

From Theocritean to Longan Bucolic: Eugenianus' *Drosilla and Charicles*

Joan B. Burton

FOUR TEXTS represent a revival of the ancient Greek novel in twelfth-century Constantinople; three were written in verse, the fourth in prose. One of the three verse novels—that of Nicetas Eugenianus, with its extensive intertextuality between Theocritean, Longan, and other bucolic texts—also represents a remarkable reemergence of the Greek bucolic. After a long period in which Longus' bucolic novel seems to have gone underground, Eugenianus' extensive, multiple Longan references, adaptations, and conflations suggest expectation of a sophisticated, informed readership. Similarly, Eugenianus' display of intimate knowledge of a wide range of Theocritean poetry suggests a more broadly knowledgeable readership of Theocritus than has been assumed.¹ This paper focuses on how Eugenianus' novel reenacts the literary history of transformations and ideological shifts between Theocritean and Longan bucolic.

Points of interest include Eugenianus' representation of the programmatic move away from a Theocritean focus on love as disease and torment toward a more propitious, Longan Eros.²

¹ On the range and density of allusions to Theocritus' poetry (including *Id.* 12 and 29 as well as ps.-Theoc. *Id.* 8), see J. B. Burton, "A Reemergence of Theocritean Poetry in the Byzantine Novel," *CP* 98 (2003) 251–273.

² On Theocritean versus Longan love see J. R. Morgan, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Oxford 2004) 183–184, and "Poets and Shepherds: Philetas and Longus," in K. Doulamis (ed.), *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction* (Groningen 2011) 139–160, at 157; cf. M. Fantuzzi, "Bucolic and Non-Bucolic Love," in M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter,

Eugenianus also echoes Longus' innovative focus on themes of innocence and erotic education. In altering and incorporating his bucolic models, Eugenianus both reconstructs the bucolic tradition and also playfully complicates the generic positioning of his own text. The extensive interweaving of Eugenianus' echoes and borrowings from Longus' bucolic novel and from Longus' chief model, Theocritus, has gone largely unexplored.³ Yet these intertextual moments are frequent and together contribute toward a multifaceted novel that raises questions regarding the utility of bucolic art and performance in a Christian world.

Longus' prologue and the utility of art

Part of a cohort of professional writers in twelfth-century Constantinople, Eugenianus followed Theodore Prodromus in reviving the genre of the Greek novel; like Prodromus' novel, Eugenianus' is nine books long and in twelve-syllable verse.⁴ Yet Eugenianus' novel sets itself apart in its profusion of gardens, bucolic imagery, and allusions to past bucolic texts. A notable characteristic of his novel is the general movement away from descriptions of the torment of Eros toward the more benign imagery characteristic of Longan bucolic. Frequent references to Theocritus and Longus, including to their notably programmatic *pharmakon* passages, highlight ideological differences between Theocritean and Longan bucolic.

The theme of finding a treatment for love sickness has a long history in Greek literature. The novels of antiquity mention various *pharmaka* for love or grief, including sleep, embrace, and love potions.⁵ Eugenianus follows Longus in reaching outside

Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry (Cambridge 2004) 170–190.

³ For suggestive remarks see R. Beaton, *The Medieval Greek Romance*² (London/New York 1996) 76–78; P. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel* (Washington 2005) 110.

⁴ With the exception of three hexameter passages: Eugen. 3.263–288, 297–320; 6.205–235.

⁵ Among the novels of antiquity and Byzantium, the word *pharmakon* used

this novelistic repertoire to engage centrally with the theme of finding a *pharmakon* for love through song and music; a key figure is Theocritus' Polyphemus. Among the extant Greek novels of antiquity and twelfth-century Byzantium, there are no other references to Polyphemus as a lover than in Eugenianus.

Theocritus' *Idyll* 11 offers a paradigmatic proposition of song and music as *pharmaka* for love (1–3):⁶

οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
 Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,
 ἦ τὰ Πιερίδες.

No other treatment is there for love, Nicias, neither unguent, I think, nor salve, save only the Muses.

Polyphemus serves as the exemplar for this proposition. Longus' project of reinventing the novel involves close engagement with this theme of finding a remedy for lovesickness. He introduces an authorial figure, Philetas, an old man in a goat-skin, recalling Philitas of Cos, to serve as *praeceptor amoris* for Daphnis and Chloe. Philetas' amatory history includes breaking his panpipes—a key moment in his 'correction' of the Theocritean remedy for love (Longus 2.7.7):

of treatments for love or grief appears mostly in Longus, Ach. Tat., and Eugen.: of sleep (Longus 1.22.3–4; Ach. Tat. 4.10.3; Eugen. 6.246), embrace (Longus 2.7.7, 2.8.5, 2.9.1, 2.9.2, 2.10.3, 3.14.1–2; Ach. Tat. 5.26.2, 5.27.2; cf. Eugen. 6.377–378), the beloved (Char. 6.3.7; Eugen. 2.243, 2.257, cf. 4.218; Prodr. 3.410), death (Ach. Tat. 3.17.3, 7.9.2), time (Ach. Tat. 5.8.2), company (Ach. Tat. 7.2.3), talk (Eugen. 1.269), cf. written message (Eugen. 2.145–146). For the *pharmakon* of song/music: Eugen. 3.310, 4.379–380, 4.384–385; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 11.1–3, 11.17–18 (also *Anth.Gr.* 12.150). In Ach. Tat., in addition to the uses above, *pharmakon* often refers to love potions (as well as sleeping potions and poisons). In other novelists, *pharmakon* refers to a treatment for love or grief rarely: in Chariton only at 6.7.3 (the beloved); Heliod. uses *pharmakon* only of poisons. In Prodr. *pharmak-* refers to a treatment for love or grief only at 3.410 (the other three occurrences refer to poison), cf. Macrembolites 3.9.21 (the only other occurrence refers to a foot cure, 3.4.26). (TLG data.)

⁶ I use A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*² (Cambridge 1952), for text and translation (occasionally revised for clarity).

ἔρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ᾠδαῖς λαλούμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασι.

For there is no medicine for love, nothing that can be drunk or eaten or uttered in song, except a kiss and an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies.⁷

Eugenianus' novel reinscribes in the context of the Byzantine revival of the novel the polemical engagement between the Theocritean and Longan *pharmaka* for love. Other novelists raise the theme of art's utility for love, but not with such pointed prevalence of the term *pharmakon* and reference to Theocritean and Longan formulations.

Eugenianus revisits Longus' prologue throughout his novel,⁸ testing its propositions regarding the utility of art through a range of embedded genres, including lyric poems, letters, bucolic poetry, novels, and epigrams, and also various audiences (Longus *proem* 3–4):

κτῆμα δὲ τερπὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται καὶ λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, τὸν ἐρασθέντα ἀναμνήσει, τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει. πάντως γὰρ οὐδεὶς Ἔρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύζεται μέχρις ἂν κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν.

⁷ Greek text: M. D. Reeve, *Longus: Daphnis et Chloe*² (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1994); transl: J. R. Morgan, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Oxford 2004), occasionally revised.

⁸ A brief plot summary of Eugenianus' novel: The hero, Charicles, first sees the heroine, Drosilla, at a festival of Dionysus in their hometown in Thessaly. They elope, experience two captivities (first by Parthians, then by Arabs), and gain a prison friend, Cleandrus. While en route in captivity to Arabia, Drosilla escapes and finds her way to a village, where she is sheltered by an old woman and wooed by the innkeeper's son, Callidemus. Meanwhile, Charicles and Cleandrus gain release from the Arabian king and find Drosilla at the old woman's house; the old woman dances a Bacchic dance in celebration, and they return home to be wed by a priest in a temple of Dionysus. As in Longus, erotic experiences take place largely in association with gardens, and Eros and Dionysus are central, controlling deities.

A possession to delight all mankind, which will heal the sick and comfort the distressed, stir the memory of those who have been in love, and give preparatory instruction to those who have not. For certainly no one has ever escaped Eros, nor ever shall, so long as beauty exists and eyes can see.

In the context of Eugenianus' project of reviving the ancient novel, and in light of ongoing Christian concerns regarding the use of fictional and pagan texts in education, Longus' opening claims about the functionality of his novel are notable.

In Eugenianus' novel, direct references to the Longan prologue highlight the interplay between Longan and Theocritean approaches to bucolic love and poetry. The target text is Longus' assertion of Eros' power: πάντως γὰρ οὐδεὶς Ἔρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύζεται μέχρις ἂν κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν. The first of Eugenianus' allusions to this description occurs in Book 4, when the hero, Charicles, comes upon the heroine asleep in a garden and delivers a soliloquy (332–413)—an episode that evokes Daphnis' uttering a soliloquy while Chloe sleeps (Longus 1.25). In this context, Eugenianus has Charicles recall the story of Polyphemus' *pharmakon* as borrowed from Theocritus' *Idyll* 11 (Eugen. 4.379–386):⁹

ἔρωτος οὐδὲν ἄλλο φάρμακον ξένον·
ὥδῃ δὲ τις καὶ μοῦσα παῦλα τῶν πόνων.
βεβλημένος γὰρ καὶ Πολύφημος πάλαι
τὸ στέρνον ἐξ Ἔρωτος ἀνδροτοξότου,
πλατὺ τρέφων τὸ φίλτρον εἰς Νηρηίδα
ἔφεῦρεν οὐδὲν ἄλλο φάρμακον νόσου,
ὥδῃν δὲ καὶ σύριγγα καὶ θέλγον μέλος,
καὶ πέτραν ἔδραν, τῇ θαλάττῃ προσβλέπων.

There is no other strange *pharmakon* for love: song and music alone offer a rest from love's cares. Even Polyphemus once,

⁹ Greek text: F. Conca, *Nicetas Eugenianus: De Drosillae et Chariclis Amoribus* (Amsterdam 1990); transl.: J. B. Burton, *A Byzantine Novel: Drosilla and Charicles* (Wauconda 2004), occasionally revised. Another English translation has just appeared: E. Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* (Liverpool 2012) 351–458.

when he was hit in the breast by Eros, murderous archer, and nursed a strong love for a Nereid, found no other *pharmakon* for his sickness than a song, a reed pipe, and a charming tune, and a rock for a seat, from which he gazed at the sea.

Content, vocabulary, and syntax closely link Eugenianus' summary with Theocritus *Idyll* 11.1–3, 8, 13–18:

No other *pharmakon* is there for love, Nicias, neither unguent, I think, nor salve, save only the Muses ... even Polyphemus of old, when he was in love with Galatea ... he, alone upon the wrack-strewn shore, would waste away with love as he sang of Galatea from dawn of day, having deep beneath his breast an angry wound which the shaft of the mighty Cyprian goddess had planted in his heart. Yet the *pharmakon* he found, and seated on some high rock would gaze seaward and sing thus.

Immediately following the evocation of Theocritus' Polyphemus, Eugenianus has Charicles offer a recollection of the image of Eros given at the close of Longus *proem* 4 (Eugen. 4.387–391):

πρῶτον γὰρ οἶμαι—καὶ καλῶς οὕτως ἄρα—
 πτηνοδρομήσαι τοὺς λίθους εἰς αἰθέρα
 καὶ λίθον ἀδάμαντα τμηθῆναι ξίφει
 ἢ τοξικῆς Ἔρωτα παυθῆναι κάτω,
 κάλλους παρόντος καὶ βλεπόντων ὀμμάτων.

I think—and I am right—that sooner would stones fly winged to the sky and diamond be cut by sword than Eros cease to shoot arrows below, as long as beauty exists and eyes see.

By placing an extended borrowing of Theocritus' *Idyll* 11 in a distinctly Longan context—a soliloquy over a sleeping heroine in a bucolic garden—and also including a quotation from Longus' prologue, Eugenianus displays a technique of multiple references that highlights his distinctive interest in the dialogue between Theocritean and Longan bucolic.

Eugenianus' second echo of Longus *proem* 4 occurs during a courtship speech addressed by the lovesick innkeeper's son, Callidemus, to Drosilla (Eugen. 6.367–370):

οὐκ ἐκφύγη τις, κἄν δοκη πεφευγέναι,
 Ἔρωτα τὸν τύραννον ὀπλοτοξότην,

ἄχρισ ἄν ἐν γῆ φῶς τε καὶ κάλλος μένη,
καὶ τῶν βροτῶν τὸ ὄμμα πρὸς τοῦτο βλέπη.

No one will escape—even if one thinks one’s escaped—Eros, the tyrant armed with a bow, so long as light and beauty exist on earth and the eyes of mortals look upon them.

The pivotal repetitions of this passage in the novel, Books 4 and 6, underscore the importance of Longus’ programmatic prologue as an intertext for Eugenianus. Both these references to Longus’ prologue occur in connection with extended references to Theocritus’ *Idyll* 11, with its proposition of song/music as a *pharmakon* for love. Further, the different representations of Theocritus’ lovelorn Polyphemus illustrate different modes of reading—the hero’s, learned and ironic; the innkeeper’s son’s, bookish and naive.¹⁰

Callidemus’ courtship speech in Book 6 also features the Longan corrective of ‘naked embrace’ for the Theocritean *pharmakon* of ‘music and song’. Thus, after describing his love symptoms, Callidemus borrows both Philetas’ description of Eros (Eugen. 6.374–376, cf. Longus 2.7.1), and then also Philetas’ *pharmakon* for love (Eugen. 6.377–378, cf. Longus 2.7.7):

οὐ φάρμακόν τις εὔρεν οὐδεὶς ἐν βίῳ,
εἰ μὴ περιπλοκὴν τε καὶ γλυκὺν γάμον.

Against him [Eros] no one in life has found a *pharmakon*, except embrace and sweet nuptials.

Directly following, Callidemus adopts a Philetan role of *praeceptor amoris* to further his love suit (6.382–387):

Listen, then, learn, and understand, O girl now near me, with your pearly breasts and naturally golden locks of hair—comprehend the size of love’s waves, rough waters, and storm! I beg you to have in mind the people of long ago who were united by love into one soul.

¹⁰ Discussion: C. Jouanno, “Nicétas Eugénianos: Un héritier du roman grec,” *REG* 102 (1989) 346–360; Burton, *CP* 98 (2003) 253–262; Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia* 68–79.

But Callidemus misreads his sources, offering as his first examples of reciprocated love Heliodorus' decidedly mismatched Arsace and Theagenes (a satrap's wife and the hero) and Achaemenes and Charicleia (a maid's son and the heroine) (6.389–390). In Callidemus' self-interested revision of the romance novel here, the rival wins the girl.

An earlier allusion to Polyphemus' *pharmakon* signals the pre-occupation of Eugenianus' novel with the Theocritean model of bucolic love and song. In Book 3 a singer emblematically named Barbition performs the mythological story of Syrinx to an audience of young male companions attending a festival of Dionysus. The song ends with a Theocritean twist on Pan's creation of the panpipes (Eugen. 3.308–311):

κηροχύτους δ' ἐπέπηξε, συνήρμοσε χεῖλεσιν ἐσθλοῖς,
 φίλεεν ἠδ' ἄμπνυτο· πνοή δὲ κάλαμον ἐσήχθη
 καὶ μέλος ἠδὺ σύριξε τὸ φάρμακόν ἐστιν ἐρώτων.
 καὶ σὺ μισεῖς στέργοντα, καὶ οὐ ποθέοντα ποθεῖς με;

He joined the reeds with wax, fit them to his noble lips, kissed them, and blew forth; and his breath entered a reed and produced a sweet song, which is a *pharmakon* for love. And you, do you hate the lover and not desire me who desires you?

Eugenianus underscores the foundational value of the Syrinx story for bucolic poetry by connecting Pan's creation of his panpipes with the theme of song as a *pharmakon* for love (3.310, cf. Theoc. 11.1). The final reference here to a key anxiety regarding unrequited love (3.311), reminiscent of another of Theocritus' Polyphemus poems (*Id.* 6.17), reinforces the echo of the Theocritean *pharmakon*.¹¹

Eugenianus' focus on Longus and Theocritean models of *pharmaka* for love's suffering signals the novel's interest in the dialogic interplay between Theocritus' and Longus' contrasting

¹¹ Eugenianus' retelling of the story of Syrinx parallels Ach. Tat. 8.6.7–10 in key details (cf. Longus 1.24.4). See also the retelling of Syrinx's story in Longus, as attributed to a Sicilian goatherd evocative of Theocritus (Longus 2.33.3–34.3, cf. 2.37.1–3).

ideologies of bucolic love and song. Among the extant Greek novels of antiquity and Byzantium, apart from Eugenianus only one citation of a *pharmakon* for love sickness seems to engage with the key texts of Longus 2.7.7, Longus' prologue, and Theocritus 11.¹²

Eugenianus' pervasive interest in the *pharmakon* theme is underscored by his presentation of a range of other *pharmaka* (beyond song and embrace) for love's suffering—a practice not common among other ancient and Byzantine novels. The first instance of the word in Eugenianus occurs in Book 1, when a prison mate, Cleandrus, overhearing Charicles lamenting for his beloved, declares that talk is a "*pharmakon* for every pain" (λύπησ γάρ ἐστὶ φάρμακον πάσης λύγος, 1.269). Finding solace through talk is a commonplace, yet Eugenianus' presentation of the *pharmakon* of talk also echoes Longus' description of the utility of his novel to "comfort those in distress" (λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, *proem* 3). A few lines later (1.273), Cleandrus' description of talk's ability to "comfort those in distress" (παρηγορεῖν ἔχοντα τοὺς λυπούμενους) reinforces the perception of an echo of Longus: in both cases, a present passive participle of λυπέω in the masculine accusative serves as the direct object of a synonymous verb starting with the prefix *para-*.

Eugenianus Book 3 offers another notable instance of the novel's interest in themes of instruction in love and the utility of art. The occasion is the hero's story of falling in love, as told to a friend in prison. Charicles recounts how he and young male companions were sitting in a garden precinct, under a shady, Phaedran plane tree, near a stream, during a festival of Dionysus. The mention of herdsmen and goats underscores the sanctuary's bucolic nature (3.79, 95–96). After the companions exchanged performances of epigrammatic and anacreontic songs, a character named Barbiton arrived and contributed

¹² At Ach. Tat. 5.26.2 Melite addresses the hero: "One embrace is enough for me: it is a small remedy for so great a disease"; cf. 5.27.4 (transl. T. Whitmarsh, *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon* [Oxford 2001]).

two songs of mythological exempla: Rhodope and Syrinx. Like Longus, Eugenianus approaches the theme of how stories can instruct through a focus on those who are innocent of love: Charicles describes himself as coming to the festival “un-initiated in love’s arrows” (105–106, cf. 59–60). In this context, Barbition’s presentation of mythological love stories in a garden setting seems to align him with an initiator/authorial figure akin to the Longan Philetas.¹³

The description of Barbition’s songs of mythological exempla as *terpna* (delightful: ἄσμα τερπνόν, 3.262; τερπνόν ... μέλος, 3.296) may also be reminiscent of Longus’ claim that his novel is a *terpnon* possession for human kind (*proem* 3). Longus’ claim for art’s utility as well as pleasure engages also with Thucydides.¹⁴ Barbition’s songs serve to help instruct a novice in love, as revealed by Charicles’ remark on first catching sight of Drosilla: “I knew from the stories heard earlier that lovers feel grief and pain” (3.339–340). Like Daphnis and Chloe’s response after listening to Philetas’ stories of Eros (Longus 2.8.1–5),¹⁵ Eugenianus’ Charicles now recognizes the meaning of his symptoms.

Yet does Charicles learn anything beyond recognition of symptoms from the songs performed by his companions and Barbition? After hearing the stories and identifying his symptoms, Charicles decides to “seize the day” and “abduct the maiden” (3.366–372, 3.384–86).¹⁶ The novel is in part explor-

¹³ Other references to the Philetan episode in Longus strengthen the suggestion that reminiscences of Philetas may be meant here; see discussion below of how Charicles’ description of Eros’ age (Eugen. 3.115) evokes the description given by Longus’ Philetas (2.5.2).

¹⁴ See e.g. R. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe* (Cambridge 1983) 48–49.

¹⁵ Longus 2.8.1–2: “When they went back to their cottages that night, they compared their own condition to what they had been told [by Philetas]. ‘People in love are sick, and so are we...’”

¹⁶ On the theme of abduction in relation to civil and canon law see J. B. Burton, “Abduction and Elopement in the Byzantine Novel,” *GRBS* 41 (2000) 377–409. Cf. C. Jouanno, “Les jeunes filles dans le roman byzantin

ing a way out for Charicles from this male-defined, sympotic world of unreciprocated love, as presented in Book 3, to a fictive world compatible with mutual love.

The personal stories told by Cleandrus in Book 2 further illustrate Eugenianus' preoccupation with the theme of finding *pharmaka* for love. Cleandrus proposes, as a *pharmakon* for love, to send a letter to the girl (φάρμακόν τι συννοῶ μου τῆς νόσου / μήνυμα γραπτὸν ἀντιπέμψαι τῇ κόρῃ, 2.145–146). His third letter identifies his beloved as both sickness and *pharmakon* (243 σὺ καὶ νόσος μοι καὶ σὺ φάρμακον νόσου, cf. 257–258) and ends with a wish for a 'Philetan' remedy: "May we lie beneath one cloak, with burning desire in our heart, and enjoy a splendid coupling" (275–277; cf. Longus 2.7.7, Theoc. 18.19, *Anth. Gr.* 5.169). Similarly in Book 6, Callidemus ends his courtship speech with a 'Philetan' wish borrowed from Paulus Silentiarius: "may you be stripped to your very flesh and bring your naked limbs near mine" (6.640–643, cf. *Anth. Gr.* 5.252).

Callidemus contemplates various stories of reciprocity in love but finally adopts as his model for courtship Theocritus' love-lorn Cyclops (Eugen. 6.503–551). He also models his love symptoms after Longus' cowherd Dorcon's amorous soliloquies (Longus 1.18.1–2; cf. Eugen. 6.357–362, 365), which Longus' narrator introduces by the verb ἐπελήρει as foolish chatter. Callidemus' inept use of past literature marks him as a buffoonish lover, and in the end his strategies for abducting the heroine fail when, in a comic turn, the lovesick Callidemus falls ill with fever (7.67–72).

There are many ways to read texts—readers willfully remember what they choose. Eugenianus' novel presents, throughout, different kinds of readers and different traditions of love and poetry in counterpoint to one another. Unruly visions and alternative viewpoints are revealed in letters, lyric poems, personal narratives, and songs. Even a lovesick Parthian prince

du XII^e siècle," in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec* (Lyon 2001) 329–346.

(a captor) takes up a cithara and sings (4.151–219). Yet all the lovers use bucolic imagery for courtship, some more comically than others. An interest area is the asymmetrical love of Theocritean bucolic as contrasted with the mutual love of Longan bucolic; in emphasizing these contrasts, the novel explores the process of moving from a tradition of unhappy love to a more benign imagery of love.

Imagery of torment to describe Eros

The early books of Eugenianus' novel show characters frequently using tormenting imagery to describe the deity Eros. In Book 2 in particular, such passages are plentiful; they dwindle in number over the course of the novel. Of interest here is not the ubiquitous arrow/flames/sickness imagery, unless festering wounds or the like are involved, but rather the kind of tormenting imagery represented by the description of Eros as a marsh leech in Theocritus' *Idyll* 2. The only Greek novel other than Eugenianus' where the deity Eros is described in similarly tormenting terms is Macrembolites', another of the twelfth-century novels, but despite the large number of times Eros appears in that novel, only twice is he described through tormenting imagery (Macremb. 3.4.1, 10.12.3).¹⁷

Eugenianus Book 2 features stories told by Cleandrus, representing love in terms of torturous attacks on the lover's body. For example, Cleandrus uses imagery of tormenting punishments to describe falling in love (2.135–142):

πανδαμάτορ, πάντολμε, παντάναξ Ἔρωσ,
 ποιηλατεῖς πικρῶς με μὴ πταίσαντά σοι·
 οὐ χεῖρα κόπτεις οὐδὲ συντέμνεις πόδας
 οὐδ' ἐξορύττεις τὰς κόρας τῶν ὀμμάτων,
 αὐτὴν ὀπιστεύεις δὲ καρδίαν μέσην
 καὶ θανατοῖς με· δυσμενές, βριαρόχειρ,

¹⁷ On Macrembolites' use of monarchical imagery for Eros see P. Magdalino, "Eros the King and the King of *Amours*: Some Observations on *Hysmine and Hysminias*," *DOP* 46 (1992) 197–204.

σφάττεις, φονεύεις, πυρπολείς, καταφλέγεις,
πλήττεις, αναιρείς, φαρμακεύεις, ἐκτρέπεις.

All-taming, all-daring, all-ruling Eros, like a fury you pursue me cruelly, a man who's done you no wrong. You don't chop off my hand, cut off my feet, dig out the pupils of my eyes; instead you shoot arrows at the very middle of my heart and you make me die. Strong-handed enemy, you slaughter, kill, burn, inflame, strike, destroy, poison, and eliminate.

The foils here recall Byzantine penalties of mutilation (e.g. for thievery, sacrilege, and political offense), which would make these torments vivid for a contemporary audience.¹⁸ In the context of prison talk between captives after violent attacks on a town, imagery of slaughter at enemy hands might readily come to mind. Yet Cleandrus inserts similarly tormenting imagery of Eros into love letters he recollects sending his beloved, for example the snake imagery of his second letter (2.216–219):¹⁹

Within my wretched heart, cruel Eros, the snake-child, rolls around obliquely, like a serpent, and devours my heart and inward parts, alas.

Compare letter three's use of imagery of wounds and worms to appeal for amatory solace (2.257–263, 271–272):

You did not at once provide a cure for my heart when it was wounded, and now, when the wound has festered, the worms that arose are devouring me. Thus Eros always stretches his bow tight and slaughters, slays, wounds, mangles, afflicts, goads, damages, kills, maims, and torments ... clear away from me at once the wound-eating, heart-stinging, thick worms!

There are two major Theocritean passages using tormenting

¹⁸ See J. Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* (London/New York 2009), esp. 107–110 on how the “courts and their savage punishments were troubling imperial subjects in the early imperial centuries, appearing in their dreams and their cultural representations” (108).

¹⁹ For the image of Eros as a snake coiling around the heart (but not so graphically) cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.296–297.

imagery for Eros, and Eugenianus' novel echoes them both. The first is Simaetha's description of Eros (Theoc. 2.55–56):

αἰαὶ Ἔρωσ ἀνιαρέ, τί μευ μέλαν ἐκ χροῶς αἶμα
ἐμφὺς ὡς λιμνᾶτις ἅπαν ἐκ βδέλλα πέπωκας;

Ah torturing Eros, why have you clung to me like some marsh leech, and drained all the dark blood from my body?

Compare Charicles' description at Eugenianus 4.399–403:

ἀνιαρόν τι χρῆμα τοξότης Ἔρωσ·
ἐμφὺς γὰρ ὡσπερ βδέλλα λιμνῆτις πίνει
τὸν αἵματος ῥοὺν πάντα. τῆς ἄκρας νόσου.
ὡς ἐξανάπτεις οὖς λάβης, Ἔρωσ, Ἔρωσ,
καίεις, φλογίζεις, πυρπολεῖς, καταφλέγεις.

A nasty creature is the archer Eros, for clinging closely like a marsh leech he drinks up every drop of blood. What a dreadful plague! How you inflame those you seize, Eros—ignite, combust, cremate, and incinerate them.

Simaetha's description of Eros as a marsh leech suits a magic ritual performed in the dark of night.²⁰ But Eugenianus embeds this tormenting imagery in a soliloquy which Charicles delivers over his beloved, asleep in a Longan garden at midday (4.332–413). The soliloquy is filled with peaceful, bucolic imagery (345–378), e.g. “The blowing of the winds has also ceased, I think, from respect for the beauty of the sleeping girl. How hushed is every tuneful sparrow! The streams alone are flowing, beloved, to bring you sweeter sleep” (358–362).²¹ In this context, the tormenting imagery of Eros seems more discordant than in its original Theocritean context. If tormenting imagery might seem appropriate to the larger situation in Eugenianus—the hero and heroine's captors are threatening their virtue—

²⁰ An additional point of contact with Simaetha's love magic: Eugen. 4.397–398, cf. Theoc. 2.28–29.

²¹ The next section of Charicles' soliloquy (379–386) combines references to Polyphemus' *pharmakon* of song and (390–391) to Eros' image in Longus *proem* 4, as discussed above.

still Eugenianus extends the violent imagery that he borrows.²²

The second tormenting image of Eros that Eugenianus can be seen to echo occurs at Theocritus 3.15–17:

νῦν ἔγνω τὸν Ἔρωτα· βαρὺς θεός· ἦ ῥα λεαίνας
μαζὸν ἐθήλαζεν, δρυμῶ τέ νιν ἔτραφε μάτηρ,
ὅς με κατασμύχων καὶ ἐς ὀστίον ἄχρῖς ἰάπτει.

Now I am acquainted with Eros, and a grievous god is he. Truly a lioness' was the breast he sucked, and in the wild woods his mother reared him. His slow fires torture me to the very bones.

In Eugenianus this Theocritean image of Eros seems to resonate in Cleandrus' description of seeing his beloved for the first time (2.88–91):²³

ἔμελλες, ὦ γέννημα θηρίων Ἔρωτος,
ἐμὴν πατάξαι καὶ σπαράξαι καρδίαν·
γάλα λεαίνης ἐξεμύζησας ἄρα
καὶ μαστὸν ἄρκτων ἐξεθήλασας τάχα.

You, Eros, child of beasts, were about to beat and tear my heart —you who'd drunk milk from a lioness and perhaps sucked the breasts of bears.

Eugenianus characteristically expands the image by adding the detail “beat and tear my heart.” Other novelists note Eros and/or shafts entering the heart, but such details of additional violence are not specified.

One last description of Eros highlights the interplay of benign and tormenting love imagery in Eugenianus' novel. As Charicles recalls obtaining a good seat for viewing maidens at a Dionysiac festival, he thinks of Eros' power and the attack unleashed against him (3.114–118):

εἴωθε καὶ γὰρ ὁ βριαρόχειρ Ἔρωτος,
ὁ πρεσβύτης παῖς, τὸ πρὸ τοῦ Κρόνου βρέφος,
ὡς ἐκ θυρίδων ἐμπεσὼν δι' ὀμμάτων,

²² Charicles' soliloquy (and Book 4) ends with two more Theocritean images of inescapable love (4.410, cf. Theoc. 14.51; 4.411–413, cf. Theoc. 30.25–27).

²³ Cf. Eugen. 6.379–381 (also referring to Theoc. 3.15–16).

τὰ σπλάγχνα πιμπρᾶν καὶ φλέγειν τὴν καρδίαν
καὶ νεκρὸν ὡσπερ τὸν ποθοῦντα δεικνύειν.

Strong-handed Eros, too, the old child, the baby born before Cronus, typically attacks through eyes as if through windows, burns up inward parts, inflames the heart, and makes the lover into a corpse as it were.

This description stresses the tormenting power of Eros but it also conflates that imagery with a Longan description of Eros as older than Cronus (Longus 2.5.2):²⁴

οὔτοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος

I am not a child, even if I seem a child, but older than Cronus

The repeated intermingling of benign with violent love imagery throughout Eugenianus' novel seems reflective of dialogue between Theocritean and Longan ideologies of bucolic love.

Over the course of the novel, the frequency and intensity of imagery of tormenting love diminishes from a high point in Book 2 to the last three books, where the deity Eros is mentioned only three times: once in Book 7 and twice in Book 8. The single mention in Book 7 is transformative for presentations of Eros in the novel. The old woman in whose house the reunion of the hero and heroine takes place invites the hero to recast his story in the context of "Eros' mystical courage, with its pleasure and delights" (7.107–108). The last two mentions of Eros occur during love play between hero and heroine in a Longan garden near the old woman's house. One might perhaps expect a transition from a prevalence of tormenting imagery of Eros early in a novel (when love is unrequited and lovers are separated) to more benign imagery (when love is requited and lovers reunite), but the extant novels of antiquity do not use this kind of graphic, tormenting imagery of the deity

²⁴ Although a paradoxical description of Eros' agelessness is commonplace, Eugen. 3.115 and Longus 2.5.2 offer the only two passages in TLG where παῖς appears within three lines of πρεσβυτ- within three lines of τοῦ Κρόνου. Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 178B–C, πρεσβύτατος but without mention of Cronus.

Eros, and that is key to the thought that there is interesting interplay going on in Eugenianus' novel. In light of Eugenianus' frequent turn toward Longan and Theocritean themes and imagery, these changes in the imagery of Eros over the course of the novel seem to reflect a movement from Theocritean unhappy bucolic love toward Longus' happy, mutual love.

Initiation into Longan love

In Book 7 an episode centering on the hospitable old woman provides a key arena for revisiting significant themes of Eugenianus' novel: the nature of love, erotic education, the utility of art, and the possibility of *pharmaka*—also key issues in Longus' novel (including in dialogue with Theocritus). A major theme of Eugenianus' novel has been a shift from earlier imagery of tormenting love toward a more propitious image of love; the author shows the old woman functioning as a kind of initiator for the young people into this new imagery. Drawing on the language of initiation, the old woman suggests that the hero refashion his experiences as “mystical courage,” in a context of “shared joy” (7.106–108, 113–115):²⁵

λέγοις ἂν ἡμῖν σὴν ἄφιξιν ἐνθάδε
καὶ τὴν Ἔρωτος μυστικὴν εὐτολμίαν
μεθ' ἡδονῆς πάντως τε καὶ προσχαρμάτων.

...
οὕτω παρόντος, ὡς χαρᾶς συνημμένης
πάντων κρατούσης, ὃ θεῶν σωτηρίων,
εὐχρηστον οἶμον ἢ διήγησις λάβοι.

Tell us of your arrival here and the mystical courage of Eros with its pleasure and delights ... since you are present and a shared joy rules over all (oh savior gods!), let the narrative take a happy course.

These instructions place the old woman in a role of *praeceptor amoris*. She draws from the linguistic code of initiation to re-

²⁵ On erotic initiation in Longus see e.g. T. Whitmarsh, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance* (Cambridge 2011) 104–106.

describe the role of Eros in the hero and heroine's story, and introduces the principle of reciprocal happiness as central to a project of fashioning a life story. This moment thus represents a culmination of the novel's movement from Theocritean, tormenting love to Longan, happy love. The deity Eros is mentioned only two more times in Eugenianus' novel, during a bantering lovers' conversation in the garden near the old woman's house (8.102, 181).

The old woman's instructions also position her as an authorial figure, inviting a reconception and renarration of the central love story. Charicles complies by reconfiguring the past, shifting the emphasis from "grief and pain" (3.340) to instantly reciprocated love. He elides Drosilla's initial refusal of him and her betrothal to another; he does not mention his impulse, twice, to abduct her forcibly²⁶ (7.140–146):

I saw her and was conquered; you won't blame me, woman, for looking at the vision of this girl's face, since in the great crowd then flowing together it was not possible to see a girl more beautiful than Drosilla. Being conquered, I addressed her and asked her to join me in flight. She consented since she returned my love with great intensity.

After Charicles and Drosilla tell their stories, a memorable image marks the couple's transition into a state of harmoniously shared stories and reciprocal joy (7.230–234):

Like ivy to oak, they kissed each other gladly. They were so hard to separate that they gave Maryllis the impression that the two of them had become one body, who in conversation had become one soul.

In Book 1, while in captivity, thinking Charicles had forgotten her, Drosilla delivers a soliloquy of despair that includes imagery of a similarly Edenic state of intertwined body and soul (1.324–329). So too in Book 6, when Charicles thinks Drosilla is dead, his soliloquy of despair includes like imagery

²⁶ Eugen. 3.367–372, 384–386.

of concordance of soul (6.82–85). The recasting of that earlier imagery, in the context of Book 7's joyous reunion, reinforces the sense that things are changing now for these young people, and the focalization of this imagery through the old woman suggests that her visions too may have a positive influence here.

Reminiscences of Longus' emblematic figure of Philetas in the old woman's role here would intensify a sense of movement toward a Longan Eros. In Longus, at the end of Philetas' story of Eros' epiphany, Philetas informs Daphnis and Chloe of their consecration to Eros, and he cites his old age as warranty for his statement (2.6.2):

Unless I have grown these grey hairs for nothing and my brain has turned soft in my old age, you are consecrated to Eros, my children, and Eros is taking care of you.

In Eugenianus, the old woman similarly uses her old age as warranty and attests to the young couple's consecration to a god (7.249–252, 262, 264):

I am an old woman, advanced in years, and I have experienced many things, good and bad, but I certainly haven't known so great a love nor have I seen such a graceful couple ... you say this is a god's work and you are right ... Who could separate those whom a god has joined?²⁷

Additional parallels include the fact that each of the old people has a nearby garden filled with birds, and both gardens feature myrtle (Eugen. 8.6, Longus 2.4). Further, in the bird-filled garden near the old woman's house, Charicles uses extended metaphors of bird marriage in a Longan-style seduction attempt. The old woman's name seems to reinforce a link with Longus' Philetas. Scholars give her name variously as Maryllis or Baryllis.²⁸ The name Maryllis would recall Amaryllis, familiar from Theocritus 3.1, 4.36 and 38, and Virgil's *Eclogues*;

²⁷ Cf. Eugen. 3.12 for an earlier echo of the same biblical line (Mt 19:6, Mk 10:9).

²⁸ Discussion: Burton, *A Byzantine Novel* 201, with references. Three manuscripts read Maryllis (MSS. **PUL**), one (**M**) Baryllis.

Amaryllis is also Philetas' beloved in Longus (2.7.4–7, 2.8.5). Thus the strong Longan coloration of the Eugenianean episode involving the old woman also favors the name Maryllis.²⁹ If named Maryllis, the old woman would represent an Amaryllis grown old and playing a similar role to Longus' old Philetas.

In the context of Eugenianus' novel, this episode featuring the old woman also explores a radically new portrayal of old age. Before this episode, old age was presented primarily in derogatory terms. The first sustained examples occur in Book 3 when Charicles tells his prison mate Cleandrus how he first caught sight of Drosilla at a Dionysus festival at which he and male companions sang joking songs to females nearby. Charicles (re)performs the series of songs: the first set ends with a song detailing an old woman's physical decrepitude (3.174–196, cf. Agathias Schol. *Anth.Gr.* 5.273); the second set begins with a song critiquing an old woman in love with a hermaphrodite (3.207–215). The introduction of a hospitable old woman in Book 6 who helps guide the young couple's erotic education offers a new model for old age and non-elite behavior in Eugenianus' novel.

Another key interest of the novel has been the efficacy of different *pharmaka* for coping with love's suffering; Charicles' re-performance of songs in Book 3 shows songs providing relief in a prison. Charicles introduces them as "amusing words of love" and "delightful songs" (3.128–129), and Cleandrus certifies their success (197–198): "What laughter has come to me just now from your honey-sweet tales!" Such shared amusement provides a means for feeling (temporarily) empowered. These songs (with their mocking attitudes toward old age and women) also represent the hero's memory of home and past male camaradery. Two books later, Eugenianus shows Charicles still

²⁹ Cf. the use, in both Eugenianus and Longus, of the name Gnathon for a stock figure introduced late in the novel, bringing in values from New Comedy (in Longus, the parasite Gnathon, first appearing at 4.10.1; in Eugenianus, the merchant Gnathon, at 8.188).

reflecting the values of that world when he uses similar insults to reassure Drosilla that an aging barbarian queen is not a rival for his affections but rather a source of disgust (5.73–83, 95).³⁰

Yet if the old woman's role as helper in Book 7 seems to challenge the hero's previous attitude of mockery against old women, the narrator complicates that when he has the old woman dance immodestly (7.276–288):³¹

Taking napkins in her hands, she danced a rather frenzied, Bacchic dance while making a sniffing sound from her nose, which produced delight and caused laughter. But her continuous twistings and turnings tripped Maryllis up as she moved ceaselessly along, and the poor woman fell down, overturned by an entanglement of her legs; then she lifted her feet at once to her head and pressed her head into the dust. Her drinking companions were convulsed in laughter. As that old woman, Maryllis, lay there after her fall, she broke wind three times.

The old woman is isolated by the young people's laughter; she loses control over her bodily processes. When she appeals for help getting up, Cleandrus laughs so hard he falls down, and Charicles turns away to kiss his girlfriend (290–301).

Why have the old woman engage in such a rude dance? Is it simply for the audience's amusement (both internal and external audiences), employing well-worn motifs of drinking and aging in women? Is there anything more at stake? The detail of the Dionysiac dance provides one interesting opening for discussion. There is a contemporary issue in play in terms of church regulations and religious attitudes regarding pagan celebrations and women's behavior. Canon 62 of the Council at Trullo in 691/2 banned public dances of women, dances in general in honor of Greek gods, and invocations of Dionysus in

³⁰ Cf. Callidemus' profession, in courting Drosilla, that he will love her even in old age (6.635–639, cf. Paulus Silent. *Anth.Gr.* 5.258), a seemingly chivalrous claim immediately undermined by the wish that she "be stripped to her very flesh" (6.640–643, cf. Paulus Silent. *Anth.Gr.* 5.252).

³¹ Cf., in Prodrōmus' novel, a drunken sailor's dancing at a party and in his sleep (2.109–110, 3.19–32).

particular. This canon attests to a long-standing anxiety, among Christian leaders and others, regarding Dionysiac celebrations and women dancing.³² Christian suspicion of Dionysiac dancing is underscored by the rejection, even in relatively liberal sixth-century Gaza, of dances common to Dionysiac celebrations.³³ Further, Christian leadership also disapproved of boisterous laughter, which they associated with intemperance, immodesty, and sex; virgins were even advised to avoid smiling.³⁴

Eugenianus seems to be deliberately challenging his contemporary Byzantine audience with a worst case scenario: a drunken old woman dancing an immodest Dionysiac dance at a mixed dinner party including a virgin female, and inciting raucous laughter (7.268–308). Although the severity of Canon 62's views may not have been generally representative—popular culture and street festivals continued to thrive in the Byzantine period³⁵—still, in light of Christian norms of decorum,

³² Discussion, with references: J. B. Burton, “The Pastoral in Byzantium,” in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden/Boston 2006) 554–557; Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia* 292–294.

³³ F. K. Litsas, “Choricus of Gaza and his Descriptions of Festivals at Gaza,” *JÖByz* 32 (1982) 434–436. Cf. women's activities at the festival of Agathe: A. E. Laiou, “The Festival of ‘Agathe’; Comments on the Life of Constantinopolitan Women,” *Byzantium: Tribute to Andreas N. Stratos* I (Athens 1986) 111–122.

³⁴ See e.g. N. Adkin, “The Fathers on Laughter,” *Orpheus* 6 (1985) 149–152; J. Haldon, “Humour and the Everyday in Byzantium,” in G. Halsall (ed.), *Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge 2002) 48–71. Cf. Basil's monastic long rule, q. 17 (*PG* 31.901, 961–965).

³⁵ J. Haldon, “Laughing All the Way to Byzantium: Humour and the Everyday in the Eastern Roman World,” *Acta Byzantina Fennica* 1 (2002) 27–58: e.g. “The very fact that these ordinances had to be repeated, as well as a great deal of other evidence, suggests that neither the court nor the mass of the ordinary population paid them much attention” (44). On “basic bodily functions and mishaps” as a basis for Byzantine humor see L. Garland, “And His Bald Head Shone Like a Full Moon: An Appreciation of the Byzantine Sense of Humour,” *Parergon* 8 (1990) 1–31, esp. 26–28.

Eugenianus is portraying markedly oppositional behavior. The repeated instances of women engaging in public Dionysiac dance throughout the novel underscore Eugenianus' interest in engaging with issues of women's dance and Dionysiac festivities (1.116–119, 150–151; 3.335–338).

Eugenianus uses the episode of the old woman to raise other important, thematic concerns, as revealed by the old woman's surprising explanation for her behavior (7.310–315):

By the gods, children, take notice: ever since Maryllis' beautiful child Chramos was buried—it has been eight years—I have not laughed or danced. I thank you, then, for these things; they say that even an old man runs when playing with children.

This revelation sets the Dionysiac dancing in another context, one that has been of central importance in the novel—that of finding a *pharmakon*. For eight years, the old woman has needed a *pharmakon* for her grief. Her condition as bereft of her son relates emblematically to numerous other references to sorrowing mothers in the novel (e.g. 1.30–35, 2.327–330, 5.434–438, 6.616–617). The *pharmakon* that finally works is not song or music (or sleep, etc.) but features vulgar dancing and laughter.³⁶ Such a *pharmakon* for grief would fit into the tradition of finding consolation through laughter and dance at Dionysiac festivities, e.g. Euripides *Bacch.* 378–381:³⁷

He is the god whose sphere it is to bring people together in the dance, to laugh to the pipe's music, and put an end to cares.

The theme of rejuvenation through dance is also appropriate to the Dionysiac context of Eugenianus' novel, with Dionysus serving as patron god of the hero and heroine (cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 184–190, 322–324). Eugenianus' portrait of an old woman dancing and evoking laughter may also reflect ongoing popularity of mimes and jesters at the Byzantine court and in

³⁶ Cf. how Baubo's self-display induces Demeter to accept drink in spite of her grief for her lost child (Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.20.2–21.1).

³⁷ Transl. J. Morwood, *Euripides: Bacchae and Other Plays* (Oxford 1999), modified.

popular festivals.³⁸ Thus, in a context of church disapproval of Dionysiac dance and laughter, the novel shows Dionysiac dancing and laughter having a positive effect in the world.

Throughout Longus' novel, older people serve as positive role models, including as performers and teachers (e.g. 2.3.1–2.8.5, 2.33.1–2.37.1). A direct echo of Longus in Eugenianus' description of the old woman's dancing reinforces a sense that Longus' novel, with its more positive image of old age, resonates in this episode. In Eugenianus her Dionysiac dancing is introduced thus (7.277):

ὄρχησιν ὠρχήσατο βακχικωτέραν
she danced a rather frenzied, Bacchic dance

Compare, in Longus, the description of Chloe's foster father's dancing, in a key episode featuring older people engaging in performance activities (2.36.1):

καλεύσας συρίζειν Διονυσιακὸν μέλος ἐπιλήνιον αὐτοῖς ὄρχη-
σιν ὠρχήσατο.
asking him to play a Dionysiac tune, he danced them a dance of
the wine vintage.

In both cases, during a celebration of a young couple's reunion after the female escapes from brigands, an old person dances a Dionysiac dance. A TLG search shows only three instances of the phrase ὄρχησιν ὠρχήσατο, and only at Longus 2.36.1 and Eugen. 7.277 is the dance described as Dionysiac. In both novels, after the dinner celebration the young couple engage in lovers' oaths (Longus 2.39; Eugen. 8.1–182, esp. 19–72, 148–162). Longus' old man performs his vintage dance with "grace and realism" (2.36.2), in contrast to the unrefined dancing of Eugenianus' old woman. Her surprising dance invites interpretation, which Eugenianus puts in the mouth of the old woman and also the young people.

³⁸ E.g. Garland, *Parergon* 8 (1990) 1–31. On the carnivalesque aspects of the old woman's dancing cf. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia* 288–296.

The young men's response to the old woman's explanation (citing her son's death) underscores this episode's climactic quality for central themes of the novel (7.316–328):

“μὰ τὸν σὸν υἱόν,” ἀντέφησαν οἱ νέοι
 “ἡδυνας ἡμᾶς, ὦ Μαρυλλίς κοσμία,
 ἄλλοις τε πολλοῖς καὶ τροφῇ σῆ καὶ πόσει·
 ὄρχημα δ' οὖν σὸν καὶ τέχνη λυγισμάτων
 καὶ σῶν ποδῶν κίνησις ἀφθονωτέρα
 καὶ πυκνὸν ἀντίλοξον εὐστροφον τάχος
 ὑπὲρ τροφὴν ἡδυνεν, ὑπὲρ τὴν πόσιν,
 ὑπὲρ τράπεζαν τὴν πολυτελεστάτην,
 ὑπὲρ φιάλην τὴν ὑπερχειλεστάτην.
 καὶ καινὸν οὐδέν, μητὲρ, ὧν κατειργάσω·
 ἡμεῖς δὲ κἂν γέροντες ἡμεν τρισσάκις,
 συμμετριάζειν οὐκ ἂν εἶχομεν φόβον,
 πάντως τὰ λῶστα τῶν θεῶν δωρουμένων.”

“By your son,” answered the young men, “you have given us pleasure, honest Maryllis, with many things and especially your food and drink; but then your dancing—the skill of your twisting movements, the plentiful action of your feet, and your constant, slantwise, nimble quickness—has given us pleasure beyond food, beyond drink, beyond the most lavish table, beyond the overflowing wine bowl. And there is nothing strange, mother, in those things you’ve done. Even if we were three times as old, we would not be afraid to respond like you³⁹ when the gods give wonderful gifts.”

This response recasts the episode of the old woman's Bacchic dance as providing a learning experience for the young people: they gain a different perspective on appropriate behavior in old age. The narrator's description of her dancing highlighted the “continuous twistings and turnings” that tripped her up. The young people now reassess that mode of dancing as skillful with nimble quickness. Their response also reverses the negative

³⁹ For the possibility that *συμμετριάζω* might also connote here a playful, jesting mood, see *μετριάζω* at schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 64, and *μετριάσμός* at *Suda* s.v. ἀκρισία; LSJ 1122 translate as “jest” and “jesting.”

perspective on old age voiced repeatedly earlier, as they foresee their own old age—as a time that would still include dancing and laughter and the gods' wonderful gifts.⁴⁰ There is also a metaliterary aspect to their response: the example of the old woman prompts the young people to envisage a time beyond the adventure world. As the novel nears its end, this passage seems to forecast what is involved in leaving the adventure world (for the fictive young people, for the novel's audience, and for the author).⁴¹

The Greek bucolic tradition

Christian attitudes toward ancient novels were complex: Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius were transformed into bishops, which perhaps facilitated the reading of their novels among Christians.⁴² Claims for utility include suggestions that ancient novels could offer models for morality.⁴³ Epigrams also show continued interest in the novels.⁴⁴ Yet there is little evidence of readership of Longus' novel before the twelfth century. Only traces of Longan influence have been suggested, for example, in Agathias' sixth-century dedicatory epigram for *Daphniaca* (*Anth.Gr.* 6.80) and Constantine of Sicily's ninth-century anacreontic text on chasing Eros.⁴⁵ Had it survived, Agathias' nine-book *Daphniaca* might have reflected close knowledge of

⁴⁰ On Byzantine identification of old age with positive qualities see A.-M. Talbot, "Old Age in Byzantium," *BZ* 77 (1984) 267–278.

⁴¹ On the metaliterary significance of the heroine's two lengthy lamentations in Book 9 see Burton, *CP* 98 (2003) 265–267.

⁴² Discussion: S. MacAlister, *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novels from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London/New York 1996) 109–110.

⁴³ E.g. *Anth.Gr.* 9.203 on how one should ignore the beauty of the style of Achilles Tatius' novel and instead focus on the example it offers of a moral life.

⁴⁴ E.g. *Anth.Gr.* 14.34 (Ach. Tat. 2.14), 9.485 (Heliodorus 3.2), 9.490 (Heliodorus 8.11).

⁴⁵ T. Bergk, *Poetae lyriici graeci* III (Leipzig 1882) 351–354; R. Cantarella, *Poeti bizantini* I (Milan 1948) 158–161. Discussion: R. C. McCail, "Did Constantine of Sicily Read *Daphnis and Chloe*?" *Byzantion* 58 (1988) 112–122.

Longus' novel.⁴⁶ But Photius' ninth-century *Bibliotheca*—an idiosyncratic reading guide including summaries of the novels of Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, Iamblichus, and Antonius Diogenes—does not mention Longus, nor does Michael Psellus' eleventh-century essay comparing Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus.⁴⁷ Yet Eugenianus in the twelfth shows expectation of a richly informed readership of both Longus' bucolic novel and Theocritus' poetry.

Eugenianus' project of reviving the ancient novel was also centrally involved with reviving and rewriting the bucolic. The popularity of bucolic poetry was disturbing to some Christian readers, as is shown by, e.g., Jerome's complaint that priests were ignoring the Gospels and instead reciting erotic passages from bucolic poetry.⁴⁸ Although there is evidence of interest in Theocritean poetry among Byzantine authors and scholars,⁴⁹ there is no evidence of a tradition of self-standing Greek bucolic after post-Theocritean bucolic.⁵⁰ This contrasts with the ongoing tradition of self-standing Christian bucolic in Latin from the fourth century and extending through the early modern period.⁵¹ A strong, Christianized reading of Virgil's

⁴⁶ Hunter, *Daphnis & Chloe* 23, cf. 41–42.

⁴⁷ Discussion: e.g. N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore 1983) 172–177 (including the observation that Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus “enjoyed a much greater popularity in Byzantium than the other representatives of the genre, including Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*,” 174).

⁴⁸ *Ep.* 21.9. M. Mastrangelo, “The Decline of Poetry in the Fourth-Century West,” *IJCT* 16 (2009) 311–329, at 320 n.38.

⁴⁹ For the Byzantine scholia (marked *Rec.*) see H. L. Ahrens, *Bucolicorum graecorum Theocriti, Bionis, Moschi reliquiae* II (Leipzig 1859).

⁵⁰ Cf. A. Cameron, “The Empress and the Poet: Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II,” *YCS* 27 (1982) 231: “pastoral is the one major Hellenistic genre that is conspicuous by its absence in early Byzantine times.” See ps.-Theoc. *Id.* 27 for a possibly late imperial example of Greek bucolic.

⁵¹ See S. C. McGill, “*Poeta arte christianus*: Pomponius's *Cento Versus ad gratiam Domini* as an Early Example of Christian Bucolic,” *Traditio* 56 (2001) 15–26. Cf. Lactant. *Div.Inst.* 7.24 (text and transl. in J. M. Ziolkowski and

fourth Eclogue may have encouraged the writing of Christian bucolic in Latin; the artistry of Virgil's verse could provide stimulus for such imitation. Greek speakers also had such an interpretation available to them, e.g. the "Oration of Constantine," appended by Eusebius to his *Life* of Constantine, which includes a free translation of the fourth Eclogue with commentary linking the baby with Jesus. Similarly, a Greek martyrdom of Artemius, dated before the ninth century, has Virgil's bucolic poem foretelling Christ's advent.⁵² Greek writers also recognized the bucolic's potential for political allegory: for example, in the sixth century John Lydus, a native Greek speaker from Asia Minor, remarks that Virgil uses the name Amaryllis "enigmatically in the bucolic style" to refer to a city.⁵³ Even in the early centuries CE when Calpurnius and Nemesianus were writing pagan bucolic in Latin, we have no evidence of a Greek counterpart. The next example of self-standing Greek bucolic, after post-Theocritean bucolic, comes from the thirteenth century, in the form of a single poem by Maximus Planudes, also known for translations from Latin into Greek. Yet bucolic themes, imagery, and conventions infuse a rich array of Greek texts outside the realm of self-standing bucolic, for example satires by Lucian; letters by Alciphron and Aristaenetus; Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*;⁵⁴ Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*;⁵⁵

M. C. J. Putnam [eds.], *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Hundred Years* [New Haven/London 2008] 488–491).

⁵² *Passio S. Artemii* 46; transl. in S. N. C. Lieu and D. Montserrat (eds.), *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views, A Source History* (London 1996) 242.

⁵³ *De mensibus* 4.73; transl. B. Baldwin, "Virgil in Byzantium," *A&A* 28 (1982) 81–93, at 83.

⁵⁴ E.g. B. Effe, "Longus: Towards a History of Bucolic and its Function in the Roman Empire," in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford 1999) 189–209, and L. R. Cresci, "The Novel of Longus the Sophist and the Pastoral Tradition," in *Oxford Readings* 210–242; cf. Hunter, *Daphnis & Chloe* 77–78, 82.

⁵⁵ E.g. B. Harries, "The Pastoral Mode in the *Dionysiaca*," in N. Hop-

and epigrams by Cyrus, Agathias, and others.⁵⁶ This is the richly mosaic literary world that Eugenianus' novel joins.

Conclusion

Eugenianus' novel represents a surprising reemergence of Greek bucolic in twelfth-century Byzantium. Intrigued by questions about the utility of art, Eugenianus finds a fresh path in by exploring the *pharmakon* dialogue between Theocritus and Longus; a key issue is whether effective treatments exist for love sickness and grief. This paper has shown Eugenianus' sophisticated interweaving of the bucolic intertexts of Theocritus and Longus in approaching such questions. The profusion of gardens in Eugenianus recalls the centrality of garden scenes as sites of erotic education in Longus. Eugenianus' novel also engages throughout with issues relating to Christian imagery and themes as well as Christian concerns regarding pagan literature and rituals. Eugenianus' experiment did not establish a tradition any more than Longus' novel did, but his novel went somewhere innovative and different—stressing continuities with past bucolic but also introducing new ways of approaching issues of *pharmaka* and the value of art. Throughout, Eugenianus tests his narrative against different kinds of readers and literature. Sometimes criticized as a pastiche, Eugenianus' novel, with its complex interweavings of imagery and borrowings from a wide range of past texts, demonstrates a deep knowledge and understanding of bucolic literature and themes. His novel mirrors the history of the ideological transition between tormenting, Theocritean love and happy, Longan love.

kinson (ed.), *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus* (Cambridge 1994) 63–85, and “The Drama of Pastoral in Nonnus and Colluthus,” in *Brill's Companion* 515–547.

⁵⁶ E.g. *Anth.Gr.* 9.136 Cyrus (cf. Theoc. 7, Verg. *Ecl.* 10); discussion: Cameron, *YCS* 27 (1982) 230–235. Cf. Meleager *Anth.Gr.* 9.363; Agathias Schol. 5.292.1–6 (cf. Theoc. 7.135–142), with reply Paulus Silent. *Anth.Gr.* 5.293. On how tenth-century Ioannes Geometres' “second encomium of the apple” shows familiarity with Theocritean bucolic, see A. R. Littlewood, *The Progymnasmata of Ioannes Geometres* (Amsterdam 1972), esp. 19–20, 78–80.

In doing so, Eugenianus also rewrites this bucolic tradition in such a way that it could encompass his richly textured, innovative verse novel too.⁵⁷

August, 2012

Department of Classics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
jburton1@umd.edu

⁵⁷ This paper began as a talk delivered at the Langford Seminar (Florida State Univ.) on Bucolic and Mime in Antiquity, November 2011. I am grateful to that audience for their helpful remarks. I also wish to thank the referee and editors of *GRBS* for their valuable suggestions.