sm

Małgorzata Cieśluk

Institute of History
University of Szczecin
malgorzata.ciesluk@usz.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-2863-1440

Bandits and/or pirates – the meaning of the words ὁ λησητής and ὁ πειρατής in ancient Greek novel

In the introduction to his book on piracy in antiquity, Philip de Souza draws attention to the significance of the nomenclature used by Greek and Roman authors to refer to people whom we today call bandits and pirates. Since no items of material culture unequivocally associated with piracy have been recovered, written sources are often the only legitimate basis for research and interpretation in this area. In view of that, the understanding of Greek and Latin source terms is of fundamental importance[1].

In Greek texts, three words are used to denote pirates: ὁ καταποντιστής, ὁ λῃστής, and ὁ πειρατής. The meaning of the noun ὁ καταποντιστής does not raise any doubt: it literally means "one who throws into the sea" or "plunges into the sea"[2]. The contexts in which this word appears clearly point to the illicit nature of the activities which the people so named conduct and the connection between these activities and the sea. This term, however, was rarely used by ancient authors[3]. Since the time of Homer, the most common words used when referring to pirates and piracy had been forms of the noun ὁ λῃστής, which had a general meaning "bandit" or "robber" and appeared in ancient sources in reference to people engaged in various types of robbery or raiding.

---

1   Philip de Souza, *Piraci w świecie grecko-rzymskim*. Trans. Jacek Lang (Zakrzewo: Wydawnictwo Homini, 2008), 17–31.

2   See entry ὁ καταπονιστής in LSJ.

3   de Souza, *Piraci*, 27. The limited function and semantics of the noun ὁ καταποντιστής are also evidenced by the sparsity of cognate words. The Greek-Polish Dictionary, edited by Zofia Abramowiczówna, lists only two related forms – the verb καταποντίζω (plunge or sink in the sea) and the noun ὁ καταποντισμός (sinking). To compare, the noun ὁ λῃστής has eleven and the noun ὁ πειρατής – four cognates.

From the middle of the 3rd century BC, the noun ὁ πειρατής started to be increasingly used in Greek texts[4]. In view of the emergence of this new word (ὁ πειρατς), it seems pertinent to ask whether it differed in meaning from ὁ λῃστής (which could indicate that the people referred to by those terms conducted different types of activities), or whether the two nouns were used synonymously to designate people with the same identity traits. Put in semantic terms, the question is whether the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής had identical (equivalent) meaning ranges, and so were used interchangeably, or whether there is evidence (at least in the writings of some authors) that they were connected by a different type of relationship (hyponymy, hyperonymy or overlapping).

Another, even more fundamental, question that arises in connection with this problem is whether the authors of the Greek texts understood the word ὁ πειρατής in the same way as we understand the denotation of the word "pirate" today? The etymological relationship between the Greek word ὁ πειρατής and the Latin noun "pirate" and then the English noun "pirate" or Polish "pirat" makes it natural for one to intuitively project the contemporary understanding of piracy onto the ancient concept of this activity, which may limit the understanding of the phenomenon in its historical context[5]. One should also not overlook the possible changes in the meaning range of the word in question over the span of antiquity, associated with the natural evolution of the Greek language. If, following de Souza, we take the century BC as a *terminus post quem*, then the ancient Greek texts in which the noun ὁ πειρατής appears come from different time points in a period that stretches over seven centuries. This temporal perspective can be extended even further when we also include Byzantine authors who were in constant dialogue with their ancient predecessors.

The Suda, one of the most important Byzantine encyclopaedic lexicons (10th century), provides precise definitions of the concepts in question. They show that the 10th-century author of the lexicon saw the words ὁ καταποντιστής and ὁ πειρατής as being equivalent in meaning. The term ὁ λῃστής, on the other hand, could only be treated as a synonym of the previous two, if it was accompanied by a word denoting the "sea", which narrowed down the semantic range of the noun "bandit" to "bandit at sea" (κατὰ θάλασσαν): πειρατῶν: καταποντιστῶν, κατὰ θάλασσαν λῃστῶν (1454).

Used on its own, the word ὁ λῃστής referred strictly to activities conducted on land: λῃσταί: καὶ λῃστὴς μὲν ὁ ἐν ἠπείρῳ πειρατὴς δὲ ὁ ἐν θαλάσσῃ (474).

The definition given in the Suda is valuable since it makes a clear distinction between the meaning ranges of the nouns ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής: a bandit (λῃστὴς) operates on land (ἐν ἠπείρῳ) and a pirate (πειατὴς) at sea (ἐν θαλάσσῃ). This distinction means that the nouns are not synonyms *sensu stricto*. Although the meaning

---

4   de Souza, *Piraci*, 19–20.

5   On this tendency in contemporary research, see e.g. Paul McKechnie, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC* (London: Routledge, 1989), 106.

ranges of these words shared common elements (bandit), they did not overlap completely, which is a condition for the existence of a relationship of equivalence. The ancient Greeks assigned different features to the designates of ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής, which significantly limited their interchangeable use with reference to the same people or phenomena.

The Byzantine definitions correspond with the modern understanding of the word "pirate", which, apart from robbery/raiding, has the following denotative components: being a member of a ship's crew, operating at sea, and conducting an activity consisting in attacking other ships. This similarity in meaning, however, does not necessarily extend to the earlier period. McKechnie notes that the distinction made in the Suda should not be treated as a universal one and that it may not be found in the oldest texts containing both words[6]. De Souza states even more emphatically that the definitions in the Suda say little about how these words were used in the successive periods of antiquity[7], and then goes on to make a radical conclusion: "From the texts cited above it can be seen that *peirates* is a synonym for *leistes*. They both mean pirate or bandit, and can both be translated by either English word, or by the neutral term plaunderer"[8].

De Souza's analyses of the oldest sources containing forms of the noun ὁ πειρατής are convincing: it seems that both terms were used quite freely, and their meaning ranges permeated one another. He, however, takes the same position on the synonymy of the two words in later texts written up to the end of antiquity. From this, one can infer, although de Souza does not say this explicitly, that he does not see any evidence of significant change in the meaning of the word ὁ πειρατής over the next seven centuries. It seems worthwhile to subject this assumption to critical reflection.

The aim of this article is to examine the semantic range of the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής and related nouns and adjectives in a compact body of texts that are collectively referred to as the ancient Greek novel or romance novel[9]. The fact that these

---

6   Ibidem, 106

7   de Souza, *Piraci*, 24.

8   Philip de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 8.

9   The ancients did not have a genre name for the large and internally diverse body of fictional texts written in prose. The names "romance" or "novel" have been given to these works by scholars who have conducted genological studies from the early modern period to the present day. The genre of the ancient Greek novel is represented by five surviving works: Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* (or *An Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes)*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius' *Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Heliodorus of Emesa's *Aethiopica* (or *An Ethiopian Story of Theagenes and Chariclea*); see Niklas Holzberg, *Powieść Antyczna* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Homini, 2003), 13–43. Whitmarsh proposes that this genre should be called "romance", and that the five texts belong to a broader category of novel, which also includes works of prose in which themes other than love and journey are the leading motifs; see Tim Whitmarsh, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Returning Romance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 1, fn. 1.

texts are works of fiction does not make them any less valuable as objects of semantic reflection. There are three main reasons why these works provide good material for this type of study. Firstly, they represent the same literary genre, and, therefore, follow the same conventions, making it easier to carry out a comparative analysis. Secondly, they are extensive pieces of writing, with bandits and pirates of various sorts playing an important role in the plot of each novel, which means the terms of interest appear in these texts numerous times in various contexts. Thirdly, owing to the findings of the last few decades, we know that they come from the period between the first half of the 1st century and the middle of the 4th century AD[10]. This broad chronological horizon allows to make comparisons between the meanings of the investigated words in different periods. The importance of Greek and Latin fiction to research on ancient piracy has also been noted by de Souza, who included the ancient novels among his source materials[11]. In this present study, four of the five Greek novels are analysed. Longus, the author of *Daphnis and Chloe*, does not use the word ὁ πειρατής or its cognates, which places his novel outside the scope of this paper.

The analysis covered all passages in which the novelists used the terms ὁ καταποντιστής, ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής as well as related nouns and adjectives, and the situational context was taken into account. Two questions were addressed: (1) do the linguistic data confirm de Souza's claim that the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής have identical meaning ranges, and (2) do the novels contain hints pointing to changes in the meaning range of the noun ὁ πειρατής? Given those goals, special attention was paid to passages in which at least two of the investigated words were used in the same situational context. It was also important to determine whether there existed groups of robbers which were referred to using only one of the nouns under study and its cognates. For the sake of clarity, the noun ὁ λῃστὴς is henceforth translated as "bandit", and ὁ πειρατής as "pirate".

Chariton:

Although there is no clear evidence for the dating of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, it is assumed that it was most probably written in the first half of the 1st century AD[12]. Accordingly, Chariton's novel is the oldest of the Greek novels, and its author may have been only slightly younger than Strabo. Some scholars consider the writer from Aphrodisias to have been the actual creator of the genre[13].

---

10   It is worth emphasising that the chronology of the individual texts is only approximate, as there is no confirmed information about the authors of the novels. In most cases, only the writer's name and place of origin are known. For more on this subject, see Holzberg, *Powieść*, 69; Whitmarsh, *Narrative*, 261–263.

11   de Souza, *Piraci*, 24–25, 255–259.

12   Holzberg, *Powieść*, 70; Whitmarsh, *Narrative*, 262; Tilg, *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 37.

13   Tilg, *Chariton*, VII et seq.

Before we proceed to linguistic analyses, it is necessary to understand the contexts in which the terms in question appear. To get the big picture, let us look at the general characteristics of the two groups of robbers featuring in Chariton's novel. The most important role is played by a band from Syracuse, composed of local thugs and port gangsters, commanded by the supposed ferryman Theron. The brigands rob a tomb in Syracuse, and, along with other loot, carry off the heroine Callirhoe, the daughter of the famous Syracusan politician and general Hermocrates[14], who has been mistakenly buried alive in the tomb. Then, the robbers take the heroine on a ship to Miletus, where they sell her as a slave. Theron is the commander of the band and the *spiritus movens* of their undertakings. References to this character and the abduction and enslavement of Callirhoe are made repeatedly throughout the novel. This far into the analysis, we should consider the relationship between the robbers and the space in which they operate: they plunder the grave and abduct the heroine on land, and then go out to sea, which at this point only serves as a transport route. The band operates in a complex space that combines both types of setting. In the novel, land is directly connected with the sea: the plundered tomb is located close to the sea shore, and Theron and his band have their base in the port of Syracuse.

The role of the second band is much less prominent. Recruited by one of the characters, the bandits sink a Syracusan ship off the shore of Miletus, thus preventing a prompt reunion of the novel's protagonists. The novelist does not focus on the identity of this group – one might even get the impression that he does not pay much heed to it, as the information he provides about them is inconsistent. At first mention, he says that the attackers were barbarian soldiers (φρουρίον βαρβάρων: 3.7.2.5; similarly: 3.10.2.1). The historical context clearly indicates that it would have had to be a Persian garrison stationed in the vicinity of Miletus, as the plot of the novel is set in Greece at the turn of the 5th century BC[15]. At the end of the novel, however, when recapitulating the plot, the male protagonist (Chaereas) attributes the attack to the robbers from Phrygia (Φρύγες λῃσταὶ: 8.8.1.3). Unlike Theron's band, the Milesian attackers feature in the novel as a collective character stripped of any individual traits. Like their identity, also the relationship of the Milesian band with the space type (land/sea) is vague. Undoubtedly, the burning and sinking of the ship anchored off the shore is a one-off action and does not point to a closer relationship of the brigands with the sea.

This rather small representation of robber gangs, of which one plays only an incidental role, does not allow to formulate any in-depth conclusions. What can be said

---

14   The character of Callirhoe is very loosely set in the historical context: we only know from historical accounts that Hermocrates had a daughter of an unknown name who died due to an accident; see Bryan P. Reardon, Introduction to *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Chariton, in: *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, edited by Bryan P. Reardon (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 2008), 18.

15   Reardon, Introduction, 19.

for sure is that both bands are most often referred to with the noun ὁ λῃστής (bandit). Various forms of this word appear nearly thirty times in the text of the novel. What is important from the point of view of our deliberations is that, when referring to Theron's band, Chariton also uses the noun ὁ πειρατής as well as the related adjective "piratical" (πειρατικός) and the noun denoting a pirate crew or pirates' lair (τὸ πειρατήριον). However, even on close inspection of the contexts of use of those words, it is difficult to identify and define any specific criteria that guided the writer in choosing one rather than the other term. The adjective πειρατικός is used as an attribute of a ship (τῷ πειρατικῷ κέλητι: 8.7.7.4; τῷ πειρατικῷ πλοίῳ: 8.7.8.1. 1.2, 6.2.10.2). By contrast, Chariton does not use the adjectival form λῃστρικός at all. Yet, when describing Theron's band's lair he uses both the noun τὸ πειρατήριον (1.7.1.3; 3.3.13.2) and τὸ λῃστήριον (2.9.3.1, 4.1.1.2, 6.2.10.2). The female protagonist describes the members of the band as πειρατὰς when she says that fate has subjected her to "pirates more dreadful than the waves" (τῶν κυμάτων τοὺς πειρατὰς φοβερωτέρους ἐπέστησας: 1.12.3.2). Also the inhabitants of Babylon emphasise that Callirhoe was saved from the hands of pirates (ἐξήγαγε πειρατῶν: 6.1.3.2). At the same time, there are numerous passages in the novel in which both Theron and members of his robber band are referred to as ὁ λῃστής (see 1.7.1.2, 1.9.4.2, 1.9.7.3, 1.11.4.1, 1.12.1.4, 1.13.10.4, 1.14.9.4, 2.2.8.6, 2.6.3.7, 2.8.7.2, 2.9.5.1, 3.2.8.4, 3.4.14.1, 4.3.2.5, 5.1.5.1, 5.7.4.3, 6.1.2.4, 6.6.3.5, 6.6.4.3, 6.7.9.1, 8.7.8.2). The practice they indulge in is called ἡ λῃστεία (banditry) (1.7.5.3, 8.4.5.1).

An analysis of passages in which the author uses both terms within the same situational context turns out to be equally ineffective. In the first of these excerpts, Chariton explains how Theron gathered his band:

"There was a certain Theron, a wicked man, who out of vileness took to the sea and had bandits (λῃστὰς) lying in wait in ports. Under the pretence of ferrying, he assembled a pirate crew (πειρατήριον)" (1.7.1.3)[16].

We can see that Chariton associated the terms λῃσταὶ and πειρατήριον closely by putting them side by side within the same situational contexts: the bandits form a pirate crew. There is no evidence that the words have different meaning ranges – on the contrary, it seems clear that they are used as synonyms. On the margin, it is worth noting the causal relationship that the writer discerns between sailing the sea and vileness, as highlighted in the first part of the quote (ἐξ ἀδικίας πλέων τὴν θάλασσαν). The sea in Chariton's novel is a type of space that has negative connotations (Theron followed a life of crime on the sea "out of vileness"). It seems that this idea could be explicated in the following way: wicked people feel better at sea than on land, and, therefore, a person associated with the sea, even through a profession such as a fisherman or a ferryman, is prone to unethical behaviours.

---

16   Unless stated otherwise, all the translations from ancient Greek are mine.

A similar situation is found in the passage in which Theron wonders if it was prudent of him to have left the plunder behind on a ship moored in the vicinity for a few days while he was looking for someone to sell his loot to. He concludes that he acted as though "he were the only bandit that existed" (λῃστής), and asks himself: "Do you not know that other pirates, also, sail the sea?" (πειραταί: 1.12, 2–3). This example seems unambiguous: Chariton identifies his character by means of both words and uses them interchangeably. Of course, it is worth noting that the noun πειραταί is used in direct connection with the phrase "at sea" (τὴν θάλασσαν), but this does not change the impression that, for Chariton, the nouns λῃστής and πειραταί are synonymous.

This is confirmed by at least two other passages, in which the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής appear in an identical context. In one of the many lamentations, the heroine complains about her fate, and uses three different terms to describe her captors (Theron's gang). She says that she fell into the hands of tomb-robbers (τυμβωρύχων) and was taken to sea by "pirates more dreadful than the sea waves" (εἰς θάλασσαν καὶ τῶν κυμάτων τοὺς πειρατὰς φοβερωτέρους), and that her beauty only served one purpose: for Theron, the bandit (Θήρων ὁ λῃστής), to receive a higher price for her (1.14.8.4). Finally, at the end of the novel, Callirhoe's father, Hermocrates, recalls that during the search for his daughter, the Syracusans found a pirate ship at sea (ἐν δὲ τῇ θαλάσσῃ τῷ πειρατικῷ πλολου), and on it Theron and the bodies of other bandits (τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους λῃστὰς) who had died of thirst (8.7.8.2).

The analysis above indicates that Chariton, like Polybius or Strabo, belongs to a group of authors who, according to Philip de Souza, did not see a major difference in meaning between the nouns ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής and used them as synonyms[17]. In Chariton's case, it seems pertinent to ask whether it is of any significance that he did not use the word πειραταί to refer to the bandits who sank the Syracusan trier near Miletus. If so, then the nautical connotations of Theron's band (their base in the port, Theron's job as a ferryman, their ship and sea voyage) could signal that this group has a partially different identity than the brigands from Miletus. Then it would be meaningful that the members of Theron's band are referred to as ὁ λῃστής but also as ὁ πειρατής. Unfortunately, the very limited linguistic material pertaining to the Milesian gang makes it impossible to formulate a convincing hypothesis.

Achilles Tatius:

The novel *Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon* features a larger gallery of characters referred to as ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής (or both), who are more broadly involved in the plot compared to those in the story of Callirhoe. We read about a band recruited from among fishermen near Tyre. They abduct Clitophon's half-sister Calligone from the beach during a festival in honour of Heracles and, on boats, take her to the ship of

---

17 de Souza, *Piracy*, 26.

Callisthenes, who has orchestrated the kidnapping. Tatius also devotes quite a lot of attention to Egyptian robbers living in the backwaters of the Nile Delta who control the coast and attack both ships sailing on the Nile and seafaring ships passing this area. They abduct Clitophon and Leucippe during their journey on the Nile. Finally, a third group of brigands appears, assembled on the island of Pharos from local thugs, about whom we only learn that they are people associated with the sea[18]. They kidnap the hero and heroine and take them on a ship to Alexandria, but the captives escape with the help of local pearl divers.

Similarly to Chariton's novel, *Leucippe and Clitophon* contains at least three passages in which the writer uses the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής alongside one another in the same situational context. All these excerpts refer to the group of abductors from Pharos, who abscond with Leucippe to a ship, and then immediately set off on their way, chased by another craft with soldiers who have been summoned to her rescue. Tatius relates this situation as follows:

"Meanwhile, the bandits (οἱ λῃσταὶ) sailed at a still greater speed, and when we neared them, the bandits (οἱ λῃσταὶ) sighted another ship, and, on recognising it, summoned it for help: its crew were purple-fishers, also dealing in piracy (πορφυρεῖς δὲ ἦσαν πειρατικοί). The commander, seeing that there were now two ships against him, was perturbed and ordered his crew to reverse, and the pirates naturally ceased their flight and were challenging us to give battle" (5.7.6–7).

The same situation is again recounted near the end of the novel, this time from the perspective of the abducted female protagonist. Among other things, Leucippe tells us about a prostitute brought to the ship by the same bandits (οἱ λῃσταὶ), who offered the girl to one of the pirates (τινὶ τῶν πειρατῶν), saying that the bandit (ὁ λῃστής) was in love (8.16.1–2).

In both excerpts, the noun ὁ λῃστής has an identical meaning range as the noun οἱ πειραταὶ and the related adjective πειρατικοί. The author uses these forms interchangeably with reference to the same individuals, which may indicate that they are synonymous. The third passage confirms this conclusion: also here the author uses the noun "bandit" interchangeably with forms of the noun "pirate". This time the Pharian kidnappers are summoned by Thersander, who is keeping Leucippe prisoner in a village near Ephesus. When the girl rejects his erotic advances, saying that even the bandits did not take her virginity, Thersander mockingly asks how it is possible that she spent so many nights among pirates (πειραταῖς) and still managed to keep her virginity. Then he says with irony: "Did these bandits (οἱ λῃσταί) become eunuchs for your sake? Or was it a band of piratical (τὸ πειρατήριον) philosophers?" (6.21.3.3). Let us add that

---

18   De Souza points out that Caesar in *De bello civili* (3.112) accused the inhabitants of the island of Pharos of comporting themselves like pirates; see de Souza, *Piracy*, 221, fn. 21.

in many other places in the novel in which the author returns to the events on Pharos, the kidnappers are referred to solely as οἱ λῃσταί (5.3.2.2, 5.7.3.1, 5.7.3.4, 5.7.4.1, 5.17.5.5, 5.17.9.3, 7.7.3.3, 7.9.3.2, 8.5.1.5, 8.5.6.2, 8.15.4.1, 8.15.4.2, 8.16.5.1, 8.16.6.3, 8.16.7.3).

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the fact that Tatius only uses the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής synonymously when describing the gang of Pharian abductors. It is, therefore, necessary to take a closer look at the terminology related to the remaining groups of robbers.

The group of Egyptian Nile Delta bandits, whom Tatius also calls the herdsmen (οἱ βούκολοι; see, among others, 3.9.2, 4.12.4, 4.12.8), plays an important role in the novel – most of Book III and the entire Book IV revolve around their activity. It is them who kidnap the protagonists and put them through a series of dramatic adventures in captivity, including the counterfeit, theatrically staged death of Leucippe. Tatius depicts a scene in which the herdsmen attack a ship sailing along the coast – the Egyptians used small, light boats which could also move freely on the backwaters of the Nile Delta, their natural habitat. Tatius devotes a lot of space to the description of the fighting methods used by the herdsmen, which allowed the bandits to stand up to regular army troops. When referring to the Egyptian abductors, the novelist only uses the noun ὁ λῃστής (3.5.5.5, 3.9.3.3, 3.10.5.3, 3.12.1.4, 3.12.2.3, 3.13.1.3, 3.13.2.3, 3.13.4.2, 3.13.5.4, 3.14.4.3), 3.15.1.3, 3.16.4.3, 3.17.1.3, 3.18.5.4, 3.19.2.3, 3.19.2.4, 3.20.2.3, 3.20.3.3, 3.21.1.3, 3.21.5.3, 3.21.6.2, 3.22.2.2, 3.22 2.3, 3.22.3.3, 4.1.3.1, 4.6.4.3, 4.9.5.4, 4.9.6.2, 4.17.6.4, 4.18.1.1) or its derivatives. He describes their boats using the adjective λῃστρικός (σκαφῶν λῃστρικῶν: 3.20.5.3), calls their leader ὁ λῄσταρχος (3.12.1.4, 3.19.2.4, 3.21.6.3, 3.22.2.3, 3.22.3.4, 3.22.5.3), and says that they are a gang of bandits (τὸ λῃστήριον: 3.14.1.5, 3.19.3.4 and ἡ λῃστεία: 3.24.1.4). The number of forms of the noun bandit (ὁ λῃστής) which Tatius uses to refer to the Egyptian herdsmen is large enough to exclude the possibility that he chose these terms randomly. For some reason, the author does not, even once, use any form of the noun ὁ πειρατής to refer to this group of robbers.

The last band, which consists of bandits recruited from among local fishermen in the vicinity of Tyre, features only once in the plot of the novel. They have been gathered to kidnap a girl participating in a religious rite on the seashore and deliver her to a young man who is in love with her and is waiting on a ship moored nearby. The writer refers to the fishermen (ἁλιεῖς) involved in the abduction as οἱ λῃσταί (2.16.2.6, 2.17.3.2, 2.18.5.2). However, in describing the servant who has been given the task of assembling the band, he uses the adjective πειρατικός (piratical). Writing about the servant's aptitude for this task, Tatius emphasises that he was a fellow of a robust body and "by nature piratical" (φύσει πειρατικός: 2.17.3.2)[19]. The mere fact that Tatius employs

---

19 Translators of *Leucippe and Clitophon* propose different understandings of the phrase φύσει πειρατικός. Zawadzki, in a Polish translation of the novel, uses the expression "skłonny do rozbojów"

the adjective "piratical" here, however, does not mean that the character belongs in the category denoted as ὁ πειρατής. The fact that the servant has a trait that makes him resemble a pirate, does not automatically mean that he is the same sort of character as οἱ πειραταὶ of the Pharian gang[20].

These observations lead to the conclusion that, in the final analysis, there is a visible difference in Achilles Tatius' vocabulary between the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής. The former (ὁ λῃστής) is generic and is used in relation to various types of characters, both those who engage in banditry only incidentally (the kidnappers of Tyre and Pharos) and those for whom banditry is a permanent element of their identity (the Egyptian herdsmen). However, not every bandit (ὁ λῃστής) in Tatius' novel is a pirate (ὁ πειρατής).

There seem to be two attributes that distinguish the kidnappers of Pharos (pirates) from the other robbers. The first one is having a seagoing ship. The Pharian freebooters are the only ones to sail a ship; they flee on the vessel and quickly find another ship crew who are ready to come to their aid in a military confrontation with the pursuing soldiers (5.7.2–7). Meanwhile, the herdsmen attack ships in the area of the Egyptian coast from small light boats (σκαφῶν λῃστρικῶν: 3.20.5.3). The fishermen–kidnappers of Tyre operate in a similar way: they row up to the shore on a boat, abduct the girl and carry her off to the ship where the young man in love with her is waiting for them. The writer refers to the boat used for the abduction as ὁ λέμβος, a light boat that could be used by both pirates and fishermen[21]. The context suggests that the boat used by the attackers is a fishing boat, as it does not cause panic among the people gathered on the shore. To compare, the vessels taking part in the kidnapping on Pharos are referred to by the noun ἡ ναῦς (5.7.6–7), as is the ship which the perpetrator of the abduction in Tyre waited on (2.17.1.1) and the ship attacked by the Egyptian herdsmen (3.20.2–4). In

---

(given to robbery), and, therefore, interprets the adjective in an evaluative context; see Achilleus Tatios, *Opowieść o Leukippe i Klejtofoncie*. Trans. Robert K. Zawadzki (Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie, 2002), 89; similarly Ebbe Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary* (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1962), 53. J.J. Winkler, in an English version, translates the term as "a born pirate"; see Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Trans. John J. Winkler, in: *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, edited by Bryan P. Reardon (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 2008), 197. These discrepancies result from the broad meaning range of the noun ἡ φύσις, which could be used when speaking of someone's origin as well as external appearance and character. In such a situation, the translator is forced to make a choice in accordance with his interpretation.

20   I disagree on this point with Philip de Souza, who quotes this passage to support his claim that the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής are used synonymously in Tatius' novel. The researcher says: "The obvious translation of both words here is pirate, rather than bandit"; see de Souza, *Piracy*, 7. Much more convincing evidence for the synonymity of these words is found in passages 5.7.6–7, as discussed above (de Souza also makes note of them, but does not analyse them in detail; see de Souza, *Piracy*, 25, fn. 28), and passage 6.21.3.3.

21   See Lionel Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton-New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971), 162–3.

all cases, they are seafaring vessels fit to travel over long distances. A second attribute of pirates revealed by the comparison of the different groups of robbers, is the potential to operate in the open sea – which does not preclude activity on land (e.g. abduction of Leucippe from her home on an island). Οἱ πειραταὶ not only have a ship but are also ready to fight in the open sea.

Achilles Tatius' linguistic practice in using the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής is in certain respects similar to that of his predecessor, Chariton: in some passages, they both use the nouns "bandit" and "pirate" interchangeably to refer to the same characters. However, while in the tale of Callirhoe, there was little differentiation between the gangs of robbers, and so the evidence was too scanty to draw any far-reaching conclusions, the observations made on the basis of Tatius' novel point to a tendency towards concretisation of the meaning of the word ὁ πειρατής. Of crucial importance here is the fact that Tatius gives this name exclusively to one band of robbers. A comparative analysis of the two novels allows to identify features indicative of a gradual development in the Greek language of the connotation of the word "pirate" (ὁ πειρατής) into one partially distinct from that of the word "bandit" (ὁ λῃστής). It is difficult to say how important the chronological distance between Chariton and Tatius was in this regard. *The terminus ante quem* for Tatius' novel has been established, on the basis of papyrus finds, at the end of the 2nd century AD[22]. This means that the author of *Leucippe and Clitophon* lived about 150 years later than Chariton, which makes it likely that the language has evolved at least slightly during this period.

While reflecting on the differences in the meaning range of the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής, it is worth paying attention to two elements that seem to be common to the linguistic practice of both novelists. The first of them is the relationship between the proclivity for robbery and the space of the sea. In our earlier discussion of Chariton's novel, a passage was quoted describing the bandit Theron in which the narrator says that he "took to the sea out of vileness" (ἐξ ἀδικίας πλέων τὴν θάλασσαν: 1.7.1.3). Similar overtones can be heard in an excerpt from Tatius' novel in which the narrator portrays Chaereas, who inspired Leucippe's abduction on Pharos. The narrator states that "he contrived a plot, having assembled a squad of robbers of his own sort, for he was himself a seafaring man" (θαλάσσιος ὢν ἄνθρωπος: 5.3.2.2).

The second element that the two novels have in common is associated with the evaluative connotation of the term ὁ πειρατής. Philip de Souza also reflects on this issue when arguing with David S. Potter's claim that originally this term had no pejorative connotations[23]. There is no doubt that in the texts of both novels, which come from a later period, the word ὁ πειρατής carries a great potential of negative associations.

---

22 Robert K. Zawadzki, Wstęp do *Opowieść o Leukippe* i *Klejtofoncie*, Achilleus Tatios [Achilles Tatius] (Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie, 2002), 28–29.

23 de Souza, *Piraci*, 23.

In Chariton's work, the pejorative connotation is only hinted at when Callirhoe complains that she has been taken captive by "pirates more dreadful than the sea waves" (τῶν κυμάτων τοὺς πειρατὰς φοβερωτέρους: 1.14.8.4). In Tatius' novel, the characters who wish to convey that they see someone's behaviour as particularly negative, use the adjective πειρατικός (piratical) or the noun τὸ πειρατήριον, which stands for pirates' base or lair. Leucippe recollects her abduction, speaking of the pirate's violence (ὕβρις πειρατική: 6.16.5.3), which has stripped her of her true identity. Later, when she is imprisoned and harassed by the Ephesian merchant Thersander, she describes his attitude and intentions by saying that she has again found herself in a pirates' lair (οὖσα ἐν πειρατηρίῳ: 6.13.1.3; similarly: 6.13.3.2). She then warns Thersander and his cruel servant that if they were to commit the crimes they were planning to, their hiding place would be "the real pirate's lair" (ἀληθινὸν τοῦτο πειρατήριον: 6.22.2.1). The attributes that are the most saliently related to the concept of piracy are haughtiness, taking people captive, and violence, including sexual violence. This is also seen in the reproachful remarks the imprisoned male protagonist addresses to his lover/guardian Melite. The woman has been falsely accused of killing Leucippe. Clitophon laments that the one who twice escaped death at the hands of brigands has now been killed by Melite's pirate gang (τὸ δὲ τῆς Μελίτης πεφόνευκέ σε πειρατήριον: 7.5.3.5). The respected Ephesian widow Melite, who was in love with the protagonist, obviously had nothing to do with pirates. The metaphor of Melite's house as the pirates' lair is intended to highlight the magnitude of the alleged murderess' iniquity. The passages quoted above clearly show that the negative connotation had settled for good in the Greek language. Piracy became the synonym of the most cruel violence.

Xenophon of Ephesus:

Researchers assume that *An Ephesian Tale of Anthia and Habrocomes* was written no earlier than the end of the 1st century AD, i.e. several decades after Chariton's novel, but earlier than Tatius' novel[24]. Despite this chronological proximity, Xenophon of Ephesus shows a clear autonomy in his usage of the words ὁ λῃστής and ὁ πειρατής.

Xenophon's novel features three gangs of brigands, which play different roles in the plot. The first to appear in the story are pirates from Tyre, who attack the ship carrying Anthia and Habrocomes and take the protagonists captive, sending them off on a conventional wandering adventure. A second gang plays an even greater role in the plot, featuring differently in each protagonist's story. The female protagonist is captured by the robbers twice and has to deal with all sorts of threats to her life and virginity, while her husband Habrocomes, unaware of Anthia's fate, joins the gang for a short time and befriends their leader. A third group of brigands play an incidental part in the story.

---

24   Ludwika Rychlewska, Wstęp do *Opowieści efeskie czyli o miłości Habrokomesa* i *Antii*, Ksenofont z Efezu [Xenophon of Ephesus] (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo, 1970), XXXV–XXXVII; Holzberg, *Powieść*, 79; Whitmarsh, *Narrative*, 263–264.

In some ways, they resemble Theron's gang from Chariton's novel. They rob a tomb in Tarsus, find the heroine buried alive in the tomb, and carry her off, along with the loot, on a ship to Alexandria.

Xenophon uses the term ὁ πειρατής only to refer to the first band – the Tyrian pirates, commanded by Corymbus, who attacked the ship carrying the protagonists and abducted them. Similarly to Chariton's and Tatius' novels, Xenophon's work contains a passage in which the noun ὁ πειρατής is used side by side with the noun ὁ λῃστής in the same situational context. When the heroes are held captive by Corymbus' band, Habrocomes laments that they have been exposed to the insolence of pirates (πειρατῶν ὕβρει: 2.1.2.4) and, worse still, his beauty has aroused passion in one of the bandits (λῃστῇ ἐρῶντι: 2.1.3.3) – despite the fact that he uses two different terms, he undoubtedly refers to the members of the same gang. This time, however, the mere co-occurrence of the terms "pirate" and "bandit" in the same context is not sufficient evidence for their synonymy. Xenophon differs from his predecessors in that he uses the noun ὁ πειρατής much more often in his novel (in reference to the Tyrian gang). The noun ὁ πειρατής appears 10 times in the novel (1.13.1.1, 1.13.3.1, 1.13.4.1, 1.13.6.2, 1.14.6.3, 1.14.6.6, 2.1.2.4, 2.2.2.3, 3.3.1.3, 5.14.1.5), while the noun ὁ λῃστής is used only three times (1.15.3.3, 1.16.5.2, 2.1.3.3). Xenophon also uses, once, a word denoting a bandit-companion, derived from the noun ὁ λῃστής (ὁ συλλῃστός: 1.15.3.3). A reverse proportion is observed in Chariton's novel, which contains seven occurrences of forms of the noun "pirate" (all used in relation to Theron's gang) and 25 occurrences of forms of the noun "bandit". A similar quantitative relationship between forms associated with the words ὁ πειρατής (7 occurrences) and ὁ λῃστής (22 occurrences) (used to refer to the Pharian abductors) is found in Tatius' novel.

The quantitative data support the claim that Xenophon's linguistic practice is different from Chariton's and Tatius', but in order to understand what exactly this difference consists of, one has to analyse the passage in which Anthia recapitulates her adventures. It shows that the author of the *Ephesiaca* perceived the pirates of Tyre as a gang having specific features, distinct from other robbers, and that he used the words ὁ πειρατής and ὁ λῃστής to make this distinction clear. Anthia relates her story to Habrocomes:

"I have found you again although I have wandered over many a land and sea (ἀπείληφά σε πολλὴν γῆν πλανηθεῖσα καὶ θάλασσαν), escaped harsh punishment from bandits (λῃστῶν ἀπειλὰς ἐκφυγοῦσα) and plots from pirates (καὶ πειρατῶν ἐπιβουλὰς), insults from pimps (καὶ πορνοβοσκῶν ὕβρεις), chains (δεσμὰ), deep pits (καὶ τάφρους), slave-runners' tables (καὶ ξύλα), poisons and graves (καὶ φάρμακα καὶ τάφους)" (5.14.1.5).

A recapitulation of the plot at the end of the story was an invariable element of the structure of all ancient Greek novels. It had a more or less conventionalised form. Also

conventional were the adventures of the protagonists: all of the novels start off with robbers who take the heroes captive and, thus, precipitate a series of life-threatening events which put the characters' fidelity to the test. In this light, the words denoting chains, fetters, and enslavement, and other such general terms could be regarded as topoi, not closely connected with the actual plot of the specific story. In Xenophon's novel, however, Anthia's recapitulation of her adventures, while fully conventional, is closely associated with what she actually went through. This is evidenced by the use of the noun ἡ τάφρος – "pit in the ground". Xenophon's is the only one of the surviving ancient Greek novels in which the protagonist was trapped in a deep pit with hungry dogs. The novelist scrupulously recalls this motif in the recapitulation. Therefore, if we assume that the individual perils Anthia enumerates allude to her actual adventures, we can conclude that the expressions "threats from bandits" (λῃστῶν ἀπειλὰς) and "plots from pirates" (πειρατῶν ἐπιβουλὰς) refer to two different groups of villains. Λῃσταί are members of the land-based (πολλὴν γῆν) gang commanded by Hippothous, while πειραταί are the pirates assembled by Corymbus, who attacked the protagonists in the open sea (θάλασσαν). The analysis of Xenophon's usage of the two terms leads to the conclusion that in his vocabulary, the words "bandit" and "pirate" have different meaning ranges, and the writer intentionally calls the two gangs by different names.

Given this, it is worth taking a closer look at Xenophon's pirate gang, bearing in mind our earlier observations on the pirates of the island of Pharos portrayed in Tatius' novel. Let us recall that the Pharian band had two distinctive characteristics: they possessed a seagoing ship and were ready to fight in the open sea. The pirates of *An Ephesian Tale* also fully meet these two criteria. Xenophon relates that a huge trireme (ἐν τριήρει μεγάλῃ) with Phoenician pirates dropped anchor in the port of Rhodes, accidentally, next to the ship which carried the protagonists (1.13.1.1). Already at that time, the pirates drew up an attack plan, but it was only after both ships had sailed to sea that they put their scheme into action. Around noon, as weariness overwhelmed the sailors and passengers, the pirate vessel approached at high speed and the pirates, fully armed, boarded the protagonists' craft. After a short fight in which they murdered the few defenders, the pirates transported the spoils to their own ship, captured those passengers whom they deemed good enough to be sold as slaves, and set fire to the plundered ship, which sank along with the remaining travellers (1.13.4–1.14. 6).

Xenophon's pirates not only have their own ship, but operate mainly at sea and have the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully attack other ships (selection of the time of the attack). In addition to these two essential points, Xenophon provides readers with further information about the pirate gang. He, thus, describes the characteristic appearance of the gang's leader Corymbus (τῶν δὲ πειρατῶν ὁ ἔξαρχος: 1.13.3.1): he was a young man of tall stature with a scary gaze and messy hair. The narrator also says that the pirates had their lair (τὰ οἰκεῖα: 1.14.6.6) in Tyre. The pirate gang was not fully

independent – its leader, Corymbus, was in the service of the local landowner, Apsyrtus, and received payment and part of the loot for his services (1.14.6.6). As Apsyrtus appears in the novel, Xenophon returns to using forms of the word ὁ λῃστής: he says that Apsyrtus was the leader of a bandit gang (ἀνδρὸς ἄρχοντος λῃστηρίου: 1.14.6.6; ὁ προεστὼς τοῦ λῃστηρίου: 2.2.1.2). The writer's linguistic choices, thus, emphasise the distinct nature of the characters involved in the action. Apsyrtus is consistently referred to as the leader of bandits, but he is never directly called a "bandit" or a "pirate" himself. He controls the pirates, decides how to divide the plunder, and keeps the most valuable slaves to himself, while the pirate Corymbus, though reluctantly, has to accept his decisions. Xenophon's language is precise and unambiguous: though Apsyrtus reaps profits from piracy, he is certainly not a pirate. As the action unfolds, it turns out that his cooperation with the pirates does not prevent him from living a life of a respected resident of Tyre, who ultimately takes care of the protagonist (2.10.1–4).

Xenophon uses a completely different linguistic practice with regard to the other two bands of robbers: the tomb-robbers of Tarsus and Hippothous' gang. Particularly interesting is the latter group, if only because it is the single typically "land-based" gang among all the bands we come across in the ancient Greek novels. In fact, we should be speaking of two gangs led by Hippothous. The first one operated in forests on the border between Syria and Cilicia. After it had been destroyed by a squad of soldiers, Hippothous easily created another gang with which, "overcoming all opposition, burning villages and killing many people"[25] (4.1.1), he travelled through Syria, Phoenicia and Egypt. The gang established its base near the Ethiopian border, close to the trade route towards India. Since the writer linked Hippothous' fate with the fates of the two separated protagonists, numerous references to his gang are made throughout the novel. Without exception, they are always called ὁ λῃστής (2.11.11.3 2.13.1.1, 2.13.4.2, 2.13.5.4, 2.13.6.4, 3.9.5.3, 3.9.5.4, 4.1.1.5, 4.5.1.2, 4.5.3.2, 4.6.4.6, 4.6.6.6; 5.3.1.6, 5.3.2.5, 5.4.1.2, 5.4.2.2, 5.4.3.3, 5.4.4.4, 5.5.3.4, 5.9.6.3). No form of the noun ὁ πειρατής is ever used to refer to this group of brigands. The same applies to the tomb-robbers of Tarsus. Although they carried the heroine off to their ship and sailed with her to Alexandria, Xenophon speaks of them only as bandits – οἱ λῃσταί (3.8.3.1, 3.8.6.2, 3.8.7.6; 3.9.2.3, 3.9.8.5, 3.10.2.1, 3.10 4.8, 3.11.1.1).

The discussion above shows that Xenophon's linguistic practice is quite novel and unique when compared to Chariton's and Tatius'. Although, indeed, Xenophon, like Tatius, uses the noun ὁ πειρατής to denote a gang of robbers who have a ship and conduct their activities in the open sea, he employs it much more frequently when talking about Corymbus' pirate gang than Chariton or Tatius did in analogous cases. Accordingly, the proportion between the occurrences of the nouns ὁ πειρατής and ὁ λῃστής is

---

25 Ksenofont z Efezu [Xenophon of Ephesus], *Opowieści efeskie czyli o miłości Habrokomesa* i *Antii*. Trans. Ludwika Rychlewska (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo, 1970), 50.

different in Xenophon's work. What is even more important is that, in his novel, he sets all piratical activities exclusively in a maritime context, from spotting the target of the attack, through attacking the vessel, to its sinking. In no passage does Xenophon suggest that Corymbus' pirates also operate on land, even if only temporarily. It, therefore, seems plausible to say that Xenophon understood the concept of "pirate" in a narrow sense, as a robber who conducts his ‹raiding' activities only at sea, looting and destroying ships. Also very interesting are the themes of the pirates' permanent base and the relationship between the gang and Apsyrtus, the mastermind behind their illicit practices, who is also a respected citizen of the city.

HELIODORUS

The exact date of when Heliodorus lived and wrote is still vividly discussed in the literature of the subject. Indirect evidence suggests that he wrote the *Aethiopica* at some point in the broad chronological horizon between the mid-3rd and mid-4th centuries AD[26]. In any case, the time span between Heliodorus and his immediate predecessor, Achilles Tatius, is between 50 to 150 years. It may be due to this temporal distance that Heliodorus' lexical choices regarding the groups of robbers he describes are clearly distinct from those of the earlier novelists.

Although the *Aethiopica* is the longest of the ancient Greek novels and has a complicated plot, an extensive range of characters and a complex, multi-layered narrative, it only features two gangs of brigands: Egyptian herdsmen inhabiting the backwaters of the Nile Delta and pirates who raid the ship with the protagonists, Theagenes and Chariclea, on board. Both gangs play an extremely important role in the plot, which may explain the high frequency of the investigated linguistic forms in the text. What particularly draws attention in Heliodorus' novel is the large variety of cognate words. In addition to the noun ὁ λῃστής, the writer uses the adjective λῃστρικός (bandit-like) and the nouns τὸ λῃστρικόν (banditry), ἡ λῃστεία and ἡ λῃστρική (act of banditry) and ὁ λῄσταρχος (gang leader). The group of words related to the noun ὁ πειρατής is much smaller: it includes the noun τὸ πειρατήριον (a pirate gang) and the adjective πειρατικός (piratical). Importantly, the word ὁ πειρατής itself never appears in Heliodorus' novel. Instead, he uses the word ὁ καταποντιστής, and is the only one among the Greek novelists to do so.

---

26 See Sylwester Dworacki, Wstęp do *Opowieść etiopska o Theagenesie* i *Chariklei*, Heliodor [Heliodorus] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2000), XVIII–XX; Whitmarsh, *Narrative*, 262. One of the scholars who proposes dating Heliodorus' novel to the middle of the 3rd century AD is Holzberg, *Powieść*, 144–145.

The appearance of the form ὁ καταποντιστής requires a few words of comment. As already mentioned at the beginning of the present paper, this noun was used by Greek authors to denote a pirate *sensu stricto*[27]. It appeared in Greek texts slightly earlier than the form ὁ πειρατής: it was used in the 4th century BC by authors such as Isocrates and Demosthenes. However, as indicated by the low frequency of its use, for some unknown reason, it did not enjoy popularity among Greek authors. There is also no surviving evidence of cognate adjectives or nouns. In their place, writers most often employed forms of the noun ὁ λῃστής, which meant that the noun ὁ καταποντιστής was used, in the same text by the same author, side by side with words such as λῃστικός (bandit-like) or ἡ λῃστεία (act of banditry) to refer to the same characters. This does not mean, however, that the noun ὁ καταποντιστής was equivalent to the noun ὁ λῃστής in all contexts. Ancient authors often used these two words to differentiate between the people they described. Isocrates, in the *Panathenaicus*, discriminates among different types of villains: "pirates and bandits and those given to other vile practices" (τοὺς καταποντιστὰς καὶ λῃστὰς καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀδικίας ὄντας: 226). Demosthenes, in his oration *Against Aristocrates*, writes about the island of Alopeconnesus that "it was full of bandits and pirates" (λῃστῶν δ᾽ ἦν μεστὴ καὶ καταποντιστῶν: 166; similarly: 167). A 2nd century AD author, Cassius Dio, clearly states how he understands the difference between καταποντισταί and λῃσταί: "Pirates (οἱ καταποντισταὶ) harassed those who sailed ships, in the same way as bandits [those who engaged in banditry] (οἱ τὰς λῃστείας ποιούμενοι) did those who lived on land" (36.20.1). As de Souza notes, Dio does not use any forms related to the noun ὁ πειρατής[28].

Heliodorus' linguistic idiom turns out to be very similar to Cassius Dios'. The novelist uses the noun ὁ καταποντιστής twice, each time juxtaposing it, in one phrase, with a form of the noun ὁ λῃστής. At the beginning of Book I, Chariclea recites the misfortunes she and Theagenes suffered together:

"… loss of loved ones and capture by pirates (καταποντιστῶν ἅλωσις), thousands of perils of the sea (θαλασσῶν μυρίος κίνδυνος) and being imprisoned by bandits again, this time on land" (λῃστῶν ἐπὶ γῆς: 1.8.2.6).

Elsewhere, the narrator relates the adventures of one of the background characters: "And among many other dangers and many miseries at that time, he was taken captive by pirates (περιπεσὼν ἁλοὺς δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ καταποντιστῶν), and then, when he fled and again came to Egypt, he was, in turn, captured by herdsmen–bandits (ὑπὸ τῶν βουκόλων ληφθείη λῃστῶν: 6.2.4.7)".

There is no doubt that, in both passages, Heliodorus makes a distinction between pirates and bandits. The first passage is particularly worthy of attention as it

---

27   de Souza, *Piracy*, 27.

28   For more on this topic, see ibid.

emphasises the difference in the spacial context in which the two words appear: the capture by pirates was associated with dangers of the sea (θαλασσῶν), while the λησται kidnapped the protagonists on land (ἐπὶ γῆς).

Also noteworthy are the next two excerpts, which recapitulate the story and are the male protagonist's lamentation. What is important for the present discussion is that, although the situational context of these passages has not changed, the writer replaces forms of the noun ὁ καταποντιστής with forms of the noun τὸ πειρατήριον (pirate gang). At the beginning of Book II, Theagenes is convinced that his beloved Chariclea has been murdered and blames the vengeful goddess Erinys for having made them flee, for having exposed them to the "dangers of the sea" (κινδύνοις θαλασδῶνις) and the "dangers of the pirate gang" (κινδύνοις θαλασδῶνις), for having given them to "bandits" (λησταῖς), and finally for depriving them of everything they had (2.4.1.5). Later in the text, he once again returns to this part of the story, lamenting his destiny:

"Don't you see how it added a pirate gang (πειρατήρια) to the escape and to the dangers of the sea (τοῖς ἐκ θαλάττης ἀτόποις), how it made sure we suffer those [dangers] of land (τό ἐκ γῆς), even graver, the war that came right after the bandits" (λησταῖς: 5.6.3.2).

What is particularly notable about the four passages above is the recurrence of several motifs. For the sake of clarity, let us collate the key excerpts:

1.8.2.6
– capture by pirates
  (**καταποντιστῶν** ἄλωσις)
– countless dangers of the sea
  (**θαλασσῶν** μυρίος κίνδυνος)
– taken […] by bandits on land
  (**ληστῶν ἐπὶ γῆς**)

5.6.3.2
– added a pirate gang
  (**πειρατήρια**)
– to the dangers of the sea
  (τοῖς ἐκ **θαλάττης** ἀτόποις)
– those of land (**τὰ ἐκ γῆς**): the war that
  came right after the bandits (**λησταῖς**)

6.2.4.7

– he was taken captive by pirates
  (περιπεσὼν ἁλοὺς δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ
  καταποντιστῶν)
– he was, in turn, captured by
  herdsmen–bandits
  (ὑπὸ τῶν βουκόλων ληφθείη **ληστῶν**)

2.4.1.5
– the dangers of the sea
  (κινδύνοις **θαλασσῶν**)
– the dangers of the pirate gang
  (κινδύνοις **πειρατηρίων**)

– given them to bandits
  (**λησταῖς**)

Heliodorus repeatedly refers to the same motifs, consistently using the related terminology. The noun λησταί (bandits) appears in all the quotes, and in two cases the relationship between λησταί and land is highlighted (ἐπὶ γῆς: 1.8.2.6; τὰ ἐκ γῆς: 5.6.3.2). The motif of λησταί, in turn, is preceded by the motif of dangers of the sea (θαλασσῶν: 1.8.2.6, 2.4.1.5; θαλάττης: 5.6.3.2). Up to this point, we can speak of the writer's consistent use of both the motifs (bandits, land, sea) and their linguistic representations (ὁ ληστής, ἡ γῆ, ἡ θάλαττα / θάλασσα). However, Heliodorus uses two different names to refer to bandits who operate in the space of the sea: πειρατήρια (5.6.3.2, 2.4.1.5) and καταποντισταί (1.8.2.6). On one occasion, the noun καταποντισταί is used without an explicitly expressed relation with the sea (6.2.4.7). The comparison above distinctly shows that Heliodorus uses the words καταποντισταί and πειρατήρια in the same context to refer to the same type of characters operating in the space of the sea. Undoubtedly, the writer treats the two words as synonyms – the meaning range of the nouns καταποντισταί and πειρατήρια is the same.

So, who are the pirates (αἱ καταποντισταί) of the pirate gang (τὸ πειρατήριον) in the *Aethiopica*? They have their base in the vicinity of a port on the island of Zakynthos. The gang is led by Trachinus, who, unlike Corymbus in Xenophon's novel, is an independent pirate. Trachinus has his own seagoing ship and sets up a piratical ambush (πειρατικὸν ἐργαστήριον: 5.20.3.2) behind one of the island's headlands to attack the Phoenician ship carrying the protagonists. When the heroes manage to avoid the ambush, the pirates chase them, embarking on a piratical expedition (πειρατικὸς ὁ στόλος: 5.24.1.3). They follow the fugitives to Crete and further towards the African coast. Heliodorus describes the pirates' strategy. They attacked when the moment was ripe – as the sun set, the wind subsided and the large Phoenician vessel lost the speed advantage it had gained, having larger sails. The lighter pirate ship (πειρατικὸν ἀκάτιον: 5.22.8.9), owing to efficient rowing, easily caught up with the protagonists' ship. The pirates first circled around the Phoenician ship, not allowing it to escape, and then got on board, forced the crew and passengers to leave the ship with just the "one chiton on their backs" and sent them off in a lifeboat. The pirates remained on the captured vessel and tried to tow their own ship on a rope. However, a violent storm had them choose between the two craft, and ultimately they decided to keep the captured ship. The novelist vividly describes the difficulties the pirates had handling the large ship in the rough conditions of the night storm (5.27)[29].

The complexity of the terminological situation is exacerbated by the fact that the writer also uses the noun ὁ ληστής several times in reference to Trachinus' pirate gang (5.20.7.5, 5.24.4.2, 5.25.1.1, 5.27.2.3, 5.27.5.2, 5.27.8.5, 5.30.1.3). He describes the

---

29 Heliodorus calls the large Phoenician merchant ship ἡ ὁλκάς (5.20.3, 5.23.3, 5.25.2, 5.27.2, 5.27.5), the pirate ship – ἡ ἄκατος (5.23.3, 5.24.1, 5.27.2, 5.27.5, 5.27.7), and the lifeboat in which the crew and passengers departed after the attack – τὸ σκάφος (5.24.2, 5.25.3).

leader of the pirates as ὁ λήσταρχος (5.20.5.2, 5.30.2.3), and also introduces the concept of "bandits' law" (τὸν ληστρικὸν νόμον: 5.31.3.7). The piratical ambush (πειρατικὸν ἐργαστήριον: 5.20.3.2) is referred to elsewhere as ἡ ληστρική (5.22.6.4).

In this respect, Heliodorus' linguistic practice is more or less similar to that of the other novelists.

In his descriptions of Trachinus' pirate gang, one can observe certain tendencies regarding the choice of the words of interest. The writer uses the noun ὁ καταποντιστής (pirate) only in the protagonists' retrospective accounts and lamentations. When directly relating the action, he uses forms with the general meaning "bandit" (ὁ λῃστής) and specifies what kind of banditry he has in mind combining them with the adjective πειρατικός (piratical). The way the writer employs the term τὸ πειρατήρια (pirate gang) clearly indicates that he understands it as a synonym *sensu stricto* of the word ὁ καταποντιστής. Thus, although Heliodorus does not use the noun ὁ πειρατής, we can surmise that it would also be synonymous with the noun ὁ καταποντιστής. It seems, therefore, that in Heliodorus' vocabulary, the words ὁ καταποντιστής and ὁ πειρατής have a fully shaped meaning and are interchangeable. The meaning range of these words partly overlaps with that of the general name ὁ λῃστής (bandit), but it also contains specific elements that set the concept of "pirate" apart from that of "bandit". To put it differently, not every bandit (ὁ λῃστής) from Heliodorus' novel can be called a pirate (ὁ πειρατής).

A second gang appearing in the *Aethiopica* belongs to the category of bandits who are referred to solely with forms of the noun ὁ λῃστής and its cognates, such as the adjective ληστρικός (bandit-like) and the nouns ἡ λῃστεία and ἡ ληστρική (an act of banditry) and ὁ λήσταρχος (gang leader). The gang are the Egyptian herdsmen-bandits who abducted the protagonists shortly after Chariclea and Theagenes had happily concluded their adventure with the pirates. It was them who the heroes recollected in the recapitulations analysed above. What is important from the point of view of the present discussion is that they live and conduct their activity in the space of a marshy lake shore seasonally flooded by the Nile. Boats are an indispensable piece of equipment for people living in such an environment[30]. Heliodorus describes with interest the specific solutions the inhabitants of this area used to deal with the adverse natural conditions. We read, among other things, about the way they raised their children (1.6.1.3), about unique buildings, the erection of which required a "bandit's skill" (τέχνης ληστρικῆς: 1.28.2.6), and about the special rules of the community that governed itself in its own bandit-like way (ληστρικὸν πολιτεύεται: 1.5.3.1). Parenthetically, this community is not a uniform one – it is made up of numerous, smaller groups that wage bandit wars

---

30   Heliodorus refers to the herdsmen's boats with the same term he used earlier to describe the lifeboat on which the sailors and merchants, robbed by Trachinus' pirates, sailed off from the Phoenician ship: τὸ σκάφος (1.5.3.3).

(ληστρικὸς πόλεμος: 1.29.6.7) against one another. Some of these groups inhabit bandit villages outside the marshes (τὰς κώμας τὰς ληστρικάς: 1.33.2.9) – Heliodorus mentions that they practise banditry (ἡ ληστεία: 6.13.2.5) as their main occupation. All this adds up to the overall picture of a bandit's way of life (ληστρικὸς ὁ βίος: 1.3.1.8, 7.5.5.9). Heliodorus also introduces the concept of a "bandit's nature" (ληστρικὸν ἦθος: 1.4.3.4). One can assume that it is comprised of such temperamental traits as fierceness and a short temper typical of barbarians (θυμοῦ ληστρικοῦ καὶ βαρβαρικῆς ὀργῆς: 2.12.5.6), fickleness (φύσει τε ἀβέβαιον καὶ ληστρικὸν: 2.17.5.4) and greed (πλῆθος ληστρικόν: 1.3.4.1). The novelist does not forget to describe the typical appearance of a bandit, whose most distinctive feature is long hair (τὸ ληστρικώτερον εἶδος: 2.20.5.3, 2.20.5.8). Heliodorus uses forms of the adjective λρστρικός (bandit-like) in twenty passages describing the herdsmen (see also: 1.1.1.2, 1.1.1.7, 1.3.3.2, 1.33.2.4, 2.10.3.6, 5.2.7.1, 5.2.8.6). For the sake of completeness of the picture, it should be added that the leader of the thugs, Thyamis, is referred to as ὁ λησταρχός (1.4.1.1, 1.4.2.1, 1.7.1.2, 1.7.1.6, 1.7.2.7, 1.18.2.2, 1.19.2.5, 5.4.3.6, 6.13.5.10).

Let us note that in portraying the herdsmen-bandits in such a precise manner, Heliodorus never uses any form of the word ὁ πειρατής. The consistency with which the robber terminology is deployed in the novel makes it plain that the identity of the herdsmen is distinct from that of the Zakynthian pirate gang. The differences between the two groups seem clear. The main difference is in the nature of the space in which they operate: the pirates conduct their activities in the open sea, while the herdsmen lead their bandit life in the temporarily flooded parts of the Nile Delta. Although water is the herdsmen's natural habitat, the entire area in which they live falls into the spatial category of land. Other differences follow from this basic spacial division: starting with the type of vessels the robbers use, to their fighting skills at sea or on land.

CONCLUSIONS

The detailed analysis above leads to some concrete findings regarding the development of the meaning of the word ὁ πειρατής and its relationship with the word ὁ ληστής in the ancient Greek novel. At the most general level, it was found that the only word that the Greek novelists used to refer to all groups of robbers was the noun ὁ ληστής. In Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the oldest of the surviving novels, this noun is used interchangeably with the noun ὁ πειρατής, and the book provides no evidence that would allow to differentiate the denotations of these two words. Observations regarding Theron's gang indicate that it conducted its activity in the interlaced spaces of the sea and land and that the function of their ship was unique: it was not used in sea raids, but only served as a means of transport. In later novels, there is a visible tendency for

the meaning range of the noun ὁ πειρατής to be saturated with specific elements which render its denotation partially distinct from that of the word ὁ λῃστής. This phenomenon is fully conspicuous in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Pirates, unlike other robbers, have a seagoing ship, and they attack other ships in the open sea as their regular occupation. The term ὁ πειρατής and its cognates are never used to denote robbers who do not meet these two criteria. This interpretation is convincingly confirmed by Heliodorus' use of the word ὁ καταποντιστής as a synonym of the noun τὸ πειρατήριον. In both novels, therefore, the noun ὁ πειρατής is a hyponym of the noun ὁ λῃστής. This means that every pirate is a bandit, but not every bandit is a pirate. By the same token, the usage of the two words is consistent with the definitions found in the Suda, as cited in the introduction to this paper.

This last observation is actually an argument against Philip de Souza's view that the two words are universally synonymous. It indicates that one should not assume *a priori* that the meanings of ὁ πειρατής and ὁ λῃστής are equivalent in all ancient texts. It seems that, especially with regard to later texts from the Roman era (in the case of the novels, texts from the end of the 1st and beginning of the 2nd century AD), one should investigate the possibility that these two words are related by hyperonymy/hyponymy. In some instances, this may be a vital clue for the identification of people and interpretation of various phenomena related to ancient piracy described in written sources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramowiczówna, Zofia. *Słownik grecko-polski*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962.

Casson, Lionel. *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Princeton–New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971.

de Souza, Philip. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

de Souza, Philip. *Piraci w świecie grecko-rzymskim*. Trans. Jacek Lang. Zakrzewo: Wydawnictwo Replika, 2008.

Dworacki, Sylwester. Wstęp do *Opowieść etiopska o Theagenesie* i *Chariklei. Heliodor.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2000.

Goold, George P. (ed. and trans.). *Chariton, Callirhoe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Holzberg, Niklas. *Powieść antyczna*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Homini, 2003.

Ksenofont z Efezu [Xenophon of Ephesus]. *Opowieści efeskie czyli o miłości Habrokomesa i Antii*. Trans. Ludwika Rychlewska. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo, 1970.

LSJ *The Online Liddle-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon*, accessed: 11.09.2020. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.

Mc Kechnie, Paul. *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century B.C.* London: Routledge, 1989.

Papanikolaou, Antonios D. (ed.) *Xenophon Ephesius, Ephesiacorum libri V: de amoribus Anthiae et Abrocome.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1973.

Rattenbury, Robert M., Lumb, Thomas W. (eds.) Héliodore, *Les Éthiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée).* Trans. Jean Maillon. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1960.

Reardon, Bryan P. Introduction to *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Chariton. In: *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. Bryan P. Reardon, 17–21. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 2008.

Rychlewska, Ludwika. Wstęp do *Opowieści efeskie czyli o miłości Habrokomesa i Antii*, Ksenofont z Efezu, III–LXXIX. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo, 1970.

Suda On Line: Byzantine Lexicography, accessed: 11.09.2020. https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/.

Tatios, Achilleus [Tatius, Achilles]. *Opowieść o Leukippe i* Klejtofoncie. Trans. Robert K. Zawadzki. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie, 2002.

Tatius, Achilles. *Leucippe and Clitophon.* Trans. John J. Winkler. In: *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. Bryan P. Reardon, 175–284. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2008.

Tilg, Stefan. *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Vilborg, Ebbe (ed.). *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1955.

Vilborg, Ebbe. *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon. A* Commentary. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1962.

Whitmarsh, Tim. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel. Returning Romance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Zawadzki, Robert K. Wstęp do *Opowieść o Leukippe i Klejtofoncie*, Achilleus Tatios, 7–49. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Częstochowie, 2002.

English version: Radosław Dolecki, Mark Atkinson

SUMMARY

The present article deals with the problem of the meaning range of the words ὁ πειρατής and ὁ λῃστής in ancient Greek novels. The aim was to verify Philip de Souza's claim that ancient authors used these terms interchangeably as synonyms. The analyses confirmed de Souza's assumption only with regard to Chariton's *Callirhoe*, the oldest of the surviving novels dating back to the first half of the 1st century AD. In later novels, especially in the works of Xenophon of Ephesus and Heliodorus, the noun ὁ πειρατής is used as a hyponym of the noun ὁ λῃστής. This means that in the investigated texts, the referents (designata) of the word ὁ πειρατής have features specific only to the meaning range of this term which partially differentiate its denotation from that of the general term ὁ λῃστής. This is an important clue for interpreting written sources related to ancient piracy.

The study was conducted from a semantic perspective using the methods of comparative philological analysis.

ROZBÓJNICY I/CZY PIRACI: ZNACZENIE NAZW Ο ΛΗΣΤΗΣ I Ο ΠΕΙΡΑΤΗΣ W ANTYCZNYCH POWIEŚCIACH GRECKICH

Słowa kluczowe: piractwo w antyku, antyczna powieść grecka, semantyka historyczna

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule podjęty został problem stosunku zakresu treści nazw ὁ πειρατής i ὁ λῃστής w antycznych powieściach greckich. Celem było zweryfikowanie tezy zaprezentowanej przez Philipa de Souzę, zgodnie z którą autorzy antyczni stosowali te nazwy jako synonimy i w efekcie można je rozumieć na zasadach zamienności. Przeprowadzone analizy potwierdziły powyższe założenie jedynie w wypadku najstarszej powieści Charitona, pochodzącej z pierwszej połowy I wieku po Chr. w powieściach późniejszych, szczególnie u Ksenofonta z Efezu i Heliodora, stwierdzono występowanie stosunku podrzędności nazwy ὁ πειρατής wobec nazwy ὁ λῃστής. Oznacza to, że we wskazanych tekstach desygnaty nazwy ὁ πειρατής posiadały cechy specyficzne tylko dla zakresu treści tej nazwy, wyodrębniając częściowo jej denotację w stosunku do ogólnej nazwy ὁ λῃστής. Stanowi to istotną wskazówkę podczas interpretacji źródeł związanych ze zjawiskiem piractwa antycznego.

W rozważaniach przyjęto perspektywę semantyczną oraz zastosowano metody porównawczej analizy filologicznej, uwzględniającej kontekst sytuacyjny.