

Reading Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* in Counterpoint

JEAN ALVARES
Montclair State University

Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* appear as distinctly different works. The former stresses childhood innocence and the life of the lowly, has few journeys or real adventures, posits a close communion between human and the divine, and provides a lasting happy ending. The latter has sophisticated, if not slightly degenerate, urban protagonists who undertake a long journey and endure rather grotesque adventures. What divine apparatus exists has an ironic cast. Further, the reader even wonders if Clitophon has really enjoyed a substantial happy ending. Nevertheless these jarring differences mask very significant points of comparison. I shall first consider how these romances deal with many similar issues and contain many similar themes and imaginings, especially regarding the value of *paideia*, the possibility of a beneficial education in love and its transformational power, and the creation of new conceptions of the amatory bond and of proper erotic behavior. Afterwards I shall produce readings of these two romances based upon their employment of such elements. As we shall see, reading the two romances in tandem produces a mutual illumination useful for scholars and teachers of the ancient novel.

Achilles Tatius and Longus were near-contemporaries of such innovative writers as Apuleius, Lucian, and Iamblichus, writing within an environment conducive to literary experimentation.¹ Along what lines then might second sophistic romance-writers innovate? First, the romance's customary travels and episodes provide considerable opportunity for sophistic digressions and rhetorical display, a potential all authors use – if not abuse. Parody offered

¹ Reardon 1994b, 81.

another avenue, but one need not consider *Leucippe and Clitophon*² parody any more than *Daphnis and Chloe*.³ The romances of Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus contain a humorous dimension, probably derived from New Comedy and folktale. Longus and Achilles Tatius develop this comic potential but along different lines; Achilles Tatius locates his humor in a more ironic/satiric vein; Longus' comedic elements are gentler, arising from the contrast between the protagonist's absolute innocence and ignorance, the crudeness of their rustic company, and the reader's superior knowledge and inferior virtue.⁴ Some writers (Iamblichus, Apuleius, Achilles Tatius) increased the self-consciously ironic and satiric elements; comedy often contains a 'realistic' aspect and, as in Frye's taxonomy, naturally shades off into the (sometimes bitterly) satiric.⁵ Correspondingly, the romantic heroes develop more anti-heroic elements, and their adventures become more lurid or absurd. Alternatively, Longus (and to some extent Heliodorus) build upon the ideal and archetypal themes and elements inherent in heroic romance; thus their iconically noble heroes have marvelous births, are exiled and lose their birthright, experience a childhood in some innocence, and then regain their true status, a restoration which brings about a substantial benefit for their society.⁶

This new quasi-genre allowed considerable variety in plot and characterization.⁷ Already Xenophon of Ephesus, who adapts Chariton,⁸ had made

² On *L & C* as parody, see Chew 2000, 57–70; Durham 1938, 1–19; Anderson 1982, 23–32. I hereafter abbreviate *Leucippe and Clitophon* as *L & C* and *Daphnis and Chloe* as *D & C*.

³ One obvious example appears in Daphnis' escape from the pirates and account of the swimming cows (1,30); see Morgan 2003, 180.

⁴ Goldhill discusses how easily *D & C* allows a 'smutty' reading, a potential which so revolted Rohde. See Goldhill 1995, 13–14; Rhode 1914, 549.

⁵ Frye 1957, 177 ff.; see also Denham 1978, 84.

⁶ Such components of the hero of traditional romance, especially as manifested through the six phases of Frye's *muthos* of romance, are discussed in Frye 1957, 186–206, and 1976, 65–93; for discussion in respect to ancient romances, see Alvares 2002, 1–30.

⁷ The early novel *Metiochus and Parthenope* may not have ended in reunion and marriage; Parthenope could have stayed a virgin; the earlier *Ninus Romance* was probably more 'historical' than *Chaïreas and Callirhoe* and its hero seems more active. Novels such as *Babylonica*, the *Calligone Romance*, the *Phoenicica*, the *Iolaus Romance*, and the *Tinouphis Romance* have decidedly non-ideal protagonists and even more lurid events, as does the unique *Wonders Beyond Thule*; see Stephens 1996, 655–683; Stephens and Winkler 1995.

⁸ Papanikolaou 1964; Gärtner 1967, 2055–2084.

his Anthia more aggressive, sexual and cunning.⁹ Habrocomes actually contemplates union with Kyno and takes up with the *über*-bandit Hippothoos. Achilles Tattius made Clitophon and Leucippe substantial and recognizable comic/satiric versions of aristocratic youth, figures who embody practices and attitudes which provoked outrage and anxiety in his era. Further, Achilles Tattius' narrative concerns Phoenicians, Easterners, not main-line Greeks, and thus has more leeway for comic exaggeration of character.¹⁰

In this period attitudes and actions toward social behavior, private life, and the personal were being vigorously contested. An increased stress developed among the Greco-Roman aristocracy on self-presentation, an activity linked to matters of status, authority, and fitness to rule.¹¹ Increased energies were focused on civic life as well as on the family, and an intense, competitive, mutual inspection¹² of an aristocrat and his family was commonplace.¹³ Young men were trained and expected to advance their families, and elite Greco-Roman women could receive enough education for them appreciate the higher strata of art and society. Wives could share more of their husband's public life, have notable official functions, and even demonstrate significant autonomy, although some of this might be more show than substance.¹⁴

A more 'companionate' view of marriage was somewhat in evidence, along with a spiritualization of the bonds of marriage and married life,¹⁵ which could be presented as a space wherein the couple (the male, of course, taking the lead) provide each other considerable emotional support and forge

⁹ Desperately in love, she despises the usual modesties, speaks for Habrocomes to hear, and tries to reveal as much of her body as possible; the pleasures of their wedding night are vividly narrated (1,9); and in her use of cunning becomes a veritable Odysseus; see Hunter 1996, 191.

¹⁰ There were many novel-like works with titles like *Babyloniaca*, *Ephesiaca*, *Milesiaca*, *Aethiopica*, as well as *Phoenicia*. Achilles Tattius' romance might be considered a collection of sensational 'Phoenician Tales'; see Morales 2001, xvii–xix.

¹¹ See especially Veyne, 1987, 36–49; Foucault 1986; Swain 1999, 89.

¹² See Swain 1999; Gleason 1995; Kaster 1988; Bartsch 1994; Barton 1995; also Brown 1988, 11. Such intense inspection was not new to the Greeks; see Winkler 1990, 40.

¹³ On the family as an indicator of fitness to rule, see Swain 1999, 88–91; Cooper 1996, 94–95.

¹⁴ See Marshall 1975, 109–127; MacMullen 1980, 215–216; Lefkowitz 1983, 56–57; Haynes 2003, 27–28.

¹⁵ See, for example, Plutarch's *Eroticus*, *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, and *Consolation to his Wife*; for discussion and bibliography, see Nikolaidis 1997, 27–88; Goessler 1999, 97–115; Patterson 1999, 129–137.

a harmonious unity based on mutual respect and restraint. Women could be more readily depicted as capable of profound thought, bravery, and virtue as men. Further, the firm fidelity and even virginity expected of women was being demanded of men.¹⁶ Correspondingly, both our romances make the hero's attitudes and treatment of the heroine and their own erotic behavior a more complex matter than in earlier romances.

Nevertheless, conservative attitudes still largely prevailed; for example, Plutarch strongly disliked the independence Romans allowed their elite women, preferring that wives, at most, serve as bolsters for their husbands.¹⁷ The romances, while seeming to condone transgressive behavior, themselves largely promulgate a conservative, and sometimes even archaic, view of women's roles.¹⁸ Cooper has called the romances a 'rhetorical echo chamber' for the anxieties and fears of the elite class concerning marriage, which had potentially grave repercussions for the economic, social, and even political welfare of the extended families involved, as well as for their city.¹⁹ In this context one should consider how the behavior of Clitophon, Leucippe, and their friends crosses the line into the scandalous and disreputable.²⁰

First, Leucippe's actions and transgressions make her a more realistically engaging character than Anthia or Callirhoe. Leucippe has quite considerable *paideia*, being a skilled musician (2,1), and is learned enough to appreciate Clitophon's rhetoric-driven erotic pursuit. She is strong willed, proud (as is Callirhoe), and, notoriously *unlike* Callirhoe and Anthia, seems willing to be seduced. Later she even pleads to run away from home. Clitophon in some ways recalls Petronius' Encolpius²¹ and Apuleius' Lucius. Like Lucius he belongs to a leading family of his city; like Lucius and Encolpius he plots seduction and uses all opportune circumstances to achieve his goals and is something of a sophistic voyeur. While Clitophon falls quickly for Leucippe, it is more a matter of lust, not love, and virtuous marriage is not his goal.

¹⁶ Musonius, Hierocles, Plutarch, and Dio of Prusa all strongly advocate such male fidelity and chastity; see Goessler 1999, 111–112.

¹⁷ Swain 1999, 93.

¹⁸ Egger 1994, 260–280; Egger 1990.

¹⁹ Cooper 1996, 20–44.

²⁰ The story of Callisthenes, whose suit for Leucippe is rejected with contempt by her father due to his reputation (2,13), illustrates exactly the consequences of such scandalous behavior.

²¹ On the comparison between Clitophon and Encolpius, see Anderson 1997, 2285.

Clitophon is less naïve in matter of love than his narrative openly admits.²² He has two expert *praeceptores amoris* nearly suited for the *Satyrice*; first his *servus callidus* Satyrus, who engineers the means to his erotic ends; second is Clinias, more experienced than Clitophon in erotic matters, who prefers boy-love, is a slave to erotic pleasure (δοῦλός ἐστιν ἐρωτικῆς ἡδονῆς, 1,7,2) and whose conduct clearly borders on the scandalous. Melite, a ‘widow of Ephesus,’ will be his third and later instructor. Clitophon overuses rhetoric and is by turns foolishly hapless and unobservant, grotesquely passive, hyper-emotive and self-pitying, as if he saw himself (again, rather like Encolpius) as a figure in a tragedy or a declamation – or as a character in a romance.²³ Clitophon is something of the *scholasticus gloriosus*, whose rhetorical education has taught him how to explain everything, but not to understand what is really important; this rhetorical pose may mask a real incoherence in Clitophon’s own grasp of the world and his inability to properly order, due to desire, his own experiences. When Clitophon comes to Alexandria, he is so stunned that he must confess ‘eyes, we are beaten’ and his subsequent description gives us little real information about the city, but rather of how it impressed him seeing it. Clitophon is not only seduced by the desire for the beautiful, but also by the sheer pull of sententiousness.²⁴ Whitmarsh further suggests that the discerning reader can observe how Clitophon recasts the events he relates due to this tendency to sophistry and melodrama, and that he misunderstands the true profoundness of the events he narrates. Achilles Tattius further allows the reader discern what Clitophon misses.²⁵

Little might seem either natural or noble in Clitophon. Yet Clitophon cannot defy his father and accepts the arranged marriage (2,5,2; 2,12,1); his doubts, hesitation, guilt (especially concerning his responsibility for Leucippe’s sufferings), and even self-loathing demonstrate Clitophon’s potentially better nature. Leucippe seems too complaisant in Clitophon’s seduction, yet there is little indication that her feelings for him at this stage are particularly deep; Leucippe is easily read as a bright, headstrong girl who has discovered the pleasure and real excitement of being romanced and

²² He has had sex with prostitutes (2,37,5), and, after he has given an impassioned (and graphic) defense of girl-love, Menelaus proclaims him a ‘old man’ in Aphrodite (2,38,1).

²³ Morgan 1996, 185.

²⁴ Morales 2004, 121.

²⁵ Whitmarsh 2003, 191–205.

chafes at parental control, with her elopement as much about adolescent rebellion as love. Yet the real shame Leucippe feels at her mother's accusations indicates a capacity to appreciate the values inherent in chastity and marriage.

L & C's narrative relates how these potentials for better conduct are realized in both protagonists; such a positive reading helps explain how later legends made Achilles Tatius a bishop and Leucippe and Clitophon the parents of the martyr St. Galaction.²⁶ Goldhill states that a 'central move' in a moralizing reading of Achilles Tatius is 'policing the digressive turn' as epitomized by epigram *A.P.* 9,203, which suggests the reader, if he desires to remain *sôphron*, should not focus too closely the episodes but concentrate on the outcome.²⁷ While it is a stretch to call *L & C* a 'panegyric of chastity,'²⁸ such a rigorous policing is unneeded to produce a more ideal reading. Admittedly, as Morales has shown, the text's dreams, *ecphraseis* and various digressions, such as sententious statements, present unsettling images of women, of their objectification and consumption, and the erotization of violence.²⁹ But recall that the romances have many characteristics of Frye's genre of comedy, which often feature heroes who succeed, despite their stupidity or failings, because they are fundamentally either lucky, basically good or both. Clitophon is not a exemplar of *sophrosyne* like Theagenes, but Leucippe and he can be viewed as somewhat comic characters who succeed because they have 'desired rightly' in the sense of 'finally having proved themselves able to desire the right thing' – which does not exclude them still being able to desire and do quite improper actions as well.

Whereas Achilles Tatius has given his protagonists comic-realistic failings, Longus has done nearly the opposite – his protagonists have comparatively little real character;³⁰ instead they are so ideal, iconic, and wish-fulfilling that they draw the reader by embodying deeply mythic and persistent dreams of the paradise of youth, nature and eros. Longus' narrator has come to the country to escape the city and its harsh realities, and his stylized narrative accentuates the unreality of the pleasant rural world, making it conform to traditions of the pastoral paradise and urban nostalgia for the

²⁶ MacAlister 1996, 110–111; Morales 2001, xxx–xxxii.

²⁷ Goldhill 1995, 100–102.

²⁸ Gaselee 1917, xi.

²⁹ Morales 2004.

³⁰ Reardon 1994a, 140.

countryside's simple life.³¹ Correspondingly, the narrator idealizes the couple and their *sophrosyne*. Longus' narrator also appears not to fully grasp the account he was told, and his narrative is skewed due to his impulse for sentimental idealization,³² a powerful temptation for the sentimentally inclined reader and critic as well.

Properly displayed *paideia* defined the elite Greco-Roman social class and justified their social and political preeminence over the masses and separated them from barbarians, slaves, and social inferiors, and served as a counter to Roman political power and pressures to assimilate.³³ Both our romances problematize the value of *paideia* even as they demand it from readers. As do Petronius, Apuleius, Lucian (and, I argue, even Heliodorus), Achilles Tattius reveals how Greek *paideia* does not necessarily ennoble, but gives depravity the gloss of refinement. Thus Clitophon and Charmides (4,3–5) use sophistry for seduction, as authors such as Ovid had recommended.³⁴ As noted, everything Clitophon sees, thinks, and does appears infused with sophistry.³⁵ Clitophon is hardly alone in this; all the major characters seem to have part-time careers as sophists.³⁶ Such excessive and inap-

³¹ Morgan 1994, 65; Morgan 2003, 176.

³² The narrator's description of the countryside allows many harsh and naturalistic details; yet the narrative generally underplays any details which jar with the overall idyllic tone, as if the narrator were contemptuous of rustic realities that interfere with this sentimental reverie. In this the narrator resembles Dionysophanes' compatriots, for whom the ornamental garden is spruced up, the farmyard filth hidden, a few grapes left on the vines, and a display of sheep control through music orchestrated so that the urban vacationers can have a more satisfying rural holiday; see Pandiri 1985, 116–141; Morgan 2003, 178–179; Morgan 1994, 65; Winkler 1990, 107–112; Reardon 1994a, 135–147.

³³ For further discussion of the role of *paideia* and the *pepaidumenos* see Swain 1996; Bowersock 1969; Anderson 1989; Brown 1992, 35–70; Whitmarsh 2001b.

³⁴ Ovid (*Ars Am.* 1,219–228) advised describing foreign marvels to prolong time with the beloved, and Menander Rhetor likewise recommended using stories of the loves of animals, plants, rivers, etc. as encouragement for sex; Morales 2003, 42–43; Goldhill 1995, 86–87.

³⁵ Morgan 1996, 185 considers that Clitophon's thoughts betray their origins in 'book-learning, recycled experience, empty rhetorical commonplace;' see also Anderson 1997, 2291. Yet Hunter 1996, 192 points out that, while there is certainly comic value in such episodes, such an ability to use prior texts was a 'significant and privileged way of ordering experience and was respected and highly valued.' Zeitlin 1994, 154 notes that the whole Second Sophistic project was a 'renewed creative energy directed toward highly skilled mimetic reorderings and ambitious emulations of Classical and Hellenistic type' citing Bompaiere 1958, 1–154.

³⁶ Consider Melite's sophistic attempts on Clitophon, Menelaus' rant against women (2,36 ff.), the deliberations over the oracle's meaning (2,14). The lament of Clinias and the

propriate use of rhetoric is an important source of humor, but a more important point is that the habits of sophistry appear to have distorted natural forms of love and other personal relations. The dramatic arc of *L & C*'s narrative concerns how Leucippe and especially Clitophon manage to act like proper and devoted lovers despite such *paideia* and its distorting effects.

Longus' protagonists have exactly the opposite problem; raised as country slaves, they lack any aristocratic education or experience of the city.³⁷ They begin as nearly pure children of nature, imitating the sounds and even practices of the natural world – even in respect to sex.³⁸ Whereas Leucippe slyly goes along with Clitophon's pursuit, Daphnis and Chloe imagine Dorkon, in his attempted rape, was really just playing a country jest (1,21). Instead of being reflexive sophists, Daphnis and Chloe are maddeningly straightforward.³⁹ The fact that those individuals endowed with the most *paideia*, such as the young men from Methymna, the original parents of Daphnis and Chloe, or the parasite Gnathon,⁴⁰ commit such evils makes suspect the value of such *paideia*.⁴¹

In the complex cultural milieu described above, Eros was less easily depicted as simply given, a force that fell upon individuals, who had limited (usually tragic or comic) means to deal with this condition. Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus make the couple fall in love and marry quickly, and then undergo their adventures; as with the *Odyssey*'s protagonists, their trials prove the endurance of initial bond rather than describe how that bond developed and demonstrate the importance of loyalty and commitment as opposed to the sheer erotic attraction which brought them together.⁴² In Longus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus the marriage occurs at the conclusion; the preliminary adventures are a transformational *rite de passage*, a

boy's father over Charicles (1,13–14) resembles a rhetorical competition; on this, see Anderson 1982, 26.

³⁷ Although they are given a better than average education for inhabitants of the countryside (1,8).

³⁸ Morgan 1994, 70; Deligiorgis 1974, 3; Epstein 2002b, 31.

³⁹ For example, when they ask Philetas whether Eros is a kind of bird (2,7) or take his advice about lying together naked on the ground literally (2,8 and 3,14).

⁴⁰ Gnathon is called *pepaideumenos*, having learned the complete *erotica muthologia* at the symposia of the debauched (4,17); see Goldhill 1995, 47.

⁴¹ Dio of Prusa similarly created a picture of simple rural folk and country life in the *Hunters of Euboeia* as a contrast to contemporary practices, especially amatory habits; Jones 1978, 55–64; Swain 1996, 125–126.

⁴² Konstan 1994, 45–46.

period during which the protagonists are moved from one condition to a more mature state and then wed.

Longus and Achilles Tattius reject the convention of fully formed passion at first sight, devoting considerable narrative space to the development of the couple's love. It requires four books for Daphnis and Chloe to first feel the stirrings of sexual desire, to realize that they *are* in love, to find out exactly who and what Love is, get an inkling of what to do about this condition, and, finally, to learn that eros is about more than sex, and how to unite love with the demands of society. In the process they lose their original equality and innocence, and comprehend the pains that come with true adulthood.⁴³ Similarly, the development of the couple's love takes most of *L & C*'s narrative. The couple do not begin their real adventures until Book 3, the first two books being preoccupied with the stages of Clitophon's wooing of Leucippe, leading up to their interrupted attempt at uncommitted sex. I would argue that at 5,9, immediately after the narrative leaps head to two months after Leucippe's second false death, the narrative has left the realm of adventures proper⁴⁴ and return to what resembles New Comedy with melodramatic overtones.⁴⁵ The erotic tango and trials involving Clitophon, Leucippe, Thersander and Melite, as I discuss below, comprise several important stages of the couple's amatory progress.

Both romances emphasize the purposeful teaching and learning of love's habits and the problem of finding correct sources for such knowledge. Longus' narrator declares his whole literary offering to be didactic, able to remind the erotically experienced reader and to prepare the inexperienced one. Longus' couple desperately requires an education in love and seeks instruction from nature and from wiser heads such as Philetas. Daphnis gets a private lesson in erotic technique from Lykainion and in turn instructs Chloe; in a somewhat similar (if less satisfactory) fashion, Clitophon is advised by Clinias and given his lesson by Melite. Longus' Eros wishes to make a didactic myth out of Chloe, and Clitophon becomes an exegete of Love's productions. *L & C*'s references to amatory education are obviously

⁴³ Chalk 1960, 45–46.

⁴⁴ According to Sedelmeier's analysis, Books 3 and 4 are primarily devoted to adventures, with Books 5 and 6 describing the Melite affair and Books 7 and 8 describing the trials and conclusions; see Sedelmeier 1959, 113–114.

⁴⁵ Reardon 1994b, 90; Pandiri 1985, 127–130.

more ironic, with Clitophon, Clinias and Charmides practicing an Ovidian *ars amatoria* and casting Eros as a sophist in their own image.

It is an informing conceit of *D & C* that, cocooned within the pastoral world, beyond the city's corrupting influence, Daphnis and Chloe will 'naturally' begin to learn to love correctly. Nature is presented as the first, but not only, educator. As soon as Daphnis and Chloe begin their pastoral careers they become 'imitators of the things heard and seen' (1,9). Their education follows the seasons and is aided by nature spirits such as the nymphs and Pan. Even at the climax of Lykainion's sexual tutorial the final steps are taught by *phusis* (3,18,4). *D & C* indicates that 'human nature' is hardly something either 'natural' or even fixed.⁴⁶ Chloe and Daphnis are shown as being on the one hand godlike,⁴⁷ and on the other hand rather close to the animals they imitate. The fact that Daphnis and Chloe cannot succeed at sex merely by imitating sheep (3,14) suggests that human culture is indispensable.⁴⁸ Yet animal passion are also part of the divine order here; Pan looks half-human, half-goat and yet is also a full-fledged god,⁴⁹ and is a particularly important figure for Daphnis and closely connected to him; Daphnis, who is assimilated to the goats he tends, must confront and rehabilitate the Pan-like side of his erotic nature.

Despite the technical erotology, passages in *L & C* also suggest innate guides to love beyond artificial technique or brute passion.⁵⁰ The references

⁴⁶ For Winkler 1990, 103 *D & C* underscores how it is cultural conventions that give shape and meaning to the raw material of nature, not mere instinct.

⁴⁷ Daphnis is the son of Dionysiophanes (= 'Dionysos manifest'), is suckled by a goat as Zeus was, and declares he is beardless like Dionysos (1,16,4), and is even compared to the young Apollo (4,14); Chloe's name may recall Demeter Chloe; see Winkler 1990, 126.

⁴⁸ Morgan suggests that Longus stresses that, to become adults, Daphnis and Chloe must abandon an essentially sterile imitation of the natural (and non-human) world; but, as Epstein implies, the imitation of nature is not only sterile, but dangerous; cf. Morgan 1994, 66–72.

⁴⁹ Pan is in many respects Daphnis' 'tutelary deity;' note, for example, how Daphnis' herd is so well kept that said to resemble Pan's sacred flock (4,4); how he dedicates his own small pipes to Pan and receives the pipes of Philetas which look like Pan's own (2,35,2); Philetas, the mentor of Daphnis, is likewise connected to Pan; Daphnis also takes Pan's part in the mime and tries to swear by him; see Epstein 2002b, 25–39.

⁵⁰ Clinias declares love is self-taught, and that a lover will know what to do automatically (1,10,1); Satyrus assures Clitophon that Love will dictate his letter to Leucippe (5,20,4); Melite successfully philosophizes, taught by Eros (5,27,1), who helps them successfully improvise intercourse the jailhouse floor (5,27,4); Morgan 1996, 180.

to Eros as sophist and to Melite's successfully philosophizing due to Love's instruction may seem simply duplicitous rhetorical tropes, like Clitophon's calling a discussion of seduction techniques as 'doing philosophy' (1,12,1), but these passages also recall Diotima's speech in the *Symposium*, which makes the Eros the ultimate improviser also the ultimate sophist (*Symp.* 203d7), who is always 'doing philosophy.'⁵¹ And, as we shall see, Aphrodite and Artemis both contribute to the couple's erotic education.

Morgan and Hunter⁵² have argued that the romances cannot be considered as *Bildungsromane* in the same sense as Dickens' *David Copperfield* was, because such a genre was a creation of a more individualist-bourgeois world which promoted notions of individual growth and freedom, whereas the ancient world tended to view individuals as much more bound by society and fate.⁵³ It is often declared the romantic couple's love does not substantially change during their travels in 'adventure time.'⁵⁴ I argue that the evidence that Clitophon and Leucippe receive an education in love and its habits is best found in their actions, which have real consequences, not their understanding.⁵⁵ Further, a *Bildungsroman* need not be restricted to the erotic career; the protagonists' development as social beings would have seemed as important, and perhaps more so, for themselves and their society, and to the readers as well. Chariton's Chaireas becomes a fitting successor to Hermocrates and has achieved impressive victories, not to mention a wife. Heliodorus' Charicleia and Theagenes become priest of the Sun and priestess of the Moon and heirs to the rule of Meroë. *D & C's* couple not only learns of love, but assumes their proper places as urban aristocrats who merge the best of the world of city, country, the natural, human and divine together and provide a better model for life. They also make important benefactions, such as the shrine and painting which the narrator views and is inspired by. If Callisthenes' story is meant to parallel Clitophon's, there are grounds to

⁵¹ Goldhill 1995, 78.

⁵² Morgan 1996, 163–190; Hunter 1996, 191–205.

⁵³ Selden has noted how some critics tie the superior value now given to physiologically realistic and coherent characters who can 'develop' to various post-Classical ideologies which stress individualism and personal development; see Selden 1994, 45–47.

⁵⁴ Usually with a citation of Bakhtin 1981, 89.

⁵⁵ I have argued Alvares 1997, 613–629, that due to what he has endured, Chaireas' behavior toward Callirhoe changes – he comes to control his jealousy better and to have absolute trust in her. The same is true for the characters in Achilles Tattius, Longus and Heliodorus; their experiences change their amatory behavior and knowledge of each other.

think the reader is intended to see that Clitophon is not only well married, but has been reformed into a member of good standing in society.⁵⁶

The ‘adventures’ during which they are educated taste of parody. Structurally, such adventures are an important part of the archetypal pattern of romantic adventure, wherein a hero must leave his homeland, visit the ‘lower world’ and face multiple challenges to his sanity, identity and life before he can return with new adult status, thematized by the possession of a bride and kingdom. The adventures of *D & C* appear especially incongruous because, to use Frye’s taxonomy, *D & C* is really more comedy than romance, a genre whose central concerns involves the dispelling of illusion, the breaking of baleful social situations and the formation of a new society, epitomized by the concluding wedding.⁵⁷ The pastoral genre provides an interpretive frame for Longus’ readers, and pastoral’s ability to absorb and translate the contents of other genres causes a certain suspension of the consequences of its realistic elements, so that the narrative does not become either fairy tale or refined pornography.⁵⁸ *L & C* has more or less proper romantic adventures; tasteless and stylized as they are, *L & C*’s scenes of mutilation, slavery, madness, murder, mistaken identity,⁵⁹ abundant paradoxes and the confusion generated by the narrative’s embedded sophistries conform nicely with the requirements of Frye’s ‘lower world,’ where traditionally violence, loss of self, madness and confusion reign, and nothing is quite what it appears. *L & C* shares with Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* a graphic depiction of how illicit sex equals death and an erotization of death,⁶⁰ horrors from which Lucius and Clitophon are saved.

Both narratives, Longus’ especially, are complexly posited regarding the depictions of violence toward women customary in erotic narratives as well as in life. In *D & C* the violence of the inserted myths of Pitys, Phatta, Echo

⁵⁶ Morgan 1996, 195–196.

⁵⁷ Frye 1957, 163–171.

⁵⁸ As noted Longus comes close to introducing realistic and violent elements incompatible with ‘soft’ pastoral; see Reardon 1994a, 135–147; also Pandiri 1985, 116 and n. 3.

⁵⁹ Themes of mistaken and altered identity abound; as when Calligone, mistaken for Leucippe is kidnapped, Clitophon thinks Leucippe has been disemboweled, and later laments over what he believes is her headless corpse and later does not recognize the shaven haired slave as Leucippe. As Frye 1976, 104–116 points out, such losses of identity are also common elements of the ‘underworld’ of romance. Melite, from this perspective, can also be viewed as a type of Calypso figure, the mistress of a type of Venusburg that Tannhäuser escapes from.

⁶⁰ Morgan 1996, 183.

and Syrinx epitomize male aggression against and oppression of independent females as social beings in marriage and in society at large. The violent events depicted on Dionysos' altar likewise suggest that struggle, violence and pain are part of the natural order, in which even the gods partake.⁶¹ The pain is ameliorated by Daphnis' sensitive treatment of Chloe, legitimizing social structures and knowledge of the natural order which make the remaining pains meaningful.⁶² There is not such obvious reconciliation of evils in *L & C*. The feigned disemboweling and decapitation of Leucippe, her drug-induced madness, the shaving of her head, the whipping and other abuse she receives,⁶³ the fate of the prostitute and the women in ecphrases of Philomela, Procne and Andromeda, along with the scopophilic luxuriation of their description, indicate that *L & C*'s narrative world is a place dangerous for women, where a woman in pain is an object of male consumption, visually and even literally. As Chloe to some extent is identified with Phatta, Syrinx, Pitys and Echo and must avoid their fates, so Leucippe's lurid adventures likewise mirror the histories of Europa, Andromeda, and even Philomela. As in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* and later Christian romance, such a world provides the opportunity for Leucippe to show that unbreakable will to virtue which so attracted the writer of *A.P.* 9,203. As noted above, what saves Leucippe and Clitophon from being basically comic characters (as are Daphnis and Chloe) is that they can rise, on occasion, to near-heroic choices and action.

Artisans of the Second Sophistic emphasized the rhetorical art's ability to capture and express physical reality and even help the reader imagina-

⁶¹ Chalk 1960, 42.

⁶² I agree with Winkler 1990, 101–126 that *D & C* narrates how the young and ideal protagonists are socialized into the less forgiving realities of the urban and adult world. I do not accept that Chloe's fate is quite so brutal. I think the coarseness of the rustics outside the wedding chamber corresponds to the oppressive expressions of eros seen before; but here it is not symbolic of what happens inside as Chloe loses her virginity, but rather a contrast. Their wedding night is joyful because Daphnis approaches Chloe's person with respect and self-restraint, having taken Lykainion's lesson to heart. I am sensitive to Winkler's complaint that such a reading sanctions 'patriarchal oppression,' but one might also suggest that a certain loss of self-integrity is the inescapable price of civilization, a perspective of great importance to thinkers such as Marcuse or Freud. I think Longus would agree and thus has Daphnis make for Chloe the best of an imperfect situation.

⁶³ One suspects Leucippe's sufferings are greater, not only so that Clitophon might have more to overreact to, but because she, a female who has willingly transgressed parental authority, has more to suffer and atone for.

tively enter into scene described.⁶⁴ This was the age of allusion and allegory, where the world and its objects were viewed as texts waiting to be deciphered.⁶⁵ Both romances begin with an ecphrasis, which, as in works by the Philostrati, Lucian, Cebes, and Callistratus, offer themselves for analysis to the exegete/interpreter/reader who fashions a narrative which goes far beyond what is clearly depicted, one that often has a pronounced ethical, moral meaning or allegorical significance. Such ecphrases often foreshadow subsequent themes.⁶⁶ The sophisticated reader expects to find items, such as *L & C*'s paintings and dreams or Longus' gardens, which demand to be interpreted. This is always a risky, complex business, and both works play an elaborate game with interpretation and interpreters, seemingly possessing narrators who do not fully grasp the story they tell and inviting the reader to write his own fuller narrative, as Longus' narrator does of the story he hears.

Passages in both romances foreground the problem of the relation between nature, art, human life, imitation and education. Clitophon's narrative appears processed through the machinery of sophistry, producing an air of the artificial and overdone. Yet *L & C*'s ironies are not truly bitter, and the reader can perceive the existence of another world behind Clitophon's narrative, one under-appreciated by this the sophist-narrator, where the power of a true Eros dwells and opposing gods work to serve its purposes. In *D & C* art versus nature is a major theme, as is art's educative power, and the idealizing narrator clearly takes his inspiration from art, not nature.⁶⁷ Like other notable sophists-spectators, Longus' narrator wishes to produce a verbal response to the painting⁶⁸ whose beauty is worthy of the beautiful object,⁶⁹ and which, as noted above, contains elements which the discerning reader must interpret. Further, Longus' text, as felicitously described by Zeitlin, is 'almost entirely mimetic, a hallucinating echo text.'⁷⁰ This textual world, made out of imitations, functions because the imitated elements combine together to reinforce

⁶⁴ An important theme suggested by Philostatus *Imagines*; see Zeitlin 2001, 215; who cites Pollitt 1974, 53.

⁶⁵ Cooper 1996, 33.

⁶⁶ See Bartsch 1989, 14–32 and 41–43; Harlan 1965, 56–59.

⁶⁷ Morgan 2003, 181.

⁶⁸ πόθος ἔσχεν ἀντιγράψαι τῆ γραφῆ (1,2).

⁶⁹ See Goldhill 2001, 160–167; Zeitlin 1994, 151–152, who stress how, according to the attitudes of the Second Sophistic, it is only the untutored man who is mute before beauty; it is the mark of *paideia* to make such an elegant response, one which can seem to be in rivalry with its object.

⁷⁰ Zeitlin 1994, 154.

the sentimental vision which is strengthened by the readers' sentimental desire.⁷¹ Because of their smooth, almost inevitable interworking, Longus has 'renaturalized' these conventional elements.⁷² The couple spontaneously enact many of the standard practices of lovers (especially pastoral ones) and erotic discourse, such as the erotic slanging match (1,15–16), pelting each other with apples, and Daphnis' pursuit of the overlooked apple (3,33–4), implying that these literary conventions also reflect something natural, that nature can imitate art.⁷³ For Longus the highest art succeeds in bringing out beauties potential within nature, and is not merely a sterile imitation of it.⁷⁴ In addition, rhetorical and philosophical theories of *phantasia* and *energia* as represented by pseudo-Longinus and Philostratus, for example, suggested that the artist's imagination, combined with intellect, might intuit and represent deeper realities, intuitions validated by the sheer power of the image (literary or visual) to make the reader to 'see' what it represents.⁷⁵ Both texts (especially Achilles Tattius⁷⁶) powerfully showcase the power of sight to transform spirit and behavior.

The artisans of the Second Sophistic habitually employed philosophy, whether seriously (Plutarch) or ironically (Lucian). Such elements easily produced the impression of deeper issues being addressed.⁷⁷ But there is a utopian potential in such conventional elements, which fit naturally with the ideal orientations of romance and comedy.⁷⁸ Philosophy and mystery religion had been two avenues by which individuals could find relief from the world's horrors and even obtain some transcendence or salvation, a hope strongly implied in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. This desire was fulfilled

⁷¹ *D & C* describes how the protagonists come to understand and manage their erotic desires. Its narrator stresses the narrative is the product of his own desires in response to a veritable *historia erotos*. The text's 'implied reader' is likewise a desirer. Desire in Longus is presented as a constitutive state for the human condition. On modern literature's focus on desire as constitutive, see Goodheart 1991, 1–22; also Carson 1996.

⁷² Zeitlin 1994, 155.

⁷³ Zeitlin 1994, 149.

⁷⁴ Thus, when Chloe is given a makeover, the narrator declares 'and then one might learn what beauty was, when it had gotten its adornment' (4,32,1).

⁷⁵ Zeitlin 2001, 215 who cites in particular Manieri 1998; Watson 1994.

⁷⁶ Longus uses the Platonic topos of beauty capturing the soul through the eyes (*Symp.* 209d–3; *Phdr.* 249d–252c); Pandiri 1985, 118, n. 13. On this theme in *L & C* see Goldhill 2001, 167–177; Morales 2003, 39–49.

⁷⁷ Perry, for example, will consider Apuleius' use of such religious themes as 'ballast' to give more weight to an ultimately trivial work; see Perry 1967, 244.

⁷⁸ In Frye's understanding of the *muthoi* of comedy and romance; see Frye 1957, 158–162.

(however well) by Christianity's ability improve upon aspects of salvation familiar from mystery religion and make them compatible with Greek philosophy, especially later forms of Platonism and Stoicism. Language and images recalling Plato, especially the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*⁷⁹ occur frequently in Longus and Achilles Tatius.

Longus' text significantly engages and plays against Plato's writing.⁸⁰ The contrast between *muthos* and *logos* features prominently as Chloe and Daphnis learn to make the world of *logos*, as emblemized by the city, compatible with the world of *muthos*, the erotic pastoral world Eros presides over.⁸¹ The protagonists of *D & C* must learn in the countryside, a *locus amoenus* more suited to pleasant allegories rather than precise knowledge, exactly where Socrates declares he is unable to learn (*Phaedrus* 230d3). The narrator's story, a rendition of the exegete's narrative of the painting of a past event, is, by Platonic reasoning, at a quadruple remove from reality.⁸² The passage's reference to Thucydides 1,22 is complex, for this *ktêma* is *terpnon*, possessing a pleasure which Thucydides rejects since it arises from the sort of *muthoi*-making that historians such as Herodotus promulgated.⁸³ Just as Longus underscores the combination of art and nature, so he also stresses the union of utility (the text will educate) and pleasure (the text will please). The *muthos* that is *D & C* is a fiction which tells the truth of human experience in love, which is best grasped in the form of an artistically arranged narrative,⁸⁴ for art's artifice can claim to portray the 'really real' by making more obvious the essential patterns of human experience.

The Platonic Eros was associated with a sexless, paiderastic love which supposedly aimed more at philosophical and spiritual improvement than at emotional fulfillment.⁸⁵ *D & C*'s Gnathon, described as *πάσαν ἐρωτικὴν μυθολογίαν ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀσώτων συμποσίοις πεπαιδευμένος* (4,17), a mock-

⁷⁹ The *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus* were parts of the rhetorician's stock, and allusions to them were common; see Hunter 1997, 16; Trapp 1990, 143–173.

⁸⁰ See Hunter 1997, 15–28 with discussion and bibliography.

⁸¹ Hunter 1997, 18–23.

⁸² Morgan 2003, 181.

⁸³ For more discussion of this recollection of Thucydides, see Valley 1926, 102; Hunter 1983, 47–50; Pandiri 1985, 117–119 and n. 9 with bibliography.

⁸⁴ Morgan 1994, 73–77; Carson 1986 details the necessary connection between Eros and fiction.

⁸⁵ This conception that was being increasingly contested and ridiculed; for example, in Plutarch's *Eroticus* (752a–b) Daphnaeus had mocked the hypocrisy of such views, as Lucian also did.

ing phrase recalling the *Symposium* of Plato as well as the symposium as a supremely aristocratic setting and represents the distorted, unnatural eros produced in a city detached from the country.⁸⁶ But even heterosexual love can be problematic. As Hunter observes, Aristophanes' myth in the *Symposium* illustrates the problem of an ideal common to the erotic romances; all the couple want is each other, which does not lead to philosophic enlightenment or spiritual improvement.⁸⁷ Daphnis and Chloe in particular simply want to be with each other, like Aristophanes' lovers. But philosophers and authors such as Plutarch granted a spiritual and philosophic dimension to the sort of heterosexual, common love and demonstrated how family life could be training ground for virtue.⁸⁸ Accordingly *D & C* demonstrates how the pair learn exactly how complex, given persistent social structures and individual differences, it is to 'be with' another person, and how they are improved spiritually in the process.

Achilles Tattius' romance is an ironic inversion of Longus'. The love of Daphnis and Chloe is connected to a level of profundity they barely comprehend and never articulate with any sophistication. Clitophon can give impressive philosophic and medical disquisitions, such as on the connection between sight and love (1,4), the increased power of disease at night (1,6), on the varieties of love in the natural world (1,16–18), and on the kiss (2,8), recalling motifs in *D & C*. But here the employment of philosophy is heavily ironized, as when, for example, Clitophon and Clineas' discussion about strategies of seduction is termed philosophizing (1,12,1).⁸⁹ Especially in its first two books, the work resembles the anti-*Phaedrus* of a Plato *eroticus*.⁹⁰ Such a treatment accords with the *L & C*'s other elements of satire and par-

⁸⁶ Chalk 1960, 50–51.

⁸⁷ Hunter 1996, 193–194.

⁸⁸ Foucault 1986, 198–209.

⁸⁹ Clitophon tells Melite they should play the philosopher and stay chaste until they reach land (5,16,7); he informs Leucippe's father that he and Leucippe have been philosophers (8,5,7) and compares his passiveness during Thersander's beating to a philosopher's behavior. (5,23,7).

⁹⁰ Presumably because the rhetoric is used more for seduction than for philosophic illumination; see Anderson 1982, 25; also Martin 2002, 147–148. Clitophon's dream of being split apart from a woman recalls Aristophanes' myth in the *Symposium*; Melite's comments on Clitophon's unwillingness to consummate their marriage (5,22,5) alludes to Alcibiades' remark on how he rose from sleeping with Socrates as if 'from a eunuch.' In the debate, Menelaus' comments on boy-beauty recall common and heavenly love describe by Pausanias in the *Symposium*.

ody. But, as we shall see, both romances stress that the ability to love properly is not really a matter of sophisticated knowledge but of experience and the correct choices and actions.

The language of mystery religion figures prominently in both romances. Longus' constructed narrator presents the erotic plot as driven by Eros with the help of Pan and the Nymphs. Evocations of Plato and of Dionysos-Orphic mystery religion, elements permeating *D & C*,⁹¹ give seeming substance to an imaginative vision of a world wherein nature, the divine, the physical and the human are watched over by a cosmogonic eros. *L & C*'s references to divine activity seem much more ironic,⁹² since Clitophon constructs his narrative according to standard rubrics of earlier romances and tragic declamation, making him the victim of Tyche and Eros.⁹³ Nevertheless, *L & C*'s chaotic, horrific, and mystifying world, like that of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, virtually demands such beneficent supernatural elements to enable the necessary happy-ever-after conclusion. And, as we shall see, a more robust story of gods who direct and protect the couple can be discerned within Clitophon's narrative.

The preliminaries done, I shall now produce readings (with the greater focus on *L & C*) which demonstrate how both romances present a story of a rediscovery and reeducation in a love which is tied to the couple's place in society. This love, a fundamental and even ennobling force within nature, leads the protagonists of both romances from their original condition of ignorance to a proper *sophrosyne*, a more adult Eros and to the assumption of adult roles and responsibilities.

The prologue of each romance⁹⁴ suggests that the initial narrator needs, seeks, and receives an education/revelation about Eros. Longus' narrator has come to find a pleasurable escape from the city; as a hunter he resembles the youths of Methymna, whose hunting party, initially tolerant, abuses the countryside and prompts a senseless war (2,12–19). His mood is conducive to love and pleasure, and he finds the painting more delightful (*terponotera*) than the natural setting. The grove and its picture comprise a shrine which attracts a substantial following of the devout. The narrator does not quite

⁹¹ See Chalk 1960, 32–51; also Merkelbach 1960, 47–60.

⁹² *L & C* 1,2,2; 1,7,1; 1,9,7; 2,19,1; 5,15,6; 5,26,3.

⁹³ Whitmarsh 2003, 197.

⁹⁴ For some comments on the similarity of the two prologues, see Morgan 2003, 174.

know what story the picture tells, but, projecting his amatory interests,⁹⁵ thinks it obviously a love story. He locates an exegete (such as are found at formal religious sites) to reveal the full narrative. The narrator, further inspired, writes *D & C*'s four books as a dedication to Love, the Nymphs, and Pan, whose prologue presents Eros as universal and inescapable, as does the subsequent story. The narrator can also be viewed as one who has had repressed on his soul by the power of the sight those truths which earlier, in his aggressive career, he had forgotten, and this work sums up that reformed knowledge. Indeed, the work is a dedication (ἀνάθημα) such as one who had been rescued or otherwise benefited by the god would set up. Such dedications are also testaments, and thus the narrator's carefully crafted *ktêma* will have a didactic function, being a revelation of the god's power. The beauty and allure of this amatory topic is a powerful stimulant, and thus he begs for himself to maintain *sophrosyne*, which in Morgan's interpretation, means to stay true to an idealized and pure vision of eros, but may also be a plea not to fall into an *enthusiasmos* generated by sort of nympholepsy which Socrates falls prey to (*Phaedrus* 238c–241c).⁹⁶

L & C's narrator has been saved from a terrible storm at sea.⁹⁷ The storm-world symbolizes the violent environment the narrator inhabits. He makes a dedication to Astarte, an eastern goddess of love and conflict, two forces ruling this storm-world. While viewing the city and the god's dedications he comes upon the picture of Europa/Selene and the bull. In his description of this artwork he reveals himself very much like Clitophon, a sophistic fellow with interests in voyeuristic and aggressive sex and violence.⁹⁸ He is ἐρωτικός (1,2,1) and is particularly impressed with portrayal of Eros' cosmic power, which confirms his own intuitions. In Lucian's *Hercules*, Lucian does not understand what he sees in the shrine until some local Celt comes up to decode the work for him.⁹⁹ Similarly, Clitophon, a local,

⁹⁵ Morgan 2003, 175–177.

⁹⁶ Morgan 2003, 177–178; Hunter 1997, 26–27. Here the narrator recalls Philetas, who, having a close encounter with Eros, is warned that even an old man is not immune to the trials of love (2,5,2); also Pandiri 1985, 119.

⁹⁷ Aphrodite is well connected to the sea, and the love affair as storm is a common simile.

⁹⁸ Note how the narrator luxuriates over Europa's quasi-nudity, her terror, and how beautiful all these images are, just as Clitophon make sure to point out the transparency of the chained Andromeda's gown (3,7,5) and the raped Philomela trying to cover herself (5,3,6).

⁹⁹ Bartsch 1989, 42.

reveals himself as having special knowledge of the painting's subject matter and thus, in a sense, plays a role similar to the exegete in *D & C's* prologue. The frame-narrator seems only to want entertaining love tales from Clitophon, rather like Lucius at the beginning of the *Metamorphosis* or Knemon while listening to Calasiris' story of the couple's early history. Clitophon the exegete also corresponds to the *aretalogi* who declared the true miracles of the deity and could produce entertaining stories.¹⁰⁰ The narrator then leads Clitophon to a grove (not a meadow) for the dialogue that, with its ice-cold water, plane trees and bench, reflects the cooler, more objective setting of a philosophical discourse.¹⁰¹

Clitophon's status as exegete accords with the couple's rescue and vindication through various divine intercessions;¹⁰² and thus his whole life story serves, to some extent, as an exegesis of the painting.¹⁰³ Longus' Eros wanted to make a *muthos* out of Chloe (2,27), one illustrating a history of love superior to the three narrated myths.¹⁰⁴ Clitophon declares his adventures are like *muthoi* (1,2,2). These *muthoi* can be pleasurable yet reveal deeper truths, some which may escape their narrator. Relating this first painting directly to Clitophon's subsequent narrative (as *D & C's* initial ecphrasis relates to the subsequent narrative), puts Clitophon in the role of an aggressive abductor humbled by Eros just as Zeus was, and Leucippe as a not unwilling Europa taken at a spot near where the couple eloped.¹⁰⁵ As *D & C's* inserted myths portray the egoistic, repressive sexual aggression that Daphnis ameliorates, so within the playful productions of Achilles Tatius, Clitophon and Leucippe find a history of love superior to the one implied in the Zeus-Europa myth.

¹⁰⁰ Edsall 2002, 120–121.

¹⁰¹ Martin 2002, 147–148.

¹⁰² Note how, after Clitophon and Sostratus have met again and told their stories, the crowd bless the name of Artemis (7,16,1); during the trial priest declares that Artemis has saved them both (8,9,13), and of course, Leucippe passes the test of the Pan's pipe; see Edsall 2002, 119–121.

¹⁰³ Martin 2002, 155–156.

¹⁰⁴ MacQueen 1985, 119–134.

¹⁰⁵ On how this ecphrasis trickily foreshadows the subsequent narrative, see Bartsch 1989, 48–50, 63–65, who notes that Europa does not seem particularly disturbed by her abduction. Nakatani 2003, 8 has further argued that, since Zeus and Europa's story parallels that of Leucippe and Clitophon, the fact that they were united and had children is a further hint that we should consider that Clitophon enjoyed a true happy ending.

In Longus, after Daphnis and Chloe's parents send them out upon their erotic career by making them shepherds,¹⁰⁶ their adventures and development are structured by the progress of the seasons and the participation of the gods to produce an increasing knowledge of each other, of proper love and its forms, and to initiate them into adult life and their necessary social responsibilities. The conflict and crises in *D & C* complement this process fairly well. *L & C*'s events are likewise structured to display the couple's amatory progress, with Leucippe's three false deaths providing markers of their progress.

L & C's first two books describe how Clitophon falls in love and proceeds in his seduction of Leucippe, who, strong willed and sophistically educated, is cooperative.¹⁰⁷ The books also contain warning examples of improper eros which are ignored.¹⁰⁸ Yet the language of mystery religion and Clitophon's erotic disquisition on Love's universal power, one which can remove the poison of a venomous snake (1,18,4–5), alludes to the possibility of a provident eros which, as it transforms fierce animals, will transform them also.¹⁰⁹ Clitophon is something of the snake in the garden, and the couple's interrupted attempt at sex is a critical lapse which leads to their self-expulsion from the safety of their home into the 'lower world' where they will be tested, beginning with the storm and shipwreck which signal their entry into this world. The fearful dream of Leucippe's mother underscores the gravity of Clitophon's crime, whatever other meanings the dream con-

¹⁰⁶ Rather like the parents of Xenophon of Ephesus who send out their children due to the oracle; parents (especially wicked parents) sending out children for one reason or other is a fairly common occurrence in folktale.

¹⁰⁷ It is clear Clitophon woos Leucippe within an erotic garden, similar to the garden Europa played in prior to her abduction; walled gardens as symbolic of the female body is a common trope, all elements suggesting Leucippe's receptiveness to amatory activity; see Bartsch 1989, 53–55.

¹⁰⁸ Thus Clitophon follows the advice of Clineas who is 'slave of sexual pleasure,' and delivers a vicious diatribe against the love of women, an excessive character whose own love relationship ends horribly. The fact that Clitophon goes directly from boy's funeral to his seduction (1,15,1) reminds one of Apuleius' Lucius, who, having been given many warnings, nevertheless vigorously pursues his quest for knowledge of magic, with terrible consequences.

¹⁰⁹ Daphnis and Chloe go beyond imitating animals and engage in a particularly human eros; but Achilles Tattius, contrariwise, stresses how a humanlike eros pervades even the natural world.

tains,¹¹⁰ as does the way Clitophon leaps out the window like a bandit or rapist.

The first stage of the couple's trials culminate in Leucippe's pseudo-disembowelment, Clitophon's thoughts of suicide (3,16) and Leucippe's bizarre 'resurrection.' The couple have learned from this ordeal. Note how soon after, when Clitophon suggests that they have sex, Leucippe surprisingly describes a dream from Artemis ordering her to keep herself chaste and declaring they would be married in time. Clitophon suddenly remembers his own dream: a woman, resembling a statue of Aphrodite, barred his way into Aphrodite's temple, yet promised she would make him Aphrodite's priest. Such congruent dreams signal that their amatory careers, like those of Daphnis and Chloe, are under divine supervision, although not quite a harmonious one, as I discuss later. Further, Leucippe's recent horrific pseudo-death plausibly would have made her aware that more was at stake in her elopement with Clitophon than adolescent rebellion. She has given up nearly everything for Clitophon, a sacrifice that, to be meaningful, must have meaningful sanction. Thus virginity, and its protectress, Artemis, and marriage become important for her. At this point Clitophon no longer pressures Leucippe for sex. His dream underscores his new commitment (to marriage, not just sex) and the new sense of responsibility he has acquired.

But more development and maturation are needed. The second stage culminates in Leucippe's second false death, brutal enslavement, and the aftermath on Melite's estate, including Thersander's return. These adventures strongly expose the couple to the dangers of aggressive eros, as Leucippe becomes the target of Charmides, Gorgias, and Chaireas, she suffers madness and its embarrassing results, and, finally, fairly brutal servitude, and a displacement of self symbolized by Leucippe's adoption of the name Lakaina. But consider how, although he believes Leucippe dead and has the beautiful and rich Melite wanting him, Clitophon remains loyal to Leucippe, and has to be dragged into marriage with Melite. Leucippe learns from Melite's own mouth of his surprising faithfulness. Although Clitophon's intercourse with Melite is part of Aphrodite's plan, this deed still represents a lapse in loyalty to Leucippe, which brings further suffering and education.

The beginning of the last phase of these trials comes with Clitophon's rearrest, Leucippe's kidnapping and third false death and its aftermath. In

¹¹⁰ For example, predicting Leucippe's later disemboweling; see Bartsch 1989, 87–89; McAlister 1996, 76–77.

contrast to Clitophon's inconsistency with Melite, Leucippe, put into Thersander's power, demonstrates a great moral fortitude in her forceful taunting of him (6,21), which echoes the protests of a Christian martyr. Clitophon's 'confession,' (7,7) is markedly different from that of Chariton's Chaireas (*Chaireas and Callirhoe* 1,4,4). Chaireas plausibly believes he has killed Callirhoe, however accidentally. Clitophon has not murdered Leucippe, but he has grounds to think that his disloyalty to Leucippe, committed by encouraging Melite, has contributed to her pitiful death. Clitophon paints himself as willing to murder Leucippe simply for security – which, for him, was the central reason for the marriage. This confession is Clitophon's vindication – not his canonization. After this episode comes Leucippe's fortuitous escape and discovery in the temple and reunion with her father Sostratus, who has been sent to Ephesus by divine encouragement. Clitophon and Leucippe are embarrassed before Sostratus, and matters still need sorting out. This begins at the dinner put on by Artemis' priest and aided by Dionysos' wine, during which Clitophon gives a somewhat embellished account of their adventures which stress Leucippe's virtue. The trial's final phase presents a battle between Artemis' priest and Thersander, a form of divine intervention, which leads to the final triumphant tests of Leucippe and Milete and the expulsion of Thersander, who embodies the aggressive, violent, hypocritical but all-too-common sexual behavior that is an affront to both Artemis and Aphrodite. The conclusion, with its strong emphasis on *anagnorsis*, its double marriage and Thersander's simple expulsion, presents an essentially comic ending, which, as Frye notes,¹¹¹ often concerns the breaking of unjust laws and powers (which Thersander embodies) and the recognition of the truth, which in turn leads to a new form of society as epitomized by marriage.

While both romances narrate the erotic education and reformation of their protagonists, their depictions of love, its duties and actions, play against the formal moral code and suggest more complex views of eros; for transgression can bring positive results. Daphnis and Chloe at first engaged in sex-play more earnest than the narrator admits.¹¹² They are initially quite equal, children of nature imitating nature; but once they begin to see sexual

¹¹¹ Frye 1957, 163–171.

¹¹² Chloe is aroused by the sight of Daphnis bathing and unashamedly tries to see him naked again; Daphnis takes advantage of the situation to put his hands down Chloe's clothing to retrieve the cicada, later they 'wrestle' with their animals; see Morgan 2003, 186.

behavior for what it is, especially in its aspects of domination and aggression, evidence of shyness, hesitation and even shame sets in and their equality diminishes. Once Daphnis has learned the secret of intercourse, he is ready to run off and teach Chloe, having no idea that premarital sex could be wrong. Lykainion informs Daphnis about the pain and the blood to prepare him for the lovemaking she presumes he will immediately engage in. But Lykainion granted Daphnis the opportunity to show a more sympathetic eros, and thus Daphnis chooses to deny himself sexual pleasure out of the desire to avoid anything that suggested hostile violence to Chloe.¹¹³ The exaggerated description of a maiden's loss of virginity points to Lykainion's desire to impress Daphnis with the need for sensitivity at this moment; one imagines Lykainion's first experience was not particularly gentle.¹¹⁴

Longus is much concerned to reconcile the loss of childhood and female innocence with the demands of males, marriage, and society. Daphnis becomes more the *praeceptor amoris* as he relates the myth of Echo to Chloe.¹¹⁵ But there is a further loss of innocence and equality, as he avoids being naked with her as before and he even displays some aggression, climbing to get the apple against Chloe's protests.¹¹⁶ While Philetas' *muthos* reveals eros as a cosmic principle, the text itself suggests that human love, which is a matter of far more than sex, is very much a human and social construct. The cyclic progress of human life is observed in Eros's account of Philetas' personal history, in the transfer of his pipes to his successor Daphnis and in the narrator's description of how the couple and their children will maintain the pastoral mode. Such natural cycles were often emphasized in religion, especially in the rites of Eleusis, which presented pain, death, and a better rebirth as all parts of one great, necessary, and divine movement. *D & C*'s three myths of increasingly violent male sexuality delineate the silencing and destruction of women, who, somewhat like Persephone, are nevertheless reborn into something which produces a beneficent harmony.¹¹⁷ Pain and loss must be inflicted, but this pain is ameliorated when it has meaning and purpose and compassion is employed. The violence of the myths served only

¹¹³ Note that Daphnis did not wish Chloe to cry out as 'if against an enemy' (3,20); the males in the inserted myths were, of course, enemies of the women whom they destroyed.

¹¹⁴ Pandiri 1985, 128.

¹¹⁵ Hunter 1997, 20–21.

¹¹⁶ Winkler 1990, 123.

¹¹⁷ See Morgan 1994, 64–79. Music is a major motif of *D & C*; see Maritz 1991, 56–67.

male desire and pride, elements certainly potential in the relationship between Daphnis and Chloe¹¹⁸ but which Daphnis circumvents by waiting for the sanction of marriage. Daphnis marries Chloe not only for himself, but for their families and for the wider community, who correspondingly participate in the wedding. Winkler has suggested that the harsh noises the shepherds make while the couple make love suggests violence,¹¹⁹ yet the last lines strongly suggest their mutual pleasure.¹²⁰

Both romances demonstrate how power of love and erotic devotion not only improves the central characters, but also other individuals. Lykainion's name, 'Miss Little Wolf' suggests the danger implicit in her; note how she 'ambushes' Daphnis (λοχήσασα, 3,15,3) out of need, like the female wolf of Book 1. Her relationship with her mate Chromis, the reader suspects, had been deteriorating due to his age. Yet she attends the wedding with him. Morgan suggests that her encounter with Daphnis has made her able to see another, affective side to love, knowledge through which she can love Chromis again.¹²¹ Note too how Lykainion not only felt sexual hunger for Daphnis, but also pity for the couple (3,15,5). Daphnis's ability to love Chloe without sex, and even deny himself out of compassion perhaps provided Lykainion a paradigm for new relationship with Chromis. Gnathon too shows up at the wedding,¹²² who had gone from trying to make Daphnis his sexual play-thing to Chloe's rescuer. Somewhat more puzzling is Lampis' attendance, who even plays the *aulos* for the couple. This last detail may central, for the musical ability is often linked to some nobility. Earlier Dorkon, whose aggression against Chloe was more serious, died, but not

¹¹⁸ As Epstein 2003b, 25–40 details, Daphnis is linked to the aggressively sexual goats he tends, as indicated when Daphnis falls into a pit with a goat who has just had a sex-motivated battle. Daphnis is pulled up by Chloe's breastband, with Dorkon's help, which symbolizes how Chloe will raise Daphnis to a higher level. Beginning his account of Phatta, Daphnis says, 'There was such, O maiden, a maiden beautiful, and she thus herded many cattle in the woods,' (1,27,2) underscoring the similarity between Chloe and Phatta, both real or potential victims. Chloe also wishes to be Daphnis' pipes (1,14,3), and later Chloe and Daphnis mime the myth of Syrinx and Pan, suggesting that it is potentially their story, among other correspondences.

¹¹⁹ Winkler 1990, 101–126.

¹²⁰ Daphnis resembles the husband of Plutarch's *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, who is his wife's leader and educator, but does all he can to spare his partner's feelings and make her happy.

¹²¹ Morgan 2003, 183–184.

¹²² Plato connects physical eros with philosophic enlightenment; in part Gnathon is redeemed because he is a *theates* of Daphnis' beauty; see MacQueen 1990, 170.

before helping save Daphnis and getting a kiss from Chloe; indeed his funeral (1,3,1–2,4), where even his cattle lament, presents Dorkon something of a pastoral hero.¹²³

In Achilles Tatius' romance the transgressive Melite resembles Chariton's Dionysios, who failed to keep a proper loyalty to his dead spouse and married Callirhoe.¹²⁴ The story of Melite and Thersander in some respects is an inverted doublet of the protagonists' story. Like Leucippe, Thersander is a husband falsely believed dead who finds his spouse apparently married to another. But, unlike Clitophon, Melite was eager to enter into a new relationship, and unlike Leucippe, who still wished the best for Clitophon, Thersander rages madly when he learns of Melite's inconsistency. Melite also recalls the transgressive Ismenadora of Plutarch's *Erotikos*, a rich, experienced widow who has taken up with a younger man. I suggest that Melite's acquittal does not occur just because Artemis is a stickler for legal technicalities; note the water does not rise at all during the test. Rather, Melite, in serving Aphrodite's purposes has also served something more important than mere physical chastity (which can be a matter of accident) by showing a proper respect for the couple and helping them, as Lykainion did. Melite is the only woman in the text referred to as an ἄγαλμα (5,11,5), and thus she is probably the woman referred to in Clitophon's dream who promised that, if he would only wait a bit longer, she would make him a Aphrodite's priest. Melite does this in a scene evoking the language of mystery religion.¹²⁵ Melite, the servant of Aphrodite's purposes, gives Clitophon (who has up to now known only commercial sex) knowledge of sex not as mere physical technique, but as a type of emotional interchange, a cure for a sick spirit as well as for a lusty body, as Lykainion allowed Daphnis to demonstrate a love that went beyond intercourse.¹²⁶ Melite, in tempting Clitophon earlier, also gave him a chance to understand the depths of his own loyalty to Leucippe, as well as for Leucippe to learn more about Clitophon's deep devotion to her. Clitophon's statement that Eros taught Melite how to properly philosophize may sound like a sophistic rationalization for sex – especially coming from him – but it is truer than he knows, as was Lykainion's claim to have been sent by the nymphs to help Daphnis. Clitophon knows already enough about sex as

¹²³ Pandiri 1985, 122.

¹²⁴ See Alvares 2002, 107–115.

¹²⁵ Bartsch 1989, 91–92.

¹²⁶ See Morgan 1996, 181.

carnal satisfaction, as illustrated by his shockingly vivid description of female orgasm, which makes Menelaus call him ‘an old hand at Aphrodite’ (2,38). So what precisely is Aphrodite going to teach Clitophon when she makes him her priest? What Melite does teach him – that erotic love can be emotionally restorative, as well as the possible severe consequences for erotic lapses.

The history of *L & C*’s Callisthenes shows an even more radical rehabilitation achieved through love. Callisthenes is a young reprobate of degraded repute, an *akolastos* more dissolute even than Clinias, and also more violent. That Calligone can be mistaken for Leucippe suggests the potential equivalence of the two girls, who will both reform their men. And not only does Callisthenes respect Calligone’s virginity, but turns himself completely around, becoming a model of social respectability. Morgan has suggested the narrative’s linking of Callisthenes and Clitophon indicates Clitophon has in fact had his happy ending. I would see another parallel. At *D & C*’s conclusion, as part of their assumption of civic duty, the couple makes dedications to the gods that have helped them, dedications which tell their story. Perhaps Clitophon has come to Sidon to make a similar dedication and confession to the goddess.

More than humans are rehabilitated. It has been suggested that *Daphnis and Chloe* was written in response to the supposed proclamation that ‘Great Pan is dead!’¹²⁷ which asserts the fatal decline of an archaic paganism incompatible with a more developed Greco-Roman world. But, as now with the narratives of Christianity, efforts were made to rehabilitate the old gods, and even make them cooperative workers in a higher purpose. Thus at the beginning of *D & C* Eros, an important god of the protected pastoral world, sets the plot in motion, aided by the nymphs, more beneficent nature spirits. It is in Philetas’ garden, where neither Dionysos or Pan are represented, that Daphnis and Chloe get their first revelation about love. But as the less gentle, more mature world increasingly intrudes, the presence of Pan and Dionysos is increasingly felt. Daphnis must learn about Pan, to appreciate his own Pan-potential as it were, which is a preliminary to the full discovery of the deeds of Love.¹²⁸ But here Pan, unlike the murderous violator of Echo, Pitys and Syrinx, protects the love-career of Daphnis and Chloe. Similarly, when Daphnis and Chloe mime the myth of Syrinx, they enact no real rape, but

¹²⁷ McCulloh 1970, 13–15.

¹²⁸ Zeitlin 1994, 161–162.

rather Daphnis' Pan plays love tunes for Chloe (2,37), after which performance Philetas hands him his pipes. Daphnis has passed his test as a master-musician, and, like Philetas, is now a *muscian-vates*, whose artistic productions present this new Pan. Pan's assault on the Methymnaeans has Dionysic overtones, and at the consequent celebration Dryas, having called for a Dionysic tune, enacted the grape harvest and wine making (2,36). As noted before, Dionysos, accompanied by images of his violent history, lies at the center of the garden of Book 4, a four part *ktêma* symbolic of the entire work, but there is nothing of Eros or the Nymphs, nor is music heard in the garden. Dionysos' operations are mysterious and disturbing, and are linked to the movement of the young lovers from the protected, musical realm of eros (one rather like Philetas' garden) to more problematic world of the city. And this agrees with Dionysos' role in myth and ritual as a god who incorporates the violent natural world into the realm of civilizing order; comedy and tragedy, which Dionysos also rules, provide intellectual spaces for the reconciliation of these opposites.

The myth of Syrinx likewise has an important place in *L & C*, and, although Clitophon worries about Leucippe's safety in the realm of such a notably lustful being (8,13,2–3), Pan's pipes in fact celebrate her virginity. In this version of the tale, Pan, after slicing up the reeds, *feels regret* and cries because he believes he chopped up his beloved (8,6,9). Later Pan made an agreement with Artemis that the cave could become a place where virginity was vindicated.¹²⁹ Both romances, in effect, show a 'rehabilitation' of Pan, which corresponds to the rehabilitation of the male heroes, for Pan and the Nymphs also can symbolize the masculine and the feminine sides of sexuality.

As Segal noted, *L & C* also posits a reconciliation of Artemis and Aphrodite,¹³⁰ although I would suggest *L & C* presents their relationship as something of a productive rivalry, with the transgressive behavior prompted by Aphrodite serving some of Artemis' purposes, just as the lustful Pan provides a virginity test. In *D & C*, while Aphrodite herself does not appear, the whole story of Longus' Daphnis rewrites Theocritus' *Idyll* I, in which Aphrodite destroyed a rebellious Daphnis. Longus' Daphnis, of course, loves successfully. Leucippe holds within herself the potentials of Artemis and

¹²⁹ Notice too the sweetness of the music Pan makes when vindicating Leucippe, which echoes the theme of musical harmony seen in *D & C*.

¹³⁰ Segal 1984, 83–91.

Aphrodite; she resembles Calligone in her virginity and purity, but also recalls Melite in her transgressive sexuality. As Morales has shown, to the some eyes, Leucippe's very experiences, such as among bandits or as a slave, would have made her technically unchaste, whether *intacta* or not. Leucippe simply knows too much to be a proper *parthenos*. Leucippe participates in two double vindications; she and Melite are proven at the same time in Ephesus and Calligone and Leucippe are wed on the same day. The waters of the Styx arose from a former conflict between Aphrodite and Artemis; Rhodopis swore eternal virginity in faithfulness to Artemis, but due to Aphrodite's machinations had illicit sex and was turned to water by Artemis, who now acquits the 'loose' Melite – and, by implication, Clitophon.¹³¹ Melite's triumph suggests that virtue is not defined narrowly in terms of sex. The dual triumph of Melite and Leucippe also suggests a certain equivalence between them. Later the vindicated Leucippe, no longer observing customary *aidôs*, shows pity for the murdered prostitute (8,16).¹³² As noted, a familiar motif of comedy is the breaking of irrational rules, and Melite's acquittal fits this theme.¹³³ Note how Artemis' priest in *L & C* indulges in coarse Aristophanic invective (8,9,1). Further, Menelaus' earlier comments about the two types of beauty, *pandemon* and *uranion* (2,36), although defending homosexual love in their echoes of Pausanias' two Aphrodites (*Symp.* 180D), hint at a more spiritualized Aphrodisian love. Artemis appears to Leucippe in a dream vowing that she herself would 'decorate her as bride.' I have already discussed how Aphrodite, with Melite's help, makes Clitophon her priest, one who will provide his mate's final lessons in love (4,1). Later Clitophon will act the role of exegete of Eros and philosophic educator in Sidon. The romance begins with a focus on Astarte/Aphrodite, but ends with their triumph at the city and shrine of Artemis, whose works the people bless (7,16,1) and who has sent a dream to Leucippe's father Sostratus. Thus Artemis and Aphrodite cooperate in events leading to the marriage of Clitophon and Leucippe, a process demonstrating a broader view of the requirements of love than is prescribed in their myths and in conventional morality.

¹³¹ Segal 1984, 88.

¹³² The fact that the prostitute is a virtual double of Leucippe suggests their equivalence.

¹³³ Clitophon, in the omission of his love-making with Melite from his account to Leucippe's father, recalls Odysseus' omissions to Penelope during their reunion; Odysseus, whatever his problems with strict chastity, is portrayed by Homer as deeply committed to Penelope, and in part gives up immortality for her.

In the above I hope I have shown how *Daphnis and Chloe* and *Leucippe and Clitophon*, although so different, share very similar concerns about such matters as *paideia*, art and rhetoric, education (especially the education in love), social transgression, the growth of young people into their proper adult roles, and the imaginative possibilities of Love as a divine force which can guide basically good individuals to a success beyond their capabilities or circumstances. Both romances contain a story of a couple who, guided by love, become proper lovers and proper members of society despite their education, understanding or circumstances. And due to such similarities, studying and teaching these two romances in tandem provides a significant and mutual illumination.

Bibliography

- Alvares, J. 1997. 'Chariton's Erotic History', *AJP* 118, 613–629.
 — 2002. 'Utopian themes in Three Greek Romances', *AN* 2, 1–30.
 Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes - Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico, CA.: Scholars Press.
 — 1989. "The Pedaideumenos in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Empire", *ANRW* II.33.1, 79–108.
 — 1997. 'Perspectives on Achilles Tatius', *ANRW* II.34.3, 2278–2299.
 Bakhtin, M. M. and C. Emerson and M. Holquist (trans.) 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
 Barton, T. S. 1995. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
 Bartsch, S. 1994. *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
 — 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel-the Reader and the role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 Bompaire, J. 1958. *Lucien écrivain. Imitation et Création*, Paris: E. de Boccard.
 Bowersock, G. W. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Brown, P. 1988. *The Body and Society. Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York: Columbia University Press.
 — 1992. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
 Carson, A. 1996. *Eros the Bittersweet. An Essay*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 Chalk, H. H. O. 1960. 'Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus', *JHS* 80, 32–51.
 Chew, K. 2000. 'Achilles Tatius and Parody', *CJ* 96, 57–70.
 Cresci, L. 1978. 'La Figura di Melite in Achille Tazio', *A&R* 23, 74–82.
 Cooper, K. 1996. *The Virgin and the Bride. Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
 Deligiorgis, S. 1974. 'Longus' Art in Brief Lives', *CQ* 53.1, 1–9.

- Denham, R. D. 1978. *Northrop Frye and Critical Method*, University Park, PA.: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Durham, D. G. 1938. 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CP* 33, 1–19.
- Edsall, M. 2002. 'Religious Narratives and Religious Themes in the Novels of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus', *AN* 1, 114–133.
- Egger, B. 1990. 'Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine', Diss., University of California-Irvine.
- 1994. 'Women and Marriage in the Greek Novel: The Boundaries of Romance', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 260–280.
- Epstein, Stephen 2002a. 'Longus' Werewolves', *CP* 90, 58–73.
- 2002b. 'The Education of Daphnis: Goats, Gods, the Birds and the Bees', *Phoenix* 56, 25–40.
- Foucault, M. 1986. *The Care of the Self*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 1976. *Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gärtner, H. 1967. 'Xenophon von Ephesos', *RE* 2.9, 2055–2084.
- Gaselee, S. (trans.) 1917. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe & Clitophon*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goessler, L. 1999. 'Advice to the Bride and Groom. Plutarch Gives a Detailed Account of His Views on Marriage', in: S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translation, Commentary, Interpretive Essays and Bibliography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 97–115.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity. Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2001. 'The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict', in: S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 154–194.
- Goodheart, E. 1991. *Desire & Its Discontents*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harlan, E. C. 1965. 'The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and its Application in Achilles Tatius', Diss., Columbia University, New York.
- Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London: Routledge.
- Hunter, R. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1996. 'Response to Morgan', in: Sommerstein, A. H. and Atherton, C. (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction*, Nottingham Classical Lecture Series, Vol. 4. Bari: Levante Editori, 191–205.
- 1997. 'Longus and Plato', in: M. Picone and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*, Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 15–28.
- Jones, C. P. 1978. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kaster, R. A. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Laplace, M. M. J. 1983. 'Légende et Fiction chez Achille Tatius. Les Personnages de Leucippé et de Iô', *BAGB* 1983, 311–318.
- Lefkowitz, M. 1983. 'Influential Women', in: Averil Cameron and Amelie Kuhrt (eds.), *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London: Croom Helm, 49–64.

- MacAlister, S. 1996. *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire*, London: Routledge.
- MacMullen, R. 1980. 'Women in Public in the Roman Empire', *Historia* 29, 208–218.
- MacQueen, B. 1985. 'Longus and the Myth of Chloe', *ICS* 10, 119–134.
- Manieri, A. 1998. *L'immagine poetica nella teoria degli antichi. Phantasia ed enargeia*, Pisa – Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.
- Maritz, J. 1991. 'The Role of Music in *Daphnis and Chloe*', *GCN* 4, 56–67.
- Marshall, A. J. 1975. 'Roman Woman and the Provinces', *AnSoc* 6, 109–127.
- Martin, R. P. 2002. 'A Good Place to Talk. Discourse and Topos in Achilles Tatius and Philostratus', in: M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis, (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 1, 141–160.
- McCulloh, W. E. 1970. *Longus*, New York: Twayne.
- Merkelbach, R. 1960. 'Daphnis und Chloe. Roman und Mysterium', *Antaios* 1, 47–60.
- Morales, H. 2001. 'Introduction', in: Tim Whitmarsh (trans.), *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, vii–xxxii.
- 2003. 'The Taming of the View: Natural Curiosities in *Leukippe and Kleitophon*', in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Netherlands – Boston: Brill, 39–49.
- Morgan, J. R. 1994. 'Daphnis and Chloe: Love's own sweet story', in: J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 64–70.
- 1996. 'Erotika Mathemata: Greek Romance as Sentimental Education', in: A. H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction*, Nottingham Classical Lecture Series, Vol. 4. Bari: Levante Editori, 163–190.
- 2003. 'Nymphs, Neighbors and Narrators. A Narratological Approach to Longus', in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Netherlands – Boston: Brill, 171–190.
- Nakatani, S. 2003. 'A Re-examination of Some Structural Problems in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *AN* 3, 1–19.
- Nikolaïdis, A. G. 1997. 'Plutarch on Women and Marriage', *WS* 110, 27–88.
- Pandiri, T. A. 1985. 'Daphnis and Chloe; the Art of Pastoral Play', *Ramus* 14, 116–141.
- Papanikolaou, A. D. 1964. 'Chariton und Xenophon von Ephesus: Zur Frage der Abhängigkeit', in: A. Anastassiou, A. Kambylis, and A. Skiadis (eds.), *Kharis: Konstantinos I. Bouberes*, Athens, 305–320.
- Patterson, C. 1999. 'Advice to the Bride and Groom. Traditional Wisdom Through a Philosophic Lens', in: S. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translation, Commentary, Interpretive Essays and Bibliography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 129–137.
- Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: a Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pollitt, J. J. 1974. *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History, and Terminology*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Reardon, B. P. 1994a. 'Μύθος οὐ λόγος: Longus's Lesbian Pastorals', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 135–147.
- 1994b. 'Achilles Tatius and the Ego Narrative', in: J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*, London: Routledge, 80–96.
- 1996. 'Chariton', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 309–335.

- Rhode, E., Schmid W. (ed.) 1914³. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 1996. 'The Rise of the Greek Novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 29–86.
- Sedelmeier, D. 1959. 'Studien zu Achilleus Tatiος', *WS* 72, 113–143.
- Segal, C. 1984. 'The Trials at the End of Achilles Tatiος' *Clitophon and Leucippe*. Doublets and Complementaries', *SIFC* 77, 83–91.
- Selden, D. L. 1994. 'Genre of Genre', in: J. Tatum (ed.) *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 39–64.
- Stephens, S. 1996. 'Fragments of Lost Novels', in: G. Schmeling, (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 655–683.
- Stephens, S., Winkler, J. (eds.) 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Swain, S. C. R. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World A.D. 50–250*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1999. 'Plutarch's Moral Program', in: Sarah Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife. English Translation, Commentary, Interpretive Essays and Bibliography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 85–96.
- Trapp, M. B. 1990. 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in second-century Greek Literature', in: D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 141–173.
- Veyne, P. 1987. *A History of Private Life I: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*, New Haven: Harvard University Press.
- Valley, G. 1926. 'Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus', Diss., University of Uppsala.
- Watson, G. 1994. 'The Concept of 'Phantasia' from the Late Hellenistic Period to Early Neoplatonism', *ANRW* II.36.7, 4765–4810.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001a. "'Greece is the World': Exile and Identity in the Second Sophistic", in: S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 269–305.
- 2001b. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Inspiration*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2003. 'Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatiος', in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Netherlands – Boston: Brill, 191–205.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990. 'The Education of Chloe: Hidden Injuries of Sex', in: J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge, 101–126.
- 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: the Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1994. 'Gardens of Desire in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*: Nature, Art and Imitation', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 148–170.
- 2001. 'Visions and Revisions of Homer', in: S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 195–266.