Mnemosyne

A Stormy Debate. Issue- and idea-theory in Longus' pastoral trial.
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	MNEM-2680R2
Full Title:	A Stormy Debate. Issue- and idea-theory in Longus' pastoral trial.
Short Title:	
Article Type:	Article
Corresponding Author:	Olivier Demerre Universiteit Gent Gent, BELGIUM
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universiteit Gent
First Author:	Olivier Demerre
Order of Authors:	Olivier Demerre
Abstract:	This article aims at a better understanding of a passage in Longus' novel Daphnis and Chloe, the trial scene (2.12-19). It argues that Longus capitalises on contemporary rhetorical debates to elaborate on his own literary project. The insertion in Philetas' verdict of a debated point (the storm) in stasis-theory aims at underlining the discrepancy between the means of persuasion mastered by an uneducated cowherd and by an educated reader. This allows a reflection on the incidence of the displacement of an elite social practice, the trial, into the rustic world of Daphnis and Chloe. This displacement is further emphasised in the trial itself by the juxtaposition of two speeches, one that is artificially simple (the Methymnaians'), and another naturally simple (that of Daphnis). Through this, Longus promotes his own stylistic project. I eventually contend that this scene explores the notion of credibility within Longus' fictional world.
Keywords:	Greek Novel Longus Rhetoric Fiction
Funding Information:	Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (GOB7516N) Mr. Olivier Demerre

A Stormy Debate
Issue- and *Idea*-theory in Longus' pastoral trial.

Olivier Demerre
Ghent University, Dept. of Literary Studies.
Olivier.Demerre@UGent.be

Abstract

This article aims at a better understanding of a passage in Longus' novel *Daphnis and Chloe*, the trial scene (2.12-19). It argues that Longus capitalises on contemporary rhetorical debates to elaborate on his own literary project. The insertion in Philetas' verdict of a debated point (the storm) in *stasis*-theory aims at underlining the discrepancy between the means of persuasion mastered by an uneducated cowherd and by an educated reader. This allows a reflection on the incidence of the displacement of an elite social practice, the trial, into the rustic world of Daphnis and Chloe. This displacement is further emphasised in the trial itself by the juxtaposition of two speeches, one that is artificially simple (the Methymnaians'), and another naturally simple (that of Daphnis). Through this, Longus promotes his own stylistic project. I eventually contend that this scene explores the notion of credibility within Longus' fictional world.

Keywords
Greek Novel – Longus – Rhetoric – Fiction.

Acknowledgements

A Stormy Debate

Issue- and *idea*-theory in Longus' pastoral trial

Olivier Demerre

Ghent University, Dept. of Literary Studies.

Olivier.Demerre@UGent.be

Abstract

This article aims at a better understanding of a the trial scene in Longus' novel *Daphnis and Chloe* (2.12-19). It argues that Longus capitalises on contemporary rhetorical debates to elaborate on his own literary project. The insertion in Philetas' verdict of a debated point (the storm) in *stasis*-theory aims at underlining the discrepancy between the means of persuasion mastered by an uneducated cowherd and by an educated reader. This allows a reflection on the incidence of the displacement of an elite social practice, the trial, into the rustic world of Daphnis and Chloe. This displacement is further emphasised in the trial itself by the juxtaposition of two speeches, one that is artificially simple (the Methymnaians'), and another naturally simple (that of Daphnis). Through this, Longus promotes his own stylistic project. I eventually contend that this scene explores the notion of credibility within Longus' fictional world.

Keywords

1. Introduction

In recent years, studies have emphasized the way in which Greek novelists interact with their rhetorical environment.[1] This is in line with a greater attention paid to the novels as products of their sophistic and intellectual environment.[2] This paper aims to contribute to this trend by studying how Longus' trial-scene (2.12-19) interacts with contemporary rhetorical theory and practice. Contrary to other novels, the trial scene in Longus does not revolve around adultery or murder but concerns a trivial issue. Rich young people from the neighbouring city of Methymna navigate to the part of the countryside where Daphnis and Chloe live, in order to enjoy the harvest; they bring along their dogs, so they can hunt. However, the rope that they use to moor their ship is stolen by local inhabitants. They create a new one with willow and leave the boat unattended as they go hunting. The dogs' barking scares Daphnis' goats, peacefully grazing in the mountains. They end up on the beach where the boat is tied up to the shore and eat the willow rope, which causes the boat to drift away from the beach. The Methymnaians seize Daphnis and begin to beat him up, before local inhabitants come to his rescue. The young city-dwellers demand that a trial take place. Philetas, a local cowherd known to Daphnis, is appointed as judge. The Methymnaians, pretexting the loss of valuable goods, accuse Daphnis and his goats of being responsible for the loss of the ship, and demand to take him as a compensation. Daphnis on the other hand accuses the Methymnaians' dogs and the storm of being responsible for the loss of the ship. Philetas rules in favour of Daphnis, but the

---

[1] See for instance Hock 1997; Van Mal-Maeder 2007; Webb 2007 and 2017a for general studies; Doulamis 2011 and De Temmerman 2014 *inter al.* for detailed aspects.

[2] On the relationship between the novels and sophistic rhetoric, see Cassin 1995, 493-512 and specifically on Longus 507-512.

Methymnaians, unhappy with the verdict, go back to Methymna, lie to their assembly and provoke a war with the neighbouring city of Mytilene.[3]

The trial-scene contains two opposing orations recounted in direct speech. The account of the trial must meet the needs of two audiences: on the one hand, the narrator addresses the narratee, who shares characteristics with the narrator in that he has a full knowledge of the events as told by the narrator as well as an appreciation of rhetorical practice and theory;[4] on the other hand, the internal audience of the speeches is composed of the local country folks, who do not possess any knowledge of previous events and are not—we may easily presume—accustomed with either courtrooms or rhetorical theory.

Critics have shown how this scene 'pastoralizes' a novelistic *topos*.[5] They have also underlined how crucial this scene is for the development of Daphnis' rhetorical abilities: after facing an internal aggression by Dorcon, Daphnis fends off an external threat from the Methymnaians.[6] Others have shown that the biased presentation and narration of the scene by the narrator aim at concealing a ploy by the rustic characters to exonerate Daphnis.[7] Finally, the legal aspects of the trial have been explored.[8] However, few commentators have studied how

---

[3] Longus 2.12-19.

[4] On the characterisation of the narrator and narratee in Longus, see Morgan 2004b. On the rhetorical skills of the audience, see below.

[5] See Cresci 1999, 233-234 and Saïd 1999, 97-98. Morgan 2004a, 187 suggests that the whole episode has metaliterary implications because it represents the first confrontation between country and city.

[6] De Temmerman 2014, 233-236.

[7] Schwartz 1998; Morgan 2003.

[8] Schwartz 1998, 153-161 and 2005.

this scene interacts with contemporary rhetoric, despite the fact that a trial-scene constitutes a direct emergence of rhetorical oratory within the narrative.[9]

In this paper I will argue that Longus has inserted allusions to contemporary rhetorical debates in his pastoral trial-scene. The awareness of the debate eventually sheds light on Longus' literary project. I will concentrate on *stasis*-(or issue-)theory on the one hand, which provides the orator with ready-made arguments and structure with respect to a particular situation.[10] On the other hand, *idea*-theory enables the orator to adopt a style fit for a particular thought, as much as it gives him tools to analyse others' speeches. Thus, both systems have a twofold aim: they are as much critical tools as they help in reaching persuasion, by creating a credible narrative that matches given data, and by expressing it in the right way in accordance with its content and the public. *Idea*-theory is an innovative system in the 2nd and 3rd century AD, while *stasis*-theory, even though it originated in the work of Hermagoras in the 2nd century BC, is intensively discussed and redefined at the same period as *idea*-theory.

Although it is not possible to date with certainty Longus' book, evidence seems to point towards a date around 2nd-3rd century AD.[11] Due to the dating uncertainty, and also because many treatises were lost, it is difficult to determine which systems were known to Longus. In any case, my aim in this paper is not so much to prove that Longus slavishly exploits tools drawn from rhetorical schools, as to suggest that he capitalises on important debates and a shared rhetorical background to consolidate his own literary and fictional project. For all these

---

[9] To the exception of Patillon 2010, 89-90, who, however, merely aims to show how *stasis*-theory analysis may be used as a critical tool for literary works, but does not reflect on Longus' engagement with theory.

[10] For an introduction to *stasis*-theory, see Nadeau 1959; Heath 1995, 17-27; Patillon 2010, 43-78. For an introduction to *idea*-theory, see Rutherford 1998; Patillon 2012, vii-cxxxiii. For a contextualisation of both theories, see Heath 2004, part 1.

[11] For Longus' dates, see Hunter 1983, 3-15 and Morgan 2004a, 1-2.

reasons, I will present as many rhetorical systems as possible. And although I shall mainly refer to Hermogenes' treatises *On Issues* and *On Types of Style*, because both represent the most extensive version of their respective theories, I will also examine other systems known through scholia to Hermogenes and other, less systematic, treatises. For the same reasons, I will not infer any direct link between Longus and a particular treatise, nor will I attempt to date Longus.

I will first focus on Daphnis' speech which, I believe, contains allusions to on-going debates on *stasis*-theory. I will then show how Longus puts the emphasis on the means of persuasions through a reflection on simple style. Finally I conclude by suggesting that Longus sets up the rules of his own narration in this scene.

2. Analysis of Daphnis' speech with tools from *stasis*-theory

The object of the trial in Longus' novel is to determine liabilities for the loss of a ship containing valuable property.[12] The Methymnaians, acting as prosecution, accuse Daphnis of being responsible for the loss of their ship, since his goats have eaten the rope. Daphnis gives methodical answers to the accusation brought forward by the Methymnaians in a defence speech in four steps. The Methymnaians' argument relies on the supposedly bad herding skills of Daphnis: the goats have committed the wrongdoing, and Daphnis is accountable for their actions. Daphnis starts by fending off the Methymnaians' accusation that he is a bad goatherd by appealing to the internal audience composed of the country folks. He then accuses the Methymnaians and their dogs of having scared the goats. The goats, having run down to the beach, had nothing else but the willow to eat. According to Daphnis, the storm, wind and sea are responsible for carrying away the ship. Finally, he calls the credibility of the Methymnaians' testimony into question.

---

[12] On the intricacy of causality, see Schwartz 1998, 149.

Hermogenes' *stasis*-theory provides an analytical grid made to determine the basic structure of a speech in accordance with data such as the persons involved, whether the act is flagrant or accepted by both parties, etc. In Longus' trial, the persons are well defined. The Methymnaians are 'young rich people', a category found in Hermogenes' *On Issues*,[13] and Daphnis a 'poor country folk', a category present in Hermogenes' *On Types of Style*.[14] As the event has already occurred, the situation is judicial. Because the accused acknowledges that the act happened, the issue is not a conjecture (στοχασμός). However, the responsibility for the loss of the ship is debatable, and the verdict is not self-evident. The formulation of the problem in a *meletē* would be something like this: "Rich young men fasten their boat to shore with a rope. Goats eat the rope, and the boat with all their belongings is lost. They accuse the goatherd of being responsible for it".[15]

If we label the different phases of Daphnis' speech with Hermogenian categories taken from *stasis*-theory, Daphnis uses (1.) a counteraccusation (ἀντέγκλημα), (2.) a transference (μετάστασις) and (3.) a mitigation (συγγνώμη).[16]

1. The counteraccusation consists in transferring the responsibility for the act back to the victim, when the accuser does not contest the act in itself. Daphnis, in his speech, is accusing the dogs of the young Methymnaians; but he makes sure that everyone holds the Methymnaians

---

[13] This is the first piece of information given about the Methymnaians in 2.12.1. See Hermog. *Stat*. 29.20. For a discussion of characters in Hermogenes, see Schouler 1990, 234-242. See also, on ethical categories and their use in declamation, Russell 1983, ch. 1. De Temmerman 2014 offers a study of characterisation in the Greek novels.

[14] Hermog. *Id*. 323.14.

[15] Schwartz 1998, 149 is right in pointing out that there is no attestation of such a theme in declamations that we know of, but notes interesting parallels with later legal cases.

[16] Patillon 2010, 89-90 provides a different analysis of Daphnis' speech: first a counteraccusation and then two mitigations. But I consider that deflecting the accusation to the goats is not a mitigation but rather a counteraccusation: the goats can be held responsible for the loss of the ship.

themselves responsible for the act, by calling their dogs 'badly educated' (κακῶς πεπαιδευμένους):

Οὗτοι δέ εἰσι κυνηγέται πονηροὶ καὶ κύνας ἔχουσι κακῶς πεπαιδευμένους, οἵτινες τρέχοντες πολλὰ καὶ ὑλακτοῦντες σκληρὰ κατεδίωξαν αὐτὰς ἐκ τῶν ὀρῶν καὶ τῶν πεδίων ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ὥσπερ λύκοι.[17]

These are useless huntsmen, with badly trained hounds, which chased them down from the hills and plains to the sea by running amok and baying raucously, no better than wolves.

2. The issue is called a transference when the defendant concedes that an action has been undertaken but transfers the accusation to a person or a thing that can be held accountable. The goats are held responsible for chewing the willow rope. However, the transfer of accusation to the goats would implicitly cause the goatherd to be accused and that is precisely the Methymnaians' accusation. This is why Daphnis justifies in addition the goats' actions:[18]

---

[17] Longus 2.16.2. Texts and translations are from Morgan 2004a, slightly modified when needed.

[18] This is where my analysis diverges from Patillon 2010, 89-90: while Patillon considers that this sentence is a mitigation, it is still a way to account for the actions of the goats and thus to imply their responsibility. However, as Schwartz 1998, 155-156 has shown, in legal terms, the owner of an animal could be held responsible for that animal's actions. So transference is not the best course of action. The differentiation between Daphnis and the goats in Philetas' verdict indicates that the judge considers that there are two separate entities involved. As one of the anonymous reviewers suggests, this points back to the responsibility of the Methymnaians, since the goats would not have eaten the rope, had they not been forced to come to the shore. This is in fact mitigation in a transference. Finally, the differentiation between the two possible responsible actors is emphasised in the last point,

Ἀλλ᾽ ἀπέφαγον τὴν λύγον. οὐ γὰρ εἶχον ἐν ψάμμῳ πόαν ἢ κόμαρον ἢ θύμον.[19]

So they ate through the willow. That is because there was no grass, arbutus or thyme for them on the sand.

3. The mitigation is used, in Hermogenes' system, when the defendant accepts the act, but transfers the responsibility to someone or something that cannot be judged. Daphnis accuses the bad weather, χειμών, of being responsible for the loss of the vessel:

Ἀλλ᾽ ἀπώλετο ἡ ναῦς ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης. ταῦτα χειμῶνος οὐκ αἰγῶν ἐστιν ἔργα.[20]

So the ship has been lost because of the wind and sea. That is the tempest's doing, not goats.

This way of calling into question the credibility of the Methymnaian's speech may be analysed as a conjecture and an analysis of the facts; however, Philetas the judge will not react to this last part. It is noteworthy that Daphnis' speech follows the same order as the *exposé* of

---

when Daphnis explicitly contrasts the storm and the goats. Fernández-Garrido 2009, 469 n. 57 notes that either mitigation or transference could apply to this passage.

[19] Longus 2.16.3.

[20] Longus 2.16.3.

staseis of counteraccusation in Hermogenes' treatise.[21] I believe, as I set out to explain now, that this cannot be attributed to chance.

3. The trial scene and rhetorical debates

So far I have considered how the basic structure of Daphnis' speech may be analysed with *stasis*-theory. I now intend to show how Longus capitalises on theoretical debates for the construction of his trial-scene. In this, Longus is in line with ancient novelists whose courtroom-scenes contain challenging elements from a rhetorical point of view. For instance, fr. 35 of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* preserves the speech of a husband accusing his slave of adultery. Photius' summary informs us that 'women who visit there must publicly announce the dreams that they have' in a shrine of Aphrodite. The wife reveals that she had sex with the slave in her dream.[22] The dream, the husband argues, reveals behaviour that his wife adopts in real life. Whether a dream is a valid piece of evidence is a debated notion, judging by the lengthy confirmation developed by the husband. Achilles Tatius' and Chariton's trials, both aiming to determine the rightful husband of a widow whose seemingly dead husband turns out to be alive after she remarried another man, intertwine legal and rhetorical difficulties.[23] Although Longus' trial does not involve a love intrigue, it is also challenging, for it involves issues of responsibility that were intensively discussed in theory and must have been difficult to judge in practice.

---

[21] Hermog. *Stat*. 39.1-16 and 72.6. I refer to the order of the division of *staseis*, and not to the succession of heads of argument.

[22] Phot. 75a, translation from Stephens and Winkler 1995.

[23] See e.g. Van Mal-Maeder 2007, 133; Webb 2007, 532-533; Schwartz 2016, 31.

However, while Chariton's courtroom scene is interrupted by a war, and that of Achilles is settled by divine interventions, in Longus' trial a judgement is pronounced by Philetas.[24] In his verdict, the pastoral judge dismisses the transference (the goats are not responsible for eating the rope), but puts the emphasis on the mitigation, claiming that the wind and sea, i.e. the storm (χειμών in Daphnis' speech), are responsible for the loss of the ship:

Τουτοῖς ἐπεδάκρυεν ὁ Δάφνις καὶ εἰς οἶκτον ὑπηγάγετο τοὺς ἀγροίκους πολύν, ὥστε ὁ Φιλητᾶς, ὁ δικαστής ὤμνυε Πᾶνα καὶ Νύμφας μηδὲν ἀδικεῖν Δάφνιν ἀλλὰ μηδὲ τὰς αἶγας, τὴν δὲ θάλασσαν καὶ τὸν ἄνεμον, ὧν ἄλλους εἶναι δικαστάς.[25]

Daphnis followed up his speech with tears, winning much sympathy from the country folks, so that Philetas the judge swore by Pan and the Nymphs that Daphnis was completely innocent, and the goats too; the sea and the wind were to blame, and they were answerable to other judges.

Accusing the storm is the example used by Hermogenes for mitigation in the introduction to the various existing issues:

Συγγνώμης δὲ παράδειγμα οἱ δέκα στρατηγοὶ οἱ διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα μὴ ἀνελόμενοι τὰ σώματα καὶ κρινόμενοι.[26]

---

[24] We unfortunately do not know the outcome of the trial in Iamblichus; but it seems as though it does not involve the protagonists.

[25] Longus 2.17.1.

[26] Hermog. *Stat*. 39.15-16. I use the edition of Patillon and the pagination of Rabe 1913 for both Hermogenian treatises. I use the translation of Heath 1995 for *On Issues*.

An example of mitigation: the ten generals who, due to the storm, did not retrieve the corpses, are judged.

Mitigation is illustrated by a famous theme in Greek oratory of the naval battle that opposed the Athenian and the Spartan fleets. It took place in 406 BC near the Arginusae, a group of islands close to Lesbos, which provides the setting of Longus' novel. After the battle was won by Athens, a sudden storm prevented the generals from retrieving the corpses of the dead soldiers. Upon their return to Athens, the generals were tried and sentenced to death by angry citizens.[27] Themes for *meletai* derived from this historical event proved particularly popular among imperial authors. Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* for example recounts an oration of Aelius Aristides on that theme: 'against Callixenus (the man who introduced the motion against the generals) who wants to deprive the generals of a burial place'.[28] Hermogenes' *On Types of Style* mentions Aristides' vivid description of the storm in which the generals were caught.[29] P.Yale 2, 105 preserves the *epilogos* of a speech on the Arginusae-theme. This papyrus, along with another treatment of the theme mentioned by Sopatros, a 5th-century commentator of Hermogenes, seem to have been used in an educational context.[30] Moreover, in the passage of *On Issues* quoted above, the storm is a paradigmatic external hindrance probably taught at school.

---

[27] X. *H.G.* 1.6.27-7.34.

[28] Philostr. *V.S.* 584.

[29] Hermog. *Id*. 244.15-245.3. See Stephens 1983, 172 and n. 2.

[30] Sopat. Rhet. 8.223.10-227.3 Walz; Stephens 1983 compiles these references. See also Kohl 1915, 42-42 and 150-152.

In fact, the theme of the generals caught in the storm is at the centre of a debate concerning the exact delineation of the *stasis* of mitigation around Hermogenes' time.[31] Hermogenes himself signals this first in the synopsis of the different *staseis* at the beginning of his treatise:

Εἰ δέ τις ἡμῖν τι περὶ τούτων ἀμφισβητεῖ, συγγνώμης λέγω καὶ μεταστάσεως, ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀντιθέσεως λελέξεται.[32]

If anyone is inclined to dispute these definitions—I mean, of transference and mitigation—I will discuss them in greater detail in the section on counterposition.

And the rhetorician comes back to it in greater detail in due course:

Ἔτι τὴν συγγνώμην ἀπὸ τῆς μεταστάσεως οὐ τῷ ἀνευθύνῳ καὶ ὑπευθύνῳ ἐχώρισάν τινες, ἀλλὰ ἁπλῶς τὰ μὲν εἴς τι τῶν ἔξωθεν μεθιστάντα τὸ ἀδίκημα πάντα μεταστατικὰ εἰρήκασιν εἶναι, ἐάν τε χειμὼν ἐάν τε βάσανοι ἐάν τε ἄλλο τι τοιουτότροπον ᾖ, τὰ δὲ εἰς ἴδιόν τι πάθος ψυχῆς μόνα συγγνώμης εἶναι ὡρίσαντο, οἷον ἔλεον ἢ ὕπνον ἢ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον. καὶ ἴσως ταῦτα οὐ κακῶς· διαφέρει δὲ οὐδὲν πλὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς συγγνώμης, ᾧ κἂν ταῖς μεταστάσεσι πολλάκις ἄν τις χρήσαιτο καλῶς, <ὡς> κἂν ταῖς ὁμολογουμέναις συγγνώμαις τῇ μεταστάσει πάλιν αὖ τοὐναντίον χρήσεται. τουτὶ δὲ οὐ τοῦ διαιρετικοῦ εἴδους οἶμαι, τοῦ δὲ τοῖς καιροῖς εἰδέναι χρῆσθαι καὶ μεθοδεύειν ὀρθῶς τὰ νοήματα.[33]

---

[31] Heath 2004, 108-110.

[32] Hermog. *Stat*. 39.17-19.

[33] Hermog. *Stat*. 75.11-76.2.

Some have not differentiated mitigation from transference in terms of accountability and non-accountability; they have simply said that arguments transferring the crime to some external factor are all transference (*e.g.* a storm, torture, or something else of that nature), and defined only arguments transferring the crime to the individual's own internal state as belonging to mitigation (*e.g.* pity, sleep, etc.). This may be satisfactory—there is no difference except in the use of the term 'mitigation', which one would often find good use for even in cases of transference; and, conversely, in what are agreed to be mitigations one will use transference. This is not, in my view, a matter of division, but of knowing how to use opportunities and how to treat ideas correctly.

The first passage appears at the outset of Hermogenes' treatise and aims at providing the reader with an overview of the various issues. Hermogenes' mention of a debatable point is unique in the synopsis, and signals that the author's view will somehow surprise the skilled reader. In the second passage, Hermogenes mentions another system of differentiation between mitigation and transference, according to which mitigation consists in shifting the blame onto an internal state of mind, and transference onto an external event. But the rhetorician finally decides to leave this to *kairos*, in what Heath calls an "unusually eirenic … criticism" for Hermogenes.[34]

This criticism is assumed to be directed at Minucianus, who composed a treatise on issue-theory before Hermogenes.[35] Minucianus considers that mitigation should be used for

[34] Heath 2004, 110.

[35] The relative dating of Hermogenes and Minucianus is debated: some think that the latter was older than the former, as Stegemann 1932, 1975 and Patillon 2010, 59 (one generation), others, as Ruiz-Yamuza 2004, 193 n. 3, have postulated that they were contemporaries. The modern consensus is that Minucianus' treatise precedes that

psychological states only, and consecutively thinks that shifting the blame to an external element, such as the storm in the Arginusae-theme and its derivatives, is a transference.[36] A Latin writer, Sulpicius Victor, purportedly translating Zeno's treatise on *stasis*-theory, written around the same time as that of Minucianus, also discusses a variation on the Arginusae-theme to illustrate *remotio*, the Latin word for transference.[37] Thus, Zeno produces a similar system to that of Minucianus, whose views appeared predominant at the time when Hermogenes set forth his classification in his treatise, hence the soberness of his criticism.[38]

If Apsines, the author of a rhetorical handbook, is to be identified with the Apsines mentioned by Philostratus at the end of his *Lives of the Sophists*, his treatise must have been written after Hermogenes' and testifies to the persistence of Minucianus' views.[39] Apsines differentiates between an 'internal' state (drunkenness or madness for instance), which allows

---

of Hermogenes. On the target of the criticism, see Heath 1995, 128; 2004, 110; on the rivalry between Hermogenes and Minucianus, see Gloeckner 1901, 26-49, 111-115; Ruiz-Yamuza 2004.

[36] *Rh.* 4.688.14-22; 689.3-12, on which see Heath 2004, 109.

[37] See Sulp. Vic. 347.14 and for the storm as *remotio* (transference) and not *deprecatio* (mitigation) see 347.20ff. For the relative dates of Zeno, Minucianus and Hermogenes, see Jaeneke 1904, 133; Heath 1994; Heath 2004, 28-32; Patillon 2010, 73ff. The relative dating of Minucianus and Zeno is difficult to establish. Both seem to have composed their treatises before Hermogenes and to use similar systems for the differentiation of transference and mitigation. On the reliability of Sulpicius' translation, see Gloeckner 1901, 104; Schissel 1931, 873; Gärtner 1972, 142; Jaeneke 1904, 131ff.; Patillon 2010, 73-78.

[38] Heath 2004, 109-110.

[39] On the attribution of the treatise to Apsines of Gadara—Philostr. *VS* 628—and his dates, see Brzoska 1895, 277, Dilts and Kennedy 1997, xv, and Patillon 2001, vii-ix; Heath 1998, with further arguments in Heath 2004, 55-56, on the contrary challenges this commonly accepted attribution and puts forward the name of Aspasius, a student of Apsines. Whether Apsines or his student is the author of the treatise is of no consequence for my present purpose, for both of them were active after Hermogenes.

one to resort to mitigation, and an 'external' one (such as fate) in which case transference may be used.[40] It then is clearly on the same line as Minucianus and Zeno.

Rhetoricians after Hermogenes felt that placing a storm into the category of mitigation rather than transference was a more logical solution to the theme.[41] In the middle of the 3rd century, Menander argues in his commentaries to Hermogenes' and Minucianus' respective works on issue-theory that transference arises when one has not done something that should have been done, and mitigation when one has done something that should not have been done.[42] Finally, Porphyry contends that there is a transference when the event was avoidable, but

---

[40] Aps. *Rh*. 276.7.3-7 Spengel-Hammer, text and translation Heath 2002a, 661-662: Γίνεται λύσις καὶ μεταστατικῶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν πάθη συγγνωστά, οἷον ἀδικεῖς, φησίν, ὑβρίσας· ἢ συγγνωστὸς διὰ μέθην ἢ διὰ μανίαν. Ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς δέ, ὡς ἐν τῷ περὶ στεφάνου· ἥττης γέγονας αἴτιος, ὦ Δημόσθενες· κυρία τούτου ἡ τύχη. The text is variously edited and translated: Dilts and Kennedy 1997, 160-161 translate μεταστατικῶς by 'metalepsis'. Patillon 2001, 148 n. 337 contends that for Apsines, mitigation is a subcategory of transference, but Heath 2002a, 662, whose interpretation I follow, rightly objects that there is no parallel to this.

[41] Heath 2004, 110.

[42] Christophorus, cited by Heath 2004, 108: Ὁ δὲ Μένανδρος τοιαύτην λέγει διαφοράν, ὅτι ἐν μὲν μεταστάσει κρίνεται ἐφ' οἷς οὐκ ἐποίησεν δέον δὲ ποιῆσαι ... ἐν δὲ τῇ συγγνώμῃ ἐφ' οἷς ἐποίησε δέον μὴ ποιεῖν. Heath 2004, 119 casts doubts on the person to whom Christophorus refers: it could also be Metrophanes. On Menander's dates, see Radermacher 1931, 762-764; Pernot 2005, 434-438; Heath 2004, 118-119. Whether Menander commented on both Minucianus and Hermogenes is debated because of the ambiguity of the notice in the *Suda*, M 590: ἔγραψεν ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὴν Ἑρμογένους τέχνην καὶ Μινουκιανοῦ Προγυμνάσματα καὶ ἄλλα. While Heath 2004, 118-119 considers that Μινουκιανοῦ is to be constructed with Προγυμνάσματα, Patillon 2009, viii n. 2 argues that a comma should be added after Μινουκιανοῦ, hence in coordination with Ἑρμογένους. Προγυμνάσματα would then be a treatise composed by Menander. The practice of writing a commentary to *Progymnasmata* is not attested elsewhere. The argument of Heath 2004, 119 that Menander innovated by writing a commentary to a basic school-text but that "in this he found no follower" seems to me rather weak. I am therefore inclined to favour Patillon's reading.

mitigation when it was not. The *stasis* in the Arginusae-theme is mitigation, because the generals could not avoid the storm.[43] Porphyry's view is in effect close to that of Hermogenes.

It is striking that the sequence of counteraccusation—transference—mitigation in Daphnis' speech is the same as in Sulpicius' (and Zeno's?) and Hermogenes' treatises.[44] Moreover, choosing mitigation as a basis for his verdict makes Philetas closer to Hermogenes, because of the presence of two external elements. Everything points *a priori* towards an endorsement of Hermogenes' theory by Longus. Although points of contacts between the two authors have been underlined in previous scholarship, I would not postulate a direct link, because our knowledge of the imperial developments of *stasis*-theory is incomplete and relies to a great extent on later commentators, although Hermogenes' views on mitigation were probably original in his day.[45] Moreover, the dates of Longus remain an educated guess. Whether he lived at the time of Hermogenes and read him directly, or lived later and read his work with a commentary, or whether Longus read another treatise—or several other treatises—cannot be known with certainty.

At any rate, Longus certainly expects his reader to react to this judgement. When Philetas reaches his verdict, he claims that climatic events are the domain of other judges: ὧν ἄλλους εἶναι δικαστάς.[46] This last claim not only denotes the piety of Philetas but also underlines that the liability for the act is external to Daphnis, since gods are responsible for climate.[47] However, I believe that it is also an appeal from Longus to his audience, who are required to play an active

---

[43] *Rh*. 7.203.22-204.4, on which see Heath 2002b, 163; Heath 2003.

[44] Minucianus and Porphyry probably followed a different order: counterstatement, transference, counteraccusation, mitigation. See *Rh*. 5.173.23ff.; *Rh*. 4.647.17ff.; *Rh*. 4.397.17ff.; Heath 2003, 156-158.

[45] See for instance Hunter 1983, 92-98.

[46] Longus 2.17.1.

[47] At the intradiegetic level: Morgan 2004a, 188 n. *ad* 2.17.1 considers that it is a "ploy to conceal partiality" in a backchannel communication between author and reader.

role specific to the context of *meletē*. A *meletē* is an advanced school exercise and also the vehicle for sophists to display their skills in front of an educated audience. Students and orators are invited to take on the fictive *persona* of a speaker who produces a speech on a particular theme, for instance the aforementioned Arginusae-theme.[48] In a forensic theme, the audience take up the *persona* of the judge and are addressed as ἄνδρες δικασταί ('judges').[49] In the present case, the relative pronoun in the genitive (ὧν) indicates that they are required to pronounce specifically on the liability of the storm. I believe that Longus alludes to the debate on *stasis* and asks his audience to judge whether the climatic conditions are to be placed in a different category than the goats, or if both external elements should be placed into the same category. This has the effect of highlighting the debatable point.

Longus' contemporary audience, composed of πεπαιδευμένοι, must have been in contact with rhetoric at several levels.[50] At one level, they could have attended and practiced *meletai* as pupils or later. They could also have experience of listening to actual courtroom debates. On the other hand, they were in contact with theoretical writings. There is however not a clear-cut distinction between these two levels of engagement in that listeners of a *meletē* would have been attentive to technical details.[51] Moreover, *meletai* served to inculcate theory. Of course, theoretical knowledge is difficult to assess and must have varied greatly among readers as among audiences of *meletai*. However, given the fact that *stasis*-theory represents a useful

---

[48] On the practice of *melete*, see Russell 1983; Webb 2006; Schmitz 2017.

[49] The link between audience and orator in fictitious speeches is explored by Korenjak 2000 and Webb 2006. Bowie 2019, 189-190 n. *ad* 2.15.1 links the trial-scene to contemporary sophistic practices.

[50] On the audience of the Greek Novels, see Wesseling 1988; Bowie 2003; Stephens 1994; Morgan 1995; Hunter 2008. On interactions between Longus and his intended audience, see more specifically Morgan 2003. An introduction to declamation in the first centuries AD is found in Schmitz 2017 with bibliography. On imperial rhetorical education, see an introduction in Webb 2017b with bibliography and especially Cribiore 2001.

[51] See for instance Webb 2006, 37-39; Schmitz 1997, 161ff.

heuristic and critical tool, it was certainly studied early in the rhetorical curriculum. Its method

of division is in line with what the pupil has learned when practicing *progymnasmata*, while

the scholia to Demosthenes testify to its use in the analysis of a speech, also with didactic aims.[52]

Therefore, issue-theory was deeply rooted in the minds of advanced students of rhetoric, who

certainly composed the greater part of Longus' audience. The theme of the storm bridges these

two levels. On the one hand, *meletai* based on the Arginusae-theme and involving storm were

popular. On the other hand, the treatment of the theme in an educational context was aimed at

studying, among other things, strategies of argumentation, as this theme is the standard

illustration of a particular *stasis*.

At one level, Longus expects his readers to react with amusement to such a 'pastoralization'

of a common theme in education, as the storm of the Arginusae that led to the deaths of the

Athenian generals is transposed as a little wind in a trivial case of lost property.[53] At another

level, the insistence on a basic tool for strategies of argumentation is, I believe, central to

Longus' reflexion on the means of persuasion, as I will argue now. Philetas' phrasing deepens

the gap between the rustic judge and the highly sophisticated debate he touches upon. This

reversal is further emphasised by the first half of his verdict, the oath to the Nymphs and Pan,

which represents, as I will argue now, a form of argument.

4. Philetas' judgement and aphelic argumentation

In what follows, I wish to argue that Longus creates a gap between the means of argumentation

displayed by Philetas and the debate he touches upon. Before the proclamation of Daphnis'

innocence, Philetas appeals to two divinities: Pan and the Nymphs. Bowie rightly links the oath

---

[52] Heath 1995, 18-19. For the pedagogical dimensions of the treatise, see Lindberg 1996, 2004-2005; Patillon 2010,

71.

[53] I wish to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for this suggestion.

to a practice in classical Athens, which Longus "adapts … to Philetas' rustic environment".[54] The oath is also used as an argument by Philetas to add trustworthiness (πίστις) to his verdict. This is corroborated by a later passage in book 2, in which Daphnis and Chloe, finally reunited thanks to Pan after the heroine's abduction by the Methymnaians' fleet, swear oaths of fidelity to each other:[55]

Καὶ τούτοις ἅπασι θερμότεροι γενόμενοι καὶ θρασύτεροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἤριζον ἔριν ἐρωτικὴν καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον εἰς ὅρκων πίστιν προῆλθον.[56]

Inflamed and emboldened by all this, they began to compete with one another in a contest of love, and progressed little by little to swearing oaths by way of proof.

The oath (ὅρκος) is a proof (πίστις) that one will act according to its terms. This is further underlined a few lines later, when Chloe calls the oath's trustworthiness into question because of the disparate behaviour of its recipient (Pan):

Τοσοῦτον δὲ ἄρα τῇ Χλόῃ τὸ ἀφελὲς προσῆν ὡς κόρῃ ὥστε ἐξιοῦσα τοῦ ἄντρου καὶ δεύτερον ἠξίου λαβεῖν ὅρκον παρ' αὐτοῦ, "ὦ Δάφνι," λέγουσα "θεὸς ὁ Πὰν ἐρωτικός ἐστι καὶ ἄπιστος …"[57]

[54] Bowie 2019, 191-192 n. *ad* 2.17.1.

[55] See on this passage De Temmerman 2014, 1ff.

[56] Longus 2.39.1.

[57] Longus 2.39.2.

But so great was Chloe's girlish simplicity that when she came out of the cave she asked Daphnis to give her a second oath, saying, "Daphnis, Pan is an amorous god and not to be trusted …"

Because Pan is ἄπιστος ('untrustworthy'), the oath itself has no argumentative force. Chloe asks Daphnis to swear another oath by the goats that nursed him. Daphnis complies with her wish, and she is finally persuaded (ἐπίστευεν, 2.39.6). Chloe's need for another oath reveals her simple character (τὸ ἀφελές) according to the narrator. Many commentators have rightly linked the notion of ἀφελές—the only occurrence of the word in the novel—to a particular *idea* found in Hermogenes' *On Types of Style*.[58] Ἀφελείᾳ is characteristic of Longus' novel as critics have noticed.[59] Aphelic style is also described in the first volume of a treatise falsely attributed to Aelius Aristides, where it is opposed to political style. Ἀφελείᾳ is a characteristic feature of ethical categories like children and peasants, of subjects, such as simple matters, and of argumentative methods, oaths and the accumulation of details for instance.[60]

---

[58] Morgan 2004a, 199 n. *ad* 2.39.2.; Bowie 2019, 219 n. *ad* 2.39.2.

[59] On Longus' ἀφελείᾳ, see Castiglione 1928; Mittelstadt 1964, 171-180; Hunter 1983, 85ff.; De Temmerman 2014, 215ff. Parallels between other novels and prescriptions on aphelic style have made, especially Xenophon of Ephesus: Doulamis 2007, 166-169; De Temmerman 2014, 119-123, commenting upon the great number of vows. Besides ἀφελείᾳ, Longus' style is also associated with γλυκύτης (sweetness), on which see Hunter 1983, 92-98. For style and ποικιλία, see Briand 2006. See Phot. for a late description of other novels' style: *Bibl.* c.73 Heliodorus: καὶ γὰρ ἀφελείᾳ καὶ γλυκύτητι πλεονάζει; c.87 Achilles Tatius: ἀφοριστικαί τε καὶ σαφεῖς καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ φέρουσαι αἱ πλεῖσται περίοδοι; c.129 Lucianus: Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν σαφής τε καὶ καθαρὸς καὶ φίλος γλυκύτητος; c.166 Antonius Diogenes: σαφὴς ἡ φράσις καὶ οὕτω καθαρὰ ὡς ἐπ' ἔλαττον εὐκρινείας δεῖσθα… Ταῖς δὲ διανοίαις πλεῖστον ἔχει τοῦ ἡδέος. Σαφήνεια and καθαρότης are components of ἀφέλεια, and ἡδύς is frequently used to characterise γλυκύτης in Hermogenes.

[60] Hermog. *Id*. 322.5-329.23.

Longus finds himself embedded in a trend of users of simple style. Many writers are known either as models or users of simple style in the second and third century BC: Aelian, Dio Chrysostom, Herodes Atticus, Nicostratus, and Philostratus.[61] It is difficult to determine to what extent the aforementioned writers were consciously using simple style, whether this is a descriptive framework created *a posteriori*, and whether all these practitioners and theoreticians had an unified vision of what simple style is.

At any rate, oath is a simple argumentative tool according to Hermogenes:

Ἔτι ἀφελές τε καὶ ἠθικὸν κατ᾽ ἔννοιαν καὶ τὸ δι᾽ ὅρκων πιστοῦσθαι ὁτιοῦν ἀλλὰ μὴ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων … καὶ εἰ τοὺς ἀκούοντας δὲ ὀρκίζοι ἢ τὸν ἀντίδικον, ὡσαύτως.[62]

It is also Simple and Ethical with respect to the thought to give credence to an idea through oaths and not through facts … the same applies when [Demosthenes] adjures his audience or opponent.

Longus amusingly shows that Chloe is the prototype *par excellence* of aphelic character, since she does not only need one, but two oaths in order to be convinced.[63] The use of the word ἀφελές leaves no doubt that oaths are associated with this style in Longus. Moreover, it is fair

---

[61] Hermog. *Id*. 407.8-18 and Ps.-D.H. *Rh*. 2.9 (Nicostratus); Men.Rh. 389.32-390.4 Sp. (Dio, Philostratus, Aelian and Nicostratus); Philostr. *VS* 487 (Dio), 564 (Herodes Atticus), 624 (comparison between Aelian, Nicostratus and Dio).

[62] Hermog. *Id*. 326.23-327.6, my own translation. See also Ps.-Aristid. *Rh*. 1.8 and 1.91, where oaths are linked to trustworthiness.

[63] On the association between the protagonists' ignorance and the stylistic concept of ἀφελεία, see De Temmerman 2014, 215.

to assume that this adjective applies to the whole book, since, at this point of the story, Chloe has been called the object of the μῦθος of Love.[64]

Philetas' oath, a 'simple' argument, is at odds with his meddling in a theoretical debate of which he knows nothing. It is emblematic of Longus' technique of creating a gap between the protagonists' and the educated audience's experience.[65] On the one hand, Longus makes fun of Philetas' pretentions to be a fair judge—he was, at the beginning of the episode, chosen for his sense of justice.[66] On the other hand, Longus pokes fun at the debate itself by showing that even a bumpkin can reach such a verdict. However, I believe that Longus asserts the argumentative and persuasive powers of simple style in this passage. This is illustrated by the succession of speeches of the Methymnaians and Daphnis, as I will argue in the next section.

5. A praise of natural simple style

Commentators have highlighted the paradoxical rhetorical abilities of Daphnis' speech in that, by this point of the story, he has verbally defeated two opponents, Dorkon and the Methymnaians, although both speeches may be characterised as simple.[67] In both cases, Daphnis is able to take advantage of his opponents' argumentative structure.[68] With the marriage proposal in book 3, the trial-scene has been considered as the second of the three key moments that mould Daphnis' rhetorical abilities.[69] However, although Daphnis' line of argument in the trial is cunning, De Temmerman rightly points out that Daphnis' speech, on the

---

[64] Longus 2.27.2. See Morgan 2013, 227-228 on the metatextual dimension of Longus' heroine.

[65] Morgan 2003.

[66] On Longus' contempt for the naivety of his characters, see e.g. Cresci 1999, 241.

[67] Daphnis has won over Dorcon in a 'beauty' contest, with Chloe as judge, earlier in the novel: 1.15.4-17.1; see e.g. De Temmerman 2014, 233-234.

[68] See e.g. Morgan 2004a, 188.

[69] De Temmerman 2014, 245.

plane of expression, "evokes rhetorical clumsiness" because of the word-order, paratactic style, repetitions and short sentences.[70]

The idea that somebody who has not received a proper training in rhetoric may prevail on an educated man is found elsewhere in imperial literature.[71] Moreover, treatises specify that rhetoric is a mixture of both nature (φύσις) and training (τέχνη).[72] This is in accordance with Longus' concern throughout *Daphnis and Chloe* for the articulation of these two notions.[73] At the intra-diegetic level, Daphnis has not received a proper rhetorical education, although it might be argued that his argument with Dorkon accounts for a practical lesson.[74] However, his lack of education turns out to be profitable. Daphnis is a product and model of simple style. He does not need to mould his speech for the internal audience of the trial, because, in his case, rhetorical ἀφελεία is engendered by his ethos of ignorant peasant. In contrast, simple style is unnatural for the Methymnaians, and the narrator indicates that they make their oration *artificially* clear and brief out of consideration for the social standing of their judge, in accordance with the advice of progymnasmatic and stylistic treatises that style must suit

---

[70] *Ibid.*, 234.

[71] In D.Chr. 7.29 and 7.43-53, a hunter unwittingly takes advantage on a skilled speaker; in Alciphr. 2.26, the sender is astonished by the addressee's rhetorical skills in sharp contrast with his outer appearance, his work, and the sender's knowledge and expectations. The name of the addressee, Anthophorion, may be a reference to a flowery style.

[72] See e.g. Hermog. *Stat.* 213-4; Teske 1991, 98ff., Morgan 2004a, 14-15.

[73] See e.g. Zeitlin 1990.

[74] Daphnis and Chloe are taught letters (γράμματα ἐπαίδευον) in 1.8.1. As Morgan 2004a, 156 n. *ad* 1.8.1. points, this "implausible" and "unrealistic" indication is aimed at the educated audience. I wish to thank Callum McIver for pointing out this passage to me.

circumstances, public and thoughts.[75] Their speech and behaviour, however, illustrate their inability to adjust to the requirements of the countryside.

Latent criticism of the style of the Methymnaians' speech, in a communication between author and reader, is found in Daphnis' oration. The Methymnaians conclude their speech by suggesting that Daphnis is a bad goatherd. In his response, Daphnis accuses the Methymnaians of being 'useless huntsmen with badly trained hounds'. The connotations of the word πεπαιδευμένος have been commented upon in earlier scholarship: Morgan notes that this is a "buzz word by which the elite defined itself" aiming at wounding the Methymnaians, while Bowie observes that *paideia* is a central feature of the novel.[76] Hunting is a typically urbane activity in the countryside, both in the corpus of Greek novels and in the real world. This activity aligns them with both Astylos, a young boy who also comes to hunt in the countryside, and the narrator.[77] However, in contrast with them, the Methymnaians' inability to hunt suggests their failure to adjust to the pastoral world.

This is reflected on the stylistic plane. Hunting is the subject of a treatise by Xenophon of Athens, and Hermogenes sets up the *Cynegeticus* as a model of aphelic style.[78] Connections between Xenophon, the Greek novels and simple style have been made through Xenophon of Ephesus.[79] Moreover, hunting is a symbol of the production of speech, and especially of *inventio* (εὕρησις). This occurs both within Longus' novel and in other works of literature. In

---

[75] Longus 2.15.1: κατηγόρουν ... σαφῆ καὶ σύντομα, βουκόλον ἔχοντες δικαστήν; see De Temmerman 2014, 234.

[76] Morgan 2004a, 188 n. *ad loc*.; Bowie 2019, 191 n. *ad* 2.16.2.

[77] See Paschalis 2005 and Sánchez Hernández 2015.

[78] Hermog. *Id*. 405.3-5 for references to *Cynegeticus*, and Hermog. *Id*. 404.17-406.18 for a notice on Xenophon's style. See on Xenophon's reception in imperial literature and stylistic treatises Patillon 2007, 517-518; Patillon 2010, 13-14 for insights into commentaries to Xenophon at imperial times; Bowie 2016 on the reception of Xenophon among Greek authors of the Roman period.

[79] De Temmerman 2014, 121.

the proem, Longus' narrator hunts in Lesbos but the only game he finds is the painting at the source of the story. In book 3, Daphnis, separated from Chloe because of the winter, tries to justify his presence near his parent's house. He ends up pretending to be setting snares for birds. This episode is scattered with vocabulary related to εὕρησις.[80] Paschalis observes that the different phases of hunting may be assimilated to rhetorical composition: *inventio* (spotting), *dispositio* (pursuing) and *elocutio* (capturing).[81] At the end of Xenophon's *Cynegeticus* there is an attack against sophists who mock Xenophon's style of writing, while the first word of the treatise is εὕρημα, the Greek word for *inventio*.[82] Longus suggests, within an internally relevant remark of Daphnis on badly trained dogs, that the speech of the Methymnaians is to be criticised for its content and style. The *natural* simple style of Daphnis' speech is praised, while the Methymnaian's *artificial* style is subtly criticised. Not only does this insistence on style serve the characterisation of the characters involved in the trial, but it is also a way for Longus to show off his skills as a practitioner of simple style: after all, Longus created the speeches of both the Methymnaians and Daphnis.

The inefficiency of the Methymnaians' simple style highlights their inability to adjust to Longus' world because of their pre-conceived idea of the countryside as a place of pleasure.[83] Their fantasy extends to the language they adopt to talk to their judge. Longus, with this latent

---

[80] Longus 3.4.5-5.4: Daphnis 'finds an expedient' (σόφισμα εὗρεν) to leave the house: he pretends (ἐπὶ προφάσει θήρας) to go set snares for birds, while the actual game he pursues is Chloe. His hunt is both successful and unsuccessful, since he catches bird but, in a dialogue to himself, is unable to find a good reason to see Chloe (ἐζήτει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅ τι λεχθῆναι), and would have left the place if not for an unexpected event.

[81] Paschalis 2005, 61.

[82] X. *Cyn*. 13.6. See on εὕρημα Dillery 2017, 215-216. Dillery notes that the work of Xenophon both adopts and rejects the codes of sophistic, which is not without analogies with Longus. Another parallel is found in Plato who describes the sophist as a 'hunter of men' in *Sph*. 218c-223a, as signalled by Edwards 1997 and Paschalis 2005.

[83] See Sánchez Hernández 2015.

criticism, instils the idea that rhetorical recommendations are of no use in front of *actual* country folks. In that respect, the criticism may extend to Longus' contemporaries whose pretentions to achieve simple style are mocked. Within the world created by Longus, *natural* simple style prevails. By remaining unconvinced by Philetas' decision, the Methymnaians are not so much unable to adjust to the *countryside*, as to the *countryside created by Longus*, whose rules they fail to understand.

6. Credibility and the trial-scene

The Methymnaians' claim that they are not convinced is symptomatic of a larger issue that pertains to fiction. In a trial scene, the authoritative account of the narrator is indeed contested through the juxtaposition of two different versions from opposing parties, in a process similar to the progymnasmatic exercises of refutation and confirmation.[84] The reader re-evaluates the authoritative account of the narrator. From a narratological perspective, the trial-scenes are internal analepses, with a shift of focalisation: the narration is repeated from the characters' standpoints, and no longer from that of the narrator.[85] The last sentence of Daphnis' speech is telling:

Καὶ τίς πιστεύσει νοῦν ἔχων ὅτι τοσαῦτα φέρουσα ναῦς πεῖσμα εἶχε λύγον;[86]

And who in his right mind will believe that a ship with such a cargo had a willow shoot for a mooring rope?

---

[84] On *Progymnasmata*, see Webb 2001 with bibliography. On fiction as a form of persuasion, see Laird 2008, 216 and Webb 2017a, 284. On refutation and confirmation, Webb 2017a, 282.

[85] See Schwartz 2016, 30.

[86] Longus 2.16.3.

On the one hand, Daphnis questions the credibility of the Methymnaians' account. On the other hand, their account follows closely the narrator's, as the latter recounts that the boat was effectively moored by a willow shoot and contained many valuable goods. A speech of the Nymphs to Daphnis in his dreams and the discovery of 3000 drachmae on the sand will later confirm this.[87] Longus reminds us that his fictional world obeys rules he has himself set. In the world of the Methymnaians, it is plausible to leave belongings on a boat. But in front of a crowd of peasants, accustomed to theft—the Methymnaians had, after all, a first-hand experience of this with the rope that was stolen—it is just not believable that somebody would leave valuable goods unattended. Truth is not always credible, and will not necessarily create persuasion.[88]

Stasis-theory is important for thinking about plausibility, because it helps to find the right narrative that meets common expectations.[89] This presupposes a knowledge of the expectations to be met. In Longus' narrative, nature plays an important role in the fictional life of the characters and in the structure of the novel. Storms in particular will become a factor in other characters' decision to put to sea.[90] The trial scene is a way to reflect on the internal coherence of the novel and prepares the reader for the internal constraints of the narration. The Methymnaians, in their assessment of the chain of events that led to the loss of the ship, failed

---

[87] For similar strategies in other novels, see Webb 2007 and 2017a, 284-286; Laird 2008, 213-215. The recovery of the ship's goods is evoked in Longus 3.27.2-5.

[88] Arist. *Rh*. 1356a.

[89] See for instance the discussion on the trustworthiness of witnesses in Hermog. *Stat*. 45ff.

[90] See Morgan 2004a, 187. After they return to the city of Methymna, the young Methymnaians successfully persuade the people's assembly, by showing their injuries (Οἱ δὲ πιστεύοντες διὰ τὰ τραύματα), that they have been attacked by way of war. The Methymnaian people believe them and decides to attack the Mitylenians. Longus however mentions that they do not send their ships on the high sea, because winter is coming (πλησίον χειμῶνος ὄντος), and it is not safe to trust (πιστεύειν) the sea. The word for winter and storm is in Greek identical.

to adjust to Longus' world by neglecting the storm. Because of this, the educated reader, who is *a priori* closer to the Methymnaians than to Philetas, is reminded of the importance of considering the events through rustic eyes rather than through urbane, educated, eyes. Not only does this dual reading of the same event prompt a reflection on the differences of interpretation that it generates, but it also reminds the reader of the necessity of maintaining both standpoints when entering the pastoral world.

7. Conclusion

The tools provided by both *idea* and *stasis*-theories are fruitful in understanding Longus' literary project as much as they show Longus' concern for the surrounding rhetorical environment. The trial scene, being a direct insertion of a contemporary practice within the novel, enables Longus to appeal to social practices, such as *meletai*, and actuates certain reflexes for the reader, such as taking the persona of the judge. The trial scene is an ideal place to reflect on the criteria of credibility of the fictional world created by the author. The narration is carried by another voice than the narrator, and makes it possible to adopt another perspective on the narration. In this case, the trial opposes not only two people, but two different visions of a single event, one from the city and another from the town. The reader's vision is displaced, and a normally urbane activity, a trial, becomes a rustic activity. Adopting the rustic viewpoint leads the reader to reflect on the displacement and the new laws of credibility of this world.

Bibliography

Bowie, E.L. (2003). The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels. In: G. Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden/Boston, pp. 87-106.

Bowie, E.L. (2016). Xenophon's Influence in Imperial Greece. In: M.A. Flower, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon,* Cambridge, pp. 403-415.

Bowie, E.L., ed. (2019). *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.

Briand, M. (2006). Aesthetics and Ethics of Poikilia in Longus' Pastorals (*Daphnis and Chloe*). In: M. Skoie and S. Velazquez, eds., *Pastoral and the Humanities. Arcadia Re-Inscribed*, Bristol, pp. 42-52.

Brzoska, J. (1895). Apsines. *RE* 2, pp. 277-283.

Cassin, B. (1995). *L'effet sophistique*. Paris.

Castiglione, L. (1928). Stile e testo del romanzo pastorale di Longo. *RIL* 51, pp. 203-223.

Cresci, L.R. (1999). The Novel of Longos the Sophist and Pastoral Tradition. In: S. Swain, ed., pp. 210-242.

Cribiore, R. (2001). *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt.* Princeton.

De Temmerman, K. (2014). *Crafting Characters. Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel.* Oxford.

Dillery, J. (2017). Xenophon. The Small Works. In: M.A. Flower, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, Cambridge, pp. 195-220.

Dilts, M.R., and Kennedy, G.A., eds. (1997). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire. Introduction, Text and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara.* Leiden.

Doulamis, K. (2007). Stoic Echoes and Style in Xenophon of Ephesus. In: J.R. Morgan and M. Jones, eds., *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, Groningen, pp. 151-175.

Doulamis, K. (2011). Forensic Oratory and Rhetorical Theory in Chariton Book 5. In: K. Doulamis, ed., *Echoing Narratives. Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction*, Groningen, pp. 21-48.

Edwards, M. (1997). The Art of Love and Love of Art in Longus. *AC* 66, pp. 239-248.

Fernández-Garrido, R. (2019). *Stasis*-Theory in Judicial Speeches of Greek Novels. *GRBS* 49, pp. 453-472.

Gärtner, H. (1972). Zenon (9). *RE* 10, pp. 140-142

Gloeckner, S. (1901). Quaestiones rhetoricae. Historiae qualis fuerit aevo imperatorio capita selecta. *Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen* 8.2, pp. 1-115.

Heath, M. (1994). The Substructure of *Stasis*-Theory from Hermagoras to Hermogenes. *CQ* 44, pp. 114-129.

Heath, M. (1995). *Hermogenes On Issues. Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric.* Oxford.

Heath, M. (1998). Apsines and Pseudo-Apsines. *AJP* 119, pp. 89-111.

Heath, M. (2002a). Notes on Pseudo-Apsines. *Mnemosyne* 55, pp. 657-668.

Heath, M. (2002b). Porphyry's Rhetoric. Text and Translation. *Leeds International Classical Studies* 1.5, pp. 1-41.

Heath, M. (2003). Porphyry's Rhetoric. *CQ* 53, pp. 141-166.

Heath, M. (2004). *Menander. A Rhetor in Context.* Oxford.

Hock, R.F. (1997). The Rhetoric of Romance. In: S.E. Porter, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period. 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Leiden, pp. 445-465.

Hunter, R. (1983). *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe.* Cambridge.

Hunter, R. (2008). Ancient Readers. In: T. Whitmarsh, ed., pp. 261-271.

Jaeneke, W., ed. (1904). *De statuum doctrina ab Hermogene tradita*. Leipzig.

Kohl, R. (1915). *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis*. Paderborn.

Korenjak, M. (2000). *Publikum und Redner. Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Laird, A. (2008). Approaching Style and Rhetoric. In: T. Whitmarsh, ed., pp. 201-217.

Lindberg, G. (1996). Hermogenes of Tarsus. *ANRW* II 34, pp. 1978-2063.

Mittelstadt, M.C. (1964). *Longus and the Greek Love Romance.* Dissertation, University of Standford.

Morgan, J.R. (1995). The Greek Novel. Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception. In: A. Powell, ed., *The Greek World*, London, pp. 130-152.

Morgan, J.R. (2003). Nymphs, Neighbours and Narrators. A Narratological Approach to Longus. In: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen, eds., *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden/Boston, pp. 171-189.

Morgan, J.R. (2004a). *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe*. Oxford.

Morgan, J.R. (2004b). Longus. In: I.J.F. de Jong, ed., *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden, pp. 507-522.

Morgan, J.R. (2013). The Erotics of Reading Fiction. Text and Body in Heliodorus. In: C. Bréchet, A. Videau, and R. Webb, eds., *Théories et pratiques de la fiction à l'époque impériale*, Paris, pp. 225-237.

Nadeau, R. (1959). Classical Systems of *Stases* in Greek. Hermagoras to Hermogenes. *GRBS* 2, pp. 51-71.

Paschalis, M. (2005). The Narrator as Hunter. Longus, Virgil and Theocritus. In: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis, eds., *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, Groningen, pp. 50-67

Patillon, M., ed. (2001). *Apsinès, Art rhétorique. Problèmes à faux-semblant*. Paris.

Patillon, M. (2007). Les modèles littéraires dans l'apprentissage de la rhétorique. In: J.A. Fernández Delgado, F. Pordomingo, and A. Stramaglia, eds., *Escuela y literatura en Grecia antigua. Actas del simposio internacional. Universidad de Salamanca, 17-19 noviembre de 2004*, Cassino, pp. 511-521.

Patillon, M. ed. (2009). *Corpus Rhetoricum, Vol. 2: Hermogène, Les états de cause*. Paris.

Patillon, M. (2010). *La théorie du discours chez Hermogène le rhéteur. Essai sur les structures linguistiques de la rhétorique ancienne.* 2nd ed. Paris.

Patillon, M., ed. (2012). *Corpus Rhetoricum, Vol. 4: Prolégomènes au De ideis. Hermogène, Les catégories stylistiques du discours. Synopse des exposés sur les ideai.* Paris.

Pernot, L. (2005) Ménandre le Rhéteur. *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* 4.M105, pp. 434-438.

Rabe, H., ed. (1913). *Hermogenis opera*. Stuttgart.

Radermacher, L. (1931). Menander (16). *RE* 15, pp. 762-764.

Richter, D.S. and Johnson, W.A, eds. (2017) *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. New York.

Ruiz-Yamuza, E. (2004). Hermógenes vs. Minuciano en la teoría de los estados de la causa. In: L. Calboli Montefusco, ed., *Papers on Rhetoric VI*, Rome, pp. 193-217.

Russell, D.A. (1983). *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge.

Rutherford, I.C. (1998). *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age. Idea-Theory in its Literary Context.* Oxford.

Saïd, S. (1999). Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or the Country Seen from the Town. In: S. Swain, ed., pp. 83-107.

Sánchez Hernández, J.P. (2015). Νεανίσκοι. The Privileged Youth of Lesbos in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. *MD* 74, pp. 181-206.

Schissel, O. (1931). Sulpicius (106). *RE* 4.A.1, pp. 873-878.

Schouler, B. (1990). La classification des personnes et des faits chez Hermogène et ses commentateurs. *Rhetorica* 8, pp. 229-254.

Schmitz, T. (1997). *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Schmitz, T. (2017). Professionals of *Paideia*? The Sophists as Performers. In: D.S. Richter and W.A. Johnson, eds., pp. 169-180.

Schwartz, S. (1998). *Courtroom Scenes in the Ancient Greek Novels*. Dissertation, New York.

Schwartz, S. (2005). The Delicts of the Countryside in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. In: J.J. Aubert and Z. Várhelyi, eds., *A Tall Order. Writing the Social History of the Ancient World. Essays in Honor of William V. Harris*, Munich, pp. 263-283.

Schwartz, S. (2016). *From Bedroom to Courtroom. Law and Justice in the Greek Novel*. Groningen.

Stegemann, W. (1932). Minukianos (1). *RE* 15, pp. 1975-1988.

Stephens, S.A. (1983). The Arginusae Theme in Greek Rhetorical Theory and Practice. *BASP* 20, pp. 171-180.

Stephens, S.A. (1994). Who Read Ancient Novels? In: J. Tatum, ed., *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore/London, pp. 405-418.

Stephens, S.A., and Winkler, J.J., eds. (1995). *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments.* Princeton.

Swain, S., ed. (1999). *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford.

Teske, D. (1991). *Der Roman des Longos als Werk der Kunst*. Münster.

Van Mal-Maeder, D. (2007). *La fiction des déclamations.* Leiden/Boston.

Walz, C., ed. (1832-1836). *Rhetores Graeci*. Stuttgart.

Webb, R. (2001). The *Progymnasmata* as a Practice. In: Y.L. Too, ed., *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity,* Leiden, pp. 289-316.

Webb, R. (2006). Fiction, *mimesis* and the Performance of the Past in the Second Sophistic. In: D. Konstan and S. Saïd, eds., *Greek on Greekness. Viewing the Greek Past under the Roman Empire*, Cambridge, pp. 27-46.

Webb, R. (2007). Rhetoric and the Novel. Sex, Lies and Sophistic. In: I. Worthington, ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, Malden, pp. 526-541.

Webb, R. (2017a). Rhetoric and Fiction. In: M.J. MacDonald, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies,* New York, pp. 279-288.

Webb, R. (2017b). Schools and Paideia. In: D.S. Richter and W.A. Johnson, eds., pp. 139-153.

Wesseling, B. (1988). The Audience of the Ancient Novels. *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 1, pp. 67-79.

Whitmarsh, T., ed. (2008). *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge.

Zeitlin, F. (1990). The Poetics of Desire. Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. In: D. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin, eds., *Before Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton, pp. 417-464.