

## A REEMERGENCE OF THEOCRITIC POETRY IN THE BYZANTINE NOVEL

JOAN B. BURTON

IN TWELFTH-CENTURY CONSTANTINOPLE, after a hiatus of some eight centuries, a revival of the ancient Greek novel took place with the appearance of four Byzantine novels.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps in part because of the relative stability and economic security of the Komnenian dynasty (1081–1185 C.E.), literary activity was thriving in Constantinople during this period. There was a rise of interest in the Hellenic past among writers, as shown by the proliferation of commentaries on ancient Greek authors and the revival of ancient genres such as the novel and satire.<sup>2</sup> The twelfth century was also a time of increased contact with the West, in part because of the Crusades, which may have contributed to a desire among some Byzantines to emphasize their Greek identity in contrast with the Latin West.

The chief models of this Byzantine revival were the Greek novels of the Second Sophistic.<sup>3</sup> In addition to basic plot elements, shared characteristics include the use of Atticizing Greek, long descriptive passages, rhetorical display, experimentation in narrative techniques, psychological realism, and frequent allusions to ancient Greek literature. The primary audience would have been well educated, able to understand scholarly Greek and to appreciate complex literary allusions.

Traditionally, critics have dismissed the four Byzantine novels as imitative and derivative of the ancient Greek novel: for example, “the slavish imitations of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus which were written in the twelfth

An earlier version of this article was presented in January 2002 at the Leeds International Classics Seminar, where I received helpful comments and warm hospitality. I am also grateful to David Stinchcomb, Thomas Jenkins, and the readers and editors of *CP* for their valuable suggestions.

1. Three novels survive complete—Theodore Prodromos’ *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*, Niketas Eugenianos’ *Drosilla and Charikles*, Eustathios Makrembolites’ *Hysmine and Hysminias*—and one in fragmentary form (Konstantinos Manasses’ *Aristandros and Kallithea*).

2. E.g., the *Timarion*, an anonymous satire modeled after Lucian. On “the twelfth-century reassertion of hellenism,” see P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), esp. 400–401 (quotation from p. 400); R. Macrides and P. Magdalino, “The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism,” in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. P. Magdalino (London, 1992), 139–56 (the section of the article entitled, “The Rhetoric of Hellenism,” by P. Magdalino).

3. Although no ancient novels seem to have been written after Heliodorus, Byzantine writers from the fifth century on attest to the enduring popularity of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, both of whom were transformed into Christian bishops, perhaps to raise the comfort level of the Christian reading public. For discussion, with references, see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1978), 121–22; S. MacAlister, *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London, 1996), 109–12.

century by . . . miserable pedants . . . Of these no account need be taken."<sup>4</sup> Although recent publications reflect an increasing interest in the Byzantine novels,<sup>5</sup> major work remains to be done, particularly in the area of literary criticism. This paper focuses on the textual interplay between the novel of Niketas Eugenianos and the poetry of Theocritus. Eugenianos' novel, written in twelve-syllable verse and nine books long, recalls the novel of his Byzantine predecessor, Theodore Prodromos, but the prevalence of love songs, letters, lyrical passages, and pastoral motifs in his novel is innovative. Although aspects of this intertextuality have received some scholarly attention,<sup>6</sup> discussion of Theocritean connections remains mostly at the level of occasional mention.<sup>7</sup> Yet the density of allusions and references to Theocritus' poetry, which include extended passages modeled closely on Theocritus' poems featuring the Cyclops and the legendary cowherd Daphnis, sets Eugenianos' novel apart from the other Greek novels of his own time and earlier.<sup>8</sup> Further, Eugenianos alludes not only to the most famous bucolic poems of Theocritus, such as *Idylls* 1 and 11, but also to Theocritus' other poetry, including his homoerotic poems.<sup>9</sup> These allusions provide important sign-

4. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley, 1967), 103.

5. For example, C. Jouanno, "Les Barbares dans le roman byzantin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Fonction d'un topos," *Byzantion* 62 (1992): 264–300; R. Beaton, *The Medieval Greek Romance*<sup>2</sup> (London, 1996); MacAlister, *Dreams* (n. 3 above); J. B. Burton, "Reviving the Pagan Greek Novel in a Christian World," *GRBS* 39 (1998): 179–216, "Abduction and Elopement in the Byzantine Novel," *GRBS* 41 (2000): 377–409; P. A. Agapitos and D. R. Reinsch, eds., *Der Roman im Byzanz der Komnenenzeit*, Referate des Internationalen Symposiums an der Freien Universität Berlin, 3–6 April 1998 (Frankfurt am Main, 2000); I. Nilsson, *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure: Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' Hysmine and Hysminias* (Uppsala, 2001); C. Jouanno, "Les Jeunes filles dans le roman byzantin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Les Personnages du roman grec: Actes du colloque de Tours, 18–20 November 1999*, ed. B. Pouderon, with C. Hunzinger and D. Kasprzyk (Lyon, 2001), 329–46; J. Labarthe-Postel, "Hommes et dieux dans les *ekphrasis* des romans byzantins du temps des Comnène," *ibid.*, 347–71. Increasing interest in these novels is also shown by their recent translations into French, German, Italian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, and Spanish: Theodore Prodromos' *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* into Italian (1994), Serbo-Croatian (1994), German (1996), and Spanish (1996); Niketas Eugenianos' *Drosilla and Charikles* into Russian (1969) and Italian (1994); Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias* into Russian (1965), German (1989), French (1991), and Italian (1994). No English translations have ever been published. I now have an English translation of Niketas Eugenianos' *Drosilla and Charikles* forthcoming from Bolchazy-Carducci in January 2004; I hope this will be one of a series of translations of the Byzantine novels, designed for use in the classroom.

6. See K. Svoboda, "La Composition et le style du roman de Nicétas Eugénianos" in *Actes du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des études byzantines, Sofia, septembre 1934*, vol. 1 (Sofia, 1935), 191–201; A. P. Kazhdan, "Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos," *JÖByz* 16 (1967): 101–17; C. Jouanno, "Nicétas Eugénianos, un héritier du roman grec," *REG* 102 (1989), 346–60.

7. E.g., Beaton, *Greek Romance*<sup>2</sup> (n. 5 above), 55: "the yokel Kallidemos" in his "comically encyclopaedic recital of classical erotica" alludes to "Theocritus as parodied in *Daphnis and Chloe*." So too in a subsequent article, Beaton remarks that for Prodromos' battle scenes "Eugenianos substitutes the bathos and buffoonery of a Theocritean idyll gone wrong" ("The World of Fiction and the World 'Out There': The Case of the Byzantine Novel," in *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider; Papers from the Thirty-Second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998*, ed. D. C. Smythe [Aldershot, 2000], 183). More extended discussion is rare: on the Theocritean refrains at 3.263–88 and 297–322, see A. M. Milazzo, "Motivi bucolici e tecnica alessandrina in due *idilli* di Niceta Eugeniano," *Studi di filologia bizantina* 3 (1985): 97–114 (cf. Svoboda, "Composition" [n. 6 above], 196).

8. While Theocritus is pervasive and evident as a model in much of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, the references and allusions are more isolated and less extended and overt. On the use of Theocritus in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, see, e.g., R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 1983), esp. 25–26, 29, 59–63, 78–82.

9. Poems 1–18, particularly the smaller group known as bucolic, were enduringly popular among Byzantine Greeks, in part as good examples of Doric dialect. Yet of Poems 19–30, R. Browning notes: "There is little trace of knowledge of these poems by Byzantine writers" ("Recentiores non deteriores," in *Griechische*

posts to thematic issues of the novel such as the nature of love, the function of poetry, and shifting alignments between author, audience, and characters.

### THEOCRITUS' CYCLOPS

Direct citation of Theocritus' amorous Cyclops is something new in the genre of the romance novel. A Cyclops is overtly mentioned only once in a Greek novel prior to Eugenianos', to characterize a fierce doorkeeper in Achilles Tatius' novel (2.23.3). In Eugenianos' novel, the hero and a rival each refer extensively to Theocritus' Cyclops in erotic speeches delivered in the heroine's presence. Their different uses of Theocritus' Cyclops in lengthy monologues of desire suggest, among other things, issues of reader reception and competency.

Theocritus' Cyclops is first mentioned in Eugenianos' novel by the hero Charikles in a monologue in Book 4. The circumstances are as follows: Parthians have enslaved Charikles and Drosilla, the hero and heroine; Drosilla has become the queen's personal slave and Charikles the prince's. The prince, in love with Drosilla, enlists the hero, his new slave, to act as go-between. Charikles finds Drosilla sleeping in a meadow. The setting is entirely pastoral: all nature is quiet in respect for the sleeping girl, except the murmuring streams. In this context, Charikles recalls Theocritus' Cyclops (4.379–86):

There is no other new remedy for love;  
song and music alone offer rest from love's cares.  
Even Polyphemos once, when he was hit  
in the breast by Eros, murderous archer,  
and nursed a strong love for a Nereid,  
found no other remedy 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.<sup>10</sup>

Like Longus' Daphnis in a similar situation (1.25), Charikles avoids the obvious erotic moves and instead delivers an amatory monologue (4.345–413). When Charikles mentions that flies must be kept from the breast of the sleeping girl (376–78), a reader familiar with Longus' novel might remember that Daphnis, in the context of a similar monologue delivered while his girlfriend sleeps, uses an insect's trespass as an excuse to slip his hand down the front of Chloe's dress. Yet rather than have Charikles seek a similar opportunity, the author has Charikles recall how Theocritus' Cyclops dealt with his desire (4.379–86). Here, as if to underscore an interest in literary lineages, Eugenianos moves from an allusion to Longus to Longus' own pastoral source,

*Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, ed. D. Harlfinger (Darmstadt, 1980), 267 (first published in *BICS* 7 [1960]: 11–21).

10. Translations from the Byzantine novels are my own. The Greek texts used for this paper are M. Marcovich, ed., *Theodori Prodomi, De Rhodanthes et Dosiclis amoribus libri IX* (Stuttgart, 1992); F. Conca, ed., *Nicetas Eugenianus, De Drosillae et Chariclis amoribus* (Amsterdam, 1990); M. Marcovich, ed., *Eustathius Macrembolites, De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus libri XI* (Munich, 2001); O. Mazal, ed., *Der Roman des Konstantinos Manasses* (Vienna, 1967). See too F. Conca, trans., *Il romanzo bizantino del XII secolo* (Turin, 1994).

Theocritus. Multiple allusions to past texts can draw attention to a literary tradition, which the text can then interrogate, engage, or even “subsume.”<sup>11</sup> Further, the connecting of past texts with target texts can also function to validate the new text.<sup>12</sup> Yet Eugenianos’ specific reworking of Theocritus here also raises to a thematic level issues of reader competence and interpretation implicit in the very practice of allusive poetics.<sup>13</sup>

A familiar crux in the interpretation of the Cyclops’ *pharmakon* in Theocritus’ eleventh *Idyll* (1, 17) is whether song works as a temporary or permanent cure for love.<sup>14</sup> Eugenianos’ Charikles comes down clearly on the side of temporary remedy (4.379–80):

Ἔρωτος οὐδὲν ἄλλο φάρμακον ξένον·  
ὥδῃ δέ τις καὶ μουσα παῦλα τῶν πόνων.

There is no other new remedy for love;  
song and music alone offer a rest (*paula*) from love’s cares.

The question then arises, is Charikles himself meant to be perceived as an insightful and engaged reader of Theocritus, or is this solely a metaliterary moment shared between author and audience?

If we take Eugenianos’ Charikles at his own valuation, he seems to think of himself as an informed reader and story teller, as suggested when he tells his new master, the Parthian prince, an elaborate false tale of seducing a beautiful female gardener. Charikles’ embedded seduction speech includes examples appropriate to flowers in a garden—the unhappy love stories of Narcissus, Hyacinth, and Adonis. Charikles expresses surprise at his fictive gardener’s seeming ignorance of these stories (4.261–64):

11. On “conflation, or multiple reference, a practice that allows the poet to refer to a number of antecedents and thereby to subsume their versions, and the tradition along with them, into his own,” see R. F. Thomas, “Virgil’s *Georgics* and the Art of Reference,” in his *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, 1999), esp. 135–40 (quotation from p. 135). Thomas singles out Catullus as “the first major proponent of multiple reference in Latin poetry,” but he calls Virgil the master (p. 29).

12. Cf. R. Hunter, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge, 1996), 52 (on the special case of hymns).

13. Recent books on allusion in antiquity include J. Farrell, *Virgil’s Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (New York, 1991); S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998); J. Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven, 1998); Thomas, *Reading Virgil* (n. 11 above); L. Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, 2001); A. Barchiesi, *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, ed. and trans. M. Fox and S. Marchesi (London, 2001); see also C. Ricks, *Allusion to the Poets* (Oxford, 2002).

14. The phrase that the Cyclops “nursed a strong love for a Nereid” (πλατὺ τρέφων τὸ φίλτρον εἰς Νηρηΐδα, 4.383) also seems to echo a closing phrase in Theocritus’ eleventh *Idyll*, that “thus Polyphemus shepherded his love with music” (80). Both phrases, in their contexts, suggest that love songs not only offer relief from love but also foster love. On *pharmakon* in *Idyll* 11, see, e.g., R. Hunter, *Theocritus: A Selection, Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* (Cambridge, 1999), 242; A. Köhnken, “Theokrits Polyphemgedichte,” in *Theocritus*, ed. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (Groningen, 1996), 181–83; M. Fantuzzi, “Mythological Paradigms in the Bucolic Poetry of Theocritus,” *PCPS* 41 (1995): 17–18; S. Goldhill, “Desire and the Figure of Fun: Glossing Theocritus 11,” in *Poststructuralist Classics*, ed. A. Benjamin (London, 1988), 86–97. On the polysemy of *pharmakon* see also J. Derrida, “La Pharmacie de Platon,” in *La Dissémination* (Paris, 1972), esp. 78–80. All citations of Theocritus’ text are taken from A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup>, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1952), vol. 1. Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own, with influence from Gow and others.

The garden is full of joys and tears;  
 it boasts of having a beautiful maiden as its gardener,  
 and it is full of love's misfortunes.  
 But you seem not to know the strange stories you are hearing.

Nonetheless the imagined seduction is a success: she welcomes him inside her garden, asks for more tales, and offers him access to her body.<sup>15</sup> In the immediate context, Charikles' tale of successful seduction aims at deceiving the prince into using him as go-between with the heroine. But the extraneous detail of the gardener's ignorance of garden mythology also raises the issue of reader competence. The character is testing the gardener in the same way that Eugenianos is testing his readers. So too, within the narrative, Charikles seems to be testing the reading competence of the prince, whom he is deceiving with his story of seduction. Eugenianos' novel, with its dense and extensive network of quotations, allusions, and references to a wide range of texts, seems to expect a high level of literary knowledge from its readers.

The second extended reference to Theocritus' Cyclops occurs in Book 6, when the hero's rival, Kallidemos, an innkeeper's son, includes the example of the Cyclops' courtship of Galatea in a lengthy courtship speech addressed to the heroine. The circumstances are as follows: Drosilla, the heroine, now a captive being taken to Arabia by carriage, falls from a cliff into the sea. After nine days alone in the wilderness, she comes upon an inhabited place, a seeming paradise, with plants, animals, and people in abundance (6.189–93). With maidenly modesty, Drosilla lingers at the edge of town, alone in a roofless house, until a hospitable old woman takes her in. A dream prompts Drosilla and the old woman to go to the inn to inquire for Charikles, whom Drosilla had assumed dead. The innkeeper's son, Kallidemos, denies knowledge of Charikles and proceeds to court Drosilla for himself.

Kallidemos' extended appeal to Drosilla, over three hundred lines (6.332–643), includes a lengthy reworking of the Cyclops' love song in Theocritus' eleventh *Idyll*. Differences between Charikles' and Kallidemos' use of the figure of Theocritus' Cyclops in their erotic speeches make it clear that reader competence and reception are matters of thematic interest in Eugenianos' novel. In Book 4, as discussed above, Charikles' adaptation of *Idyll* 11 focuses on the theme of song as remedy for love and includes an insightful gloss (παύλα, "rest," 4.380) that interprets the Cyclops' remedy as temporary, not permanent. A detached and ironic reader of past texts, Charikles invokes the frame of *Idyll* 11 and distances himself from the Cyclops; his allusion is learned and self-conscious. In Book 6, on the other hand, Kallidemos' adaptation of *Idyll* 11 does not step outside the Cyclops' love song to the frame. An unsophisticated reader of past texts, Kallidemos enters into the Cyclops'

15. On "erotic undertones" of literary gardens, see A. R. Littlewood, "Romantic Paradises: The Rôle of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5 (1979): 95–114. On gardens as "indicators of the heroine's character," see also S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton, 1989), 50–55 (quotation from p. 50). Famous later erotic gardens include Edmund Spenser's Bower of Bliss and Garden of Adonis (*The Faerie Queene* 2.12.42–80, 3.6.29–49).

delusions. The theme of song as remedy is absent; interest in the Cyclops' song is limited to the model of courtship the Cyclops offers.<sup>16</sup>

Yet the comic nature of Kallidemos' courtship is apparent well before he introduces his awkward series of amatory examples. Like Theocritus' Cyclops, Kallidemos thinks he can be an object of desire to the girl, as can his peers in town. As he assures Drosilla (6.290–91), "many of our men are superior to Charikles / and cause maidens to feel desire when they see them." Drosilla responds ironically to this Cyclopean conceit (6.292–99):

The maiden Drosilla  
smiled a little and said  
(for even a person clearly overcome by troubles  
is liable often suddenly to smile  
as if feeling joy, and to weep),  
"How could rural strangers,  
Kallidemos, Xenokrates' son, be superior  
to your compatriots, handsome young city dwellers?"

This interchange between Drosilla and Kallidemos underscores the incompatibilities of their worlds and also signals Drosilla's recognition of his pretensions early on, for in comparison to Kallidemos, Drosilla is the exotic city dweller who comes from across the sea,<sup>17</sup> while Kallidemos and his friends live in a place never called anything but χωρίον (town, village).<sup>18</sup> Thus the dynamics of *Idyll* 11's clash between sea and land, easily extended to town and country (as in Virgil's *Eclogue* 2), seem to resonate in the interactions of Kallidemos and Drosilla from the start. Other thematic parallels may resonate here as well. At the close of *Idyll* 11, the Cyclops reminds himself that there are other girls besides Galateia (76); that many girls express desire for him and titter when he responds (77–78). The Cyclops does not perceive that the girls' tittering might, in fact, be at his expense. Similarly, in Book 6, Kallidemos reminds Drosilla that there are other men besides Charikles (286–90); that many of his townsmen are superior to Charikles and cause maidens to feel desire when they see them (290–91). When Drosilla smiles in response (292–93), Kallidemos, like the Cyclops, does not perceive that Drosilla's smile might be at his expense.<sup>19</sup>

Another influence on the tone of the representation of Kallidemos' courtship is suggested by a series of correspondences with Theocritus' third *Idyll*. For example, in Book 6, immediately before beginning his series of amatory

16. In fact, when Kallidemos approaches the issue of a *pharmakon* for love earlier, he echoes Longus' comic transformation of Theocritus 11 instead (Longus 2.7.7; cf. Eug. 6.377–78: "against him [Eros] no one on earth has found a *pharmakon*, / except embrace and sweet nuptials").

17. From Barzon and Phthia. The imaginary city Barzon is designated a πόλις (city) throughout the novel. Phthia was famous as the main city of Achilles' Myrmidons in southern Thessaly.

18. A leading townsman, the hero, the heroine, a traveling merchant, the author, even Dionysus, all use the word χωρίον of this place. On χωρίον vs. πόλις, see A. Kazhdan, "The Peasantry," in *The Byzantines*, ed. G. Cavallo (Chicago, 1997), 43–44. The social distance between the heroine and the inhabitants of this place is underscored by the immediate assumption of the innkeeper's son who courts her, and later the old woman who befriends her, that, unlike them, she must come from a πόλις (Eug. 6.267, 7.15).

19. On Drosilla's smile as "un sourire de moquerie," see also Jouanno, "Nicéas Eugénianos" (n. 6 above), 356–57.

examples, Kallidemos describes Eros (6.379–80: θεὸν βαρύν σε θᾶπτον ἐγνώκειν, Ἔρως . . . [“I at once knew that you were a cruel god, Love; / I found you to be a creature of the wood, a wild animal’s offspring”]) in a manner parallel to the goatherd’s description in *Idyll* 3 (15–16: νῦν ἐγγων τὸν Ἔρωτα· βαρὺς θεός . . . [“Now I know Love, a cruel god. Surely he suckled / a lioness’ teat, and his mother reared him in the wood”]). Other parallels include Drosilla’s insistence on standing before the doors of the house and having Kallidemos summoned to her (6.259–65). This seems to evoke a basic structure underlying both *Idylls* 3 and 11, that of the *paraklausithyron* (lover’s complaint at the beloved’s door), which can include a request that the beloved come out.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps more importantly, the headache Drosilla complains of (Book 6.300–301: ἀλγῶ κεφαλὴν . . . [“My head hurts, Kallidemos, and I can’t talk with you any more right now”]) seems to recall the conventional lover’s headache of which *Idyll* 3’s goatherd complains (52: ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν, “My head hurts, but you don’t care. No more do I sing”).<sup>21</sup> A search of the entire corpus of *TLG* produced no other instance of the phrase ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν or ἀλγῶ κεφαλὴν (other than at Theoc. 3.52). In Book 6, Drosilla gets her headache before Kallidemos starts his series of amatory examples; in *Idyll* 3, the goatherd gets his on finishing his own “catalogue” of amatory examples; in both cases, the headache sufferer announces the intention to fall silent. Any one of the parallels drawn between *Idyll* 3 and Book 6 might not be compelling; yet the sheer accumulation of parallels and echoes, strengthened by the rarity of the phrase ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν / ἀλγῶ κεφαλὴν, seems suggestive of purposeful allusion. Such allusions would reinforce the perception of the author’s play with parallels between the self-delusions of Theocritus’ rustic goatherd and the innkeeper’s son.

Kallidemos’ courtship speech reveals an obsession with fictive love narratives. He begins by presenting himself as a traditional rejecter of love, who has now been conquered; his description is heavily modeled on passages from the novels of Heliodorus and Longus. Then he moves into a series of amatory examples, punctuated by lengthy, self-absorbed digressions. Kallidemos’ first two examples, drawn from Heliodorus’ novel, underscore the gap between Kallidemos’ aspirations and the role the author has given him (6.386–90):

I beg you to have in mind the people of long ago  
 who were united by love into one soul;  
 consider among the rest  
 the love of Arsake [a satrap’s wife] for Theagenes [the hero]  
 and that of Achaimenes [a maid’s son] for Charikleia [the heroine].

Stunningly inappropriate as examples of reciprocated love,<sup>22</sup> these parallels may also suggest willful misremembrance; Kallidemos’ confusion thus could signal not only a lack of literary skills (despite his pretentious self-display) but also a subconscious wish to change the standard romance story so that rival suitors could win. Thus the narrative may also be playfully raising the

20. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), 145.

21. Cf. the other famous headache in Theocritus, that of the Cyclops at 11.70–71.

22. On the humor of Kallidemos’ examples here, see also Jouanno, “Nicéas Eugénianos,” 350–51.

possibility that the standard pattern could change, now, in this text. But, of course, by having Kallidemos choose these parallels, the author can also suggest Kallidemos' subconscious awareness of his prescribed role as unsuccessful rival suitor. To be successful Kallidemos would need to subvert the paradigm, but his role as unsuccessful suitor prevents this.

Kallidemos dismisses these examples not because their loves are unreciprocated but because they are unchaste. He suggests that Drosilla might prefer examples of lovers "whom proper adherence to an oath / kept away from shame and led with justice / to the secure union of a lawful marriage" (6.393–95). But although such a description seems tailor-made for Heliodorus' Theagenes and Charikleia, instead Kallidemos offers the example of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe, who are chaste, but through ignorance and certainly not for want of trying.

This choice seems happier, and Kallidemos elaborates their situation for twelve lines (6.440–51), emphasizing the reciprocated nature of Daphnis and Chloe's love. But the differences are too great for the parallel to be comfortable. These lovers knew each other from childhood, but Kallidemos has just met Drosilla. Also, Daphnis and Chloe's ignorance and naïveté may seem unflattering to the bookish Kallidemos. In any case, Kallidemos dismisses their happy, reciprocated, and eventually fulfilled love as a thing of the past (6.452): "The earlier generation was golden in matters of love." After lamenting the slippage of his own time into a Bronze Age of unrequited love, Kallidemos next moves to the less happy love of Leander for Hero.

The parallels available in his next example, Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*, seem closer to his own story. Like Kallidemos and Drosilla, Hero and Leander come from places separated by the sea. Unfortunately their story is tragic: he drowns; she throws herself from a tower. After extolling the happiness of union in death at some length (6.477–85), Kallidemos ends by turning the sea of literal danger for Leander into a metaphorical sea of desire threatening to drown him. The image of Drosilla as a harbor for a wanderer by sea provides an ironic transition from the example of Leander, a strong swimmer, to Kallidemos' final example, Theocritus' Cyclops, who cannot swim. All the wrong things resonate in Kallidemos' new example.

The Cyclops' mode of courtship is not unlike Kallidemos' own: like Theocritus' Cyclops, Kallidemos too seems self-obsessed, as shown throughout his courtship speech, which, in typical narcissistic mode, seems more about him than her.<sup>23</sup> Kallidemos also augments and adapts the description of the Cyclops' wealth to suit himself: for example, he extends the Cyclops' sources of wealth beyond the production of milk and cheese to include hunting and beekeeping, occupations more congenial to town elite.<sup>24</sup> Kallidemos' narra-

23. E.g., Eug. 6.365–66: "I suffer pain in my chest; I quiver in my heart; / I seem agitated in body and mind"; cf. 404–5. So too, in reworking Theocritus 11, Kallidemos expands on how the Cyclops would destroy himself for her (6.509–16) and elaborates the wealth the Cyclops offers her, but nowhere in his courtship speech does Kallidemos' Cyclops compliment Galateia.

24. Kallidemos' Cyclops possesses sixty beehives and countless deer hides, in addition to the usual milk and cheese (6.523–27). On how beekeeping would be practiced by "well-off peasants" in Byzantium, see Kazhdan, "Peasantry" (n. 18 above), 56; sixty beehives would be a very large number (Kazhdan describes as



tion of the Cyclops' courtship of Galateia includes interpretive statements that show him adopting the Cyclops' self-delusional viewpoint. For example, he asserts to Drosilla that although Galateia fled her lover, "she loved him, I say" (6.507). Kallidemos' remarks suggest that, unlike the poet and Nikias in the case of *Idyll* 11, he cannot see the irony in the Cyclops' courtship.

Kallidemos ends his presentation of the Cyclops' courtship by making the parallels to his own situation explicit. Instead of reflecting on the viability of his amatory model, Kallidemos reproaches Drosilla for not responding like Galateia (6.534–37):

But as for you, you don't nod or say a word,  
and you're not even willing to play with one who's playing.  
You don't have an apple, nor do you laugh sweetly,  
as the Nereid used to do.

In his naive reading of Galateia's response, Kallidemos shows himself unable or unwilling to see that laughing girls and teasing playfulness might be other than signs of admiration.<sup>25</sup> Like a stubborn Don Quixote, the innkeeper's son insists on continuing to imitate the courtship behavior of Theocritus' Cyclops (6.544–46):

Consent to go to the home of the one who desires you,  
and you will certainly see that Kallidemos  
is wealthier in property than even the famous Cyclops.

Following the Cyclops' example, Kallidemos too supposes that personal wealth could compensate for the absence of shared interests, community, and affection. Further, Kallidemos' naive acceptance here of the Cyclops' deluded self-representations of wealth (*Id.* 11.34–49) may also suggest self-delusion in Kallidemos' own estimation of wealth.<sup>26</sup> Unlike Theocritus' Cyclops, however, Kallidemos emphasizes his father's role in the marriage brokering, not his mother's. But just as *Idyll* 11's Cyclops assumed his mother would act as his go-between, so too Kallidemos asks an old woman to act as go-between (6.557–58). Like other Byzantine and ancient romance heroes, and also reflecting contemporary (and enduring) attitudes of social snobbery,<sup>27</sup> Kallidemos goes beyond the Cyclops' credentials and adds his father's role

a "beekeeper par excellence" someone who possessed fifteen beehives). Cf. *Ov. Met.* 13.827 for the inclusion of lambs, and *Verg. Ecl.* 2.29 for a Cyclops who envisions hunting deer with Galateia (with Coleman's comment, "an aspect of country life sure to appeal to a city dweller" [R. Coleman, ed., *Vergil, Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977), 98]). In Eugenianos' novel, however, it would be appropriate for an innkeeper's son to include hunting among the Cyclopean activities since hunting would be typical for upper-class male town life (Kazhdan, "Peasantry," 55).

25. Cf. Hunter's comment regarding *Idyll* 11's Cyclops (*Theocritus: A Selection* [n. 14 above], p. 242, note on lines 77–78): "he sees the laughter of pleasure and invitation, but we will see the laughter of mockery."

26. Cf. *Verg. Ecl.* 2.20–22. For commentary, see Coleman, *Eclogues* (n. 24 above), 95–96: "If he were a free man, a flock that produced a thousand ewe-lambs would make him wealthy indeed; if he is a slave, then to claim such numbers as his own . . . is preposterous. Similarly exaggerated is his boast not just of a continual supply of cheese, like Polyphemus, but of fresh milk right through the winter and the summer . . . Once again suitor's licence."

27. See P. Magdalino, "Byzantine Snobbery," in *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. Angold (Oxford, 1984), 58–78.

as "chief man in town" and his own status as "one of the noble and rich people" (6.547, 549). Invested in normative patriarchal notions, he ignores issues of romantic love. But Drosilla is a woman who eloped with her beloved, who left a fiancé and father behind, who has already experienced adventures in the wide world. *Idyll* 11's Cyclops knew something of his beloved and her world: she consorted with his mother (11.25–29). Kallidemos' selective, self-regarding reading of Theocritus' Cyclops poems never prompts him to inquire into the differences between his and Drosilla's worlds (her history and background). Reflecting a sense of male entitlement, he assumes that all that is needed is paternal sanction and the consent of the beloved, which he expects to obtain through cajolery, not reciprocal affection.

Kallidemos' Cyclops story, the final example in his amatory series, seems to elicit a less-than-gentle smile from Drosilla afterwards, as shown by Kallidemos' self-ironical response (6.540–43):

How thankful I am for your smile, girl,  
for, as the popular proverb goes, let a poor raven  
when it's necessary take his nourishment—  
wretched bird!—even from stinking entrails.

The closure frame for Kallidemos' story of the Cyclops also includes the old woman's gentle smile. The fiction is beginning to fray for Kallidemos, for his inquiry of the old woman (6.555–56: "Why do you gently smile, with head down, good, wise, honorable old woman?") suggests he no longer assumes he knows the meaning of smiles. Thus within the fiction, Drosilla and the old woman provide an ironic audience for the pretensions of the innkeeper's son, his aspirations to be the romantic hero.<sup>28</sup> Kallidemos' courtship, bookish and comic, seems designed to elicit amusement from not only the old woman and Drosilla, his internal audience, but also the external audience, the readers of Eugenianos' romance. As typically in Theocritean poetry (and later pastoral poetry in general), the words of rustic, less sophisticated characters seem to betray them, with the irony shared by author and audience. Yet often, such characters' remarks can be seen to reveal moments of self-irony or self-recognition as well.<sup>29</sup>

The author uses the figure of the Cyclops one more time, to signal Kallidemos' possible misgivings about his role as a romantic hero. When Kallidemos resumes his speech, after a brief verbal response from the old woman, he introduces a new mode of Cyclops into his elaboration of Drosilla's hard-heartedness (6.579–80, 585–86):

Who dipped in water and tempered for the flame  
your hard heart?

. . . . .  
That one was bold, like a young Cyclops,  
fierce, strong, bloody, voracious.

28. For the novelistic motif of a bond between an old woman and a young, abandoned girl, cf. the old woman and the bandits' captive Charite in Apuleius' *Golden Ass*.

29. See, for example, S. T. Kelly, "On the Twelfth *Idyll* of Theocritus," *Helios* 7 (1979/80): 59.

Foiled as romantic hero (his courtship meeting with silence from the girl), he is now finding a way to assume the role of villainous rival. Even Kallidemos' earlier self-analogy to the Cyclops may suggest unacknowledged feelings of monstrosity vis-à-vis his beloved. Far from urbane, Kallidemos was like a one-eyed monster unable to attract his beloved's interest. The irony, then, could also be Kallidemos' irony directed at himself and his delusions, his bookish pretensions. On a metanarrative level, Kallidemos can be seen as a fictive character trying out roles, searching for one that works.

This perception of Kallidemos' rejection of Theocritus' amorous Cyclops as a role model is strengthened by his seeming rebuttal of a central notion in Theocritus' eleventh *Idyll*, that song can work as a *pharmakon* (remedy) for the lovesick (6.589–91):

Who can make the dead man live?  
Who tells the man who's drunk a cup of poison  
to take part in a charming song?

Kallidemos' recasting of the Cyclops from young lover to fierce monster (585–86) in his final speech of Book 6 (566–643) parallels his own change of role: in Book 6, he tries on the role of romantic hero; in Book 7, that of villainous rival. Although *Idyll* 11 offers a model for dealing with lovesickness, there is no such model to be found within Kallidemos' retelling of *Idyll* 11. Only by leaving *Idyll* 11 behind can Kallidemos reassess his role in this romantic tale.

Kallidemos does not take up Theocritus again. His courtship speech ends (6.616–43) with a pastiche of amatory epigrams from the *Greek Anthology*, Book 5.<sup>30</sup> He no longer shows interest in oaths, marriages, and chastity, the criteria he used at 6.392–95; his pastiche culminates instead with the wish that he and Drosilla lie naked together (6.640–41):

May you be stripped to your very flesh  
and may you bring your naked limbs near mine.

Such an action would satisfy the terms of Philetas' recipe for love, given at Longus 2.7.7 (answering Theocritus *Idyll* 11.1–3), which Kallidemos had echoed earlier in a passage directly preceding his series of amatory examples (6.377–78):

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

Against him [Eros] no one on earth has found a *pharmakon*,  
except embrace and sweet nuptials.<sup>31</sup>

Thus in an earlier section of the speech, densely allusive to Longus' novel, the author has Kallidemos include Philetas' reformulation of *Idyll* 11's famous

30. The epigrams include *Anth. Pal.* 5.222, 229, 246, 258, and 272.

31. Cf. Longus 2.7.7: "Ἔρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧδαῖς λεγόμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασι ("There is no medicine for Love, no potion, no drug, no spell to mutter, except a kiss and an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies" [trans. C. Gill]).

remedy for love theme. This makes Kallidemos' failure to refer to this theme, in his extended reworking of *Idyll* 11 (6.503–46), all the more notable. Eugenianos' earlier references to the *pharmakon* (remedy) theme encourage the reader to expect another approach to this theme in Kallidemos' *Idyll* 11, but Eugenianos neatly sidesteps the issue and the omission signals Kallidemos' naive overinvestment in the Cyclops' courtship strategies.

By having Kallidemos try on different roles, Eugenianos seems to be exploring the theme of multiple fictive selves. At first, obviously steeped in romantic stories of famous lovers from the past, Kallidemos uses their stories as parallels for his own. In the end, finding himself hopelessly mired in the role of rival suitor, not romantic hero, he aspires to become an abductor, a common variant for villainous rival suitors in the ancient novels. Part of the humor of Kallidemos' role in the novel is his failure at everything he tries. When his first villainous plan is forestalled (to murder Charikles before he and Drosilla reunite, 7.51–55), he decides to abduct Drosilla violently, with the aid of accomplices. But even here Kallidemos fails: while preparing a ship for the abduction, he falls ill, takes to his bed, and the grand abduction scheme is over.<sup>32</sup> This is where the novel leaves Kallidemos, unfit for sea travel, unable to move, landlocked like Theocritus' Cyclops. Kallidemos' illness here seems to recall the lovesickness of *Idyll* 11's Cyclops—a sickness for which the *pharmakon* was but temporary, as Charikles, Kallidemos' rival, noted earlier (4.380). In this novel, the "best" man, the one who wins the girl, is also the more sophisticated and erudite reader.

Eugenianos' repeated allusions to Theocritus' *Idylls* 3, 6, and 11 serve to articulate relationships between characters and highlight the bookish pretensions of Kallidemos. Kallidemos finds alignment with Theocritus' amorous Cyclops and *Idyll* 3's goatherd; Charikles with *Idyll* 11's Nikias and the poet; Drosilla and the old woman with Galateia, the tittering girls, and the Cyclops' mother. Shifts in these alignments, which can also reveal various alignments of author and reader, add to the sophisticated interplay of voices and allusions that characterizes Eugenianos' novel.

#### PASTORAL CLOSURE

The last book of the novel opens with a funeral. The description of this funeral echoes famous passages of bucolic grief and lamentation that serve to provide signposts to such thematic concerns as the meaning of death, in terms both of personal grief and of narrative structure. The circumstances of the funeral are as follows: In the middle of Book 8, Kleandros, the hero and heroine's friend from prison, hears from a traveling merchant that his beloved Kalligone is dead. Book 8 ends with his sudden death of grief during a meal shared with his friends and the merchant (8.311–14). Book 9 begins with his funeral (9.7–9, 11–14):

32. Eug. 7.68–72: "Instead of a flame kindled by desire, / the burning fire of a tertian fever attacked him; / instead of a ship ready to sail / his miserable bed seized him; / instead of a course to another place / he found that he couldn't move."

There, for the stranger's funeral, came every herdsman,  
every peasant, every man of compassion,  
and every woman prone to commiserate,

For him the oak tree lamented, and the rock,  
and streams in deep valleys, and shady glens,  
for truly Kleandros could make  
even the hard race of rocks feel pity.<sup>33</sup>

This passage is multilayered in its allusions. First, the gathering of herdsmen (πᾶς νομεύς) and peasants (πᾶς ἀγρότης) to mourn the dead sets a general tone of bucolic lamentation. Second, the motif of oak tree and rock lamenting, with the elaboration of Kleandros' power to elicit pity from rocks, seems to evoke the legendary musician Orpheus, whose music could move rocks and oak trees. In the long tradition of descriptions of Orpheus' death, oak trees and rocks often serve as key lamenters, as, for example, in the following anonymous epigram (*Anth. Pal.* 7.10.7–8):<sup>34</sup>

ἐπωδύραντο δὲ πέτραι  
καὶ δρύες, ἃς ἐρατὴ τὸ πρὶν ἔθελε γλυφῆναι.

and the rocks lamented  
and the oak trees, which he used to charm with his lovely lyre.

In Byzantine times, the motif of the grief of oak trees and rocks was used also in epitaphs of dead persons to suggest comparisons to Orpheus.<sup>35</sup>

In addition to evoking the general motif of Nature's grief for Orpheus' death, Kleandros' funeral seems specifically linked, by word choice and phraseology, with Theocritus' descriptions of Nature's grief for the legendary cowherd Daphnis, especially *Idyll* 7.74:<sup>36</sup>

δρύες αὐτὸν ἐθρήνεον (end of line)

For him the oak trees were singing a lament

33. Eug. 9.11–14: ἐκεῖνον ἐθρήνησε καὶ δρυς καὶ πέτρα / καὶ κοιλάδων ῥοῦς καὶ βαθύσκοι νάπαι / καὶ γὰρ ἱκανὸς ἦν Κλεάνδρος τῷ τότε / κάμψαι πρὸς οἶκτον καὶ πετρῶν σκληρὸν γένος.

34. In the Greek tradition, the list of natural features charmed by Orpheus could include other elements in addition to rocks and oak trees (e.g., streams of rivers [ποταμῶν ῥέεθρα], Ap. Rhod. 1.26–28), but rocks and oak trees continued to be characteristic, as shown by the Orpheus epitaphs of Damagetus (*Anth. Pal.* 7.9.3–4: δρύες, πέτρα) and Antipater of Sidon (*Anth. Pal.* 7.8.1–2: οὐκέτι θελγομένας, Ὀρφεῦ, δρύας, οὐκέτι πέτρας / ἄλγεις); cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.7–12 (trees, streams, winds, oaks); Verg. *Ecl.* 5 (for rocks and groves singing at the apotheosis, see 63–64: *ipsae iam carmina rupes, / ipsa sonant arbusta*); Ov. *Met.* 11.45–48 (rocks, trees, rivers); Ov. *Met.* 10.90–106 (extensive catalogue of trees).

35. Thus, for example, Theodore Prodromos (whose Byzantine novel directly influenced Eugenianos) begins an epitaph for a nobleman, George Botaneiates, by echoing the standard description of Nature lamenting for Orpheus (C. 60a1): καὶ πέτρα πένθησέ με καὶ δρυς δακρύσει ("both rock will mourn for me and oak tree will weep"). The speaker is the widow. See Wolfram Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos, Historische Gedichte* (Vienna, 1974), 489.

36. On the development of the "pathetic fallacy" in ancient poetry, see B. F. Dick, "Ancient Pastoral and the Pathetic Fallacy," *CompLit* 20 (1968): 27–44. For Theocritus' descriptions of nature's grief for the dying Daphnis, see *Id.* 1.71–75, a catalogue of animals grieving for Daphnis, and *Id.* 7.74–75, the hill and oak trees grieving for him. On how Bion's famous pastoral *Epitaphium Adonidis* 31–39 seems "inspired" by Theocritus' formulations, see J. D. Reed, ed., *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis*, with commentary (Cambridge, 1997), 215; cf. Agathias, *Anth. Pal.* 6.80 (evidence of his nine-book *Daphniaka*).

In other Greek descriptions of Nature's grief, the verb θρηνέω, "sing a lament," seems rarely if ever to appear; a search of Thesaurus Linguae Graecae E turned up only the single instance at *Idyll* 7.74, to which I compare this passage from Eugenianos' novel (9.11):<sup>37</sup>

ἐκεῖνον ἐθρήνησε καὶ δρυς (start of line)

For that one the oak tree too sung a lament

Linguistic content and occasion make an allusion probable: both *Idyll* 7.74 and Book 9.11 combine the subject noun of oak tree with the verb θρηνέω and a masculine accusative pronoun as direct object.

A further link to Theocritus' Daphnis is that, although the vocabulary is not identical, in both the first *Idyll* and Eugenianos' Book 9, herdsmen come to the dead or dying character. Thus *Idyll* 1.80–81:

ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὀπόλοι ἦνθον·  
πάντες . . .

Cowherds came, shepherds, goatherds arrived,  
all . . .

Compare 9.7–8:

ἐκεῖ συνῆλθε πᾶς νομεύς, πᾶς ἀγρότης,  
πᾶς συμπαθῆς ἄνθρωπος . . .

There came together every herdsman, every peasant,  
every man of compassion . . .

Parallels of structure and vocabulary linking these two passages include a set of three masculine nouns without conjunctions, the adjective πᾶς, and the verb ἔρχομαι in the aorist tense.

Eugenianos' use, slightly later, of a simile of snow melting to describe the grief of Kleandros' father strengthens the perception that Book 9.11's treatment of Kleandros' funeral looks specifically to Theocritus' seventh *Idyll*, line 74. In *Idyll* 7, the description of the hill and oak trees lamenting (74–75) is immediately followed by a description of Daphnis wasting away as snow melts (χιών ὥς τις κατετάκετο, 76). In Book 9, a parallel simile describes grief's effect on Kallidemios' father ("you'll be dissolved by grief, as snow by the sun" [τακήσῃ . . . ὥς χιών, 9.79–80]).<sup>38</sup>

A passage in Book 4 confirms Eugenianos' great familiarity with Theocritus' Daphnis (and propensity for alluding to him). In lines 298–309, Kleinias, the lovesick Parthian prince, asks the hero Charikles, his slave, to deliver

37. Instead the verbs used include ἐποδύρομαι (anon., *Anth. Pal.* 7.10.7–8, of oak trees and rocks, above); κλαίω and δακρύω (Bion *Epitaphium Adonidis* 33, 34); δδύρομαι ([Moschus] 3.29); πενθέω and δακρύω in Theod. Prodr. C. 60a1. Cf. the verbs used of animal lamentation in Theoc. 1: ὠρύομαι (71), κλαίω (72), δδύρομαι (75); see also the verbs used when nature is invoked to grieve at the start of [Moschus] *Epitaphium Bionis* (1–3): στοναχέω, κλαίω, μύρομαι, γοάομαι.

38. The simile of snow melting is not unique in Greek literature, of course. Cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.205–9, Callim. *Hymn* 6.91–92 (both comparisons also using a form of the verb τήκω).

to Drosilla a message heavily modeled on Daphnis' complaints in *Idyll* 1.<sup>39</sup> The passage, complete with inversions of nature, is an abbreviated version of Daphnis' song (*Id.* 1.100–103, 130–36, combining start and finish).<sup>40</sup> This passage of extended allusion to *Idyll* 1's Daphnis song makes Book 9's additional allusions to Theocritus' Daphnis likely.

Similarities of circumstance and theme strengthen the linkage of Book 9.7–14 with *Idyll* 7.73–77. Both Daphnis' and Kleandros' deaths are mysterious, the exact manner of their deaths unexplained. Likewise left unstated in both texts are the details of the beloved's loss: what happened to Daphnis' beloved Xenea in the seventh *Idyll* and her relation to his "wasting" are not explained (7.73–77); what happened to Kleandros' beloved Kalligone after their separation is unexplained (her death too is mysterious). The death of Orpheus' beloved Eurydice and Orpheus' self-destructive grief also have parallels in Kleandros' tragic story. Further, Kleandros, like both Daphnis and Orpheus, is a singer.<sup>41</sup>

The linkage of Kleandros' death with the famous death of the archetypal pastoral figure Daphnis makes Kleandros' death appear more emblematic for Eugenianos' novel. The passing of Daphnis, mythical poet-herdsman, leaves lesser musicians (owls) to sing; his death marks an end of an older, mythical bucolic world. So too in Eugenianos' novel, Kleandros' funeral signals an end to the world of adventures for the characters. After Kleandros' death, it is time for the hero and heroine to head home, end the adventures, and return to the real world where families wait.

But why does it take so long to move away from the funeral? From the announcement of Kalligone's death (8.183–85) to the end of the novel, the two deaths of Kalligone and Kleandros take up more than half the remaining text (257 of the 439 lines).<sup>42</sup> One hundred thirty-four of these lines are devoted to Drosilla's expressions of grief, first for Kleandros (9.15–107), then for Kalligone (9. 216–56). Does this excessive grieving have a point in the novel? The funeral and lamentations seem out of proportion to their narrative thrust, which often signals that a metaliterary element is in play. What might such a metaliterary element be, particularly so close to the end of the novel?

These fictive characters are having a hard time leaving the world of their adventures. They persist in grieving; they do not want to go home, meet the parents again, reenter the patriarchal world, cope with the fiancé left behind. In Theocritus' first *Idyll*, the death of Daphnis, the archetypal herdsman-singer, is also a significant event for the herdsmen, representing the passing

39. Eug. 4. 298–308: "Go, Charikles, meet with the maiden / and tell her of my distress. / A sickness consumes me. Here's a brief description of what to say: / Hades is seizing me before my time. / The bright sun himself, leader of the stars, / who sends forth rays to all, has set for me. / Let rivers flow back up to their sources, / for I am dying as destined, but before time. / Let the bramble bush too bloom with the fragrant rose; / let all things now be changed in the world / since Kleinias dies . . ."

40. Cf. Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup> (n. 14 above), vol. 2, p. 28, note on lines 132–36: "Since Virgil in *E.* 8 and Nicetas are imitating T. they presumably understood Daphnis to mean that his death is so surprising that nothing should now seem impossible."

41. Book 2 ends with the song Kleandros sang on his way to court Kalligone, 326–85.

42. Eug. 8.183–242, 311–20; 9.1–143, 216–58.

of the mythical period of their poetic heritage. In *Idyll* 1 also, the mysteries and lamentations associated with such an event seem to continue beyond their strictly narrative function. So in that sense, in Eugenianos' novel, it is appropriate for the narrative to take a while to leave Kleandros' funeral behind.

Why then the doublet—Drosilla's two grieving episodes? The two episodes are strikingly different. First, Drosilla's lamentation for Kleandros at his funeral is proper and conventional (9.15–107): her grief is shared, she laments before witnesses, her mourning represents an important public role for women in the Greek world.<sup>43</sup> The motif of sympathetic nature elevates the context of her lamentation further; her grief is in harmony with nature.

Drosilla engages in her second extended lamentation at the city of Barzon, where Kleandros' beloved Kalligone is buried, where the hero and heroine's fathers await to escort them the rest of the way home (9.216–56). Thus, Drosilla's first lamentation (for Kleandros) was performed at his funeral, among a community of mourners. At Barzon, Drosilla's second lamentation (for Kalligone) is purely a solitary act, undertaken near dawn at Kalligone's tomb.<sup>44</sup> She sneaks away from the house. There is no motif of sympathetic nature.

Why the difference? First, the hero and heroine are moving toward home, out of their adventure world. In real life, things are not so pretty as they are at a pastoral funeral. Drosilla's second lamentation represents grief and mourning in the real world. This is what really happens: the community of grievers dissolves; the solace of the funeral does not last, but the grief persists, a solitary and personal experience.

On a metaliterary level, the novel seems to be going into a tailspin of excessive lamentation. Kleandros' death seems exemplary of the romance novel. He is the only amatory character in the Greek romance tradition to die solely of love. Although romance characters repeatedly claim they will die for love, no one else actually does so.<sup>45</sup> Thus when Eugenianos has Kleandros die for love, his character has performed the ultimate romantic act.<sup>46</sup> Kleandros' act of dying of love seems to suggest a possible death of the romance novel. Where can it go now?

Yet if Kleandros actually achieves the ultimate romantic gesture, one other characters only talk about, then is Kleandros really the worthy romantic hero in this novel? How can Drosilla and Charikles seem worthy now? Klean-

43. On how women customarily perform the laments at funerals in rural Greece, even today, see, e.g., A. Caraveli, "The Bitter Wounding: The Lament as Social Protest in Rural Greece," in *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*, ed. J. Dubisch (Princeton, 1986), esp. 178–79. See also M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*<sup>2</sup>, rev. D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Lanham, Md., 2002).

44. On the parodic nature of Drosilla's tears for Kalligone when compared with Byzantine monks' tears, see Kazhdan, "Bemerkungen" (n. 6 above), 116–17; cf. C. Jouanno, "Discourse of the Body in Prodomos, Eugenianos and Macrembolites," in *Der Roman*, ed. P. A. Agapitos and D. R. Reinsch, 85–86.

45. Cf. Kleitophon's resilience after supposedly burying his beloved's body (Ach. Tat. 5.8.2): "Six months had now passed, and the intensity of my anguish began a little to fade: for time is the medicine of grief, healing the wounds of the soul" (trans. S. Gaselee). In a Greek travel novel, a secondary character kills himself for love (Antonius Diogenes 110b), but as Hägg observes, "*The Marvels beyond Thule* could never have been entitled *Deinias and Dercyllis*" (T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* [Berkeley, 1983], 120). For an important discussion of threatened suicides in Greek novels, see MacAlister, *Dreams*, esp. 43–70, 128–32.

46. Cf. MacAlister, *Dreams*, 128–29.



dros' story almost exactly mirrors that of the romantic leads: like them, Kleandros and his beloved happily eloped together, fell victim to Parthian attack at Barzon, and were separated from one another.<sup>47</sup>

Drosilla's lamentations raise questions about her and Charikles' roles now. Her first lamentation draws parallels between the plight of the deceased and her and Charikles' own situation: Who would comfort me if you died and you if I died? (e.g., 9.81–96). The character's query suggests a metanarrative issue, a possibility that such a hero and heroine might not be able to live up to their billing as the romantic leads of the novel (that is to say, might not be willing to die of love in the case of the death of the other).

For Kleandros, there is no happy ending. His story is tragic. His story is Daphnis' story, the mysterious death as a result of love's entanglements. Just as Theocritus' bucolic world is nearly undone by Daphnis' dying (he returns his pipe to Pan), so too Eugenianos' novel seems nearly derailed by Kleandros' death. Kleandros' story is also Orpheus' story. Before the heroes may return home to marry, they must lament the loss of their friend; they must leave him behind in the adventure world. Thus Drosilla's repeated lamentations over Kleandros also mirror the reader's own sense of loss of the adventure world, as we end the novel and must leave the fictive world behind.<sup>48</sup> Eugenianos must seek elsewhere than in the ancient novels for a model of dying for love. Such a figure is available, however, in Theocritus' Daphnis, a legendary romantic hero who dies, mysteriously, for love's sake. This is another example of what Theocritean pastoral can offer the romance novelist.

Drosilla ends her lamentation with the wish that she had never met Kleandros (9.253–54), that the whole adventure had never happened, that she might end that chapter of her life, exit the adventure world. Such a wish seems parallel to the start of Euripides' *Medea* (the nurse's wish that the Argonauts' expedition had never started) or the end of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* (the suggestion that all the adventures were but a dream, a fiction). In the economy of Eugenianos' novel, this seems to be what it takes to pull out: a metaliterary wish that the whole adventure story had never taken place, so that hero and heroine can return home, assimilate to society, have a properly sanctified wedding, continue their lives as if nothing has ever happened. Drosilla's lamentation is over; in just forty-two more lines, so too is the novel.

#### HOMOEROTIC DESIRE

The ancient novel offered the Byzantines both a value set on an ideal of reciprocated, symmetrical, heterosexual love, as well as a permitted literary space for subjective expressions of obsessive, unrequited, and asymmetrical,

47. As Kleandros laments after receiving the news of Kalligone's death (8.202–7): "I had a great hope sustaining my life, / that I should escape the hands of the barbarians / and be able to see you again one day, maiden. / And now, I was rejoicing with more reason / since I had obtained freedom's light (oh gods!) to look upon, / for I had in mind to find you when I returned."

48. Insofar as Kleandros' funeral is the last pastoral moment in the novel, his funeral also marks the passing of the pastoral from this novel.

even homoerotic, love.<sup>49</sup> Eugenianos found a primary model for expressing this subjective experience of love in Theocritus' poetry. The ease with which Theocritus' poetry moves between expressions of heteroerotic and homoerotic desire, in which the sexual identity of the love object appears incidental,<sup>50</sup> seems to have had special appeal for Eugenianos, perhaps not least because homoeroticism was forbidden in his Christian world.

The church had a long tradition of prohibition of homoerotic activity under canon law.<sup>51</sup> In 533, the Emperor Justinian specifically extended the civil law against adultery to include homoerotic activity as well, thus making it a capital offense (*Institutiones* 4.18.4).<sup>52</sup> In the eighth century, when Leo III revised Justinian's law code, making it supposedly more humane by converting some punishments from death to mutilation, homoerotic acts remained capital crimes (*Ecloga* 17.38).<sup>53</sup>

Thus, although homoerotic desire played an important role in the sexual dynamics of the ancient novel,<sup>54</sup> the renaissance of the ancient novel in twelfth-century Byzantium did not include a revival of overt representations of homoerotic couples and activities functioning as well-developed foils to the main plot. Yet the homoerotic theme was not absent from the Byzantine novels, although rarely explicit or extended. Instances of homoerotic themes include an embedded story of a mythological homoerotic affair,<sup>55</sup> strong statements of male admiration for young, male beauty,<sup>56</sup> a recognition of Eros' special pleasure in young male beauty,<sup>57</sup> an embedded song about loving a hermaphrodite,<sup>58</sup> a casual expectation that a young serving boy would be the

49. For interesting remarks on the "search for erotic charge" (including homoerotic) in Byzantine texts, see M. Mullett, "From Byzantium, with Love," in *Desire and Denial in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-First Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1997*, ed. L. James (Aldershot, England, 1999), 19–22.

50. E.g., *Id.* 2.44, 150. On Theocritus' "paederastic poetry," see R. Hunter, "For the Love of Boys: *Idylls* 12, 29 and 30," chap. 6 in *Theocritus and Archaeology* (n. 12 above), 167–95.

51. See, e.g., D. S. Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London, 1955), esp. 86–91. On early Christian attitudes see also B. J. Brooten, *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago, 1996); E. Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*<sup>2</sup>, trans. C. Ó Cuilleánáin (New Haven, 2002), 191–210.

52. His subsequent Novels 77 (538) and 141 (544) encouraged abstention from homoerotic practices and enjoined penance in order to avoid the extreme penalty. For discussion see, e.g., J. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago, 1980), 171.

53. On the repressiveness of twelfth-century Byzantium, with notice of a "denunciation of long hair as a perversion of nature associated with deviant and unmanly sexuality," see Magdalino, *Empire* (n. 2 above), 385.

54. See, e.g., Xenophon of Ephesus 1.14–2.1, 3.2; Ach. Tat. 1.7–8, 1.12–14, 2.34–38; Longus 4.11–18. On "the pederastic paradigm" in the Greek novel, see D. Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton, 1994), 26–30. "Xenophon of Ephesus: Eros and Narrative in the Novel," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (London, 1994), 49–63.

55. Zephyrus and Hyacinth (Eug. 4.250–53).

56. E.g., Eug. 2.158–59: Charikles interrupts Kleandros' story to say that "the look of a young man blossoms and stays beautiful / when his spirit has occasions of delight." So too in Prodr. 8.107–9, a pirate king says to a father, "Do you see near Kratandros / the youth of comely appearance, old man? / You see also how beautiful he is."

57. Eug. 6.374–75: "He [Eros] takes great pleasure, then, in young men, and where there's beauty, he at once pursues it."

58. Eug. 3.207–15.

erotic attraction at a dinner party,<sup>59</sup> the sacrifice of comely, virginal boys (not girls),<sup>60</sup> and so forth.

By drawing on Theocritus' homoerotic poems for vocabulary and imagery to explore issues of reciprocity in heteroerotic relations, Eugenianos' novel stresses correspondences rather than differences between male and female eros.<sup>61</sup> In the Classical context of a strong Greek tradition of asymmetrical love between males, *erastes* and *eromenos*, that the lover should desire reciprocity is expected. Theocritus' twelfth *Idyll* offers a paradigmatic version of an older male lover's wish for reciprocal love (10–11, 15–16):

Would that a mutual passion inspired us evenly,  
and we might become a song for all men yet to be:  
“ . . . . .  
Under a shared yoke they loved one another. Truly then  
men were again of gold, when the loved one loved in return.”

Theocritus' erotic definition of the Golden Age here is nearly unique among ancient Greek texts and hence striking and memorable.<sup>62</sup> Eugenianos reworks this homoerotic passage in an emphatically heteroerotic context. Kallidemos, the innkeeper's son of Book 6, in a passage cited earlier, reproaches Drosilla for not responding to his amatory advances positively (6.452–55):

The earlier generation was golden in matters of love,  
for the beloved returned the love even more.  
This bronze generation is not the same,  
for the beloved does not wish to return the love.<sup>63</sup>

This poetic allusion to an expression of desire originally voiced in an asymmetrical homoerotic context emphasizes the hopelessness of Kallidemos' position: he is no better situated for demanding reciprocity from Drosilla than an older male lover making demands of a beardless youth. Thus Kallidemos' use of a homoerotic text in heteroerotic courtship also serves to underscore his ineptitude as a reader (and lover), for it suggests he is unaware of the disservice such a citation might do his cause. The continued references to the beloved as male (6.453, ὁ φιληθείς; 455, φιλούμενον), although Kallidemos' beloved is female, strengthen the perception of Eugenianos' special interest in the homoerotic aspect of his sources. Kallidemos' expression of alienation from his own time (the Bronze Age) and from current modes of

59. Prodr. 2.129–35: “others admired the lovely young Dryas [the host's son], / with his downy cheeks, / fair complexion, and golden hair / tumbling down to his shoulders— / and otherwise noble and lovely in appearance. / But to me Dryas is lovely only because / he sits facing such a maiden.”

60. Prodr. 7.324–8.140.

61. On correspondences between male and female desire in Hellenistic poetry, see J. B. Burton, *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage* (Berkeley, 1995), 83–92; cf. Hunter, *Theocritus and Archaeology*, 170–71.

62. Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup>, vol. 2, p. 225, n. 16, cites only Diog. Laert. 4.21 (of Crates): “This particular aspect of the Golden Age does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere.” For a catalogue of such lovers in the heroic age, see Bion frag. 12 (useful discussion in Reed, *Bion* [n. 36 above], 175–79).

63. Kazhdan and Jouanno both discuss briefly comic elements of Kallidemos' use of the Golden Age motif, without mentioning the Theocritean source passage (Kazhdan, “Bemerkungen,” 115; Jouanno, “Nikéas Eugénianos,” 352–53).

erotic behavior may also be heightened by the passage's recall of its distant pederastic heritage and pederastic verse. Playful appropriations of homoerotic texts in heteroerotic contexts are nothing new (see, e.g., Sappho 31 and Catull. 51), but in a time of stern repression of homoeroticism such playfulness seems worth noting, suggesting a possible coded language for readers alert to such allusions. Certainly, sexual reorientations of earlier texts occur often enough elsewhere in the novel to reinforce a perception of special narrative interest in such playful textual/sexual adaptations.

The verb ἀντιφιλέω (love in return) appears five times in Eugenianos' novel, in passages that reinforce one another in meaning.<sup>64</sup> The first of these passages, voiced by Drosilla to Charikles, involves another striking allusion to Theocritus' homoerotic poems, this time to *Idyll* 29, the complaint of a lover to his promiscuous boyfriend. In Eugenianos' novel, in a passage also discussed earlier, Drosilla awakes from a chaste sleep to the sight of Charikles beside her. Both of them are currently slaves and subject to heteroerotic advances from the Parthian royalty. Drosilla expresses the desire to return Charikles' love (5.34, ἀντιφιλέω) and elaborates (35–37):

If you don't want to love me from the depths of your soul,  
I think I have only half the life I desire.  
How is this good, to grieve the girl who loves you?

Her elaboration is modeled on *Idyll* 29's representation of a lover's desire for everlasting love from his promiscuous boyfriend (4–5, 9):

You are not willing to love me with all your heart.  
I know, for only half my life is mine.  
. . . . .  
How is this right, to grieve the one who loves you?

The transformation of Theocritus' male participle of loving (τὸν φιλέοντ', *Id.* 29.9) to the female form (τὴν φιλοῦσαν, Eug. 5.37) offers an example of the process of changing the sexual orientation of a text: what it takes to imagine a virginal young woman speaking the words of a pederastic male.<sup>65</sup>

Textual interplay between the Parthian queen's expression of passionate desire for the young hero and its source passage in Theocritus further highlights how representations of the erotic desires of males and females can coincide. The queen's message to Charikles models its picture of the pain of love on pastoral comparisons in the Theocritean *Idyll* 8.57–59:

Storm is a dread plague to trees, drought to waters,  
a snare to birds, nets to beasts,  
and to a man desire for a delicate girl.

64. Eug. 5.34; 6.444, 453, 455; 7.230. The repeated use of the reciprocal verb ἀντιφιλέω ("love in return") in both Eugenianos' novel and Theocritus' poems reinforces a sense of continuity here between heteroerotic and homoerotic desire. Although reciprocal love is a major theme of the ancient novel, the verb does not appear in any of the five ideal Greek novels. Thus its use five times in Eugenianos' novel, four of these associated with Theocritus' famous usage at 12.16 (preceded by φιλέω at 12.15), seems to reinforce the connection.

65. See also Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup>, 2:505 (on 29.5): "The imitation at Nic. Eugen. 5.35 . . . seems to import into T. the ideas of Call. *Ep.* 42."

The queen's message changes the final clause from a man's to a woman's desire (Eug. 5.210–12):

Drought is harmful to a river, snow to a tree,  
a net to sparrows, sickness to the body,  
and to women love for young men.<sup>66</sup>

The dynamics of change between Theocritus' and Eugenianos' passages draw attention to areas of overlap between male and female desire, particularly striking when the object of desire is a beardless youth, as often in the early novels and elsewhere.<sup>67</sup>

Eugenianos' strong interest in Theocritus' twelfth *Idyll* is shown by repeated and notable allusions to the poem at significant points of the novel, each time marked by the conversion of its homoerotic identity to heteroerotic. We started this discussion with Kallidemos' reworking of *Idyll* 12's Golden Age motif in trying to court Drosilla. Two more allusions to *Idyll* 12 occur in Eugenianos' novel. First an extensive passage from the start of *Idyll* 12 is closely recalled in a letter addressed by the hero's friend to his beloved when he is first courting her (2.296–302):

Like a traveler out of the burning sun  
who finally finds a shady tree, I found you;  
· · · · ·  
· · · · · as  
spring is better by far than winter,  
nightingale than sparrows, sweet apple than blackthorn plums,  
as the maiden than thrice-married women . . .

As shown here, even when recalling Theocritus' non-bucolic poems, Eugenianos' novel often centers on the pastoral passages. Here is the source passage from Theocritus' twelfth *Idyll* (3–9):

As spring is sweeter than winter, as apple  
than a blackthorn plum . . .  
as maiden surpasses a thrice-married woman,  
· · · · · as a clear-voiced  
nightingale sings most sweetly of all winged things,  
so you made me glad with your coming—under the shady oak  
I ran like a traveler when the sun is burning.

*Idyll* 12's imagery of the traveler running to a tree appears again, in a monologue of Charikles, delivered when he thinks Drosilla drowned (Book 6.62–67):

Like a traveler out of the burning sun<sup>68</sup>  
into the shade I fell into your arms,

66. The queen's message of desire (Eug. 5.197–237) is in part a lengthy pastiche of Theocritean pastoral comparisons drawn especially from *Idylls* 8, 9, and 10.

67. Cf. Theoc. 15.84–86 (for discussion see Burton, *Theocritus's Urban Mimes* [n. 61 above], esp. 57–58, 85–87).

68. Rather than understanding Theocritus' phrase ἡελίου φρύγοντος (*Id.* 12.9) as a genitive absolute, Eugenianos supplies an ἐκ (6.62): ἐξ ἡλίου φέγοντος.

beautiful golden plane tree, as I fled the burning heat  
 of despair and the heavy weight of grief.  
 You lie untended, a tall, young tree,  
 but now dry and dead, no longer living.

Changes in the imagery from Theocritus' original mirror Charikles' emotional upheaval: the burning sun no longer represents love but grief, and the golden plane tree sentimentally recalls the place where Charikles first saw Drosilla (Book 3.83–84).<sup>69</sup>

Eugenianos' novel includes numerous allusions to homoerotic poetry. By resurrecting this poetry, the novel shows that past homoerotic poetry was still being valued and read in a world where homoerotic behavior was generally not accepted. Eugenianos' repeated allusions to Plato's *Phaedrus*,<sup>70</sup> another important pastoral locus of homoerotic discourse, may strengthen the impression of textual interest in the Greek heritage of homoerotic themes and poetics. Further, the sophistication and catholicity of Eugenianos' citations of Theocritus show Byzantine interest in (and knowledge of) a wider range of Theocritus' poetry than usually supposed.<sup>71</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

The Byzantine novels, modeled on Greek novels of the Second Sophistic, are naturally highly allusive in nature. Eugenianos' novel is distinguished from the rest by an elaborate and extensive network of allusions and references to Theocritus' poetry.

Allusions to Theocritus' poetry work on both thematic and stylistic levels in Eugenianos' novel. Parallels between Kallidemos and Theocritus' Cyclops and *Idyll* 3's goatherd help articulate Kallidemos' relationships with women as well as his bookish pretensions. Repeated allusions to *Idyll* 11 help raise issues of reader reception and competency, the hero aligned with Nikias and the poet while Kallidemos naively mirrors the Cyclops' self-delusions. Repeated allusions to Theocritus' Daphnis intensify the emblematic moment of Kleandros' funeral and also underscore issues of narrative structure and closure. Theocritus' poetry also provides Eugenianos with a vocabulary for approaching issues of unrequited and asymmetrical love, with his homoerotic poetry providing subtexts for expressions of heteroerotic desire.

Eugenianos' novel, perhaps because of the frequency and overtness of its allusions, has been criticized as being derivative more than has any other Byzantine novel. Yet his novel does not offer simply a pastiche of earlier literature. The allusions offer a forum for meaningful dialogues with the

69. Cf. the ambiguity in Theocritus *Idyll* 12 regarding whether the beloved is meant to be understood as "scorching sun or shady tree" (for discussion see Kelly, "Twelfth *Idyll*" [n. 29 above], 59 [quoted]; Hunter, *Theocritus and Archaeology*, 188).

70. E.g., as in Plato's *Phaedrus*, similarly in Eugenianos, a group of male friends, after leaving the city, sit beneath a large plane tree by the banks of a river and talk of love (Eug. 3.83–91, 119–322; cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 230b–c). See too C. Murley, "Plato's *Phaedrus* and Theocritean Pastoral," *TAPA* 71 (1940): 281–95; M. B. Trapp, "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature," in *Antonine Literature*, ed. D. A. Russell (Oxford, 1990), 141–73.

71. E.g., Browning, "Recentiores" (n. 9 above), 267.

themes and poetics of earlier Greek literature and culture. The very intensity of Eugenianos' allusions helps constitute his claim to originality. He is the only one among the Byzantine novelists to mention other novels directly and in fact is the first among all Greek novelists to do so. Through the comic character of Kallidemos, Eugenianos overtly refers to great works of amatory fiction of the past. But the references are not what would be expected. Although Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius had long been favorites of the Byzantines, Eugenianos' Kallidemos does not refer to Achilles Tatius' novel, and he gets Heliodorus wrong, misremembering rival suitors as reciprocated lovers. Instead, Kallidemos' series of amatory examples focuses on Longus' bucolic *Daphnis and Chloe*, Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*, and Theocritus' Cyclops and Galateia. In choosing these models for love, Eugenianos suggests a new, nonstandard literary lineage for his text, with bucolic themes holding a prominent position.

*Trinity University*