A Narrator of Wisdom.
Characterization through gnomai in Achilles Tatius.

Version 1.0

March 2007

Koen De Temmerman

Stanford University

Abstract: This paper contributes to the study of characterization in Achilles Tatius by offering an analysis of the many *gnomai* or "wisdom sayings" in this ancient Greek novel. After having illustrated the importance of *gnomai* in literary characterization with some examples from the text, I argue that a close reading of the *gnomai* in Clitophon's narrator text and character text raises questions about Clitophon's reliability as a narrator. Whereas Clitophon uses *gnomai* to portray himself as an expert in erotic affairs before his narratee in Sidon, the *gnomai* used by the protagonist and other characters *within* the story suggest that, as a character in his own story, Clitophon does not assume the authoritative position that he claims to have in this field.

A Narrator of Wisdom.
Characterization through gnomai in Achilles Tatius.

It is commonly known that Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* is set apart from the other ancient Greek novels by its narrative technique. It is the only Greek novel in which the story is narrated by the protagonist himself[1]. The novel's prologue is set in Sidon, where the primary narrator meets a young man and invites him to tell his story. This man turns out to be none else than Clitophon, the hero of the novel. Once Clitophon starts the narration of his story (1.3.1), the primary narrator does not intervene anymore, and the frame narrative in Sidon is never resumed.

Regarding the characterization of Clitophon as the story's protagonist and narrator, the homodiegetic narrative technique involves a particular problem. There is no omniscient narrator who can characterize his protagonist in a more or less "objective" way. Everything that the reader knows about Clitophon, is told to him by Clitophon himself. Simultaneously, however, since Clitophon's narration is the reader's only source about the story, Clitophon's characterization is crucial for our reading of the novel itelf. Adopting the narratological distinction between author (Achilles Tatius) and narrator (Clitophon), some scholars have suggested that the author takes a critical and ironical stance towards his narrator/protagonist. T. Hägg, for example, suggests that the novel's ironic tone "is a consequence of the author's ironic distance from his narrator hero"[2]. Along the same lines, J. Morgan surveys a number of passages where the narrator is made "an object of the novel's irony" by a so-called "hidden author"[3], and concludes that "Kleitophon's voiced perceptions often do not coincide with those of the careful reader"[4]. Following W. Booth's definition of the "unreliable narrator", Morgan aligns Clitophon with unreliable narrators as Petronius' Encolpius or Apuleius' Lucius, and explicitly labels this connection as a fruitful area for further research[5].

In this article, I want to offer some further stepstones towards mapping Clitophon's characterization, both as a narrator and as a character. I therefore adopt a specific angle of attack: I examine what the many gnomai or "wisdom sayings" in the novel tell us about Clitophon's character[6].

Reading gnomai

In narrative literature, gnomai are relevant to characterization in two ways. Firstly, a gnomê itself can explicitly deal with a characteristic of a character. In Chariton's novel *Callirhoe*, for example, the primary narrator uses the gnomê "εὐεξαπάτητον γὰρ ἄνθρωπος δυστυχῶν" (7.1.5) to explain why Chaereas instantly believes the bad news brought to him by Dionysius' accomplice. Secondly, and more importantly for my present purpose, a gnomê is an implicit index of the character of the person who uses it in his/her speech. As Aristotle suggests in his

---

[1] On the uniqueness of this homodiegetic narration in the novelistic corpus, cf., among others, Reardon (1994).
[2] Hägg (1983: 53-4).
[3] Morgan (2004: 500). Cf. also Morgan (2003: 172).
[4] Morgan (1996: 180).
[5] "A similar approach to Achilles Tatius needs to be developed", Morgan (2004: 500 n. 21). Cf. already Brethes (2001: 191) for a brief mention of the similarity between Clitophon and Encolpius.
[6] I follow Morales' (2000: 72) definition of gnomai/sententiae: "'General principles' which do not require specific circumstances. [...] They are usually statements which claim to be universal and eternal, [...] by appearing independent of any specific context."

Rhetoric, the use of gnomai makes speech "ἠθικός" ("ἠθικοὺς ... ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους") because it reveals the moral disposition (προαίρεσις) of the speaker:

> αἱ δὲ γνῶμαι πᾶσαι τοῦτο [i.e. ἦθος] ποιοῦσιν διὰ τὸ ἀποφαίνεσθαι τὸν τὴν γνώμην λέγοντα καθόλου περὶ τῶν προαιρέσεων, ὥστε, ἂν χρησταὶ ὦσιν αἱ γνῶμαι, καὶ χρηστοήθη φαίνεσθαι ποιοῦσι τὸν λέγοντα. Arist. *Rh.* 1395b.16.

Let me first briefly explain the general background against which I undertake the analysis of Clitophon's gnomai. Therefore, I turn towards ancient rhetorical theory. The construction of gnomai was one of the so-called *progymnasmata*, preliminary rhetorical school exercises in writing and composition. These *progymnasmata*, discussed by, among others, Aelius Theon, Ps.-Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Nicolaus[7], were an essential part of rhetorical education in antiquity from the first century BC onwards[8] and undeniably influenced imperial literature[9]. One of the points of interests in the discussions about gnomai in ancient treatises is the so-called ἐργασία: pupils were taught to elaborate a gnomê, which consists, in its basic form, of only one or two sentences[10], into a complete miniature speech[11]. According to ps.-Hermogenes and Aphthonius, this elaboration adopts a number of fixed "κεφάλαια" or "headings". These include, among others, a paraphrase of the gnomê's content (κεφάλαιον παραφραστικόν or κατὰ τὸ ἁπλοῦν[12]), a statement making explicit the reason behind the gnomê's legitimacy (τὸ τῆς αἰτίας κεφάλαιον or κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν), a refutation of the implications generated by the opposite of the gnomê (τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου κεφάλαιον or κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον), a comparison (παραβολῆ or κατὰ παραβολήν) or example (παράδειγμα or κατὰ παράδειγμα) underlining the gnomê's validity, and, finally, a short conclusion (ἐπίλογος βραχύς or παράκλησις). Given the place of gnomê construction and elaboration in the rhetorical curriculum, we can, I think, safely suppose that the gnomai in contemporary literature will have caught the eye of the rhetorically trained reader as entities governed by their own rules of elaboration and, thus, open to display of literary craftmanship.

My analysis will revolve around two questions. I list both, and mention briefly the methodological tools which I will use to answer them. Firstly, analyzing characterization through gnomai in narrative literature requires a description of the *applicability* of the gnomai to the various characters in the story. In his analysis of proverbs, P. Seitel underlines the importance of "the metaphorical relationship between the imaginary situation presented in the proverb and the social situation to which it refers"[13]. Under the label of "correlation", he

---

[7] All treatises are edited by Spengel (Sp.), volumes II (1854) and III (1856). A more recent edition of Theon is Patillon (1997).

[8] Cf. Kennedy (1999: 27).

[9] Cf. Cizek (1994: 236-41), Cichocka (1992), Kennedy (1983: 53 & 143). Theon *Prog.* 70.24-30 Sp. II explicitly underlines the importance of *progymnasmata* in contemporary literature: [...] πάνυ ἐστὶν ἀναγκαῖον ἡ τῶν γυμνασμάτων ἄσκησις οὐ μόνον τοῖς μέλλουσι ῥητορεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴ τις ἢ ποιητῶν ἢ λογοποιῶν ἢ ἄλλων τινῶν λόγων δύναμιν ἐθέλει μεταχειρίζεσθαι. ἔστι γὰρ ταῦτα οἱονεὶ θεμέλια πάσης τῆς τῶν λόγων ἰδέας, καὶ ὡς ἂν αὐτά τις ὑπάγηται τῇ τῶν νέων ψυχῇ, ἀνάγκη τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συμβαίνειν.

[10] According to ps.-Hermog. *Prog.* 7-8 Sp. II, Aphth. *Prog.* 25 Sp. II, and Nicol. *Prog.* 464 Sp. III, the "simple" gnomê (αἱ ἁπλαῖ, τὸ ἁπλοῦν) consists of one sentence, whereas the "compound" gnomê (αἱ συνεζευγμέναι, τὸ συνεζευγμένον, αἱ διπλαῖ) consists of two sentences.

[11] Cf. Lausberg (1998: §875).

[12] Where Aphthonius and ps.-Hermogenes use different terminology, I mention Aphthonius' before ps.-Hermogenes'.

[13] Seitel (1969: 147).

distinguishes between first-, second- and third-person gnomai: first-person gnomai apply to the speaker, second-person gnomai apply to the addressee, and third-person gnomai apply to a third person[14]. In a narrative context, the same concepts can be used to refer to a gnomê's applicability to the narrator, the addressee (or narratee) and a third character respectively[15].

My second point of interest deals with determining the *function* of a gnomê in its narrative context. Therefore, I draw upon the narratological distinction between "argument function" (the gnomê's function for the characters in the story) and "key function" (the gnomê's function for the primary narratee, that is, the reader of the story)[16]. On the level of argument function, the rhetoricians themselves underline the importance of gnomai's various functions by introducing the distinction between descriptive and prescriptive gnomai. Whereas descriptive gnomai state how things are[17], prescriptive gnomai state how things *should* be[18]. Gnomai's argument functions are, of course, not restricted to describing and prescribing. Depending on the narrative context in which a gnomê appears, it can be used, for example, as an argument underscoring a statement or thesis, or as an illustration[19], explanation or conclusion. The representation of a narrator's or character's "êthos" by his/her use of gnomai is situated on both levels: key function deals with the information that a narrator's/character's use of gnomai offers the reader about his/her character (i.e. characterization). Argument function, on the other hand, deals with how the narrator/character aims to present his/her own character by using a specific gnomê (i.e. self-portraiture).

Gnomai and characterization: some examples from Achilles Tatius

The use of gnomai has received only limited attention in Greek novel scholarship. A. Scarcella offers a classification of the gnomai in Achilles Tatius, distinguishing mainly between gnomai with an erotic content and gnomai with an ethical content. In his view, however, their function is essentially limited to flavouring the novel:

> "Queste *gnomai* concorrono a fare, anche del suo [i.e. Achilles Tatius'] romanzo, quel prodotto di consumo, pur esile ma sapido e colorito, che comunemente i romanzi greci aspiravano ad essere."
> Scarcella (1987: 269)

Other scholars acknowledge the descriptive or prescriptive functions of gnomai. J. Morgan, for example, regards the gnomê as a description and, simultaneously, maintenance of general truths, and identifies it as a technique adopted in fiction to evoke the reader's "fictional

---

[14] Seitel (1969: 149-50).

[15] Lardinois (2000) uses Seitel's concept of correlation in his analysis of Achilles', Nestor's, Odysseus' and the gods' characterization in Homer's *Iliad*.

[16] Drawing upon Andersen (1987), de Jong (1997: 309-10) applies this distinction to the function of embedded stories in Homer.

[17] Nicol. *Prog.* 465.6-7 Sp. III (αἱ <u>δηλοῦσιν</u> ὁποῖά ἐστι τὰ πράγματα), Ps.-Hermog. *Prog.* 7.13-4 Sp. II (ὁποῖον ἕκαστόν ἐστι <u>δηλῶν</u> [...] ἀποφαίνεται δὲ περὶ τῆς τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως), Aphth. *Prog.* 25.10 Sp. II (<u>ἀποφαντικόν</u>).

[18] Nicol. *Prog.* 465.6-7 Sp. III (ὁποῖα δεῖ εἶναι). Some progymnasmata authors emphasize the prescriptive function of the gnomê in their definition: Aphth. *Prog.* 25.8-9 Sp. II (Γνώμη ἐστὶ λόγος ἐν ἀποφάνσεσι κεφαλαιώδης, ἐπὶ τι <u>προτρέπων ἢ ἀποτρέπων</u>), Nicol. *Prog.* 463.25-27 Sp. III (Τὴν γνώμην ἀπόφασιν εἶναι βούλεται καθολικήν, <u>συμβουλήν τινα καὶ παραίνεσιν ἔχουσαν</u> πρός τι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ χρησίμων).

[19] Cf. Lausberg (1998: §872) ("as proof or as *ornatus*") and Demoen (1997: 129-33).

belief"[20]. H. Morales, on the other hand, emphasizes the prescriptive nature of gnomai in the novels (primarily in Achilles Tatius): rather than merely reflecting plausibility, gnomai also define it[21]. So far, however, no systematic attention has been paid to the significance of gnomai for characterization. Thus, the direction in which scholars have taken the issue of gnomai in the Greek novels is in itself an illustration of the above-mentioned distinction between argument function and key function: whereas certain argument functions (description and prescription) have received some attention, issues dealt with on the level of key function, such as characterization, have been largely overlooked.

Let me briefly point out the importance of gnomai for characterization by looking at some mere numbers. In Achilles Tatius' novel I have found 83 gnomai[22]. In my analysis of Clitophon's gnomai, I distinguish between the gnomai used in his narrator text on the one hand (that is, his narration of his story to his narratee in Sidon), and the gnomai used in his character text on the other (that is, his direct speech as a character in his own story). Clitophon uses 43 gnomai (or 51.8%) in his narrator text, and 9 gnomai (or 10.8%) in his character text. The other gnomai (31) are used, of course, in other characters' text. The ratio between Clitophon's narrator text and his character text indicates that the distribution of gnomai in Clitophon's text is statistically normal: Clitophon's narrator text occupies 52.3% of his total story, whereas his character text occupies 10.1%[23]. Thus, relatively speaking, Clitophon does not use gnomai with a significant frequency, either as the narrator or as a character.

Two characters, on the other hand, do use gnomai especially frequently. The first one is Clinias, Clitophon's cousin. Although Clinias' character text makes up only 5.2% of the entire text[24], he uses no less than 15.6% of all the gnomai in the novel (13). Furthermore, in nine cases, the internal narratee of Clinias' gnomai is Clitophon. This is an indication that the pedantic Clinias performs his task of *praeceptor amoris* of the novel's protagonist very conscientiously[25]. I will return to Clinias' gnomai addressed to Clitophon in due course.

The second character who uses gnomai relatively frequently is Sosthenes, Thersander's cunning slave. Although his character text makes up only 51 lines in Garnaud's edition[26], he uses 3 of the 82 gnomai. Interestingly, these gnomai underline Sosthenes' function as a go-between between Leucippe, the novel's heroine, and Thersander, who is in love with her: two of his gnomai apply to Leucippe ("παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔρωτα μαραίνει νέος ἔρως" and "γυνὴ δὲ μάλιστα τὸ παρὸν φιλεῖ, τοῦ δὲ ἀπόντος, ἕως καινὸν οὐχ εὗρε, μνημονεύει"; both in 6.17.4) and are used in Sosthenes' conversation with Thersander. Conversely, the other gnomê, which applies to Thersander ("χρηστότης γὰρ τυγχάνουσα μὲν χάριτος ἔτι μᾶλλον αὔξεται, προπηλακισθεῖσα δὲ εἰς ὀργὴν ἐρεθίζεται", 6.13.4), is used in Sosthenes' conversation with Leucippe. In both cases, Sosthenes uses the gnomai to gain control over his internal narratee: the gnome addressed to Leucippe is geared to convince her to have sex with Thersander by referring to the anger which will seize him if she turns him down. The argument function of Sosthenes' two gnomai addressed to Thersander is situated in a similar

---

[20] Morgan (1993: 202).
[21] Morales (2000: 73).
[22] Scarcella (1987: 269) counts 58 gnomai. Morales (2000: 73-4) lists only 37 relevant passages, whereas Morales (2004: 109-10) gives the number of 40. I refer to the appendix at the end of this article.
[23] Clitophon's entire story (that is, from 1.3.1 to 8.19.3) consists of 5079 lines in the Budé edition (Garnaud 1995). 2657 lines of them make up Clitophon's narrator text, whereas 514 lines make up his character text.
[24] Clinias' character text consists of 264 lines in Garnaud (1995).
[25] On Clinias as Clitophon's *praeceptor amoris*, cf. Morgan (1996: 180-1).
[26] That is, 1% of the entire text.

context: he uses the gnomai to convince his master that Leucippe will eventually choose him and not Clitophon, although Thersander has heard the exact opposite from Leucippe herself shortly before. Thus, in all three cases, the gnomai's key function is to underline Sosthenes' characterization as a cunning slave, determined to satisfy his master's desire to have sex with the novel's heroine.

My third preliminary example deals with Melite, who uses five gnomai. Interestingly, only one of these gnomai is a "pure" first-person gnomê (ἔρως ἀτυχῶν καὶ μαίνεται, 5.26.2). The correlation of the other four gnomai is a combination of first and second person. This means that these gnomai equally apply to Melite herself and to her narratee. She addresses three of these gnomai to Clitophon. They are all geared to persuade him to have sex with her. On board of the ship which brings them to Ephesus, Clitophon refuses, saying that the sea on which Leucippe died, is not an appropriate place to have sex (5.16.1-2). Melite adduces two consecutive gnomai pointing out that every place is suitable for sex (πᾶς δὲ τόπος τοῖς ἐρῶσι θάλαμος· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄβατον τῷ θεῷ, 5.16.3). The third gnomê serves a similar aim. In his cell in Ephesus, she tells Clitophon that she is not ashamed to talk about sex with him (οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι τὰ τοῦ Ἔρωτος ἐξαγορεύουσα μυστήρια, 5.26.3) since he is, like herself, initiated in Eros' mysteries (μεμυημένον). Her gnomê explains why she is not ashamed to talk about sex with a co-initiate (μόνοι δὲ οἴδασιν οἱ ἐρῶντες τὰ τῶν ὁμοίων τραύματα, 5.26.3). Melite's last gnomê is addressed to her husband Thersander, who has been informed that she has married Clitophon after his alleged death at sea. Although Thersander's suspicion is correct, Melite urges him not to believe the rumours. She corroborates her request with a gnomê pointing towards the pernicious effect of rumour and gossip for their relationship (Φήμη δὲ καὶ Διαβολὴ δύο συγγενῆ κακά, 6.10.4). After an elaboration of this gnomê, she explicitly adds that the two vices mentioned in the gnomê affect both herself and her husband (ταῦτά με τὰ δύο πολεμεῖ· ταῦτά σου τὴν ψυχὴν κατέλαβε καὶ ἀπέκλεισέ μου τοῖς λόγοις τῶν ὤτων σου τὰς θύρας, 6.10.6). Melite's four gnomai showing a correlation of both first and second person are significant for her characterization. In all four cases, she uses the double correlation of the gnomê to align herself with her narratee, thus trying to increase the persuasiveness of her speech. Whereas the objective of this speech before Clitophon is to persuade him to have sex with her, her objective before Thersander is precisely to *deny* any sexual link between herself and the novel hero. The thematically similar contexts in which she uses the gnomai underline that her handling of gnomai is an index of her versatility and manoevrability.

Finally, I want to draw attention to the gnomai applying to the novel heroine Leucippe. Whereas only one third-person gnomê in the character text of another character applies to Clitophon (7.9.2), four third-person gnomai apply to Leucippe. Two of them are found in Clinias' text and are geared to corroborate his guidelines addressed to Clitophon about how to seduce Leucippe ("θέλει γὰρ ἑκάστη τῶν παρθένων εἶναι καλή, καὶ φιλουμένη χαίρει καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τῆς μαρτυρίας τὸν φιλοῦντα", 1.9.6; "παῖς γὰρ καὶ παρθένος ὅμοιοι μέν εἰσιν εἰς αἰδῶ", 1.10.3). Also Sosthenes uses two third-person gnomai applying to Leucippe. In his conversation with Thersander, his gnomai seek to point out that Leucippe will answer his master's love ("παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔρωτα μαραίνει νέος ἔρως· γυνὴ δὲ μάλιστα τὸ παρὸν φιλεῖ, τοῦ δὲ ἀπόντος, ἕως καινὸν οὐχ εὗρε, μνημονεύει, 6.17.4). Significantly, all four gnomai are used in a similar context by a character who sees Leucippe as the sexual object of his narratee. Moreover, this observation is in line with the fact that there are no *second*-person gnomai applying to Leucippe. In other words, the characters do not use gnomai referring to Leucippe in their "face to face" conversations with her; they rather display their "wisdom"

about Leucippe in her absence. Once this wisdom is "applied" by Clitophon resp. Thersander, however, it does not turn out to be that useful after all: only after a long period of insisting, Clitophon succeeds in persuading the girl to have sex with him (πολλάκις κατεπᾴδων ἐπεπείκειν τὴν κόρην, 2.19.2), and Sosthenes' advice will soon appear to be worthless, since Leucippe plainly refuses to share Thersander's bed. Thus, Clinias and Sosthenes regard Leucippe not only as a sexual object, but also as an open book: they think that their wisdom allows them to formulate guidelines that will allow their narratees to profit from her, but in fact their "wisdom" turns out to be utterly futile.

Gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text

Let me now turn to the analysis of Clitophon's use of gnomai. What do they tell us about his character? Within the two above-mentioned categories of narrator text and character text, I will distinguish between first-, second- and third person gnomai. I will point out the argument function of the gnomai by situating them in their immediate narrative context. On the level of their key function, the concluding sections clarify how my observations about Clitophon's gnomai enhance our understanding of character and plot.

In Clitophon's narrator text there are first-person gnomai (19) and third-person gnomai (24)[27]. The argument function of all Clitophon's first-person gnomai is to offer an *explanation*. Before his narratee in Sidon, Clitophon uses most gnomai as explanations of emotions seizing him in the course of his story (or expressions of these emotions). Unsurprisingly for gnomai used by the narrator of a love story and applying to the protagonist of this story, almost all of them are used in an erotic context. Most of them, furthermore, apply to the protagonist's love for Leucippe. In this respect, they mark a number of important moments in the story. The first gnomê in this category appears when Clitophon describes his first encounter with the heroine. It explains why he falls in love with her on first sight (εὐθὺς ἀπωλώλειν, 1.4.4): κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ (1.4.4). This gnomê, in turn, is explained by a second gnomê (ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῷ τραύματι). With these gnomai, the narrator Clitophon wants to provide his narratee in Sidon with a "rationalistic" explanation for what can be considered one of the most important characteristics of protagonists' love in the Greek novel, namely the topos of love-at-first-sight[28]. Although this topos, as one of the hallmarks of the novelistic genre, is most probably considered self-evident for any ancient reader of the novel, Clitophon is made to adopt two gnomai to "explain" his falling in love.

Soon, Clitophon's use of gnomai for theorising about his own love for Leucippe appears to be a recurrent element in his narration. Only one paragraph after narrating his first encounter with the heroine, he mentions his reaction evoked by hearing the story of Apollo and Daphne during dinner at his father's house in Tyr. This reaction consists in an intensification of his passion for Leucippe (Τοῦτό μου μᾶλλον ἀσθὲν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν, 1.5.5) and is explained by a gnomê (ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός, 1.5.6). Subsequently, he elaborates the gnomê with the progymnasmatic headings of contrast ("ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου") (Κἂν εἰς σωφροσύνην...) and reason ("αἰτία") (ἡ γὰρ...). Also to explain his insomnia (οὐδὲ ὕπνου τυχεῖν ἠδυνάμην, 1.6.2) after having seen Leucippe, Clitophon uses a gnomê pointing

---

[27] There are no second-person gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text. In other words, Clitophon never uses gnomai that apply to his narratee in Sidon.

[28] On this topos, cf., among others, Létoublon (1993: 137-54).

out that sickness and wounds aggravate at night (Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ φύσει καὶ τὰ ἄλλα νοσήματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος τραύματα νυκτὶ χαλεπώτερα καὶ ἐπανίσταται μᾶλλον ἡμῖν ἡσυχάζουσι καὶ ἐρεθίζει τὰς ἀλγηδόνας). He elaborates also this gnomê with a reason (ὅταν γὰρ ἀναπαύηται τὸ σῶμα..., 1.6.3) and contrast (Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ..., 1.6.3-4). Thirdly, he uses a gnomê to explain why the wine makes him look impudently at Leucippe during a banquet (Τοῦ δὲ πότου προϊόντος ἤδη καὶ ἀναισχύντως ἐς αὐτὴν ἑώρων, 2.3.3): οἶνος γὰρ ἔρωτος τροφή. Equally, Clitophon's emotions marking the first kiss of the protagonists (Ῥᾴων οὖν ἐγεγόνειν καὶ μεστὸς ἐλπίδων· [...] ἐφύλασσον ἀληθῶς ὡς θησαυρὸν τὸ φίλημα τηρῶν ἡδονῆς, [...]. Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ οὕτω πρότερον ἡσθείσης τῆς καρδίας· καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἔμαθον ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐρίζει πρὸς ἡδονὴν φιλήματι ἐρωτικῷ, 2.8.1 & 2.8.3) are explained by a gnomê (τὸ φίλημα ... ὅπερ πρῶτόν ἐστι γλυκύ, 2.8.1). Also this gnomê is elaborated with a reason, which consists itself of a series of gnomai (Καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν τοῦ σώματος ὀργάνων τίκτεται, στόμα γὰρ φωνῆς ὄργανον, φωνὴ δὲ ψυχῆς σκιά).

Not only the very beginning of Clitophon's love for Leucippe is marked by gnomai, but also the *end* of their relationship – or rather, what Clitophon considers to be the end at one point in the narrative: after having seen how Leucippe is decapitated on Chaereas' ship, he returns to Alexandria. After six months, his grief starts to fade away (Καὶ ἤδη μοι γεγόνεσαν μῆνες ἕξ, καὶ τὸ πολὺ τοῦ πένθους ἤρχετο μαραίνεσθαι, 5.8.2). In his narration, he explains – or should we say: justifies? – the weakening of his grief with a gnomê (Χρόνος γὰρ λύπης φάρμακον καὶ πεπαίνει τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἕλκη, 5.8.2), elaborated with a reason (Μεστὸς γὰρ..., 5.8.2). One book later, Clitophon discovers that Leucippe is still alive. After having been thrown in prison by Thersander, he is struck by fear for Leucippe's fate (Δέος δέ με περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης εἶχεν, 6.5.4). He explains this emotion by referring to a gnomê about the capacity of the soul to predict disaster (Ψυχαὶ δὲ πεφύκασι μάντεις τῶν κακῶν, ἐπεὶ τῶν γε ἀγαθῶν ἥκιστα ἐκ μαντείας εὐτυχοῦμεν, 6.5.5). When, soon afterwards, Clitophon hears the (false) story about Leucippe's murder by Melite, he does not cry at first (οὔτε ἀνῴμωξα οὔτε ἔκλαυσα, 7.4.1); it is only later that grief for his beloved results in tears (Ἦλθε δέ μοι τότε δάκρυα καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν λύπην ἀπεδίδουν, 7.4.3). He explains this delay with a gnomê characterizing tears as blood that springs from wounds of the soul (δάκρυον γὰρ αἷμα τραύματος ψυχῆς, 7.4.5). This gnomê is preceded by an elaborating comparison between wounds of the soul and physical wounds (Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς τοῦ σώματος πληγαῖς ..., οὕτω καὶ ψυχὴ παταχθεῖσα ..., 7.4.4-5), and followed by a paraphrase (Ὅταν ὁ τῆς λύπης..., 7.4.5).

In two cases only, Clitophon's first-person gnomai explain emotions outside of an erotic context. They concern Clitophon's own safety. When he narrates the shipwreck which happened on his way to Egypt, he considers the victims lucky because their death frees them from fear for death (τῷ τοῦ θανάτου φόβῳ, 3.4.4). He explains the presence of this fear in the hearts of living people with a gnomê about the cruelty of a slow death at sea (Ὁ γὰρ ἐν θαλάττῃ θάνατος βραδὺς προαναιρεῖ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν, 3.4.4). Again, this gnomê explains an emotion that does not really need any explanation; fear is a perfectly acceptable emotion for someone who is shipwrecked in full sea. Yet, Clitophon takes the time to offer a gnomic explanation of it. Moreover, the contrast between his own situation and the situation of the dead, with which he elaborates the gnomê according to the ancient progymnasmatic heading of "ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου" (Ὁπόσοι μὲν οὖν..., 3.4.4), is of an absurd nature: "The persons who

did not survive the shipwreck are not afraid of death because... they are already dead". In the same book, Clitophon narrates the capture of himself and Leucippe by Egyptian Boucoloi. In these circumstances, he grieves silently because he cannot cry (ἐθρήνουν ἡσυχῇ, κλαίειν δὲ οὐκ ἠδυνάμην, 3.11.1). Before his narratee in Sidon, he explains this tearless way of grieving with a gnomê about the behavior of eyes when confronted with disaster (τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις κακοῖς, 3.11.1). He elaborates this gnomê with a contrast (Ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μετρίαις συμφοραῖς..., 3.11.1) and a reason (Ἐντυχοῦσα γὰρ..., 3.11.2). Strangely, however, Clitophon himself has told his narratee immediately before that he *did* cry ("κλαίειν ἦρχον τὴν Λευκίππην", 3.10.1). He seems to have forgotten this and uses a gnomê to explain why he was not crying... at a time when he *was* crying. In this passage, Clitophon's inclination towards theorizing about his own emotions clearly does not contribute to the authenticity and credibility of his narration.

Let me now turn to the third-person gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text. The argument function of all but one of them is, here too, explaining. The only exception has a *concluding* function. When Clitophon is shipwrecked on his way to Egypt, the people on board start to fight with each other. The narrator concludes the paragraph picturing the battle with a gnomê about the threat of danger for friendship (Οὕτως οἱ μεγάλοι κίνδυνοι καὶ τοὺς τῆς φιλίας λύουσι νόμους, 3.3.5). Thus, the behavior of Clitophon's companions is a specific illustration of the general truth expressed by the gnomê. Given its concluding position in the paragraph, this gnomê is a typical example of the so-called "ἐπιφώνημα", a gnomê appearing in final position in a line of thought or story[29].

The remaining 23 gnomai apply to various characters (to Thersander, Leucippe, Charmides, Melite, Sosthenes, Callisthenes, Satyrus, and the Egyptian Boucoloi). Like the first-person gnomai, most of them (16) offer an explanation in an erotic context. Five times, the narrator Clitophon uses a gnomê to explain Thersander's (expressions of) emotions . A gnomê about the role of the eyes in the perception of beauty (μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος, 6.6.3) is geared to explain that Thersander is struck immediately by Leucippe's beauty at their first encounter (Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς, ὡς ἁρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς). This passage raises an interesting point which will be emblematic for my discussion of Clitophon's third-person gnomai. Clitophon himself was not present at the scene which he narrates here. This begs the question of how he *knows* Thersander's reaction at his first encounter with Leucippe. The obvious explanation would be that Leucippe has told Clitophon afterwards. However, I would like to propose another solution. This gnomê suggests that Clitophon projects his own feelings onto Thersander. Both the gnomê and the context in which it is given remind the reader of the episode in which Clitophon himself fell in love with Leucippe (1.4.4). As I have mentioned above, Clitophon used a gnomê with a similar content (the role of eyes in the perception of beauty) when he narrated this episode. Apparently, he takes for granted that the gnomê which applied to himself will also apply to Thersander in similar circumstances. Although he does not know what Thersander's reaction has been at his first encounter with Leucippe, he simply supposes that his rival reacted in the same way as he did himself. This is subtly suggested to the reader by the similar gnomai connecting both episodes.

---

[29] Lausberg [1998: §879], Patillon [1997: lxiv-lxix]. Theon *Prog.* 91 Sp. II identifies the ἐπιφώνημα as a technique which makes a story "ἐπίχαρις" (charming).

When Clitophon narrates that Thersander starts crying when he sees Leucippe crying, he ascribes Thersander's reaction to compassion and explains it with a gnomê (Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ φύσει δάκρυον ἐπαγωγότατον ἐλέου τοῖς ὁρῶσι· τὸ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ θαλερώτερον, τοσούτῳ καὶ γοητότερον, 6.7.4). Shortly afterwards, he uses a gnomê about jealousy (ζηλοτυπία γὰρ ἅπαξ ἐμπεσοῦσα ψυχῇ δυσέκλειπτόν ἐστιν, 6.11.1) to explain why Thersander does not believe Melite's reconciling words despite their persuasiveness (πιθανῶς, 6.10.2). Here again, Clitophon's absence at the scene raises the issue of the credibility of his narration. This holds true also for the last two gnomai explaining Thersander's emotions. When Thersander has heard Leucippe say that she loves Clitophon, the narrator informs us that Sosthenes comforts his master by predicting that he will be able to take Clitophon's place as Leucippe's lover. The fact that Thersander is cheered up (ἠγέρθη, 6.17.5) by these words is explained by Clitophon with a gnomê (Λόγος γὰρ ἐλπίδος εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ἔρωτος ἐς πειθὼ ῥάδιος, 6.17.5), elaborated with a reason (τὸ γὰρ ...). Soon afterwards, however, Thersander's hopes are crushed by Leucippe, who tells him that he will never become her lover. Her words fill Thersander with love and anger simultaneously (ἤρα καὶ ὠργίζετο, 6.19.1), and the narrator provides his narratee with a long excursus explaining both emotions (6.19.1-7). This excursus is itself an elaboration of the gnomê "Θυμὸς δὲ καὶ ἔρως δύο λαμπάδες" (6.19.1). Again, Clitophon himself was not present at the conversation between Sosthenes and Thersander, nor at the subsequent confrontation between Leucippe and Thersander.

Two gnomai explain Leucippe's feelings. When Clitophon and Leucippe are caught during their first attempt to have sex together in her bedroom, Leucippe is severely reprimanded by her mother. Clitophon informs his narratee about the emotions of shame, grieve and anger which seize Leucippe afterwards. Clitophon does not merely mention her emotions (ἤχθετο, ἠσχύνετο, ὠργίζετο), but also the specific circumstance triggering each of them (ἤχθετο μὲν πεφωραμένη, ἠσχύνετο δὲ ὀνειδιζομένη, ὠργίζετο δὲ ἀπιστουμένη). He provides further information about these emotions in two gnomai ("αἰδὼς δὲ καὶ λύπη καὶ ὀργὴ τρία τῆς ψυχῆς κύματα", 2.29.1, and "Λόγος δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων πατήρ", 2.29.3). The first one is the beginning of a long excursus in which he discusses the origins and results of these emotions (2.29.2-5). The excursus is concluded by the explicit statement that it describes the reason of Leucippe's emotions at that specific moment in the story (Τοσούτων οὖν ἡ Λευκίππη γεμισθεῖσα συμφορῶν οὐκ ἔφερε τὴν προσβολήν, 2.29.5). However, since Clitophon was able to escape before being recognized by Leucippe's mother, the reader, here again, wonders how he knows the exact emotions seizing Leucippe. Also in this passage, the reader is invited to infer that Clitophon merely *pretends* to have access to Leucippe's innermost emotions using the wisdom which he displays in the gnomai and in the excursus.

One gnomê explaining Melite's body language is equally relevant to our present purpose. During the banquet in Alexandria, Melite cannot eat anything and is continuously staring at Clitophon (οὐκ ἠδύνατο τυχεῖν ὁλοκλήρου τροφῆς, πάντα δὲ ἔβλεπέ με, 5.13.3). Our narrator explains this behavior with a gnomê concerning lovers (Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἡδὺ τοῖς ἐρῶσι πλὴν τὸ ἐρώμενον). The use of this gnomê raises two points of interest. Firstly, it reveals that Clitophon has paid attention to his *praeceptor amoris* Clinias, who had earlier emphasized, in Clitophon's presence, the importance for a lover of seeing his beloved (1.9.4). Now, Clitophon does nothing more than mimicking his *praeceptor amoris*. Displaying the knowledge that he received from him, he pretends to be capable of fathoming Melite's feelings. Secondly, this scene establishes a link with Clitophon's first banquet with Leucippe, where he was characterized by the same body language as Melite is now (ἐμαυτὸν ὅλοις

ἔβλεπον τὴν κόρην τοῖς προσώποις, 1.5.3). The similarity between both scenes cannot be overlooked: about the first episode, Clitophon says that he himself "ἐῴκειν γὰρ τοῖς ἐν ὀνείροις ἐσθίουσιν" (1.5.3). In the second episode, he says to Melite: "ἔοικας τοῖς ἐν γραφαῖς ἐσθίουσιν" (5.13.5). Thus, Clitophon does not limit himself to using gnomic wisdom taught by Clinias, he takes for granted that Melite is affected by the same psychological phenomena as he himself was in an earlier, and similar, situation. In other words, Clitophon projects his own feelings onto Melite.

The argument function of all first-person gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text, thus, is to offer an explanation. Clitophon frequently feels the need to offer his narratee in Sidon a gnomic explanation of his own emotions. This underlines Clitophon's recurrent inclination towards theorizing about various aspects of himself, thus drawing attention to the skyline of his own emotional world. It does not surprise that seventeen out of the nineteen first-person gnomai deal with erotic matters, but what evokes the reader's scepticism about some of these gnomai's relevance is that Clitophon does not hesitate to offer theorizing explanations of emotions which do not need any explanation because they are self-evident. Moreover, I observed that the redundant focus on rationalizing his own emotions does not always enhance the credibility and authenticity of his story.

Also of almost all third-person gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text (23 out of 24), the argument function is to offer explanations. Most of them deal with an erotic content. Again, the abundance of gnomai offering an explanation underlines Clitophon's concern with analysis. The crucial difference between these gnomai and the first-person gnomai, however, is that Clitophon's third-person gnomai apply to emotions of *other* characters. This raises two important issues regarding Clitophon's characterization. Firstly, all these erotically-oriented explanations dealing not only with himself but also with other characters, suggest that Clitophon clearly wants to characterize himself as an expert in love affairs before his narratee in Sidon. Let us not forget, after all, that Clitophon's very first words to his narratee in the beginning of the novel underline his own experience and expertise in love, identifying his own relationship to love with the verb "οἶδα" ("Ἐγὼ ταῦτα ἂν <u>εἰδείην</u>," ἔφη, "τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος <u>παθών</u>.", 1.2.1). Clitophon regards himself as someone who *knows* the ways of love, and the argument function of his "wisdom sayings" applying to the erotic life of himself and other characters is to propagate this self-portraiture. Simultaneously, however, Clitophon's explanations about other characters raise serious questions about his reliability as a narrator. Firstly, he frequently uses gnomai to shed light on situations of which, logically speaking, he does not even know that they have taken place. Secondly, his explanations of other characters' *emotions* in particular are problematic in this respect. As a homodiegetic narrator, Clitophon is, of course, not capable of entering the mind of the characters in the story, as an omniscient narrator would be. By using various gnomai, however, Clitophon *pretends* to have access to the minds of the characters in "his" story; the reader, on the other hand, knows that he does not have such access. In fact, the possibility of entering someone's innermost thoughts and feelings is an exclusive privilege of narrators of fiction, as opposed to narrators of "fact"[30]. Whereas the reader of Achilles Tatius's novel knows, of course, that he is reading fiction, Clitophon himself does present his story to his narratee in Sidon as a true story, which *resembles* fiction but nonetheless really happened (Σμῆνος ἀνεγείρεις [...] <u>λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις</u> ἔοικε, 1.2.2). Thus, the analysis of the gnomai in Clitophon's narrator text reveals an interesting contradiction: by narrating, analysing and rationalizing his own and his characters' innermost thoughts and feelings, Clitophon tries to portray himself as

---

[30] Cf. Cohn (1989) about this "marker of fictionality".

an expert in love, and, thus, a perfectly suitable narrator of "his" love story (argument function). On the level of key function, however, precisely the technique of using gnomai to explain other characters' thoughts and feelings undermines Clitophon's reliability because it involves talking about what he cannot possibly know. Moreover, the reader's scepticism about the truth of Clitophon's representation is in some cases stimulated by Clitophon's inclination towards projecting his own feelings onto the character whom he is discussing in his narration.

Gnomai in Clitophon's character text

Most of the gnomai in Clitophon's character text are third-person gnomai (6). I want to focus on three of them, situated in an erotic context[31]. Clitophon uses the first one (ἐγγὺς γὰρ τοῦ θείου τὸ ἄφθαρτον, 2.37.1) in his discussion with Menelaus about homosexual and heterosexual love to underscore his view that the beauty of women is more heavenly than the beauty of boys because the former does not quickly fade. The two other third-person gnomai appear in the embedded story about Philomela and Tereus told by Clitophon to Leucippe (5.5.1-9). The story is set when Clitophon and Leucippe see a painting which shows the rape of Philomela by Tereus. Clitophon's narration of this story is an answer to Leucippe's question about the *mythos* behind the painting. During his narration, Clitophon uses two gnomai to clarify his own view about characters in the story. The first gnomê (Βαρβάροις δέ, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐχ ἱκανὴ πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην μία γυνή, μάλισθ᾽ ὅταν αὐτῷ καιρὸς διδῷ πρὸς ὕβριν τρυφᾶν, 5.5.2) seeks to explain Tereus' deceit of Procne. By using this gnomê, Clitophon presents inclination towards adultery as a characteristic inherently connected to barbarians like Tereus, who is Thracian. Shortly afterwards, however, the unintentional irony of Clitophon's words will become apparent: when he is persuaded by Melite to have sex with her, the man for whom one woman is not enough will turn out to be none else than Clitophon himself. H. Morales correctly labels this passage as an index of Clitophon's "hypocrisy, which undermines, rather than underpins, his authority in his laying down the law about other people"[32].

The second gnomê in Clitophon's embedded story (Οὕτως αἱ τῆς ζηλοτυπίας ὠδῖνες νικῶσι καὶ τὴν γαστέρα, 5.5.7) characterizes the protagonist in a comparable way. This gnomê is elaborated with a paraphrase (Μόνον γὰρ ὀργῶσαι γυναῖκες ἀνιᾶσαι τὸν τὴν εὐνὴν λελυπηκότα, κἂν πάσχωσιν ἐν οἷς ποιοῦσιν οὐχ ἧττον κακόν, τὴν τοῦ πάσχειν λογίζονται συμφορὰν τῇ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονῇ). Both the gnomê and the paraphrase illustrate the cruelty of Procne's revenge, which consists in murdering her own son. Clitophon warns against the terrible consequences of jealousy (ζηλοτυπίας) and, like in his gnomê discussing

---

[31] The other two are both found in 3.10.2.

[32] Morales (2000: 79-80). According to Morales, this gnomê also establishes a link between Tereus and Thersander: "This judgement not only applies to Tereus, but is also relevant to Thersandros: both are adulterous and both Thracian. It is, however, a reflection cast as a generalization, condemning all barbarians." This statement is, I think, incorrect. Since the text under consideration is a gnomê, it is, by definition, "a reflection cast as a generalization". But that does not mean that it links Tereus to Thersander. Firstly, Thersander is nowhere said to be Thracian – not even in 8.2.1-3, the passage to which Morales (2004: 83-4) refers. In fact, he is no barbarian at all: he is "γένει δὲ πρῶτος ἁπάντων τῶν Ἰώνων" (6.12.2). Secondly, Morales' characterization of Thersander as "adulterous" is somewhat inaccurate: Thersander definitely *tries* to have sex with Leucippe, but he never succeeds. Thersander is only "intentionally" adulterous. The point of the key function of Clitophon's use of this gnomê is exactly that he does not realize, unlike the reader, that it applies to himself, and to *no-one* else.

adultery, he dissociates himself from the pernicious vice on which he is commenting. This time, he constructs dissociation by attributing the vice to yet another group representing "the other", namely women. Again, however, a later episode in the novel invites the reader to take a critical stance towards Clitophon's dissociating self-portraiture in this episode. Clitophon's misogyny shining through in this gnomê will turn out to harm himself when a cellmate tells him that Melite has murdered Leucippe. About Melite's motives, the cellmate says the following:

"Ἡ δὲ ὑπὸ <u>ζηλοτυπίας</u> πεφλεγμένη τὴν γυναῖκα ταύτην ἀπαντήσασαν συλλαμβάνει καὶ παραδίδωσι ᾧ νῦν ἔφην κακῇ τύχῃ μοι συνωδευκότι, φονεῦσαι κελεύσασα." (7.3.7)

The reader knows that this story is false, and that Clitophon's cellmate is actually an accomplice of Thersander. But Clitophon's soliloquy following the news (7.5.1-4) indicates that he immediately believes that this story is true. His credulity and uncritical attitude towards the story of the stranger is implicitly emphasized by the contrast with Clinias' reaction to the story. He comforts Clitophon (παρεμυθεῖτο, 7.6.1), suggests that Leucippe may still be alive (Τίς γὰρ οἶδεν, εἰ ζῇ πάλιν;, 7.6.2), and underscores this suggestion by referring to the past episodes in which Leucippe was, incorrectly, believed to be dead (μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις τέθνηκε; μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις ἀνεβίω;, 7.6.2). Whereas the reader knows that Clinias is right, Clitophon qualifies Clinias' suggestion as sheer nonsense (Ληρεῖς, 7.6.3). Moreover, in his soliloquy, the protagonist himself equally refers to the previous times when Leucippe was allegedly dead (ποσάκις μοι τέθνηκας, 7.5.2). Unlike Clinias, Clitophon does not interpret these episodes as precedents triggering a critical attitude towards the stranger's story about Leucippe's death. Thus, it is tempting to ascribe Clitophon's exaggerated credulity in this passage to his misogyny displayed in the gnomê in 5.5.7. Moreover, his association between women and jealousy surfaces again in 7.9.12, when Clinias explicitly mentions in his apology for Clitophon before the Ephesian court that Clitophon thought that jealousy (ζηλοτυπίαν) was Melite's most important motive for the homicide. The reader concludes that, if Clitophon had been a little bit less prejudiced against women and their devastating inclination towards jealousy, he might have been more critical towards the made-up story of Thersander's accomplice about Melite's jealousy resulting in the murder of Leucippe. But instead, Clitophon's prejudice about the fatal consequences of female jealousy leads him to the equally fatal decision to commit suicide. It is, of course, both ironic and significant for Clitophon's character that precisely *Clinias* contrasts Clitophon's attitude: even Achilles Tatius' pre-eminent misogynist, who in 1.8.1-9 succeeds in listing no less than 12 mythological exempla to curse womankind ("τῶν γυναικῶν γένος λοιδορῶν", 1.8.1), appears to be less prejudiced against women's inclination towards jealousy than our novelistic hero.

Among the third-person gnomai in Clitophon's character text, the two gnomai in his embedded *mythos* about Philomela and Tereus are of special interest to us. In both gnomai, Clitophon invests himself with an attitude of natural superiority towards barbarians/women. Adopting this attitude, he feels entitled to attack the injustice performed by the representatives of these two groups (Tereus and Procne). The reader's scepticism, however, is aroused by two observations. Firstly, Clitophon himself will turn out to be an example of the inclination towards adultery from which he dissociates himself by ascribing it to barbarians in the first gnomê. Clitophon, thus, proves not to be capable of acting according to the lofty principles which he propagates. Secondly, his prejudice towards women displayed in the second gnomê

will in the course of the story turn out to be harmful to himself and to prevent him from adopting a critical stance to newly received information.

Second-person gnomai applying to Clitophon

In the final section of this paper, I want to point out that the comparison between the number of second-person gnomai in Clitophon's character text on the one hand, and second-person gnomai applying to Clitophon in other characters' text on the other reveals a significant contrast. There is only one second-person gnomê in Clitophon's character text. It appears in his discussion with Menelaus about homosexual and heterosexual love (2.35.2-38.5). Clitophon rejects his homosexual companion's statement that "ἁπλούστεροι παῖδες γυναικῶν, καὶ τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῖς δριμύτερον εἰς ἡδονήν" (2.35.3) by comparing the love for boys with the agony of Tantalus. He phrases the conclusion of this comparison as a gnomê: "καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ παιδὸς ἀπελθεῖν ἐραστὴν ἄλυπον ἔχοντα τὴν ἡδονήν· καταλείπει γὰρ ἔτι διψῶντα" (2.35.5).

In sharp opposition to the uniqueness of the second-person gnomê in Clitophon's character text, the protagonist is the *narratee* of no less than 11 second-person gnomai (that is, 13% of all gnomai in Achilles Tatius) used by other characters. Interestingly, *all* these gnomai deal with an erotic theme. It does not surprise, then, that the majority of these gnomai is used by Clitophon's two praeceptores amoris, Clinias and Satyrus, to instruct their pupil[33].

Clinias uses no less than 7 second-person gnomai in his conversations with Clitophon. In the dialogue in which Clitophon asks his cousin advice concerning his love for Leucippe, Clinias reproaches Clitophon for being ungrateful (ἀχάριστος εἶ πρὸς ἔρωτος δωρεάν, 1.9.4): Clitophon does not realize, he says, how lucky he is to see Leucippe in his own house every day (οὕτως εἰς ἔρωτα εὐτυχῶν, 1.9.2; εὐτυχῶν, 1.9.4). He underscores his statement with a gnomê, saying that merely seeing the beloved "μείζονα τῶν ἔργων ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν" (1.9.4). He elaborates this gnomê with a reason and a comparison (1.9.5). Subsequently, he advises Clitophon to try to establish contact with the girl, and underscores this advice with two consecutive gnomai ("Μέγιστον γάρ ἐστιν ἐφόδιον εἰς πειθὼ συνεχὴς πρὸς ἐρωμένην ὁμιλία. Ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ φιλίας πρόξενος καὶ τὸ σύνηθες τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς χάριν ἀνυσιμώτερον.", 1.9.5). When Clitophon asks for more specific guidelines ("Δός μοι τὰς ἀφορμάς [...]. Τί λέγω; Τί ποιῶ; Πῶς ἂν τύχοιμι τῆς ἐρωμένης; Οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδούς", 1.9.7), Clinias at first says that he cannot give any further advice since "αὐτοδίδακτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σοφιστής" (1.10.1). Shortly after, however, he advises Clitophon to kiss his beloved silently when he finds her docile, and he underscores this advice with a gnomê (τὸ γὰρ ἐραστοῦ φίλημα πρὸς ἐρωμένην θέλουσαν μὲν παρέχειν αἴτησίς ἐστι σιωπῇ, πρὸς ἀπειθοῦσαν δέ, ἱκετηρία, 1.10.5). Later in the story, when Leucippe is believed to be dead, Clinias tries to persuade Clitophon to answer Melite's love for him. He underscores his advice with two second-person gnomai (Κάλλος γὰρ καὶ πλοῦτος καὶ ἔρως εἰ συνῆλθον ἐπὶ σέ, οὐχ ἕδρας <ἔργον> οὐδ᾽ ἀναβολῆς· [...] Μισεῖ δὲ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀλαζόνας, 5.12.1).

---

[33] Apart from Clinias and Satyrus, only Melite addresses second-person gnomai to Clitophon, which have all been discussed earlier.

Second-person gnomai are traditionally regarded as gnomai in which the narrator assumes a position of authority over his narratee[34]. Clearly, Clinias' fondness of using such second-person gnomai in his dialogues with Clitophon reflects this *praeceptor amoris*' position of authority over his pupil. This conclusion corresponds seamlessly to Clitophon's explicit characterization of Clinias ("ἔρωτι τετελεσμένος", 1.7.1), his age ("δύο ἀναβεβηκὼς ἔτη τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς ἐμῆς"), and the fact that Clitophon introduces Clinias in the narrative precisely when he tells his narratee in Sidon that he was looking for help regarding his love for Leucippe (cf. "Οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδούς", 1.9.7).

Clitophon's second *praeceptor amoris*, Satyrus, uses one second-person gnomê of which Clitophon is the narratee. Also this gnomê marks an advice regarding Clitophon's love for Leucippe. When Satyrus advises Clitophon to express his love for Leucippe, Clitophon utters the fear that he will dare to do so because he will be a "δειλὸς ἔρωτος ἀθλητής". Satyrus' answer to this objection consists of a gnomê (Ἔρως [...] δειλίας οὐκ ἀνέχεται, 2.4.5).

The numerical contrast between the one second-person gnomê in Clitophon's own character text and the eleven second-person gnomai addressed to him by Clinias, Satyrus, and Melite, is highly significant for the protagonist's characterization. Since *all* these second-person gnomai have an erotic content, and since second-person gnomai imply a position of authority of the narrator over the narratee, the sheer number of these gnomai indicates that Clitophon, as a character in his own story, does *not* assume an authoritative position in love affairs. Although Clitophon tries, as I pointed out earlier, to portray himself as an expert in love through the gnomai in his narration, he is characterized differently as a character in his own story: rather than being an erotic "connoisseur", he is the one who is *being* taught. This observation becomes even more significant if we contrast the eleven second-person gnomai addressed to Clitophon with the only second-person gnomê which he uses himself: by using a second-person gnomê in his conversation with Menelaus, Clitophon does place himself in a position of authority over his narratee. Ironically, this gnomê deals with a domain about which Clitophon, as a Greek novel protagonist, knows virtually nothing, namely... *homo*sexual love.

Conclusion

The first conclusion has remained somewhat implicit in the course of the article. Reading Achilles Tatius's gnomai while bearing in mind the discussions of gnomai in the progymnasmata suggests that many of the excursus in Achilles Tatius' novel can be read as elaborations of gnomai adopting (some of) the progymnasmatic headings or "κεφάλαια".

Secondly, I have illustrated the importance of gnomai in literary characterization by exploring, as preliminary examples, a number of characters who are all characterized in a specific way by the gnomai adopted in their character text. Clinias' gnomai underline the pedantry of this *praeceptor amoris*, whereas Sosthenes' gnomai reveal his cunning as a go-between between Leucippe and Thersander. Melite's use of gnomai, thirdly, emphasizes her versatility and manoevrability. Finally, I pointed out that the gnomai applying to Leucippe inform us about the attitude of other characters towards her and about the ways in which the heroine's actual behavior renders these characters' displayed 'wisdom' utterly futile.

---

[34] Cf. Lardinois (2000: 643), drawing upon Seitel (1969).

The main focus of this article, thirdly, has been on Clitophon. I adopted a classification of Clitophon's gnomai in first-, second- and third-person gnomai and pointed out that it generates some interesting insights into his characterization as a narrator and as a character. As a character, Clitophon is characterized as someone who is not capable of living up to the lofty standards which he advertises in his gnomai, and as someone who is the victim of his own prejudices. Moreover, Clitophon is characterized as a novel protagonist who is highly receptive to the "erotic" advice of his *praeceptores amoris*. Against this background, a close reading of Clitophon's gnomai raises serious questions about Clitophon's reliability as a narrator. Firstly, there is a clear discrepancy between his self-portraiture as an experienced expert in love in his narrator text on the one hand, and the anything but authoritative position in which he is placed by the use of gnomai by his *praeceptores amoris*. Moreover, many third-person gnomai in his narrator text with an explaining argument function raise the double problem that Clitophon explains situations of which he cannot have been aware, and that he pretends to have access to the minds of other characters, which he, as a homodiegetic narrator, cannot have. It is, thus, tempting to consider the possibility that the narrator Clitophon has repeatedly invented these psychological and emotional details in order to characterize himself as an "erotic" expert who has psychological insight into the emotional lives of the characters in his story, and who is, ultimately, an exquisite narrator of "his" Greek novel[35].

References

Andersen, Ø. 1987. 'Myth, Paradigm and 'spatial Form' in the Iliad', in: Bremer, J.M., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kalff, J. (eds.) *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry. Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation.* Amsterdam, Grüner, 1-13.

Brethes, R. 2001. 'Clitophon ou une anthologie de l'anti-héros', in: Pouderon, B. (ed.) *Les personnages du roman grec*. Actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999. Lyon, Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, 181-191.

Cichocka, H. 1992. 'Progymnasma as a literary form', *SIFC* 10, 991-1000.

Cizek, A. 1994. *Imitatio et tractatio. Die literarisch-rhetorischen Grundlagen der Nachahmung in Antike und Mittelalter*. Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.

de Jong, I.J.F. 1997. 'Homer and Narratology', in: Morris, I & Powell, B. (eds.) *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden – New York – Köln, 305-325.

Cohn, D. 1989. 'Fictional versus Historical Lives: Borderlines and Borderline Cases', *Journal of Narrative Technique* 19.1, 3-24.

Demoen, K. 1997. 'A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical Exemplum in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory', *Rhetorica* 15.2, 125-58.

Garnaud, J.P. 1995[2] (1991). (Texte établi et traduit par) *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie. Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

Hägg , T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Kennedy, G. 1983. *Greek rhetoric under Christian emperors*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, G. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill – London, The University of North Carolina Press.

Lardinois, A. 2000. 'Characterization through gnomai in Homer's Iliad', *Mnemosyne* 53.6, 641-661.

Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*. Foreword by G.A. Kennedy. Translated by M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen & D.A. Orton. Edited by D.A. Orton & R.D. Anderson (Orig. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2 vol., München, 1990[3]), Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill.

Létoublon, F. 1993. *Les lieux communs du roman. Stéréotypes grecs d' aventure et d' amour*. Leiden – New York – Keulen, Brill.

Morales, H. 2000. 'Sense and Sententiousness in the Ancient Greek Novels', in: Sharrock, A. & Morales, H. (eds.) *Intratextuality. Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 67-88.

Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, J.R. 1993. 'Make-believe and Make Believe: the Fictionality of the Greek Novels', in: Gill, C. & Wiseman, T.P. (eds.) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter, University of Exeter Press, 175-229.

Morgan, J.R. 1996. 'Erotika Mathemata: Greek Romance as Sentimental Education', in: Sommerstein, A.H. & Atherton, C. (eds.) *Education in Greek Fiction*. Bari, 163-89.

Morgan, J.R. 2003. 'Nymphs, Neighbours and Narrators: a Narratological Approach to Longus', in: Panagiotakis, S., Zimmerman, M. & Keulen, W. 2003. (eds.) *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden – Boston, Brill, 171-189.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. 'Achilles Tatius', in: De Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. & Bowie, A.(eds.) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Volume One. Mnemosyne Suppl. 257. Leiden, Brill, 493-506.

Patillon, M. 1997. (Texte établi et traduit par) *Aelius Théon. Progymnasmata*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

Reardon, B.P. 1994. 'Achilles Tatius and ego-narrative', in: Morgan, J.R. & Stoneman, R. (eds.) *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*. London, Routledge, 80-96.

Scarcella, A. 1987. 'Caratteri e funzione delle gnomai in Achille Tazio', *Euphrosyne* 15, 269-280. Reprinted in Scarcella, A., Liviabella Furiani, P. & Rossetti, L. (eds.) 1993. *Romanzo e romanzieri. Note di narratologia greca*. Napoli – Perugia, Edizioni scientifiche italiane, 153-164.

Seitel, P. 1969. 'Proverbs: A social use of metaphor', *Genre* 2, 143-61. Reprinted in Mieder, W. & Dundes, A. (eds.) 1981. *The Wisdom of Many, Essays on the Proverb*. New York, Garland Publishing, 122-39.

Spengel, L. (ed.), *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. I (1853), vol. II (1854), vol. III (1856). Leipzig, Teubner.

Appendix: Gnomai in Achilles Tatius and their ἐργασία

(* = Marked as a gnomê by Scarcella and/or Morales)

Gnomai used by Clitophon
As a narrator
    1st p.

*   1.3.2 (2) φιλεῖ δὲ τὸ δαιμόνιον πολλάκις ἀνθρώποις τὸ μέλλον νύκτωρ λαλεῖν
οὐ γὰρ εἱμαρμένης δύνανται κρατεῖν
+ αἰτία 1.3.3 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐξαίφνης...)

*   1.4.4 (2) κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ·

* ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ ὁδὸς ἐρωτικῷ τραύματι.

*   1.5.6 ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός.
+ ἐναντίον 1.5.6 (κἂν εἰς σωφροσύνην...)
+ αἰτία 1.5.6 (ἡ γὰρ ὧν ἁμαρτάνει...)

*   1.6.2 ἔστι μὲν γὰρ φύσει καὶ τὰ ἄλλα νοσήματα καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος τραύματα <ἐν> νυκτὶ χαλεπώτερα καὶ ἐπανίσταται μᾶλλον ἡμῖν ἡσυχάζουσι καὶ ἐρεθίζει τὰς ἀλγηδόνας·
+ αἰτία 1.6.3 (ὅταν γὰρ...)
+ ἐναντίον 1.6.3-4 (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μὲν γὰρ...)

*   2.3.3 (2) Ἔρως δὲ καὶ Διόνυσος, δύο βίαιοι θεοί, ψυχὴν κατασχόντες ἐκμαίνουσιν εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν, ὁ μὲν καίων αὐτὴν τῷ συνήθει πυρί, ὁ δὲ τὸν οἶνον ὑπέκκαυμα φέρων·
οἶνος γὰρ ἔρωτος τροφή.

*	2.4.1	ὁ γὰρ μετὰ κλοπῆς ἐρῶν ἂν ἐλεγχθῇ πρός τινος, ὡς ὀνειδίζοντα τὸν ἐλέγξαντα μισεῖ.
*	2.8.1	τὸ φίλημα ... ὃ πρῶτόν ἐστι γλυκύ
*	2.8.2 (3)	καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλίστου τῶν τοῦ σώματος ὀργάνων τίκτεται· στόμα γὰρ φωνῆς ὄργανον· φωνὴ δὲ ψυχῆς σκιά.
*	3.4.4	ὁ γὰρ ἐν θαλάσσῃ θάνατος βραδὺς προαναιρεῖ πρὸ τοῦ παθεῖν· + αἰτία 3.4.5 (ὁ γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς...)
*	3.11.1	τοῦτο (= κλαίειν δὲ οὐκ ἠδυνάμην) γὰρ ἴδιον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐν τοῖς μεγάλοις κακοῖς. + ἐναντίον 3.11.1 (ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς μετρίαις συμφοραῖς...) + αἰτία 3.11.2 (ἐντυχοῦσα γὰρ...)
*	5.8.2	χρόνος γὰρ λύπης φάρμακον καὶ πεπαίνει τῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἕλκη. + αἰτία 5.8.2 (μεστὸς γὰρ...)
*	5.27.4	αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστὴς καὶ πάντα τόπον αὐτῷ τιθέμενος μυστήριον.
*	6.5.5	ψυχαὶ δὲ πεφύκασι μάντεις τῶν κακῶν, ἐπεὶ τῶν γε ἀγαθῶν ἥκιστα ἐκ μαντείας εὐτυχοῦμεν.
*	7.4.4	δάκρυον γὰρ αἷμα τραύματος ψυχῆς + παραβολή 7.4.4-5 (ὥσπερ...οὕτω...) + αἰτία 7.4.5 (ὅταν ὁ τῆς λύπης ὀδοὺς...)

3rd p.

*	2.13.1	τοσαύτη γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολάστοις ὕβρις, ὡς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν εἰς ἔρωτα τρυφᾶν καὶ ταῦτα πάσχειν ἀπὸ ῥημάτων, ἃ τῇ ψυχῇ τρωθέντες διακονοῦσιν ὀφθαλμοί.
*	2.29.1	αἰδὼς δὲ καὶ λύπη καὶ ὀργὴ τρία τῆς ψυχῆς κύματα· + παράφρασις 2.29.2 (ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἰδὼς...)
*	2.29.3	λόγος δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων πατήρ + παραβολή 2.29.3-4 (καὶ ἔοικεν...) + παράφρασις 2.29.4-5 (ἐν δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων...)
*	3.3.5	οὕτως οἱ μεγάλοι κίνδυνοι καὶ τοὺς τῆς φιλίας λύουσι νόμους
*	3.14.3	συμπαθὴς δέ πως εἰς ἔλεον ἄνθρωπος ἀκροατὴς ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν, καὶ ὁ ἔλεος πολλάκις φιλίαν προξενεῖ· + αἰτία 3.14.3 (ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ...)
*	4.6.1	οὐ δύναταί τις τρωθεὶς ἀνέχεσθαι θλιβόμενος τῷ πυρί
*	4.10.2	χαίρουσι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες εἰς τὰ ἐρωτικὰ προστάγματα.
*	4.14.9	ἀνὴρ γὰρ Αἰγύπτιος καὶ τὸ δειλόν, ὅπου φοβεῖται, δεδούλωται, καὶ τὸ μάχιμον, ἐν οἷς θαρρεῖ, παρώξυνται· + παράφρασις 4.14.9 (ἀμφότερα δὲ...)
	5.5.1	φιλόμυθον γάρ πως τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος
*	5.13.3	οὐδὲν γὰρ ἡδὺ τοῖς ἐρῶσι πλὴν τὸ ἐρώμενον + παράφρασις 5.13.3 (τὴν γὰρ ψυχὴν...)
*		+ αἰτία 5.13.4 (ἡ δὲ τῆς θέας ἡδονὴ...)
*	5.22.8	τὰ γὰρ ἡδέα, κἂν μήπω παρῇ, τέρπει ταῖς ἐλπίσιν.
*	5.27.1	διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ λόγους
*	6.6.2	ὁ γὰρ νοῦς οὔ μοι δοκεῖ λελέχθαι καλῶς ἀόρατος εἶναι τὸ παράπαν + παράφρασις 6.6.2 (ἡσθείς τε γὰρ...)
*	6.6.3	μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος
*	6.7.1	δάκρυον γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀνίστησι καὶ ποιεῖ προπετέστερον + παράφρασις 6.7.1 (κἂν μὲν ἄμορφος...) + αἰτία 6.7.2 (χεομένης δὲ τῆς...)
*	6.7.4	ἔστι μὲν γὰρ φύσει δάκρυον ἐπαγωγότατον ἐλέου τοῖς ὁρῶσι·

                   + παράφρασις 6.7.4 (ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ δακρύουσα...)

                   + αἰτία 6.7.5 (ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰς...)

*   6.11.1   ζηλοτυπία γὰρ ἅπαξ ἐμπεσοῦσα ψυχῇ δυσέκλειπτόν ἐστιν

*   6.17.5   λόγος γὰρ ἐλπίδος εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ἔρωτος ἐς πειθὼ ῥᾴδιος

                   + αἰτία 6.17.5 (τὸ γὰρ ἐπιθυμοῦν...)

*   6.18.3   τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες, ὅταν πρὸς τὰς ἐρωμένας ζητήσωσι λαλεῖν

                   + αἰτία 6.18.3 (οὐ γὰρ ἐπιστήσαντες...)

*   6.19.1   θυμὸς δὲ καὶ ἔρως δύο λαμπάδες·

                   + παράφρασις 6.19.2-7 (ἔχει γὰρ καὶ...)

*   6.19.7   ἀτιμίᾳ γὰρ ἔρωτος σύμμαχός ἐστι θυμός

*   7.10.4   (ἀληθὴς δέ ἐστιν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὁ λόγος, ὅτι) μνήμην ἐκπλήσσειν πέφυκε φόβος·

*   7.10.5   μάλιστα γὰρ τὸ τῶν δούλων γένος ἐν οἷς ἂν φοβηθῇ σφόδρα δειλόν ἐστιν.

      7.16.3   οὐκ ἔστι δὲ οὕτως ἄνθρωπος δρομικώτατος, ὃν οὐ τῆς φήμης φθάνει τὸ πτερόν·

As a character
    1st p.

*   4.8.2   φίλημα δὲ καὶ ἀόριστόν ἐστι καὶ ἀκόρεστον καὶ καινὸν ἀεί.

                   + ἐναντίον 4.8.2 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔργον...)

                   + αἰτία 4.8.2-3 (τρία γὰρ τὰ κάλλιστα...)

*   7.6.4   Οὐδέν [...] αἰσχρόν, ὃ λυπεῖ τὸν ἐχθρόν.

    2nd p.

      2.35.5   καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ παιδὸς ἀπελθεῖν ἐραστὴν ἄλυπον ἔχοντα τὴν ἡδονήν·

    3rd p.

*   2.37.1   ἐγγὺς γὰρ τοῦ θείου τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

                   + ἐναντίον 2.37.1 (τὸ δὲ κινούμενον...)

                   + παραδείγματα 2.37.2-6 (ἠράσθη μειρακίου Φρυγός...)

*   3.10.2 (2) ληστὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἕλληνα καὶ φωνὴ κατέκλασε καὶ δέησις ἐμάλαξεν·

        ὁ γὰρ λόγος πολλάκις τὸν ἔλεον προξενεῖ·

                   + αἰτία 3.10.2 (τὸ γὰρ πονοῦν...)

*   5.5.2   βαρβάροις δέ, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐχ ἱκανὴ πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην μία γυνή, μάλισθ᾽ ὅταν αὐτῷ καιρὸς διδῷ πρὸς ὕβριν τρυφᾶν.

*   5.5.7 (2) οὕτως αἱ τῆς ζηλοτυπίας ὠδῖνες νικῶσι καὶ τὴν γαστέρα.

        μόνον γὰρ ἐρῶσαι γυναῖκες ἀνιᾶσαι τὸν τὴν εὐνὴν λελυπηκότα, κἂν πάσχωσιν ἐν οἷς ποιοῦσιν οὐχ ἧττον κακόν, τὴν τοῦ πάσχειν λογίζονται συμφορὰν τῇ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονῇ.

Gnomai used by Clinias
    2nd p.

      1.8.3   Ἀτυχὴς ὁ μέλλων γαμεῖν· ἐπὶ πόλεμον [...] πέμπεται.

                   + παραδείγματα 1.8.4-6 (<ὁ> ὅρμος Ἐριφύλης...)

*   1.8.8   τὸ γὰρ κάλλος ἔχει τινὰ παρηγορίαν τῶν κακῶν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐν ἀτυχήμασιν εὐτυχεῖν·

                   + ἐναντίον 1.8.8 (εἰ δὲ μηδὲ εὔμορφος...)

*   1.9.4   [βλέπειν] μείζονα τῶν ἔργων ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν.

                   + αἰτία 1.9.4 (ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοις...)

                   + παραβολή 1.9.5 (καὶ ὀλίγον...)

*   1.9.5 (2) μέγιστον γάρ ἐστιν ἐφόδιον εἰς πειθὼ συνεχὴς πρὸς ἐρωμένην ὁμιλία.

        ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ φιλίας πρόξενος καὶ τὸ σύνηθες τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς χάριν ἀνυσιμώτερον.

                   + παραβολή 1.9.5 (εἰ γὰρ τὰ ἄγρια...)

*   1.10.1   αὐτοδίδακτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς σοφιστής.

<div style="text-align: right">

+ παραβολή 1.10.1 (ὥσπερ γάρ...)

+ αἰτία 1.10.2 (ἐὰν γὰρ ἡ ὡδὶς...)
</div>

*   1.10.5   τὸ γὰρ ἐραστοῦ φίλημα πρὸς ἐρωμένην θέλουσαν μὲν παρέχειν αἴτησίς ἐστι σιωπῇ, πρὸς ἀπειθοῦσαν δέ, ἱκετηρία.

*   5.12.1 (2) κάλλος γὰρ καὶ πλοῦτος καὶ ἔρως εἰ συνῆλθον ἐπὶ σέ, οὐχ ἕδρας <ἔργον> οὐδ᾽ ἀναβολῆς·

<div style="text-align: right">

+ αἰτία 5.12.1 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ κάλλος...)

μισεῖ δὲ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀλαζόνας.
</div>

3rd p.

    1.8.7   [...] πάντα τολμῶσαι γυναῖκες· κἂν φιλῶσι, φονεύουσι· κἂν μὴ φιλῶσι, φονεύουσιν

<div style="text-align: right">

+ παράδειγμα 1.8.7 (Ἀγαμέμνονα ἔδει...)
</div>

*   1.9.6   θέλει γὰρ ἑκάστη τῶν παρθένων εἶναι καλή, καὶ φιλουμένη χαίρει καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τῆς μαρτυρίας τὸν φιλοῦντα·

<div style="text-align: right">

+ ἐναντίον 1.9.6 (κἂν μὴ φιλήσῃ...)
</div>

    1.10.3   παῖς γὰρ καὶ παρθένος ὅμοιοι μέν εἰσιν εἰς αἰδῶ·

<div style="text-align: right">

+ παράφρασις 1.10.3 (πρὸς δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης...)

+ ἐναντίον 1.10.4 (γυναῖκας μὲν γάρ...)

+ αἰτία 1.10.4 (κἂν ὑποσχέσθαι...)
</div>

*   7.9.2   (ἀποθανεῖν,) ὅπερ φύσει τῶν ἀτυχούντων ἐστὶ φάρμακον·

Gnomai used by Melite

1st p.

*   5.26.2.   ἔρως ἀτυχῶν καὶ μαίνεται.

1st p. + 2nd p.

*   5.16.3 (2) πᾶς δὲ τόπος τοῖς ἐρῶσι θάλαμος·

<div style="text-align: center">

οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄβατον τῷ θεῷ.
</div>

*   5.26.3   μόνοι δὲ οἴδασιν οἱ ἐρῶντες τὰ τῶν ὁμοίων τραύματα.

<div style="text-align: right">

+ ἐναντίον 5.26.3 (τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις...)
</div>

*   6.10.4   Φήμη δὲ καὶ Διαβολὴ δύο συγγενῆ κακά·

<div style="text-align: right">

+ αἰτία 6.10.4 (θυγάτηρ ἡ Φήμη...)

+ παράφρασις 6.10.5 (ὅταν οὖν ἡ Διαβολὴ...)
</div>

Gnomai used by Menelaus

3rd p.

*   2.35.3   καὶ γὰρ ἁπλούστεροι παῖδες γυναικῶν, καὶ τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῖς δριμύτερον εἰς ἡδονήν.

*   2.36.1   ποθεινὸν γὰρ ἀεὶ τὸ ἀκόρεστον.

<div style="text-align: right">

+ ἐναντίον 2.36.1 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς χρῆσιν...)

+ παράδειγμα 2.36.2 (καὶ τὸ ῥόδον...)
</div>

*   2.36.2   καὶ τὸ ῥόδον διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἄλλων εὐμορφότερόν ἐστι φυτῶν, ὅτι τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῦ φεύγει ταχύ.

    2.38.2   γυναικὶ μὲν γὰρ πάντα ἐπίπλαστα, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ σχήματα·

<div style="text-align: right">

+ παράφρασις 2.38.2 (κἂν εἶναι δόξῃ καλή...)

+ ἐναντίον 2.38.3 (τὸ δὲ κάλλος τὸ παιδικὸν...)
</div>

*   4.8.5   ἐρῶν γάρ τις, εἰς ὅσον μὲν ἔχει τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ τυχεῖν, φέρει, ὡς εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τυχεῖν ἀποτεινόμενος.

<div style="text-align: right">

+ ἐναντίον 4.8.5 (ἐὰν δὲ ἀπογνῷ...)
</div>

Gnomai used by Sosthenes

3rd p.

*   6.17.4 (2) παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔρωτα μαραίνει νέος ἔρως·

<div style="text-align: right">

γυνὴ δὲ μάλιστα τὸ παρὸν φιλεῖ, τοῦ δὲ ἀπόντος, ἕως καινὸν οὐχ εὗρε, μνημονεύει·

+ παράφρασις 6.17.4 (προσλαβοῦσα δὲ ἕτερον...)
</div>

*		6.13.4	χρηστότης γὰρ τυγχάνουσα μὲν χάριτος ἔτι μᾶλλον αὔξεται, προπηλακισθεῖσα δὲ εἰς ὀργὴν ἐρεθίζεται.

Gnomê used by Satyrus

*	*2nd p.*	2.4.5	ἔρως [...] δειλίας οὐκ ἀνέχεται. + αἰτία 2.4.5 (ὁρᾷς αὐτοῦ τὸ...)

Gnomê used by Charicles

*	*3rd p.*	1.7.4.	πονηρὸν μὲν γὰρ γυνή, κἂν εὔμορφος ᾖ· + ἐναντίον 1.7.4 (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀμορφίαν...)

Gnomê used by Leucippe

*	*1st p.*	2.25.2	Φόβος γὰρ γλώττης ἐστὶ δεσμός.

Gnomê used by Sostratus

*	*1st p.*	8.4.4	ἔπειτα τῶν ἔργων παρελθόντων ἡ διήγησις τὸν οὐκέτι πάσχοντα ψυχαγωγεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ λυπεῖ.

Gnomê used by the priest of Artemis

*	*3rd p.*	8.9.9	οὐδενὸς γὰρ οὐδείς ἐστιν ἄνευ κρίσεως δυνατώτερος.