



A Delightful Possession: Longus' Prologue and Thucydides

Author(s): Robert D. Luginbill

Source: *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (Feb. - Mar., 2002), pp. 233-247

Published by: The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3298095>

Accessed: 17/11/2008 14:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=camws>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A DELIGHTFUL POSSESSION: LONGUS'
PROLOGUE AND THUCYDIDES¹

That Longus is deliberately imitating Thucydides in his prologue is a fact that has not been lost on modern readers of *Daphnis and Chloe*.² Indeed, the similarity in the language of his proem to the methodological remarks in the *History* is at times so close as to make it difficult to imagine Longus' original audience failing to notice it either, no matter how superficial their acquaintance with Thucydides might have been. Longus is clearly inviting this comparison, even counting on it. The question is, to what end? On the face of it, for Longus to bind his tale of love so closely to Thucydides' famous chronicle of war seems an odd thing to do.

This oddity should be lingered over a bit. The programmatic prologue is in itself unique among the Greek novels, as J.R. Morgan reminds us.³ How much more strange is it then to compare one's romance to the austere and cerebral *History* of Thucydides? Can there possibly be any similarity in purpose between the two works, different in genre, different in scope, different in subject matter and tone altogether? Longus certainly did not lack for other famous and seemingly more appropriate exemplars to paraphrase, whether pastoral, dramatic, or even philosophical.⁴ Why then, out of all available possibilities, choose Thucydides' *History*?

Longus' motives in doing so have been variously explained. He is artfully reversing Thucydidean values.⁵ He is playing with us.⁶

¹ I wish to express my sincere thanks to the anonymous referees whose many helpful suggestions and observations were critical to the production of this piece.

² See especially P. Turner, "Daphnis and Chloe, An interpretation," *G&R* 7 (1960) 117-123.

³ "Longus, 'Daphnis and Chloe': a Bibliographical Survey, 1950-1995," *ANRW* II 34.3 (Berlin 1997) 2235.

⁴ For the Stoic connection see C. Imbert, "Stoic logic and Alexandrian poetics," in M. Schofield, M. Burnyeat, J. Barnes eds., *Doubts and dogmatism: studies in Hellenistic epistemology* (Oxford 1980) 182-216. In terms of historiographical exemplars, Herodotus' *Histories* would seem, prima facie at any rate, to have made for a much closer fit in terms of tone than Thucydides' somber work.

⁵ i.e., by removing delight from the realm of the trivial: T.A. Pandiri, "Daphnis and Chloe: the Art of Pastoral Play," *Ramus* 14 (1985) 116-141.

⁶ M. Berti, "Sulla interpretazione mistica del romanzo di Longo," *SCO* 16 (1967) 343-358, and R.L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge 1983) 52. Compare M. Philippides, "The prooemium in Longus's *Lesbiaka*," *CB* 59 (1983) 33: "Thus in the

Or perhaps he is indeed laying claim to Thucydidean utility with a straight face (if with altered methods).⁷ While each of these interpretive strategies moves us forward, one is still left somewhat unsatisfied. None of these interpretations is entirely successful in getting at the strangeness of Longus' choice of Thucydides as his novel's intellectual point of departure, the very odd fact that so attracts our attention to his proem in the first place (and to the overall interpretation of the novel in turn).

This perceived dissonance between the prologue and the subject matter of *Daphnis and Chloe* has occasioned scepticism about Longus' degree of commitment to the sentiments he has espoused therein. B.P. Reardon's query—"How serious is Longus?"—directed to Longus' overall intent, is apropos to our discussion.⁸ If he is indeed serious about comparing and contrasting his novel with Thucydides' weighty history, then he must be serious about his work as a whole.

We know that Thucydides, at any rate, *was* serious. And Longus, in company with his audience, would have had no doubts about that fact. By linking his novel so tightly to a work with the *gravitas* of the *History*, Longus would seem to have burnt his bridges, and very deliberately so. Such a comparison, occurring as it does at his novel's inception, is surely meant to demand and command a serious read—unless the device is employed entirely for its humorous effect, something not impossible to imagine after all.⁹ But it is very hard to see how Longus could have intentionally penned what would then have been a largely pointless proem (if there is indeed nothing substantial to the comparison) and at the same time have expected the rest of the novel not to suffer by association.¹⁰ It seems better to take as an interpretive starting point the assumption that Longus must have felt this odd prologue to be an asset to the

final analysis, Longus' 'pleasant possession for all mankind' may run directly contrary to Thucydides' ideology and may even constitute a contradiction in terms".

⁷ Turner (1960)117-118.

⁸ B.P. Reardon, "Μῦθος οὐ λόγος: Longus's Lesbian Pastorals" in J. Tatum's *Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore 1994) 135-147.

⁹ G. Anderson, in *Eros Sophistes* (Chico 1982) 41-49, stresses Longus' playful side, while S. Goldhill, speaking specifically of the prologue in *Foucault's Virginité* (Cambridge 1995) 6, finds "Longus' allusion to the historian here is *not merely* to set up a wryly self-deprecating or ironically grandiose association of the novel with the grandest and most austere of classical prose works, *but also* to place emphasis on the adjective, *τερπνον*, 'pleasurable'." [emphasis added]

¹⁰ Even if we choose to see Longus' Thucydidean allusions as "superficial" (Philippides' word for it, 34), or sense some playful self-deprecation in the comparison (another example perhaps of Longus pretending not to take himself too seriously and so gaining more ready acceptance; cf. Reardon 1994, 144), or agree with D. Maeder's assessment that his purpose is to embrace the novel's fictionality ("Au seuil des romans grecs; effets de réel et effets de création," *GCN* 4 (1991) 1-33) the problem remains. The explicit and calculated nature of the comparison still needs to be explained.

novel, not a pointless liability that would risk trivializing his work from the outset.

Previous scholarly considerations of the prologue's debt to Thucydides have had a tendency to peel off at a rather early stage from discussing the *History* and to dive rather quickly instead into the interpretation of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Though perhaps understandable, this is a bit like the flock leading the shepherd. For if indeed the prologue is a serious flute call intended by Longus to guide us along our way, then we are ill served by reinterpreting its notes on the basis of what follows. After all, it is not as if we are later treated to further detailed and unmistakable antiphonies of this sort. There are allusions to other works besides the *History*, there are parallels to other authors, but certainly nothing on this scale, and nothing so very architectonic in nature. If there is interpretive guidance to be found, it is primarily in the prologue that Longus meant for us to look for it—with careful reference to the Thucydidean parallels off of which he so deliberately plays.

The Thucydidean Parallels

1. ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος

Although Thucydides does not use the word ἱστορία, it is clear from the parallels which follow that it is indeed to the *History* that Longus means this phrase to call our attention. Thucydides' chronicle is the critical point of reference, the point of comparison.¹¹ To understand the comparison, however, one must first properly understand the contrast. For as important as it is to wonder what Longus is affirming his novel to be with these words, it is perhaps even more important to consider what Longus is telling us that his novel *is not*.

Drawing out the implicit contrast is simple enough, at least initially. If Longus' novel is a "history of love", must he not be deliberately placing it in opposition to Thucydides' "history of war"? This sounds reasonable enough to modern ears: make love, not war. But this leaves us with an imprecise comparison. In his use of the phrase ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος, Longus has generally been taken to mean Love with a capital "L", and rightly so. For even though *Daphnis and Chloe* is the story (or history) of one particular "love", the role played by Eros and the claims of the prologue demand a more universal interpretation. We may choose to withhold our unconditional assent

¹¹ "These claims both echo and subvert those of the historian Thucydides ...", Morgan (1994) 73. According to Morgan, Longus' phrase can be taken to mean both "a history about love" and "a history by love", 75.

from critics such as Chalk who would make Eros the protagonist of the story,¹² but there can be little doubt that Longus meant this phrase to conjure up for us Love in its capacity as a cosmic force (at least in part).¹³ But if the antithesis is Eros, not a specific tale of love, can a war, any war, no matter how significant, form the thesis? Gomme's famous remark to the effect that βίαιος διδάσκαλος πόλεμος was the one moral Thucydides wanted his readers to draw from his work (if any), is pertinent here.¹⁴ The definite article is, of course, generic, and so is Thucydides' sentiment. What he has to tell us about the Peloponnesian War—not its dates and places and casualty figures, but its causes and courses, its motives and methods—are lessons he felt certain would be valuable “for all time”. Thucydides, we can say with confidence, and Longus (if we believe his prologue), both attached a general significance to their works which went far beyond the specific incidents they relate.

It seems certain, therefore, that Longus was leaving it to his readers to fill in the dangling comparison—not at all as simple a matter as it first appears. War, even generalized beyond the specific conflict Thucydides relates, still does not supply an adequate thesis to Love's antithesis. Eros may be a cosmic force in its own right, but war, while it might be personified (as in Aristophanes' *Peace*) is too broad a phenomenon to lend itself easily to such characterization. War is more an area of human activity within which *other* forces hold sway—even Love, occasionally (as the Trojan War attests only too well). The question is, in Longus' reading of Thucydides, what single force is there that so dominates the arena of war that it might be deemed comparable to Eros' mastery on the field of love?

2. ἡ γραφή τερπνοτέρα καὶ τέχνην ἔχουσα περιττήν καὶ τύχην ἔρωτικὴν

Not surprisingly, τερπνοτέρα has been the primary focus for those attempting to track references to the *History*. As it is used here, the word is generally taken to signal a departure by Longus from Thucydides' disdain for delight as expressed in his famous dictum, ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπνέστερον φανεῖται (*Hist.* 1.22.4).¹⁵

¹² H.H.O. Chalk, “Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus,” *JHS* 80 (1960) 32-51. See Reardon (1994) 139-140 for some prudent objections.

¹³ M.C. Mittelstadt, “Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and the Pastoral Tradition,” *C&M* 27 (1969) 162-177.

¹⁴ A.W. Gomme, *HCT* v.1 (Oxford 1950) 90.

¹⁵ The *History* is still a profound work of art, no matter how dark and brooding we may find it. Even its asymmetry is studied and deliberate, as J. Ros has so painstakingly demonstrated: *Die METBOΛH als Stilprinzip des Thukydides* (Paderborn 1938). The corresponding levels of pleasure are relative, as one would expect when

Of the fact that Longus had this passage in mind when he wrote *τερπνότερα* there can be no doubt. The opposition of *τερπνότερα* to *ἀτερπνέστερον* is clear enough: both adjectives modify the overall works in view, the *History*, on the one hand, and the picture (the *graphe*, to which Longus' novel responds) on the other. This sentence, therefore, serves to expand Longus' first phrase of comparison to the *History*, namely *ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος* (also applied, strictly speaking, to the picture, but again representative of his own work by mimesis). The *graphe* (whose antecedent is *ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος*, and to which Longus' work responds) possesses, by the author's own account, two salient features, characteristics which, when carefully considered, demonstrate for us precisely how this novel compares and contrasts to Thucydides' work. It will be helpful to treat the two phrases in reverse order.¹⁶

a) *τύχην ἔρωτικὴν*: First, the *graphe* (and hence the novel) is characterized by "erotic chance". With this phrase, Longus completes the unfulfilled comparison between his work and the *History* that was implied in *ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος*. Even if left unnamed, Chance, or Tyche, would have been a likely candidate for us to supply for a power in the realm of war so potent as to be comparable to Love's dominance on the field of passion. The importance in the *History* of the theme of risk was apparently not lost on Longus. In Thucydides' work, war is an arena in which "things most often come down to chances" (*Hist.*1.78.2), and it is this risk (or Tyche), the psychological pressure of uncertainty, that so influences the course of human events in war.¹⁷ Longus' modification of Tyche with the addition of *ἔρωτικὴν*, however, makes for a critical distinction: Tyche may be a force in the *History*, but in *Daphnis and Chloe* the only Tyche is an "erotic Tyche", that is to say, a Chance in whom there is no risk at all, a Chance completely subject to the guiding hand of Eros.¹⁸ It hardly needs to be said that to translate the phrase "a tale of ancient love", "an exciting, romantic subject", or "une aventure amoureuse" (as Thornley, Gill and Dalmeyda do respectively) is to fail to bring out either Longus' reference here to Thucydidean Tyche,

comparing a *μῦθος* to a *λόγος* (Thucydides' point at 1.22.4, picked up by Longus at 2.7; cf. 2.27), and dependent upon the subject matter.

¹⁶ The two nouns are reversed in ms. V.

¹⁷ For the critical role of Tyche, see S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (Baltimore 1987) 30, and my *Thucydides on War and National Character* [hereafter referred to as *TWNC*] (Boulder 1999) 53-64.

¹⁸ See Reardon (1994), 139, Mittelstadt (1969) 173 & 175, and Chalk (1960) 233-36. J.N. Davidson's sketch of the trope of all powerful Eros is particularly cogent: *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (New York 1998) 160f.

or his supplanting of it with “erotic Chance”, a periphrasis for Eros itself.¹⁹

We can now begin to get a sense for the origin of the *terpsis* Longus is claiming for his work. In contrast to a sobering examination of the ways of men in war (and the unforeseen reverses that oftentimes come upon them), Longus intends to treat us to something more enjoyable than Thucydides’ tragic chronicle. It is, then, partly because his subject matter is so different that his novel will possess a *terpsis* that Thucydides’ *History* eschewed. Longus offers us, in lieu of a war story lacking in delight (largely because of the disaster and suffering Tyche brings about), a delightful love story (whose enjoyment is owed in no small part to Eros’ superintendence of its progression). Precisely because it leaves nothing to chance, watching this “history” of the two lovers unfold so propitiously under the control of Eros—in spite of all fits and starts—produces a far more pleasurable vicarious experience than powerlessly observing the tragic, chance reverses of war.

b) τέχνην ἔχουσα περιττήν: If by τύχην ἐρωτικήν Longus meant to distinguish the guiding hand of Eros from the disruptive influence of Tyche as a governing force in his novel, to what should this reference to the magnitude of skill employed in the *graphie* (and by implication duplicated in Longus’ own work) correspond in the *History*?²⁰ It is tempting to suggest that Longus has used the word *techne* here to mirror Thucydides’ *kinesis*.²¹ With Tyche and Eros representing the cosmic forces directing events in their respective works, *techne* and *kinesis* could be seen as their most significant respective results (with Tyche producing an unparalleled *kinesis* in former case, and Eros engendering exceptional *techne* in the latter). Just as Thucydides chose for his historical paradigm the “greatest event” in the history of the world as he knew it (*Hist.* 1.1.2),²² so Longus has selected a work of art characterized by the most exceptional skill (it is, after all, a θέαμα κάλλιστον to which he responds). The comparison, though necessarily inexact, may be precisely what Longus is aiming for: Thucydides’ subject matter is

¹⁹ G. Thornley, in J.S. Edmonds and S. Gaselee, ed., *Daphnis and Chloe and Parthenius* (Cambridge 1928) 7; C. Gill, in B.P. Reardon ed. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley 1989) 288; G. Dalmeyda, ed., *Longus Pastorales* (Paris 1934) 2.

²⁰ In J. Kestner’s view, Longus is attempting to surpass the painting he describes here: “Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*,” *CW* 67 (1973) 166-171.

²¹ This balancing of *kinesis* with *techne* as a comparative point of departure from the *History* is only partially explained by his use of the *physis-techne* complex in the body of his novel, an idea developed most extensively in D. Teske’s *Der Roman des Longos als Werk des Kunst* (Muenster 1991) esp. 23-42. But see also A. Wouters, “Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé*: Le *proemion* et les histoires enchâssées, à la lumière de la critique récente,” *LEC* 62 (1994) 131-167.

²² As such, it was ἀξιολογώτατον (*Hist.* 1.1.1). See *TWNC*, 3-4.

an actual event, Longus' object, on the other hand, is the depiction of an event; Thucydides is dealing with facts, non-fiction, a λόγος, while Longus is composing a fictional account, a μῦθος.²³ By taking a step back from history into meta-history, Longus is free to place artistry over factual detail, because his avowed subject is the work of art he means to represent, which thus takes priority over the events represented within it.²⁴ In this second salient feature of the *graphe*, then, the *terpsis* in Longus' novel, ruled out on the basis of subject matter for the *History*, will come not only from the relatively much more pleasant topic to be treated, but also from the considerable artistry or *techne* he will exhibit in response to the *graphe* he describes.²⁵

To sum up this sentence explaining and expanding the ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος, Longus, like Thucydides, is indeed conducting a serious inquiry, a ἱστορία, into an important arena of human behavior (love, in place of war); like Thucydides, he finds a cosmic force at work whose embrace mortal men are largely powerless to resist (a positive development conveying *terpsis* in his swapping of Eros for Tyche); unlike Thucydides, however, his subject matter is itself an exceptional work of art which is at the same time an interpretation of events, and this exchanging of artistry for reality constitutes a second factor which also contributes to the yielding of a higher degree of *terpsis*. Were this the extent of the similarities in the two respective works, one might still be inclined to throw in with the many voices casting doubt on Longus' sincerity in broaching such a comparison. As we shall see below, however, in addition to his claim that both the *History* and his novel are true investigations of their respective, important subject matter (i.e., ἱστορία), Longus is also claiming to have employed a methodology very like that of Thucydides, producing thereby a utility for his novel on a par with the *History* (a serious claim indeed).

²³ Compare Daphnis and Chloe's reaction to Philetas' tale of Love's superintendence: ὡς περ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούοντες (2.7). Morgan sees Longus here picking up "the terminology of Plato's distinction between fictional and true narrative", (1994) 77.

²⁴ The details of the story follow as a consequence, and the order is important: Longus is telling us that he has given top priority to reflecting the beauty and artistry of the *graphe*, not to rendering an account precise and accurate in all its details. For the argument that the novel is in itself structured after the fashion painting modes, see M.C. Mittelstadt, "Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and Roman Narrative Painting," *Latomus* 26 (1967) 752-761.

²⁵ While the word περιπτώσις does not occur in the *History*, the concept underlying it is quite important. Overabundance of resources is, in fact, one of the critical factors necessary for the prudent planner to ensure success, in Thucydides' view (cf. 2.65.13); see also *TWNC* 189-215.

3. ἀντιγράψαι, ἀναζητησάμενος, ἔξεπονησάμην

These three words correspond in the *History* to ξυνέγραψε (*Hist.* 1.1.1), ζήτησις (*Hist.* 1.20.3), and ἐπιπόνως (*Hist.* 1.22.3), all terms important in the description of Thucydides' own method of research.²⁶ Given the disjunction of the two ἱστορίαι already made so clear—between the *graphie* and an actual war, between μῦθος and a genuine λόγος, between this fictional account and Thucydides' factual chronicle—Longus' readers were bound to ask the need for an empirical approach of this sort. The answer to this inevitable objection is, I believe, bound up in the further question of Longus' claim to utility along Thucydidean lines (a point he addresses directly later in the proem). Thucydides, it will be recalled, promised his readers a utilitarian advantage, provided they wished to know τὸ σαφές (the "unobscured reality") of things likely to repeat, that is, the even more important truths *behind* the events he had so painstakingly researched (*Hist.* 1.22.4).²⁷ If the "story behind the story" (rather than an accurate catalogue of facts) is the most important benefit of ἱστορία in Thucydides' view, then how much more should this not be true for Longus, whose novel is itself the "story of a story", an interpretation of a pictorial representation of events? This is really at the heart of Longus' point in laying claim to Thucydidean methodology. In the same way that Thucydides scrupulously dug out "the facts" in order to get at the truth that lay behind them, so Longus has taken care to research and present an accurate picture of love, not a training manual or advice to the love-lorn, but a true representation of "love in action" similar to the *History's* revelation of human behavior under the pressures of war.²⁸

Because he is not working with a historical "data base" in the manner of Thucydides, Longus puts his own twist on the three methodological references cited above. First, in the case of ἀντιγράψαι, and ξυνέγραψε (*Hist.* 1.1.1), both words are being used technically, both are compounds of γράφω, and both have their authors' ultimate subjects as their objects (i.e., the *graphie* and "the

²⁶ See Philippides, (1983) 34, for Longus' awareness and use of historiography here.

²⁷ ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφές σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὔθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιοῦτων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνει αὐτὰ ἀκρούστως ἔξει. See TWNC 1-9.

²⁸ Longus and Thucydides both come off far better to the critical eye when seen as paradigmatic representations of truth rather than explicit "how-to" treatises. In this respect, the more than five hundred versions of *Daphnis and Chloe* that have appeared in the last half-millennium are indication enough that Longus' picture of human nature in love has achieved a comparable success to Thucydides' picture of human nature in war. See Reardon (1994) 135 for the statistics.

war of the Peloponnesians and Athenians" respectively).²⁹ Sandwiched in between other clear references to the *History*, there can be little doubt about the fact that ἀντιγράψαι is meant to recall ξυνέγραψε, however it distinguishes Longus' method from Thucydides' at the same time it lays claim to it. Diligent effort is indicated in both instances, but rather than the laborious collection of facts implied in ξυνέγραψε, Longus' ἀντιγράψαι suggests instead a careful (and honest) representation of his object, the *graphe*.³⁰ This is not a disassociation of his novel from the *History*, merely a precise distinction. Thucydides and Longus have similar objectives and are employing similar methodologies; they are simply working with different mediums (the key factor in the contrast between the two all along): Thucydides is molding a view of the world (the world of conflict) from a lump of facts, selectively chosen; Longus is shaping his paradigm of love from art and myth; both aim at creating a mimetic composition that reflects the truths they have found.

Longus' search for an *exegetes* of the *graphe* parallels Thucydides' own careful search for witnesses (*Hist.*1.22.2).³¹ At *History* 1.20.3, Thucydides explicitly criticizes those who do not bother to do this necessary research, preferring instead an ἀταλαίπωρος ζήτησις.³² Longus' strengthening of ζητέω with the prefix ἀνα- emphasizes his conscientiousness in this matter and shows his desire to place himself in line with the Thucydidean method. Although his account is fictional, it nevertheless has the discipline of the myth behind it (in the same way that Thucydides' interpretation is based upon an accurate assessment of the facts). Finally, Longus' ἐξεπονησάμην is a clear allusion to Thucydides' methodology as expressed in the word ἐπιπόνως (*Hist.* 1.22.3), and is perhaps the most important of the three methodological references he uses.³³ Thucydides' task of uncovering the truth in the face of contradictory "facts" is a laborious one; for Longus, the process of composing a novel to represent the truth of the myth is what requires intensive labor. Once again, the vocabulary is altered slightly. Where Thucydides' ἐπι- is directive, focused on the toil of gathering eye-witness testimony, Longus' ἐκ- is perfective, drawing attention to the successful completion of a work of art. His goal, however, remains similar, and given the lengths to which Longus has gone to

²⁹ The latter is a term for technical writing used by Thucydides to distinguish his work from that of Herodotus: Hornblower (1987) 8 n.2.

³⁰ For an excellent survey of the bibliography on this point, see Wouters (1994) 139, n.29.

³¹ Anderson (1982) 46, and Pandiri (1985) 117, are doubtless correct in seeing such an interpreter as a "mystagogue" in Longus' case.

³² His own technique is outlined earlier in the same paragraph, and also in para. 21-22.

³³ Pandiri (1985) n.8, sees a reference to Theocritus here.

appropriate the Thucydidean method, modifying it to his own unique subject matter, we should not be surprised to find him laying claim to the results of that methodology as well.

4. κτῆμα τερπνόν

Acceptance of this phrase as a reference to Thucydides' κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ (*Hist.*1.22.4) has been virtually unqualified.³⁴ Of prime importance in this investigation, however, is to consider what Thucydides meant by it in order to understand Longus' development of the idea. What I have tried to show elsewhere in Thucydides' case is that he believed his *History* to be an "ageless possession" because of the accurate picture it provided of human behavior (both individual and collective) in the historical process.³⁵ By appropriating this famous phrase, Longus is making a comparable claim of utility, one which is similarly dependent upon the principle that human behavior and experience are universals, that is, that a common *physis* ensures a significant measure of common experience (here, in the realm of love).³⁶ It is true that he does not overtly repeat or replace Thucydides' ἐς αἰεὶ (that might have seemed to his readers a bit much), but with πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις and (later) μέχρι ἂν κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν he manages to give the impression of timelessness while avoiding the offense of plagiarism. Especially important for our inquiry is the fact that Longus sees his work not only as a *ktema* on the Thucydidean scale, but as a "delightful" one (a κτῆμα τερπνόν), or, to take the adjective actively as his following comments indicate we should, one that *bestows* pleasure on the reader thus making it equally valuable "for all mankind" (πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις). But how, we may well ask, does Longus see this gift of *terpsis* as truly useful and not merely entertaining (an important question if we are to take Longus' self-comparison with Thucydides seriously)?

³⁴ See in particular Turner (1960) 117-118, Hunter (1983) 47-50, Pandiri (1985) 117-118 et n.9, Teske 2-7 (1991), and Wouters (1994) 142.

³⁵ TWNC 5-7. On the limited nature of the utility Thucydides was claiming (discussed in greater detail below), see also J. de Romilly, "L'Utilité de l'histoire selon Thucydide", in *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* IV (Geneva 1958) 41-66.

³⁶ Thucydides is more concerned with imperialistic and self-preservation tendencies, of course, but he did recognize Eros as a drive, an *orge*, of human nature, or *physis* (*Hist.* 3.45.6; 6.57.3). See TWNC 21-35.

5. νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται

In these two words (expanded by the three related claims that follow),³⁷ Longus explains both the precise utility of his novel and the appropriateness of his comparison to the *History*. His effective portrayal of love in action actually has the power to heal the love-sick and generally to benefit those in all “conditions” of love, true utility indeed. The mechanism of healing, namely, the bestowal of *terpsis* upon the reader, is the pivotal difference between his work and the *History* and it is for this reason that Longus has offered it up as the sharpest point of distinction between the two.³⁸ For what utility there is in the *History* comes to the careful reader who considers the information imparted objectively *apart* from the passions and partisan considerations that motivated those actually involved. But in Longus, the *terpsis* is an involuntary reaction of pleasure to his art and depiction of love in others—exactly the opposite phenomenon. In this regard, it is also more than a little ironic that Thucydides’ authorial stance (only one step removed from events) demands that the reader maintain an emotional distance in order to benefit, while Longus’ stance (describing a pictorial record of events) calls for the reader to give in to the pleasure of the experience in order for the healing to begin.

While up to this point in the prologue the reader has been drawn to the common features of the novel and the *History*, the promise νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται (along with the claims that follow) forces us to take a step back and realize that the differences are also profound. Much of this is, again, a function of the subject matter, but this is an issue of no little moment when the contrast is between international power-politics and war on the one hand (where Apollonian rationality is at a premium), and love on the other (where over-intellectualization can be a liability, even a blasphemy: cf. θεός ἐστιν, ὦ παῖδες, ὁ Ἔρως, 2.7). Longus embraces the distinction. It was “desire” that “seized” him and led him to pen this novel in the first place (πόθος ἔσχεν). The work itself is a “votive offering” to “Love and the Nymphs and Pan” (ἀνάθημα μὲν Ἐρωτι καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Πανί). Even the *graphe* itself on which his own work is based is an integral part of a shrine, and Longus’ prayer for temperance in the writing process (ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονουσί τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν) is a clear indication that for him the creation of this work of art (as well as its curative powers) is more inspiration than

³⁷ παραμυθήσεται, ἀναμνήσει, προπαιδεύσει.

³⁸ Pandiri (1985) 117-118. See also B. Effe’s “Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit,” *Hermes* 110 (1982) 65-84.

calculation.³⁹ The reader thus understands that *Daphnis and Chloe* will not be a cerebral examination of the destructive side of human nature in the Thucydidean way (wherein one learns the value of holding back from the impulses of our common *physis*), but a therapeutic experience, cathartic rather than prophylactic. In Thucydidean situations, giving in to the drives of human nature leads to miscalculation and disaster, and the reader learns this lesson at a distance.⁴⁰ But Longus is offering us healing, encouragement, remembrance and education precisely by giving in and enjoying the *terpsis* he offers us through immersion in a chronicle of events from which we are two steps removed—such is the power of Love.⁴¹

Longus' description here of love as disease is certainly humorous, but it is not for that reason trivial or unimportant.⁴² The love-disease theme figures heavily in the pages of his novel, and it is certainly part of the delight to see Daphnis and Chloe struggling with their "condition", desperately in search of a "cure" (cf. 1.18.2; 1.22.3; 2.7.7; 3.14.1).⁴³ Religious and mystical considerations aside, there is obvious value for one's own amatory complaints in smiling at such things and in contemplating our universal predicament.⁴⁴ Thus Longus' careful separation from Thucydides at this point marks a critical difference: for readers of Thucydides, knowledge alone must often suffice in the realm where *Tyche* holds sway,⁴⁵ whereas readers of Longus are offered a delightful panacea to the pain of Love.⁴⁶

³⁹ Compare Anderson's remarks: "But his σωφροσύνη contrives that providence move in a way that is both subtly mysterious and amusing." (1982) 46. Anderson's characterization of the ἐξηγητήσας a "mystagogue" (see n.28 supra) is also relevant in this regard.

⁴⁰ Inevitabilities, as long as human nature endures: κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. *Hist.* 1.22.4.

⁴¹ On the notion of Longus as a *praeceptor amoris*, see in particular F.I. Zeitlein, "Gardens of Desire in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*", in J. Tatum's *Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore 1994) 148-170.

⁴² On Longus' modification of Theocritus' dictum that there is no medicine for love (11.1-3), see L. Cresci's "Longus the Sophist and the Pastoral Tradition" in *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. S. Swain (Oxford 1999) 240.

⁴³ ὦ νίκης κακῆς; ὦ νόσου καινῆς, ἣς οὐδε εἰπεῖν οἶδα τὸ ὄνομα. 1.18.2.

⁴⁴ The transformation of "tragedy into something *terpnon*" as Pandiri puts it (1985) 132.

⁴⁵ This is nowhere more clear than in another famous "disease context", namely, Thucydides' treatment of the plague at Athens, where he takes pains to make it clear that his detailed description offers no cure, only the ability to "recognize it, if it should break out again" (*History*, 2.48.3). And generally in the *History*, to understand the patterns of national character and individual predispositions that inevitably direct the course of history is all that most individuals in most situations can hope for.

⁴⁶ Lycaenium's "lessons" certainly benefit the couple in the end (4.40.3). For the education in love theme see also 1.2.8 and 1.2.9.

6. μέχρι ἂν κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν

This final parallel cements both the similarities and the differences between novel and history.⁴⁷ Longus' work too has universal and timeless application, as this phrase, a clear recollection of Thucydides' statement about war being an inevitability "as long as human nature remains the same", informs us.⁴⁸ Wars will continue because human beings are what they are. In such a world, Tyche inevitably reigns. Even a Nicias cannot escape the vagaries of chance, despite his piety. Even a Pericles cannot save the Athenians from themselves, once an unpredictable Tyche has snatched him away. In Longus' world, Eros is likewise in command and it is similarly pointless to resist. Beauty, whether objective or subjective, will always trump reason in the same way that men generally follow their instincts in war, rather than their intelligence. But it is both a pleasurable consolation and a healing delight to experience the former truth at work throughout Longus' "History of Love", in contrast to the sobering and cautionary experience of observing the devastating effects of the latter in Thucydides' work.

Why did Longus choose to compare his love story to Thucydides' tale of the "greatest *kinesis*" of all time? Beyond a commonality of purpose, method and carefully defined utility, it might also perhaps be argued that Daphnis and Chloe represent the "most unlikely love", and, as such, the perfect counterpoint to Thucydides' choice of the Peloponnesian War as his paradigm. Despite human expectation and false starts, Love overcomes all obstacles to bring the two together, making their story a clear example of the power and inevitability of Eros. Separations, temptations, pirates, nothing can thwart the ineluctable progress of love, not even innocence, inexperience, and lack of sophistication, possibly the most serious hindrances of all.⁴⁹ For if Love can overcome even the ignorance of Man, what force may possibly withstand it?

Longus thus uses this extended imitation of Thucydides not only to recommend his own work, but also to show by way of comparison what it can do that the *History* cannot. Longus is indeed serious in offering us this delightful possession that heals. This is a benefit that the humor and *terpsis* of his novel do not contradict but rather do much to convey—a concept, after all, which was not entirely foreign to Thucydides (*History* 2.38):

⁴⁷ The lead phrase, οὐδεις Ἐρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύξεται, may also be an echo of the schema of past and future events referred to by Thucydides at *Hist.* 1.22.4: τῶν τε γενομένων ... καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτέ αὐθις.

⁴⁸ ἕως ἂν ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ἀνθρώπων *Hist.* 3.82.2.

⁴⁹ D. Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry* (Princeton 1994) 53-54.

Furthermore, we have provided for the spirit the most plentiful respites from labor by providing games and festivals throughout the year as well as attractive surroundings for private life, a source of daily delight (τέρψις) which drives away cares (τὸ λυπηρὸν).⁵⁰

ROBERT D. LUGINBILL

University of Louisville

Bibliography

- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes*. Chico.
- Berti, M. 1967. "Sulla interpretazione mistica del romanzo di Longo." *SCO* 16: 343-58.
- Chalk, H.H.O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longos." *JHS* 80:32-51.
- Cresci, L. 1999. "Longus the Sophist and the Pastoral Tradition." in S. Swain, ed., *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford: 210-42.
- Dalmeyda, G. 1934. *Longus Pastorales*. Paris.
- Davidson, J.N. 1998. *Courtesans and Fishcakes*. New York.
- Effe, B. 1982. "Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit." *Hermes* 110: 65-84.
- Gill, C. 1989. Translation of *Daphnis and Chloe*, in B.P. Reardon, ed., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity*. Cambridge.
- Gomme, A.W. 1950. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides I*. Oxford.
- Hornblower, S. 1987. *Thucydides*. Baltimore.
- Hunter, R.L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.
- Imbert, C. 1980. "Stoic logic and Alexandrian poetics." in M. Schofield, M. Burnyeat, J. Barnes edd., *Doubts and dogmatism: studies in Hellenistic epistemology*. Oxford: 182-216.
- Kestner, J. 1973. "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." *CW* 67:166-71.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry*. Princeton.
- Lattimore, S. 1998. *Thucydides: the Peloponnesian War*. Indianapolis.
- Luginbill, R.D. 1999. *Thucydides on War and National Character*. Boulder.
- Maeder, D. 1991. "Au seuil des romans grecs; effets de réel et effets de création." *GCN* 4: 1-33
- Mittelstadt, M.C. 1967. "Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and Roman Narrative Painting." *Latomus* 26: 752-61.
- 1969. "Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and the Pastoral Tradition." *C&M* 27 162-77.

⁵⁰ The translation is Steven Lattimore's: *Thucydides: the Peloponnesian War* (Indianapolis 1998).

- Morgan, J.R. 1997. "Longus, 'Daphnis and Chloe': a Bibliographical Survey, 1950-1995." *ANRW II* 34.3: 2208-76.
- Pandiri, T.A. 1985. "Daphnis and Chloe: the Art of Pastoral Play." *Ramus* 14: 116-41.
- Philippides, M. 1983. "The prooemium in Longus's *Lesbiaka*." *CB* 59: 32-35.
- Reardon, B.P. 1994. "Μῦθος οὐ λόγος: Longus's Lesbian Pastorals." in J. Tatum, ed., *Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore: 135-47.
- Romilly, J. de. 1958. "L' Utilité de l'histoire selon Thucydide." in *Histoire et historiens dans l'antiquité, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique' IV*. Geneva: 41-66.
- Ros, J. 1938. *Die METBOAH als Stilprinzip des Thukydides*. Paderborn.
- Teske, D. 1991. *Der Roman des Longos als Werk des Kunst*. Muenster.
- Thornley, G., Edmonds, J.S., Gaselee, S. 1928. *Daphnis & Chloe and Parthenius*. Cambridge.
- Turner, P. 1960. "Daphnis and Chloe, An interpretation." *G&R* 7: 117-23.
- Wouters, A. 1994. "Longus, *Daphnis et Chloé*: Le proœmion et les histoires enchâssées, à la lumière de la critique récente" *LEC* 62: 131-67.
- Zeitlein, F.I. 1994. "Gardens of Desire in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." in J. Tatum, ed., *Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore: 148-170.