

# THE REPRESENTATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND SOCIAL DISPLACEMENT IN THE *AITHIOPIKA* OF HELIODOROS

REF: EF/025

Hilton, John (University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa)

## **Brief Summary:**

The present paper will attempt to provide an analysis of how knowledge, and, in particular, of how amphibolous explanations and statements of belief and disbelief, are related to the displacement of cultural identity in the *Aithiopika*.

## **Abstract Body:**

Two different approaches have been made to account for the citation of alternative explanations in the *Aithiopika*. Morgan (1982, 229-234) views these as part of a 'historical pose' adopted by Heliodoros to make his narrative appear to be more realistic, while Winkler (1982, 121-137) classifies such 'amphibolies' into four categories: those in which the more supernatural explanation is preferred, those in which the supernatural explanation is viewed as unlikely, those which raise questions about the supernatural control of events, and Kalasiris' elaborate but duplicitous discourses. According to Winkler, these amphibolies are not religiously or philosophically meant but are rather 'reflexive allusions to the novel's own structure of progressive and problematic intelligibility' (1982: 122). Both of these influential studies are critical of the other (Morgan 1982: 231; Winkler 1982: 133) and Dowden has made independent criticism of Winkler's hermeneutic interpretation of the text (Dowden 1996: 267). Moreover, both Morgan and Winkler deal only partially with the issue of how these amphibolous expressions can adequately be defined (in some cases up to four explanations of a particular phenomenon are given), and how they are mapped in Heliodoros' narrative between author and characters, and neither considers the way these statements are viewed – as either true or false – and how they are distributed within the narrative context (most occur in the first five books). In addition, there is a general consensus that references to the supernatural in the *Aithiopika*, which often occur in such amphibolous expressions, do not present a consistent religious framework for the narrative (already Rohde talks of 'jene dualistische Vorstellung' in Heliodoros' view of the supernatural powers [19143: 464 /435]). Recent studies have investigated the important role of magic in the narrative (Jones 2005; Ruiz-Montero 2005). My paper will attempt to resolve the problem presented by these epistemological indeterminacies by relating them to the complex initiation and resolution of the narrative in the novel in which most of the main players (Kalasiris, Charikleia, Theagenes) are uprooted from their homes and conveyed to a strange and wonderful world in which apparent paradoxes are proven to be true. Key passages will include 2.27, 3.7-8, 3.16-17, 4.12.

## **Key Citations:**

Dowden, K. 1996. 'Heliodoros: Serious Intentions', *Classical Quarterly* 46.1, 267-286.

- Jones, M. 2005. 'Base and Heavenly Magic in Heliodoros' Aithiopika', *Ancient Narrative* 4, 79-98.
- Morgan, J. R. 1982. 'History, Romance and Realism in the Aithiopika of Heliodoros', *Classical Antiquity* 1, 221-265.
- Rohde, E. 19143. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Darmstadt: Georg Olms.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 2005. 'Magic in the Ancient Novels', *Ancient Narrative* (forthcoming).
- Winkler, J. J. 1982. 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' Aithiopika', *Yale Classical Studies* 27, 93-158.