16. See also Alvares 2002: 107.

these elements, are doomed to be incurable. It is not the pattern of lovesickness we have examined that changes between the central couple and the othered categories we have examined. What does change is the outcome of that lovesickness, combined with the social, moral, and ethnic character of the individual in question. Only the central couple is narratively designed to have their infection end in marriage.⁷⁶ Each novel spells out from the very beginning who will end up together, whose lovesickness will prove successful in triggering and ensuring a union and consummation. The central couple always fall in love at the same time, usually at the beginning of the novel.⁷⁷ Everyone else simply gets there too late for anything they experience to make any difference, as they are compelled to experience lovesickness for a person who has already fallen for someone else.

The ancient Greek novels offer a diverse canvas for studying concepts of desire, lovesickness, and romantic literature in the Second Sophistic. Heliodorus' *Aethiopika* serves as an excellent microcosm for classifying the nature and use of lovesickness in the Greek novel. By establishing a new definition of lovesickness as a medical ailment that combines physical and psychological symptoms with altered behaviours, it is possible to create a working model for understanding lovesickness in the novels. Triggered through eye contact with a desired object, whether one-sided or mutual, the sickness progresses from restlessness to deterioration and eventually death, if marriage and sexual consummation are not achieved. The illness alters expressions of behaviour in both men and women, particularly involving performances of a constructed gender identity. I argue that each stage of the illness, every behaviour it affects,

⁷⁶ Perkins 1995: 46.

⁷⁷ For examples of this see Achilles Tatius 1.4, Chariton 1.1-2, Heliodorus 3.5, Longus 1.11-14, 1.17-19, Xenophon 1.3-5.

every expression of identity it influences, serves to advance the goal of the story, the eventual marriage and sexual consummation of the central couple. Lovesickness is the narrative device that ensures the story ends up where it is supposed to, something the novels facilitate by making the typical ending the cure for lovesickness.

There is a romantic pattern in the ancient Greek novel, the story of a young, Greek, beautiful, heterosexual couple who are afflicted by lovesickness from the moment their eyes meet.⁷⁸ That sickness helps to ensure their story survives pirates, parents, storms, battles, even death, to end in a marriage.⁷⁹ Their lovesickness follows an inevitable pattern, privileging their sexual desire for each other over all others in the story. Being lovesick, as is it understood here, does not ensure a marriage and a happily ever after. But being lovesick for the right person does. In these novels, it pays to be swept off your feet by a narrative device. Lovesickness is not a selective ailment in the novel, uniformly afflicting individuals from diverse backgrounds. But how it ends is fundamentally linked to how the story is intended to end. And these novels usually only end one way. It's a love story for the ages, one still being retold over and over today. With maybe a few less pirates. "And so the time for their marriage arrived...Eros was leading the way, with a lighted torch. Under this canopy they brought Anthia to Habrocomes and put her to bed, then shut the doors" (Xenophon 1.8).

⁷⁸ Toohey 2004: 61.

⁷⁹ Cooper 1996: 28-29. See also Crewe 2009: 601-02.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Loveday. 1998. "‘Better to Marry than to Burn’: St. Paul and the Greek Novel." In *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins, eds. Atlanta: Scholars Press: 235-256.
- Alston, Richard. 1998. "Arms and the man: Soldiers, masculinity and power in Republican and Imperial Rome." In *When Men Were Men*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. London: Routledge: 205-223.
- Alvares, Jean. 1995. "The Drama of Hippothous in Xenophon of Ephesus’ ‘Ephesiaca.’" *Classical Journal* 90.4: 393–404.
- Alvares, Jean. 2002. "Love, Loss, and Learning in Chariton’s ‘Chaireas and Callirhoe.’" *Classical World* 95.2: 107–115.
- Anderson, Graham. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*. Chicago: Scholars Press.
- Anderson, Graham. 2008. "An Ephesian Tale: Introduction." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 125-128.
- Anderson, Michael J. 1997. "The ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ of Persinna and the Romantic Strategy of Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*." *Classical Philology* 92.4: 303–322.
- Andújar, Rosa M. 2013. "Charicleia the Martyr: Heliodorus and Early Christian Narrative." In *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*. M. P. Futre Pinheiro, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo, eds. Barkhuis: Ancient Narrative Supplemental 16: 139-152.
- Arnold, John H. and Sean Brady. 2011. "Introduction." In *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World*. John H. Arnold and Sean Brady, eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 1-16.
- Bassi, Karen. 2002. "The Semantics of Manliness in Ancient Greece." In *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, eds. Boston: Brill: 25-59.
- Biesterfeldt, Hans Hinrich, and Dimitri Gutas. 1984. "The Malady of Love." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104.1: 21–55.
- Berg, Henrik. 2011. "Masculinities in Early Hellenistic Athens." In *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World*. John H. Arnold and Sean Brady, eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 97-113.
- Billault, Alain. 1996. "Characterization in the Ancient Novel." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 115-131.
- Boehringer, Sandra. 2014. "Female Homoeroticism." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Thomas K. Hubbard, ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell: 150-163.
- Borg, Barbara E., ed. 2004. *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

- Bowersock, G. W. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. London: University of California Press.
- Chadwick, John. 1996. *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the lexicography of Ancient Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chariton. *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. 2008. B. P. Reardon, trans. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 17-124.
- Chew, Kathryn. 2003. "The Chaste and the Chased: ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ, Female Martyrs, and Novelistic Heroines." *Syllecta Classica* 14: 205-222.
- Connolly, Joy. 2002. "Like the Labors of Heracles: *Andreia* and *Paideia* in Greek Culture under Rome." In *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, eds. Boston: Brill: 287-317.
- Cooper, Kate. 1996. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Crewe, Jonathan. 2009. "Believing the Impossible: *Aethiopika* and Critical Romance." *Modern Philology* 106: 601-16.
- Cyrino, Monica Silveira. 1995. In *Pandora's Jar: Lovesickness in Early Greek Poetry*. New York: University Press of America.
- De Temmerman, Koen. 2014. *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doody, Margaret. 1996. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick: Rutgers's University Press.
- Dowden, Ken. 2010. "The Gods in the Greek Novel." In *The Gods of Ancient Greece*. Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, eds. Stockport: Edinburgh University Press: 362-374.
- Dzaja, Nancy. 2008. "Lovesickness: The Most Common Form of Heart Disease." *University of Western Ontario Medical Journal* 78: 65-68.
- Egger, Brigitte. 1994. "Women and Marriage in the Greek Novels: The Boundaries of Romance." In *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. James Tatum, ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 260-282.
- Egger, Brigitte. 1999. "The Role of Women in the Greek Novel: Woman as Heroine and Reader." In *Oxford Readings in The Greek Novel*. Simon Swain, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 108-136.
- Elsom, Helen E. 1992. "Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman." In *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour*. Amy Richlin, ed. New York: Oxford University Press: 212-230.
- Ferrand, Jacques. 1990 (tr.; orig. 1610). *A Treatise on Lovesickness*. Donald A. Beecher and Massimo Ciavolella, trans and eds. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Finzsch, Norbert. 2008. "Male Gaze and Racism." *Gender Forum* 23: n. p.

- Fusillo, Massimo. 1988. "Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel." In *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume 1*. Groningen: E. Forsten: 17-32.
- Fusillo, Massimo. 1989. *Il Romanzo Greco: Polifonia ed Eros*. Venice: Marsilio.
- Fusillo, Massimo. 1996. "Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. L. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 277-306.
- Fusillo, Massimo. 1999. "The Conflict of Emotions: A Topos in the Greek Erotic Novel." In *Oxford Readings in The Greek Novel*. Simon Swain, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 60-82.
- Galen. 1979. *On Prognosis*. Vivian Nutton, trans and ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Gill, Christopher. 2008. "Daphnis and Chloe: Introduction." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 285-288.
- Gleason, Maud W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goldhill, Simon. 1995. *Foucault's virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorman, Jill. 2001. "Thinking with and about 'Same-Sex Desire': Producing and Policing Female Sexuality in the 'Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena.'" *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10.3/4: 416-441.
- Haynes, Katharine. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*. London: Routledge.
- Héliodore. 1960. *Les Éthiopiennes: Tomes 1-3*. R.M. Rattenbury, T. W. Lumb, and J. Maillon, eds and trans. 2nd Edition. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Heliodorus. 2008. *An Ethiopian Tale*. J. R. Morgan, trans. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 349-588.
- Hopkins, M. K. 1964. "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage." *Population Studies* 18.3: 309-327.
- Hopwood, Keith. 1998. "'All that may become a man': the bandit in the ancient novel." In *When Men Were Men*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. London: Routledge: 195-204.
- Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th ed.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hubbard, Thomas K. 2014. "Peer Homosexuality." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Thomas K. Hubbard, ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell: 128-149.
- James, Paula. 1988. "Cupid at Work and at Play." In *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume 1*. Groningen: E. Forsten: 113-122.
- Johne, Renate. 1996. "Women in the Ancient Novel." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 151-208.

- Jones, Meriel. 2007. "Andreia and Gender in the Greek Novels." In *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*. J. R. Morgan and Meriel Jones, eds. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library: 111-136.
- Jones, Meriel. 2012. *Playing the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: love in the ancient novel and related genres*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kuch, Heinrich. 1996. "A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: "Barbarians" and Others." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 209-220.
- Kytzler, Bernhard. 1996. "Xenophon of Ephesus." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 336-360.
- Lateiner, Donald. 1998. "Blushes and Pallor in Ancient Fictions." *Helios* 25.2: 163-189.
- Lear, Andrew. 2014. "Ancient Pederasty: An Introduction." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Thomas K. Hubbard, ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell: 102-127.
- Lear, Andrew. 2015. "Was pederasty problematized?: A diachronic view." In *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. Mark Masterson, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz, and James Robson, eds. London: Routledge: 115-136.
- Longus. 1964. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Moses Hadas, trans. In *Three Greek Romances*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.: 3-70.
- Longus. 2005. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Shannon N. Byrne and Edmund P. Cueva, eds. Wauconda: Bochazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
- Longus. 2008. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Christopher Gill, trans. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 285-348.
- Lye, S. 2016. "Gender and Ethnicity in Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*." *Classical World* 109: 235-262.
- Marshall, C. W. 2014. *The Structure and Performance of Euripides' Helen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- May, Regine. 2014. "Medicine and the Novel: Apuleius' Bonding with the Educated Reader." In *The Ancient Novel and the Frontiers of Genre*. M. P. F. Pinheiro, Gareth Schmeling, and Edmund P. Cueva, eds. Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Press: 105-124.
- Montague, Holly. 1992. "Sweet and Pleasant Passion: Female and Male Fantasy in Ancient Romance Novels." In *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Amy Richlin, ed. New York: Oxford University Press: 231-249.
- Montiglio, Silvia. 2013. *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morales, Helen. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Morales, Helen. 2008. "The History of Sexuality." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Tim Whitmarsh, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 39-55.
- Morgan, J. R. 1989. "The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 109: 99–113
- Morgan, J. R. 1994. "*Daphnis and Chloe*: Love's own sweet story." In *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. J. R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman, eds. London: Routledge: 64-79.
- Morgan, J. R. 1996. "Heliodorus." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*. G. Schmeling, ed. New York: Brill: 417-456.
- Morgan, J. R. 1998. "Narrative Doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*." In *Studies in Heliodorus*. R. L. Hunter, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society: 60-92.
- Morgan, J. R. 2008. "An *Ethiopian Story*: Introduction." In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 349-352.
- Mulvey, Laura. 1975. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen* 16.3: 6-18.
- Nelson Hawkins, Julia. 2017. *Therapoetics after Actium: Narrative, Medicine, and Authority in Augustan Epic*. Columbus: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Perkins, Judith. 1995. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*. London: Routledge.
- Pernot, Laurent. 1987. "Chariclée la sirène." In *Le Monde Du Roman Grec*. Marie-Françoise Baslez, Philippe Hoffmann, and Monique Trede, eds. Paris: Presses De L'école Normale Supérieure: 43-52.
- Pervo, Richard I. 1991. "Aseneth and Her Sisters: Women in Jewish Narrative and in the Greek Novels." In "*Women Like This*." *New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Amy-Jill Levine, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press: 145-160.
- Pinault, Jody Rubin. 1992. *Hippocratic Lives and Legends*. New York: E. J. Brill.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 2008. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Richardson, T. Wade. 2014. "Age and Gender Dynamics in the Erotic Novel." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Thomas K. Hubbard, ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell: 480-492.
- Rohde, E. 1960. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Hildesheim: George Olms.
- Romilly, Jacqueline de. 1985. *A Short History of Greek Literature*. Lillian Doherty, trans. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rosen, David. 1993. *The Changing Fictions of Masculinity*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Rosen, Ralph M. and Ineke Sluiter, eds. 2002. *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Boston: Brill.
- Sandy, Gerald N. 1982. *Heliodorus*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

- Shaw, Brent D. 1987. "The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage: Some Reconsiderations." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 77: 30–46.
- Skinner, Marilyn B. 2005. *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sluiter, Ineke and Ralph M. Rosen. 2002. "General Introduction." In *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Ralph M. Rosen and Ineke Sluiter, eds. Boston: Brill: 1-24.
- Stephens, Susan A., and J. J. Winkler, eds and trans. 2014. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tallis, Frank. 2004. *Love Sick: Love as a Mental Illness*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Toohey, Peter. 1992. "Love, Lovesickness, and Melancholia." *Illinois Classical Studies* 17: 265-86.
- Toohey, Peter. 2004. *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wack, Mary Frances. 1990. *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: The 'Viaticum' and Its Commentaries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Watanabe, A. 2003. "The Masculinity of Hippothoos." *Ancient Narrative* 3: 1-42.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 1999. "The writes of passage: cultural initiation in Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*." In *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*. Richard Miles, ed. London: Routledge: 16-40.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 2011. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiersma, S. 1990. "The Ancient Greek Novel and Its Heroines: A Female Paradox." *Mnemosyne* 43.1/2: 109–123.
- Williams, Craig A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, N. G. 1994. "Iamblichus." In *Photius: The Bibliotheca*. N. G. Wilson, ed and trans. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.: 104-113.
- Winkler, John J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge.
- Winkler, John J. 1994. "The Invention of Romance." In *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. James Tatum, ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 23-37.
- Xenophon of Ephesus. 2008. *An Ephesian Tale*. Graham Anderson, trans. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. B. P. Reardon, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press: 125-169.
- Zborowski, James. 2011. "Beyond the Male Gaze." *Cineaction* 84: 13-23.