CrossMark

The Classical Quarterly 70.2 827–845 © The Author(s), 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

doi:10.1017/S0009838820000695

LONGUS' NARRATOR: A REASSESSMENT*

An influential position in the scholarship on Longus is that the narrator of *Daphnis and Chloe* is dissociated from, and ironized by, the author.[1] Two articles by John Morgan, in particular, have propounded this interpretation.[2] Morgan argues that Longus' narrator relates the story with simplicity and naivety, and in ignorance of the more complex subtleties to which only Longus and the more discerning reader have access:[3] '*Daphnis and Chloe* is told by its narrator as if it were a simpler and more conventional story than it really is, and invites its reader to read it in the same way. One way to describe this textual duplicity is to think in terms of a surface "narrator's text" and a deeper "author's text". We can conceive the narrator, as established by the prologue, as a distorting and simplifying lens between the story and us. As readers we effectively have the choice of accepting what we see through the lens (that is the "narrator's text" as the "narrator's narratee") or of correcting it and reading around the narrator (that is reading the "author's text" as the "author's narratee").'[4] This type of separation of author and narrator is identifiable in Petronius' *Satyrica*, in which the first-person narrator Encolpius who tells his story in hindsight is ridiculed and his narration destabilized by the hidden author who 'is also listening, along with the reader, to Encolpius' narrative—and along with the reader is smiling at it'.[5]

* This article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the Celtic Conference in Classics at St. Andrews in 2018: I would like to thank the audience for their questions and the panel organizers, Jo Norton-Curry and Nick D'Alconzo, for the invitation. I am indebted to Ewen Bowie, Yvan Nadeau, Richard Rawles and *CQ*'s referee for their comments on the written version. Finally, I thank three successive cohorts of students in my Longus Greek Honours class at the University of Edinburgh (2009, 2017, 2020), who, above all, helped to shape my views on the novel.

[1] J. Morgan, 'Longus', in R. Nünlist, A.M. Bowie and I.J.F. de Jong (edd.), *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden, 2004), 507–22, at 509 supplies the caveat that 'it is not possible or methodologically desirable systematically to disentangle these two levels' (i.e. of narrator and author), but he does nevertheless attempt to provide clear instances of demarcation of voice and function, especially in terms of tone and knowledge. For recent works which accept Morgan's position, see e.g. J. Alvares, 'Innocence, art and experience in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in E.P. Cueva and S. Byrne (edd.), *A Companion to the Ancient Novel* (Chichester, 2014), 26–42, at 29 and C. Kossaifi, 'The legend of *Phatta* in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *AJPh* 133 (2012), 537–600, at 585. Neither of two recent important books on the novel—K. de Temmerman, *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford, 2014) and T. Whitmarsh, *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance* (Cambridge, 2011)—engages with Morgan's work on Longus' narrator, or attempts to separate out two distinguishing levels of voice in Longus.

[2] Morgan (n. 1) and J. Morgan, 'Nymphs, neighbours and narrators: a narratological approach to Longus', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (edd.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden, 2003), 171–89.

[3] See, too, J. Morgan, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Oxford, 2004), 17–20 and *passim*.

[4] Morgan (n. 2), 178.

[5] G.B. Conte, *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius's* Satyricon (Berkeley, 1996), also discussed in Morgan (n. 2), 172.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Morgan is in more difficult territory with Longus, in contrast to the narrative structures in Petronius, in that the external anonymous third-person narrator of the novel is more likely to have been identified as the voice of the author Longus himself by an ancient readership.[6] Yet, there are a number of passages in *Daphnis and Chloe* that seem to support Morgan's thesis, above all the digression on the swimming ox at the end of Book 1 (1.30.6).[7] Daphnis is rescued from the pirates' kidnapping and, along with Dorkon's herd of cattle, swims back to shore. The narrator proceeds to relate that oxen are excellent swimmers, but for the fact that their hooves fall off when saturated with water. The obvious absurdity of the statement jars with the literary depth and precision of the rest of the novel and is the kernel of Morgan's thesis for a differentiation between the foolish, pseudo-scientific voice of the urban narrator and the mocking, superior author. As Morgan himself states: 'From our narratological viewpoint we can see that the joke is on the narrator himself, whose ridiculous pedantry distances him from the author and the best reader of the novel.'[8]

In this article I seek to refute Morgan's thesis by showing that his characterization of the narrator is not one which the text can uphold. I engage with some of the specific categories and most important passages drawn up by Morgan,[9] and shall show in every instance that the narrator is a *knowing* narrator fully aware of the levels of literary deftness which Longus so carefully deploys, and that, furthermore, we are encouraged to see this figure as the projected voice of Longus himself. I postpone discussion of the digression on the oxen from Book 1 until the last section of the article, to establish that the evidence, apart from that controversial passage, cannot substantiate a diminished characterization of Longus' narrator.

THE PREFACE AND LITERARINESS

Morgan sets out four aspects concerning the narrator to prove the contrasting competence of this voice from that of the 'hidden author'.[10] In summary, these are: 1. The ironic humour of the narrator is subject to a hidden 'authorial' form of ironic humour. 2. The narrator betrays a less thorough understanding of the story, in supplying material for the story without further subjective comment. 3. The narrator idealizes the countryside, something the story itself resists. 4. The urban narrator betrays hostility and superiority to the real inhabitants of the countryside. I shall broadly follow these categories, but in different order, by analysing the apparent tension between the true rustics of the story and the urban idealization in the voice of the narrator, before proceeding to a discussion of the varying degrees of textual depth of which the narrator is apparently ignorant. This article will finish with the contentious digression on the oxen.

Any analysis of the narrator must begin with the novel's preface. Longus is unique of the extant novelists in that the narrating voice of the preface is the same as that of the

[6] The discussion of Whitmarsh (n. 1), 78 is key: 'Readers without the benefit of Genettian narratological categories would have been more disposed to identify a narrative "I" more or less directly with the author.' This is even the case where the narrator is not anonymous but antonymous to the author (as Augustine's comments on Apuleius' narrator make clear [August. *De civ. D.* 18.18]).

[7] See Morgan (n. 2), 180–1 with Morgan (n. 1), 516–17.

[8] Morgan (n. 1), 516.

[9] Especially at Morgan (n. 2), 178–9. I cannot cover all of Morgan's points, but will focus on the most salient arguments.

[10] Morgan (n. 2), 178–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

main narrative which succeeds it.[11] In the very opening of the preface we read of a sight-seer, a hunter on a visit, who saw a beautiful sight, a painting, in a grove of the Nymphs ('While hunting in Lesbos I saw in a grove of the Nymphs the most beautiful sight I have ever seen: a depiction of an image, a history of love', *Praef.* 1).[12] This same *ego*-narrator becomes the largely anonymous un-intrusive narrator of the main narrative.[13] This persona is presumably a man of wealth and a city-dweller on a hunting trip (θηρῶν). The fame of the painting, owing to its outstanding skill, its erotic subject matter and its more pleasurable aspects, draws many foreigners, who come as both suppliants of the Nymphs and viewers of the image.[14] The narrator summarizes the content of the tableaux.[15] He then explains that, after seeking out an exegete, he laboured to produce four books, as an offering to Eros, the Nymphs and Pan, on the one hand, but also a 'possession for pleasure' (κτῆμα δὲ τερπνόν, an allusion to Thucydides' 'possession for ever'), which will heal the lovesick, assuage those hurt by love, remind the one who has experienced the power of love, and teach the one who has never loved.[16] No one will escape love as long as beauty exists and eyes see, he explains, before praying that the god grant *sōphrosynē* to 'us' as 'we write of the things of others'.

The voice of this *ego*-narrator is a careful construction of sophistication underlining the literary and self-reflexive quality of narration. This is *not* a narrator who evinces aporetic unsophistication. It is argued that the narrator's summary of the painting's content as a series of scenes reflects his inability to represent the painting as narrative, and that what follows is a telling of the story instructed by a not particularly good understanding of its intricacies. To quote Morgan: 'The narrator is not its controlling intelligence, but rather a not particularly good reader (of the painting) or narratee (of the exegete), reliant on a third party's exposition and driven by a potentially irrational desire, whose take on the story need be no more authoritative than any other reader's, on either the factual or the interpretative level.'[17] Morgan bases this conclusion primarily on the summary way in which he outlines the scenes on the pictures without connecting them, on the need for an exegete to unfold their meaning and on the simple style of the preface. The most important factor to militate against this view is the terms of reference in which the writing of the four books is set. The narrator (and it is emphasized as the narrator) is seized with a desire to replicate the picture in writing: ἰδόντα **με** καὶ θαυμάσαντα πόθος ἔσχεν ἀντιγράψαι τῇ γραφῇ. It has been long recognized that ἀντιγράψαι expresses rivalry and emulation, and that the narrator wishes to outdo the

[11] Important recent discussions of Longus' preface include J. Lauwers, 'A *pepaideumenoi*'s novel: sophistry in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *AncNarr* 9 (2011), 53–76, at 59–66, and Whitmarsh (n. 1), 93–6; see further Morgan (n. 3), 145.

[12] ἐν Λέσβῳ θηρῶν ἐν ἄλσει Νυμφῶν θέαμα εἶδον κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον· εἰκόνος γραφήν, ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος. The Longus text throughout is from M.D. Reeve (ed.), *Longus: Daphnis et Chloe* (Leipzig, 1994[2]), and all translations are my own.

[13] There is one single instance of the narrator referring to himself in the first person (οἶμαι, 1.32.3). The *ego* of the main narrative must be assumed to be the same *ego* of the preface, with no evidence to suggest that the personae are differing.

[14] ὥστε πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ξένων κατὰ φήμην ἧεσαν, τῶν μὲν Νυμφῶν ἱκέται, τῆς δὲ εἰκόνος θεαταί (*praef.* 1). Ewen Bowie points out to me (rightly) that **καὶ** τῶν ξένων implies that it is locals too (one of whom may be this narrator) who come because of its reputation. On the significance of viewing, *enargeia* and novelistic openings, see R.L. Hunter, *A Study of* Daphnis & Chloe (Cambridge, 1983), 40–1.

[15] πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα ἐρωτικά (*praef.* 2).

[16] The pleasure of mythologizing and fiction is emphasized throughout the novel. Cf. 2.3.1, 2.7.1 and the discussion below.

[17] Morgan (n. 1), 508.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

depiction of the image in his four-book literary creation.[18] It has been further asserted that this desire to emulate the painting is in keeping with a man of *paideia* who produces an *epideixis* of his ability to respond and surpass the things seen.[19] In Lucian's *De domo* 2, the narrator points to the difference between a man of culture and the uneducated man:[20] the latter is mute and cannot express a response to what he sees, whereas the former in taking pleasure in the sight attempts to respond with speech.[21] Lucian's narrator goes on to explain that a flourishing of words (λόγων ἐπίδειξιν) within the hall itself is the best form of praise (3). Similarly, the narrator in the preface takes pleasure in the image and is determined, because of the pleasure he receives from the images,[22] to respond as only an educated person should. What we find in the preface, then, is a narrator marked as the type of educated responder highlighted in Lucian's *De domo*, a man of sophisticated *paideia* who can rival in words the sights he sees.[23] We should assume, therefore, that not only in this preface but throughout the narrative of the four books this is an ideal *pepaideumenos* who demands from his readership the same level of *paideia*.[24]

There are further indications within the preface of literary knowingness. The *ego* of this preface is paralleled by Philetas, the *praeceptor amoris* of Book 2, both a literary manifestation of the bucolic poet Philitas and a type of wise, author-figure come to elucidate Daphnis and Chloe.[25] He suddenly appears to Daphnis and Chloe,[26] and gives an extended speech on his experiences of Eros, whose name the young couple have not heard before. He begins by explaining that he has a garden which he built for himself once he had given up shepherding because of old age (2.3.3). The verb he uses for his labour is ἐξεπονησάμην (2.3.3), used elsewhere in the novel only in the preface, where the narrator tells us that he laboured to produce the four books: τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην (*praef.* 3). The garden of Philetas and, by metonymy, the sophisticated literary creations of the founder of bucolic poetry are identified as paralleled with, or symbolic of, the four books 'laboured forth' by the *ego* of the preface.[27] The two voices in the first person are carefully intertwined.[28] The conceit is that the production of the four physical books we hold in our hands was realized by this preface's persona, just as

[18] This Morgan recognizes and discusses in his commentary: (n. 3), 146.

[19] See especially Whitmarsh (n. 1), 94–5 and F.I. Zeitlin, 'The poetics of *eros*; nature, art and imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (edd.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton, 1990), 417–64, at 432–3.

[20] *De domo* 2: 'The same rule about sights does not apply to both uneducated and educated men' (οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς περὶ τὰ θεάματα νόμος ἰδιώταις τε καὶ πεπαιδευμένοις ἀνδράσιν).

[21] λόγῳ ἀμείψασθαι τὴν θέαν.

[22] e.g. ἡ γραφὴ τερπνοτέρα (*praef.* 1), πόθος (3), κτῆμα δὲ τερπνόν.

[23] Cf. Whitmarsh (n. 1), 96: 'The narrator is vying, competitively, with his source.'

[24] On educational elitism of this period, see principally Whitmarsh (n. 1), 100–1.

[25] On the identity and significance of the figure Philetas, see E.L. Bowie, 'Theocritus' seventh idyll, Philetas and Longus', *CQ* 35 (1985), 67–91, at 71–4; Hunter (n. 14), 76–83; and Morgan (n. 3), 5.

[26] ἐφίσταται (2.3.1), in the manner, as it were, of a divine epiphany or dream visitation. See Morgan (n. 3), 178, who compares 2.23.1.

[27] On the parallelism, see Morgan (n. 3), 149; the idea of labour as literary endeavour is Alexandrian. The final words of the novel, ποιμένων παίγνια, have also been identified as an insertion of the title of Philitas' bucolic collection: E.L. Bowie, 'Metaphor in *Daphnis and Chloe*', in S. Harrison, M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* (Groningen, 2005), 68–86, at 82–3.

[28] Cf. 2.8: Philetas leaves having taught them these things (τοσαῦτα παιδεύσας), just as the narrator in the preface promises that his pleasurable possession will educate those who have never been in love (τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει, *praef.* 3).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the garden was physically constructed by the old man in Book 2—physical reality points to a historical author, and the voice of the preface is to be identified with this author. Philetas has rightly been identified as 'acting as the author's mouthpiece',[29] but only, following the same principle, if we allow for the same identification of the author in the voice of the preface's narrator. As Morgan himself discusses further: 'The author makes Philetas and the narrator use the same form of the verb … respectively of their horticultural work and effort in producing the narrative: the effect is to make the garden and the text analogous.'[30] All of the learned authoritativeness of Philetas is assumed in this narrator, just as the text itself assumes the status of the literary associations of learning of the garden.[31] The parallel encourages no separation in the identity of the author from that of the narrator. This Longan narrator is an authorial Alexandrianesque Philetas/Philitas figure.[32]

This interrelation between the narrator and Philetas helps to elucidate the apparent lack of specificity about subject matter in the preface. Morgan argues that the preface is 'full of words of shallow approbation' such as the repeated use of καλός either in the positive or in the superlative degree in the opening two sentences.[33] Furthermore, he claims that the narrator describes what he sees on the painting as a series of unspecific and unconnected ideas, something which 'enacts his initial failure to construe it as a narrative, until an exegete instructs him'.[34] Yet, the narrator is aware that the readers have not encountered the story which follows in detail in the narrative of the four books, something the narrator states he has already completed (ἐξεπονησάμην).[35] He is surely encoding into the preface some typical novelistic themes, whereby the narrator gives mere hints as to what follows, and to an extent misdirects the reader by emphasizing pirates and foreign incursions, themes more prevalent in more typical Greek novels.[36] The narrator is careful not to give away the vital events of the later stages of the plot, and in fact does not even reflect the temporal sequence in which he relates the story in the main narrative.[37] He simply summarizes the whole as relating to Eros (πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα ἐρωτικά).

The limited understanding of the narrator accounts for the necessity of an exegete, it has been argued. He is the narrator's 'only source of information … the story that we begin to read after the prologue is essentially the narrator's retelling of that of the

[29] Morgan (n. 1), 520.

[30] Morgan (n. 1), 520.

[31] This has further implications for the type of reader required to unpack the sophistication of this text. Cf. E.L. Bowie, 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore, 1994), 435–59, at 452: 'This [i.e. the nature of Longus' literary allusions] requires readers who are mature, alert and well-educated.'

[32] *Pace* Morgan (n. 1), 517 n. 29, in particular.

[33] A similar style and generality in description, however, are to be found in the opening words of Philetas to Daphnis and Chloe, whereby he describes his garden (especially 2.3.1–4). R. McCail, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe. A New Translation* (Oxford, 2002), ad loc. is set out to illustrate the careful balancing of clause length and rhythm of both the preface and Philetas' words.

[34] Morgan (n. 1), 508.

[35] A point expertly discussed by Lauwers (n. 11), 60, who states that the aorist of 'completed' action in the preface indicates 'that Longus consciously composed this proem retrospectively, that is, after the writing down process and in full knowledge of the story itself as he wrote it down … [The author] is aware that his readers do not know the story yet'.

[36] Cf. B.P. Reardon, 'Achilles Tatius and *ego*-narrative', in J. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London, 1994), 80–96, at 86.

[37] As e.g. Morgan (n. 2), 176 notes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exegete'.[38] This is a view that fails to take into account the rivalrous creativity of the narrator, emblematized in ἀντιγράψαι. There is no obvious reason why the narrator would purposefully (and, therefore, simplistically) cause his plotting to mirror exactly the scenes on the picture, especially if the readers come to the story first through the preface before reading the rest of the novel.[39] The preface is subject to the same rhetorical strategizing as the main narrative,[40] in that it is artfully *reconstructing* the original putative gazing at the picture, not narrating-while-watching. The preface, moreover, is a discrete site in itself for programme and allusion,[41] a sort of mirror of literary practice and manual for understanding the rest of the novel.[42] It is here above all that we are to find self-reflexive artistry,[43] controlled by the *ego* who 'worked out' the four books. The reader is to dig deeply *here* to uncover the purpose and subtexts of the novel.

There are at least two levels of function embedded in the keyword *erōtika* (πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα ἐρωτικά).[44] On the one hand, the adjective chimes with the preface's hints at the novel's potential for titillation, discovered in the narrator's *pothos* (*praef*. 3) which grips him as he gazes, and implied in the prayer for *sōphrosynē* as he engages to write of the things of others (*praef*. 4).[45] On the other hand, the adjective echoes the opening gambit of the preface: this painting he saw is a history of love (ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος), containing an adventure of love (τύχην ἐρωτικήν, *praef*. 1). The personified figure Eros plays a central role in the story of the novel.[46] He is highlighted as ineluctable in the penultimate sentence of the preface (*praef*. 4). He is described as playing an active role in the events of the couple's lives (1.11.1). He is the subject of Philetas' instruction to Daphnis and Chloe at the beginning of Book 2 (2.3–6, the point at which the couple hear the name of the god for the first time) and is also the force which makes Philetas' garden beautiful (διὰ τοῦτο καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ φυτά, 2.5).[47] At 2.26, Pan appears to the Methymnian captain in a dream demanding that the kidnapped Chloe be returned, stating that the maiden he had snatched from the shrine was one of whom Eros himself wished to make a *mythos* (παρθένον ἐξ ἧς

[38] Morgan (n. 2), 177. On the topos of the exegete, see Whitmarsh (n. 1), 99–100.

[39] Cf. Lauwers (n. 11), 60.

[40] In Longus' preface the position of ecphrasis in *progymnasmata* is central: J.A. Fernández-Delgado and F. Pordomigo, 'Musical *ekphrasis* and *diegema* in Longus' novel', *GRBS* 56 (2016), 696–708, especially 697–8.

[41] On the 'how' and 'why' of paratexts, see G. Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (transl. J.E. Lewin) (Cambridge, 1997), 196–236.

[42] Cf. C. Imbert, 'Stoic logic and Alexandrian poetics', in M. Schofield, M. Burnyeat and J. Barnes (edd.), *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology* (Oxford, 1980), 183–216, at 206–7.

[43] The preface also contains technical vocabulary denotative of literary style: R.L. Hunter, 'Longus and Plato', in id., *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception. Part 2: Comedy and Performance, Greek Poetry of the Roman Empire, The Ancient Novel* (Berlin and New York, 2008), 775–89, at 785.

[44] The adjective occurs fourteen times outside the preface: 1.15.1, 1.21.5, 1.22.3, 2.10.1, 2.11.3, 2.37.3, 2.39.1, 2.39.2, 3.4.3, 3.13.2, 3.19.1, 3.33.4, 4.13.1, 4.17.1.

[45] On the implications of these terms, see S. Goldhill, *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge, 1995), 6.

[46] For discussion of the representation of Eros in Longus, see H.H.O. Chalk, 'Eros and the Lesbian pastorals of Longus', *JHS* 80 (1960), 32–51.

[47] The grove of the Nymphs in the preface is similarly nurtured by one source, described as a single spring which nourishes all things, both the flowers and the trees (μία πηγὴ πάντα ἔτρεφε καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ δένδρα). The similarity of subject-matter and vocabulary further links the two gardens as symbolic spaces for literary sophistication and inspiration. Chalk (n. 46), 36 rightly sees this fountain as symbolic of Eros.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ἔρως μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει, 2.27). Eros is not only behind the beautification of the gardens but also responsible for the very subject of the novel itself.[48] The gardens become analogous with the subject and the plot of the novel, just as the narrator of the preface hints: everything is down to Eros, as πάντα ἐρωτικά should be translated, rather than a translation which restricts the sense of the adjective only to 'amorous' or even 'sexy', as Morgan, perhaps tendentiously, suggests.[49] The *post factum* writing of the preface by this narrator to introduce the *pre*-written four books of the novel necessitates returning to the preface to unpack the full implications of *erōtika* as connotative of a (meta-)literary spectrum that is larger than a mere promise of amorous adventures.[50] In fact, in the hierarchy of literary creation, this narrator is relegated beneath Eros himself, as Imbert has shown: 'It is the God of Love who has caused the whole drama and arranged the succession of events as a revelation of his power.'[51]

The complexity of the preface bespeaks an artful narrator who obfuscates and misdirects about the subject matter of the four books he has constructed, but who above all draws attention to the centrality of Eros and the educational nature of the novel. The other authorial character within the novel, Philetas, similarly *teaches* the young couple about Eros and introduces his name within a literary setting that is loaded with careful poetic and philosophical allusion. It is essential to correlate this bucolic, learned figure with the identity of the preface's narrator, and to read the rest of the novel with this characterization in mind.

THE URBAN PERSPECTIVE

The narrator of the novel, then, is a sophisticated, knowing reader who creates an emulous literary recasting of what he purportedly sees in the painted *eikones*.[52] This narrator seems to be an urban visitor (*Praef.* 1), and it has been argued that this persona idealizes the countryside and overlooks the realities of the rustic life 'through sentimental fantasies of "noble simplicity" and "pastoral innocence"', and expresses superiority to the lack of sophistication evident in the lives of the folk of the countryside.[53] This perspective is certainly evident in the figures of the young couple, who are idealized and do not

[48] For the Platonic implications and underlying allusions of the Philetas episode, see F.-G. Herrmann, 'Longus' imitation: *mimesis* in the education of Daphnis and Chloe', in J. Morgan and M. Jones (edd.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen, 2007), 205–30, at 207.

[49] Morgan (n. 2), 176. Zeitlin (n. 19), 150 comes closest with the translation 'and everything pertained to *eros*'.

[50] At the end of the novel, as the reader gains a glimpse into the future lives of Daphnis and Chloe, the narrator relates that the couple erected an altar to Eros the Shepherd after they had adorned the grove and had hung up the *eikones* (presumably the same as those described in the preface—see Hunter [n. 14], 42–3).

[51] Imbert (n. 42), 207. Morgan (n. 1), 517 argues that the narrator fails to connect the *eikones* at 4.39.2 with the paintings described by him in the preface, but he does not account for the deliberate disconnection between the paratextual preface and the actual narration within the four books, whereby the narrator never explicitly recalls the preface. The same holds true, for example, of the separation within Lucian's *True History*: see e.g. the discussion of S. Saïd, 'Le *je* de Lucien', in M.F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann and L. Pernot (edd.), *L'invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1993), 253–70, at 263–6.

[52] Cf. Zeitlin (n. 19), 149–50: 'A sophist rhetorician who would match the *graphē* of his writing to the *graphē* of the painting he sees.'

[53] Morgan (n. 2), 178–9. For further discussion of the idealized vs real countryside, see S. Saïd, 'Rural society in the Greek novel, or the country seen from the town', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reflect the rustic norm. They are mythological others, in the description and experience of whom plausibility and actuality are suspended as the reader imbibes the fantasy and suspends expectation of realistic representation. Daphnis and Chloe are divinely protected at birth and suckled by animals, something typical in myth for children of gods—as Daphnis himself points out at 1.16.3.[54] These are characters closer to the literary figures in the *Idylls* of Theocritus, a key source for Longus,[55] in that they 'belong to no world we can identify outside the poems in which they appear'.[56]

Daphnis and Chloe, then, represent the literary bucolic world received from Theocritus (and Philitas) with all of the sophistication one would expect from a novel which is imbued with advertisement of *paideia*. It should come as no surprise that this narrator describes an idealized version of the countryside, given how carefully he is constructed as a *pepaideumenos* appealing to the similarly constructed *paideia* of his readers. The close alignment of the narrator with Philetas extends to the description of their idealized places of visitation: the grove of the preface, and the garden favoured by Eros in Book 2. The privileging of aesthetic 'prettiness' over rustic realities is emblematized by Philetas' garden and indeed the novel's preface. These are literary, conceited constructs, metaphors of literary creativity constructed within settings that attempt to bear no semblance to the rigours of actual rural life.[57] The literary is foregrounded before the realities of actual rural life, as Morgan rightly argues,[58] but only because the literary (for which read above all 'bucolic') aims of the novel predominate among other narrative emphases derived from other genres such as New Comedy.[59]

The realities of rustic life which seep through to the surface of the text from time to time, alongside the stock comic aspects, are to be read as part of the literary-bucolic texture in synthesis. We laugh with the narrator at the naivety exhibited in some of the episodes,[60] just as we take pleasure in our superior *paideia* mirrored in that of the narrator, but the fact that the city folk are sometimes ironized too does not mean that this has to be at the expense of this urban narrator. Morgan identifies two strands as separated out focalizations by two different voices. For him, the (hidden) author undermines his narrator's mockery of the rustics on a number of occasions, in keeping with his overall view that the novel's 'own artificiality and its ironic play with the literary conventions by which it is configured belong at the level of the author and are at the expense of the narrator'.[61] In what follows, I shall first discuss some aspects of the representation of the countryside through the varying focalization which the novel provides, and then

Readings in the Greek Novel (Oxford, 1999), 83–107, especially 85 and 106–7, and Whitmarsh (n. 1), 96–9, who places particular stress on the role of urban *paideia* in the contrast.

[54] Cf. Hunter (n. 14), 16 on the blurring of human and divine in the identity of the pair.

[55] On Longus and Theocritus, see L.R. Cresci, 'The novel of Longus the sophist and the pastoral tradition', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford, 1999), 210–42, and—for a more nuanced discussion—E.L. Bowie, 'Caging grasshoppers: Longus' materials for weaving "reality"', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis (edd.), *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen, 2013), 179–97.

[56] M. Payne, *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction* (Cambridge, 2007), 15.

[57] This idealization is in line with the general pattern in the Greek novels, wherein 'the country is a pleasant picture of the Golden Age ready to be enjoyed' (Saïd [n. 53], 90).

[58] Morgan (n. 2), 176.

[59] The synthesis of bucolic with the novelistic, along with comic elements, is called a 'bold experiment' by B. Effe, 'Longus: towards a history of bucolic and its function in the Roman empire', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford, 1999), 189–209, at 189, who proves (at 190) that Longus promotes the bucolic above all.

[60] Saïd (n. 53), 98.

[61] Morgan (n. 2), 180.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the extent to which this urban narrator should be paralleled with the other urban characters. In the next section I discuss some of the key instances raised by Morgan about the apparent naivety of the narrator, with particular attention paid to the tension within the 'urban' and the 'rustic' interplay.

By Book 4 the city people who have entered the story give an indication of their unfeigned superiority to the rustics they meet. 4.20.2 contains a particularly programmatic statement. Dionysophanes, the man who turns out to be Daphnis' aristocratic urban father, on hearing Lamon tell the story of how he found Daphnis, begins to believe what he has heard, because such a fantastic tale would be beyond a rustic's invention: 'πῶς δ' ἂν καὶ ταῦτα ἔπλασεν ἄγροικος;' ('how on earth could a rustic invent such things?') he says to himself. In Longus, πλάττω is used only here and in the immediate context, at 4.20.1,[62] where Dionysophanes is reported as telling Lamon to speak only the truth and not to invent things that have the semblance of *mythoi* (μηδὲ ὅμοια πλάττειν μύθοις).[63] Dionysophanes implies that his view of the rustic world is an idealized one, on the one hand, whereby it is the locus for literary invention, as *read* in, for example, Theocritus, but at the same time *mythoi* of quality belong only to educated figures and not to someone such as Lamon, who inhabits a world wherein the uneducated rustics cannot shape sophisticated *mythoi*.[64] It is no accident that his collocation for truth as an antithesis to *mythos* recalls a similar reaction from Daphnis and Chloe on hearing about Eros for the first time from Philetas (μῦθον οὐ λόγον, 2.7.1). *Paideia* is requisite for invention and is assumed to be beyond Lamon.[65]

Longus here encodes what is represented throughout the novel, something that is apparent too in the primary narrator's discourse,[66] namely a gulf in sophistication between those who have experience and above all *paideia* and those who do not. For example, at 3.15.1 Lykainion is more refined than is typical of the countryside (ἀγροικίας ἀβρότερον) and is therefore able both to instruct Daphnis and to take advantage of his naivety, because of her experience. Yet, this is not a simple urban vs rustic snobbery. Urban superiority over the countryside is something the rustics themselves acknowledge and of which they take advantage. At the beginning of the story, the narrator describes the lengths taken by the foster parents to give Daphnis and Chloe a better upbringing than would be normal for mere rustics. As the children grow, their beauty appears to their foster parents as something greater than the country-norm (κάλλος αὐτοῖς ἐνεφαίνετο κρεῖττον ἀγροικίας, 1.7.1). The focalization is that of the *rustics*,

[62] ἀναπλάττω is used at 1.11.1, discussed below.

[63] This latter expression is similar to the formulation by Socrates at Pl. *Ti*. 26e (τό τε μὴ πλασθέντα μῦθον ἀλλ' ἀληθινὸν λόγον εἶναι πάμμεγά που).

[64] Dionysophanes' view does not quite parallel that of the narrator. At 2.34 Lamon tells the story of Syrinx and Pan (the novel's second inset tale of three), a version he heard from a Sicilian goatherd (an allusion to Theocritus himself). The quality of the telling is praised by Philetas as a *mythos* sweeter than song itself (2.35.1). Thus, the status of *mythoi* and of their relation to *logos*, a recurrent theme of the novel, reappears. Morgan (n. 1), 16–17 gives an excellent overview of the discourse within the novel on this subject.

[65] K. Schlapbach, 'Music and meaning in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*: the inset tales in their performative settings', *Phoenix* 69 (2015), 79–99, at 88 n. 32 states that 'it is hardly a coincidence that the verb that refers to Lamon's activity is not μυθολογεῖν but simply "to tell" (ἀφηγήσασθαι, 2.33.3)'. This is not *extempore* creation.

[66] As Morgan (n. 3), 237 states, Dionysophanes' thinking is 'not just a snooty implication that country folk are stupid … the invention of such a tale would require a level of literary education unlikely outside the town'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not of the narrator specifically,[67] and they go on themselves to foreshadow the narrator's comment about Lykainion's non-rustic refinement (ἀγροικίας ἁβρότερον) by insisting that their fosterlings receive a more sophisticated education, even literacy and only the pleasurable aspects of the countryside (τροφαῖς ἁβροτέραις ἔτρεφον καὶ γράμματα ἐπαίδευον καὶ πάντα ὅσα καλὰ ἦν ἐπ' ἀγροικίας, 1.8.1).[68] It is altogether clear that Dryas and Lamon have not only realized that there is something mystically providential about the survival of these children, but more specifically their superior birth-status, identified in their exceptional beauty and in the expensive items found along with the abandoned children (τύχην ἐκ σπαργάνων ἐπαγγελλόμενοι κρείττονα, 1.8.1), is an opportunity for financial gain.[69] By giving Daphnis and Chloe an education and in keeping them for the fairer things of the countryside as opposed to its harsh realities, Dryas and Lamon are fostering the class separation themselves.[70] Daphnis and Chloe are on a path of *paideia* by nature and by nurture, and this is something the novel insists on emphasizing.[71] The first inset narrative, the aetiology of the wood-pigeon (*phatta*) told by Daphnis himself to Chloe, symbolizes the two-fold emphases the foster-parents give the pair.[72] Daphnis is able to put his education to use, and the pleasure they take in the sound of the wood-pigeon reflects the time they are given to enjoy it (πάντα ὅσα καλὰ ἦν ἐπ' ἀγροικίας, 1.8.1). The introductory words at 1.27.1 illustrate this higher (that is, literary) level of engagement with the world around them:

ἔτερψεν αὐτούς ποτε φάττα βουκολικὸν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης φθεγξαμένη. καὶ τῆς Χλόης ζητούσης μαθεῖν ὅ τι λέγει, διδάσκει αὐτὴν ὁ Δάφνις μυθολογῶν τὰ θρυλούμενα.

A wood-pigeon calling from the woods *in a bucolic way* gave them pleasure. And on Chloe's desire to learn what the birdsong meant, Daphnis taught her, mythologizing the bird's cooing.[73]

The narrator is framing the discourse and enquiry of Daphnis and Chloe in the very terms of the preface. This is a mirroring of the reader-response of the external recipients of the rustic literariness. Daphnis and Chloe are participants in our own readerly experience, and it is often through them that we are encouraged to partake in the layers of meaning and intertextuality available. They idealize as much as the narrator. The *phatta* is described as sounding forth *boukolikon*, an adjective usually a designator of bucolic song or poetry (as found in Theoc. 1 in the refrain beginning at line 64: βουκολικᾶς

[67] *Contra* Morgan (n. 1), 513, who assigns the judgement to the narrator himself, and whose comment at 513 n. 17 on the parallel with Lykainion is misguided—it is not only the urban characters in the novel who see the superiority of urban characteristics.

[68] On the debate on the precise meaning of this passage, see Herrmann (n. 48), 227–8.

[69] The 1983 motion picture directed by Bill Forsyth, *Local Hero*, is a very apt *comparandum*. The impoverished Scottish villagers are money-mad and are willing to sell everything they have to a Texan oil company who wish to create a refinery in the area; the American visitor, on the other hand, there to make the deal, gradually forsakes his old corporate ways in favour of the sentimentalized idyll he finds on the Scottish west coast.

[70] On class difference and exploitation in Longus, see T. Whitmarsh, 'Class', in id. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 2008), 72–87.

[71] Cf. Saïd (n. 53), 106: 'Daphnis and Chloe stand as much apart from the work of the fields as the author or the readers of the novel.'

[72] Scholarship has focussed to a great extent on the worrying implications of violence for Chloe, given the parallels between her and the *parthenoi* of the inset tales. See, above all, J.J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (London, 1990), 116–20. But it should also be emphasized that the education and the musical skills of the *parthenoi* parallel Chloe's too, given e.g. the similar vocabulary of the Echo inset tale (3.22.4–23.2).

[73] Note Schlapbach (n. 65), 84 on μυθολογεῖν: 'to produce a story that elucidates something.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἀοιδᾶς). The bucolic song gives pleasure to the hearers (ἔτερψεν αὐτούς—compare the emphasis on *to terpnon* at *praef*. 3 and at 2.7.1). Daphnis responds with his own epideictic telling of what were mere sounds from the bird, that is, he puts a literary enhancement on *ta thryloumena*.[74]

Reading idealization through both rustic and urban participants realigns responsibility to a great extent away from the sole focalization of the primary narrator. Daphnis is a literary exponent himself, able to construct set-piece manifestations of his own *paideia*.[75] In this sense Daphnis is like Philetas in his ability to construct pleasurable mythological narrative.[76] Daphnis' ability to extemporize is put to the test in Book 2 in his encounter with the rich young Methymnians who accuse him of theft (he has had practice in extemporization in his war of words with Dorkon at 1.16). Daphnis' superiority to the Methymnians is underscored by the narrator, who is clearly on his protagonist's side. Philetas is the adjudicator of the trial and finds in Daphnis' favour (2.17.1). The rustics are then described as triumphing in a mock-epic engagement which results in the Methymnians being put to flight.[77] The reader is left in no doubt that the Methymnians are unfavourably characterized by the narrator and that Daphnis is the superior debater,[78] a fact which problematizes the scholarly view that Longus undermines his narrator by paralleling his characterization with that of the Methymnians. As underlined above, the only indication of the narrator's background is that he describes himself as hunting in Lesbos (the novel's first three words, ἐν Λέσβῳ θηρῶν). It is plausible to presume that he is a man of wealth, an urban visitor to the countryside on a hunting trip. The Methymnians are rich, urban young men seeking pleasurable, exotic rustic pursuits (ἐν ξενικῇ τέρψει, 2.12.1), and Dionysophanes' son Astylus is described in similar terms (4.11.1).[79] The assumption has been made that the snobbery of these visitors from the city matches that of the narrator, and that the novel plays on the contrast between their idealized expectations of the countryside and its actual realities. Both sets of characters, the Methymnians and the urbanites of Book 4, have rightly been identified as constructs from New Comedy who infiltrate the bucolic (in a literary sense) world.[80] These intruders' characterization is undermined within the narrative, but I submit that it is the narrator himself who propounds this representation.

The pleasure-seeking Methymnians engage in country pursuits expected by rich visitors (2.12), but encounter rustic realities when their ship's cable is stolen (2.13.1). They

[74] θρυλεῖν (in the passive voice) is usually translated here as 'common talk' (cf. LSJ s.v. II), but I follow Schlapbach (n. 65), 84, who convincingly suggests that the participle refers to the *song* of the wood-pigeon, given the primary meaning of the verb as 'chatter, babble' (LSJ s.v. I).

[75] 'All novel heroes and heroines are *pepaideumenoi*': de Temmerman (n. 1), 208.

[76] It is at the level of knowledge of the realities of life, and in particular the mechanics of love, that he fails, but this is very much in keeping with his bucolic-literary characterization, set apart from the real world.

[77] They are compared to starlings or jackdaws (a conflation of the similes at *Il*. 16.583 and 17.755, for which see Morgan [n. 3], 188–9).

[78] On the rhetorical skill of Daphnis as a reflection of contemporary practice, see Morgan (n. 3), 188 (on 2.16.1).

[79] Whitmarsh (n. 1), 96 n. 135 must be correct in seeing οἷα, which introduces the description of Astylus as a rich young man come to the countryside in pursuit of exotic pleasure, as an internal reference back to the Methymnians (especially given the similarity of vocabulary).

[80] On New Comedy and Longus, see Hunter (n. 14), 67–70 and, more broadly, G. Bretzigheimer, 'Die Komik in Longos' Hirtenroman *Daphnis und Chloe*', *Gymnasium* 95 (1988), 515–55. On the Methymnians as belonging to the world of New Comedy, see Morgan (n. 3), 186.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make little fuss and replace it with a rope made of willow-shoots (2.13.3), which is eventually eaten by goats (2.13.4). They blame Daphnis and, as discussed above, end up in a trial to decide the issue. The Methymnians' assumed superiority is illustrated by their perceived need to speak clearly and succinctly because (so they thought) it was *only* a cowherd who was the judge (βουκόλον ἔχοντες δικαστήν, 2.15.1). Their misjudgement is proved by their defeat and physical expulsion at the hands of the rustics, and the mockery is complete. That the narrator himself knowingly undermines city-folk is given further weight in a passage towards the end of the novel, at the wedding of Daphnis and Chloe (4.38.4):[81]

ἐνέμοντο δὲ καὶ αἱ αἶγες πλησίον, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐταὶ κοινωνοῦσαι τῆς ἑορτῆς. τοῦτο τοῖς μὲν ἀστυκοῖς οὐ πάνυ τερπνὸν ἦν·

And the goats were also grazing nearby, as though they too were joining in the festivities. This was not at all to the liking of the townsfolk.

The idealized *pleasure* of the countryside is undermined by the presence of the goats and presumably their smell. The insistent artificiality of the countryside played out throughout the novel is constructed by the actual rustics themselves. For example, they ensure that the garden of Dionysophanes is suitably prettified, with the dung and muck removed, before his arrival.[82] Now and again, however, the reality comes to the surface, as in the case of these goats. Note the humour implied in the contrast between *astykois* and *terpnon*: this is a joke at the expense of the urbanites' snobbery,[83] dealt out by the narrator himself. The disdain of the narrator for the superficial arrivals from the city is clear, just as he implies that the Methymnians were wrong to underestimate not only the judgement of Philetas and his *paideia* but also the ability of the country folk to overcome them in 'battle'. It is, therefore, misguided to assimilate the competence and person of the narrator with the young men from Methymna. This narrator is just as prone to ironize the portrayal of the urban visitors as he is prone to ironize the actual rustics or Daphnis and Chloe themselves. It is vital to identify all characters as open to the same treatment by the same narrator. Yet, arguably, the world of the city comes off the worse in the end. The mixing of two generic strands, the bucolic and the comic/novelistic, throughout the novel comes to a head in Book 4, whereby tropes and characters from New Comedy seem to overwhelm a bucolic world threatened only rarely by foreign incursions. At the end of Book 4, however, Daphnis and Chloe decide to reject the city for the countryside (4.37.1—they cannot bear life in the city), and to bring up their children there.[84] The countryside (albeit the idealized, literary version) in the end triumphs.[85]

TEXTUAL DEPTH

I turn now to discuss the most important examples set forth as evidence that Longus' narrator has a shallow understanding of matters, literary, intertextual and otherwise,

[81] This is not a passage discussed by Morgan (n. 1) or Morgan (n. 2).
[82] 4.2–3.
[83] Cf. Theoc. *Id*. 20.3–4, a passage which neatly sums up such an opposition.
[84] As Saïd (n. 53), 107 states, this life they choose is not one of hard rustic labour, but a continuation of the pastoral idyll.
[85] Cf. Effe (n. 59), 202–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contained in the novel.[86] In accordance with the line of argumentation that 'the author's narratee is led to see that the narrator does not fully "know" his story',[87] Morgan argues that the narrator's knowledge of the divine plane is specifically limited by the author, in that the narrator acknowledges their presence and function only when they appear to the characters within the story, a phenomenon which is restricted for the most part to dreams.[88] This 'reticence about the action of the gods' is in contrast to the freedom with which characters relate the presence and even emotions of the gods in the inset tales.[89]

I begin with Eros. As discussed already, the god is given a central role in the fabrication of the story. At 2.27, Pan appears in a dream to the Methymnian captain (he and his crew have abducted Chloe) and orders him to release their captive, a *parthenos* of whom Eros wishes to make a *mythos* (2.27.1). Before the vision, supernatural events occur which cause chaos. The whole episode is narrated, Morgan argues, exactly as it was seen by those involved—the narrator, therefore, is afforded no more knowledge than the participants themselves.[90] What is emphasized is the seeming-ness of the sights (2.25.3–4): the whole land seemed (ἐδόκει) to be ablaze with fire, confused shouts and sounds arise, someone seemed to be wounded (τετρῶσθαί τις ἐδόκει) and another lay on the ground mimicking a corpse (ἔκειτο νεκροῦ μιμούμενος). To an onlooker a night-battle seemed to be ensuing, only one without any enemies present (εἴκασεν ἄν τις ὁρᾶν νυκτομαχίαν οὐ παρόντων πολεμίων). Morgan states: 'The supernatural events of the intervention itself are carefully relegated to the realm of appearances.'[91] Yet, this is standard practice in description of experience because of Dionysiac manifestation, evident as early as Euripides' *Bacchae*:[92] at lines 918–21 Pentheus describes what he appears to be seeing (δοκῶ … δοκεῖς)—two suns, two Thebes, the stranger (Dionysus) as a bull. It is a vision which occurs only to those under the influence of Dionysus—the most tragic example being Pentheus' mistaken identity in the eyes of his mother. Morgan has assigned to the narrator's ignorance what is entirely expected in the conventions of describing Dionysiac events.[93]

Morgan makes a similar argument about the scene immediately preceding these events, where the Nymphs appear to Daphnis, and relate to him the care they have taken and continue to take of Chloe. He states: 'The narrator's knowledge of the Nymphs' state of mind is limited to what a human observer could infer from their appearance.'[94] It is true that the Nymphs intrude into the novel only in the realm of dreams, and that we receive their information not directly from the narrator but in secondary narration; however, this is typical of the Greek novel generally. Divine

[86] The examples I furnish are mostly taken from Morgan (n. 1).
[87] Morgan (n. 1), 509.
[88] Morgan (n. 1), 509.
[89] Morgan (n. 1), 510.
[90] Morgan (n. 1), 509–10.
[91] Morgan (n. 1), 509.
[92] Cf. E.R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae* (Oxford, 1960^2), 193 (on lines 920–2). Longus' narration also owes something to an ecphrastic description of battle more generally (cf. Theon, *Progymnasmata* 118–19 Spengel).
[93] Cf. Verg. *Aen*. 4.469–70: Dido, maddened, sees visions of the type seen by Pentheus (*Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus | et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas*). A.S. Pease (ed.), *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge, MA, 1935), on line 469 quotes Schol. Dan.: *et bene* '*uidet agmina*' *expressit furentem, cum ait* '*uidet*', *non* '*existimat*', *sed* '*putat se uidere*', a view which neatly sums up the nature of a Bacchant's perspective.
[94] Morgan (n. 1), 509.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

visitations to mortals happen most frequently through dreams, and it is therefore through the mortal character's perspective that we understand the vision.[95] This is the case with Daphnis: the focalization through his eyes (it is emphasized that they appeared to him—καὶ αὐτῷ αἱ τρεῖς ἐφίστανται, 2.23.1) accounts for the fact that they are described as looking like the statues (τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν ὅμοιαι). Dryas and Lamon think that very thing in their dream at 1.7.2 (τὰς Νύμφας ἐδόκουν ἐκείνας τὰς ἐν τῷ ἄντρῳ), wherein those statues, now animated, hand over their adopted children to Eros. Longus is merely engaging in a novelistic trope.

That this narrator has fully omniscient knowledge of the divine plane within the novel is unambiguously on display in an important passage early in Book 1: τοιαῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν παιζόντων τοιάνδε σπουδὴν Ἔρως ἀνέπλασε ('While such things kept their playful attention, Eros plotted the following piece of seriousness'). The playful beginnings of Daphnis and Chloe's life together are complicated by the intervention of Eros himself. Morgan relegates discussion of this sentence to a footnote and argues that it is merely a metaphor on the part of the narrator which the *author's* narratee reads as a literal truth. Taken on its own, however, following on from the vision of Dryas and Lamon who see a winged figure but do not recognize the god (1.7.2), this passage indicates not only the superior knowledge of narrator and reader but also, more importantly, the full awareness of this narrator of Eros' own role in the formation of the plot. The verb used, ἀνέπλασε, underscores the fact that this is the personified Eros shaping the story, not a broad metaphor for love. As discussed above with reference to Dionysophanes, the verb, here with prefix, signifies literary creation, an ability to mythologize and shape a plot. σπουδή itself has a literary register beyond its primary meaning of seriousness of circumstance.[96] A personified, active and authorial role for Eros in the construction of the events of the plot could not be more lucidly described by the narrator, and exemplifies the latter's full cognition of the role the divine plays in the story he narrates; this is a full disclosure of direct knowledge.[97]

Longus' novel is often described as untypical in that it downplays typical motifs associated with the genre.[98] A hint of the work's self-reflexive awareness of this difference is found at 1.31.1, the point at which Daphnis escapes piracy and shipwreck.

ἐκσῴζεται μὲν δὴ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον ὁ Δάφνις, δύο κινδύνους παρ' ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν διαφυγών, λῃστηρίου καὶ ναυαγίου.

After this manner, then, was Daphnis saved, and escaped two kinds of danger—against all expectation—piracy and shipwreck.

Escape from such dangers belongs to the very fabric of the Greek novel, and to any experienced reader of such texts these would not come as unexpected events. Morgan reads this surprise at Daphnis' escape as belonging to the narrator who apparently lacks the knowingness of the author/author's narratee, and claims that the narrator 'buys into the stereotypes at face value'.[99] Yet, the novel's 'deconstructive play with

[95] See R. Cioffi, 'Seeing gods: epiphany and narrative in the Greek novels', *AncNarr* 11 (2014), 1–42, at 1 n. 2 for an exemplary list of this phenomenon.
[96] Cf. LSJ s.v. σπουδαῖος II. Cf. Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 1.1.5.
[97] Contrast Morgan (n. 1), 510.
[98] See E.L. Bowie, 'The Greek novel', in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel* (Oxford, 1999), 39–59, at 56. Even the style marks out the novel as untypical: E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig, 1914[4]), 515–21.
[99] Morgan (n. 1), 516.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

generic conventions', as Morgan cogently puts it,[100] surely comes not at the expense of the narrator but rather at the expense of Daphnis. The latter is the subject of the main verb and therefore of the participle, and the syntax leads us to see παρ' ἐλπίδα as relating to Daphnis himself. The narrator is playing with Daphnis' lack of experience and unawareness that he is part of a larger literary scheme with precedents and standard templates. A comparable example of the narrator's play with Daphnis' naivety is found at 1.8.3, where the young pair are described as rejoicing in their herding roles, in their eyes 'a great office' (ὡς ἀρχὴν μεγάλην),[101] without truly realizing just how accurate their perception of the office is. Their perspective contrasts with that of their foster-parents, who had sought a role for them superior to their own. Daphnis and Chloe are set apart from the other rustics as belonging to an idealized mythical world (watched over and administered by Eros—2.7.2), where this function they receive puts them on the same path as Eros the Shepherd, to whom they themselves erect an altar (4.39.2). What would ordinarily be perceived as a mundane task has far higher connotations in *this* novel, given Eros' oversight (1.7.2).

At the end of the preface the narrator prays for *sōphrosynē* in his writing of the things of others (ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν, *praef.* 4). The reader's expectation is therefore aroused to the possibility of erotic detail which could verge on the explicit, especially given the subject of the preface.[102] At the points in the novel where explicitness might be expected, the narrator tends to revert to euphemism, thus disappointing any titillation-seeking narratee. This is especially evident in three places: the point in Book 1 at which Daphnis falls in love with Chloe (1.14–15), Daphnis' encounter with Lykainion (3.18) and the final section of the novel, the wedding night (4.40). The first two instances have been applied in Morgan's thesis to argue that this narrator has a less than insightful awareness of some of the events of the story. After Chloe's rescue of Daphnis from the wolf-pit by use of her unrolled breast-band (1.12.1), the cowherd Dorkon, who was on hand to help, brings to bear his full attention on Chloe. It is nowhere stated explicitly that Dorkon, as is apt for his name,[103] caught sight of the bare-breasted Chloe and for that reason amorously pursued her, but that is certainly the indubitable implication of 1.15.1:

> Δόρκων δὲ ὁ βουκόλος, ὁ τὸν Δάφνιν ἐκ τοῦ σιροῦ καὶ τὸν τράγον ἀνιμησάμενος, ἀρτιγένειος μειρακίσκος καὶ εἰδὼς ἔρωτος καὶ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα εὐθὺς μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἐρωτικῶς τῆς Χλόης διετέθη.
>
> The cowherd Dorkon, who had drawn Daphnis and the goat out of the pit, a young lad with his first beard already showing, who knew both the ways and the names of Eros, immediately from that very day had erotic feelings towards Chloe.

'The narrator says no more, either from obtuseness or from the *sophrosyne* for which he prayed in the prologue, but the author's reader can easily infer that Dorkon's glimpse of Chloe's innocently bared breasts was instrumental in his infatuation. Even his name tips the wink to the author's reader behind the narrator's back.'[104] It is indeed left to the

[100] Morgan (n. 1), 516.
[101] Morgan (n. 3), 156 (on 1.8.3): 'i) the narrator laughs at DC's rusticity; but ii) in so doing distances himself from the author, who knows that the shepherd is the analogue of Eros as supreme natural force (2.7.2).'
[102] The classic discussion of the novel's self-strategy for self-control is now Goldhill (n. 45), 1–45.
[103] Dorkon < δέρκομαι: Morgan (n. 2), 182.
[104] Morgan (n. 2), 182.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reader's discernment to read between the lines, as it were, but the details given make it very obvious why Dorkon was suddenly so interested. This is someone who has sexual experience, and it could not be emphasized more that it was *immediately*, *from that very day*, that he was so interested.[105] While no overt connection is made between cause and effect, the description of the readiness and experience of Dorkon as well as the repetition of the fact of his rescue of Daphnis (ὁ τὸν Δάφνιν ἐκ τοῦ σιροῦ) to remind the reader of the breast-band are so obviously suggestive that the narrator must himself be party to the layered game he embeds in his own narration. The narrator's prayer in the preface for such self-control in itself implies awareness of the full gambit of narratorial possibilities in *writing of the things of others*.[106] Ignorant he is not.

At 3.18 Daphnis receives his erotic *paidagōgia* from Lykainion. The rusticity and naivety of Daphnis is emphasized here by the narrator perhaps more than anywhere else.[107] This is the very point of ignorance that brought him such grief (specifically *aporia*—3.14.5), and his eagerness to be taught is satirized by the narrator as belonging to his rustic unsophistication (3.18.1–2):

οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησεν ὁ Δάφνις ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, ἀλλ' ἅτε ἄγροικος καὶ αἰπόλος καὶ ἐρῶν καὶ νέος, πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν καταπεσὼν τὴν Λυκαίνιον ἱκέτευεν ὅτι τάχιστα διδάξαι τὴν τέχνην, δι' ἧς ὃ βούλεται δράσει Χλόην· καὶ ὥσπερ τι μέγα καὶ θεόπεμπτον ἀληθῶς μέλλων διδάσκεσθαι καὶ ἔριφον αὐτῇ σηκίτην δώσειν ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ τυροὺς ἁπαλοὺς πρωτορρύτου γάλακτος καὶ τὴν αἶγα αὐτήν.

Daphnis could not control himself for pleasure, but inasmuch as he was a goatherd and in love and young, he fell before Lykainion's feet and begged her to teach him as quickly as possible the skill with which he could do to Chloe what he wanted. And as though he were about to be taught something great and truly heaven-sent he promised to give her a weaned goat and soft cheeses made from the rich milk and the she-goat herself.

Once the deed is performed, he is desperate to rush off and teach Chloe, given, as the narrator tells us, he still had a rustic outlook (ἔτι ποιμενικὴν γνώμην, 3.19.1). Rustic unsophistication is emphasized too by ἅτε ἄγροικος καὶ αἰπόλος (3.18.1), though not necessarily in a pejorative way, given its collocation with καὶ ἐρῶν καὶ νέος—we both smile at and pity Daphnis. The knowing superiority of both narrator and reader is brought to the fore as we witness the impossible naivety of Daphnis. Even the opening words of the excerpt above (οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησεν ὁ Δάφνις ὑφ' ἡδονῆς), which on one level describe the joy of Daphnis, imply a different pleasure (ἡδονή) which he cannot contain and he will shortly experience. Morgan draws attention to the Platonic idea behind the words ὥσπερ τι μέγα καὶ θεόπεμπτον ἀληθῶς μέλλων διδάσκεσθαι that 'Love truly is heavenly, both in this story and at large, and that what Daphnis is about to learn is the human aspect of the entire benevolent dispensation of Eros as outlined by Philetas'.[108] This is an allusion behind the narrator's back, according to Morgan.[109] The Lykainion episode brings into focus the two competing strands of the novel. On a human, realistic level, the quest of Daphnis and Chloe is laughable,

[105] Note the allusion to Pl. *Symp*. 207b in ἐρωτικῶς διετέθη, where the sexual instincts of animals are discussed (Morgan [n. 3], 163).

[106] See, above all, Goldhill (n. 45), 26–7.

[107] I do not engage here in the long debates about the episode's euphemistic details and the ending 'as for the rest, nature itself taught what had to be done' (3.18.4). The best discussion is still Goldhill (n. 45), 20–30.

[108] Morgan (n. 2), 184, who compares Pl. *Phdr*. 245b.

[109] Morgan (n. 3), 212 (on 3.18.2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Daphnis' naivety before Lykainion impossible. But on the mythical bucolic-literary level, where realism is suspended, Daphnis is being guided by the gods, and Lykainion is truly a heaven-sent instructor to direct him. The Platonic allusion points to the Socratic-like instruction he now receives given the previous emphasis on his *aporia* and lack of knowledge (3.14.5). We have already seen that the narrator promotes and idealizes the mythological over the real, and the bucolic over the New Comic/novelistic, and we should read here two layers of meaning put out by the narrator in full realization of these levels: the joke at Daphnis' expense, whereby we read from a position of reality, along with the narrator, and the promotion of the literary mainframe of the novel, whereby the unreal 'other' plays out to a conclusion.

It is unnecessary to see such layering as beyond the competence of the narrator. The two coexisting strands of the literal and the literary can be found at either end of the Lykainion episode. She gains Daphnis' attention by pretending that an eagle had snatched away one of her twenty geese, only for that goose to be dropped deep in the woods (3.16.2). This ploy has a broader literary significance, in that Penelope dreamed of twenty geese (the suitors) who were killed by an eagle (Odysseus) at *Od.* 19.535–50: the promiscuous courtesan-figure from New Comedy is framed in reference which recalls the most chaste of all women.[110] Lykainion's parting words to Daphnis are put in terms which evoke another famous female figure from the *Odyssey*. She says: καὶ μέμνησο ὅτι σε ἄνδρα ἐγὼ πρὸ Χλόης πεποίηκα ('And remember that I made you a man before Chloe did', 3.19.3). At the level of the plot's development, this is an entirely serious and accurate statement: Daphnis now knows the *erga* of Eros because Lykainion was the first to have sex with him, before Chloe. Yet, there is another Odyssean allusion here: at *Od.* 8.461–2, Nausicaa's final words to Odysseus are very similarly constructed:

> χαῖρε, ξεῖν', ἵνα καί ποτ' ἐὼν ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ
> μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ', ὅτι μοι πρώτῃ ζωάγρι' ὀφέλλεις.
>
> 'Goodbye, stranger. Sometime, when you're back in your homeland,
> remember me, that it is to me you owe first the price for your life.'

Nausicaa, the archetypal *parthenos* ready for marriage, is (perhaps comically) a figure for Lykainion's parting words to Daphnis. Both have done a service to their respective addressees, but with very differing physical interactions. Nausicaa is the young woman whom Odysseus flattered to get into the city, but with whom he carefully avoided any further involvement to ensure he got home to Penelope, a framework of experience the reverse of the roles of Daphnis the inexperienced and Lykainion the *praeceptor amoris.*

There is nothing to be gained from arguing that this intertextual layering is at an ignorant narrator's expense, but is rather in keeping with the comic tone of the narration of the Lykainion episode as a whole.[111] As argued on the basis of the narrator's self-characterization in the preface, the learning implied as embedded within the novel, as something Hellenistic and 'laboured forth' (ἐξεπονησάμην, *praef.* 3), is altogether to be expected of this narrator.

[110] Morgan (n. 3), 211 (on 3.16.2) has an excellent discussion.

[111] The Odyssean allusions arguably undercut attempts to read serious undertones in this episode, *contra* e.g. Winkler (n. 72).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

νήχεται δὲ ἄρα βοῦς ὅσον οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπος· μόνων λείπεται τῶν ἐνύδρων ὀρνίθων καὶ αὖ τῶν ἰχθύων· οὐδ' ἂν ἀπόλοιτο βοῦς νηχόμενος, εἰ μὴ τῶν χηλῶν οἱ ὄνυχες περιπέσοιεν διάβροχοι γενόμενοι. μαρτυροῦσι τῷ λόγῳ μέχρι νῦν πολλοὶ τόποι τῆς θαλάσσης, βοὸς πόροι λεγόμενοι.

An ox swims better even than a human. Only waterfowl and of course fish are superior. An ox would not perish swimming if it were not for the fact that their hoof-ends fall off when they become wet. Witness to this account are the many maritime places which to this day are called 'Bosporos'.

There is no easy solution to account for the absurd digression on oxen at 1.30.4. This article has attempted to demonstrate that the primary narrator of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* is an erudite, careful and artful character. There is nothing in the novel which suggests anything otherwise, except for this digression. The information in this excerpt bespeaks a laughably ignorant, foolish pedant. This passage is the cornerstone of Morgan's separation of author from less sophisticated narrator:[112] 'The absurdity of this has dismayed scholars, and even led to a proposal to delete the whole passage as a copyist's addition. However, there is no good reason to do so, and from our narratological viewpoint we can see that the joke is on the narrator himself, whose ridiculous pedantry distances him from the author and the best reader of the novel. Other discursive intrusions by the narrator lack the obvious irony of this one, but nevertheless position him as an eager purveyor of erudite detail from an urban perspective.'[113]

If we put Morgan's approach to the side, as I think we should, then either this passage is an interpolation, or the passage illustrates a narrator parodying, ironically, pseudo-scientific digressions common in the prose literature of the Early Empire. The passage is marked as an interpolation in Dalmeyda's 1934 Budé edition (following Castiglioni) but the *communis opinio* is that the text is indeed of Longus, defended above all by Reeve in his Teubner edition, who states that it reeks of Longus ('Longum sapit').[114] The language does indeed suggest Longus: if it were an interpolation it must have been by a very careful and early imitator of the novelist. If anything could lend weight to the idea of interpolation here, it would surely be the temporal marker μέχρι νῦν (which occurs only here in Longus), drawing the reader's attention to the moment of composition, in a novel which altogether avoids indication of its date.[115] This is very much out of keeping with the rest of the text. The temporal marker does, however, at the same time, point to a narrator who marks his own temporal existence outside of the novel, as he steps back from the fictional unreality momentarily. This intrusion points to a voice of an authorial reality, who physically produced the four books (*praef.* 3), and wrote them (γράφειν, *praef.* 4). It would be odd for a so-called hidden author to present the narrator in such *authorial* terms of physical reality only to undermine him.

[112] Morgan (n. 1), 517.

[113] The other long digression in the primary narrative is found at 2.1.4, on the nature of the low-growing vines in Lesbos. There is a short comment by the narrator on the fine quality of Lesbian wine at 4.10.3. Neither passage is comparable with the ridiculous content at 1.30.4.

[114] Reeve (n. 12), ad loc.

[115] Morgan (n. 3), 2: the novel puts forward 'a *mise en scène* in an idealized and chronologically indeterminate past'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The alternative solution is to read parody here of pseudo-scientific writings, most likely contemporary. In his newly published commentary on *Daphnis and Chloe*, Ewen Bowie settles for this explanation.[116] For him, Longus is mocking novelists such as Achilles Tatius and other contemporary authors for their fondness for such digressions. The reader is to see the nonsensical inaccuracy about the results of oxen that swim as just that, nonsense inserted for amusement. Contemporary readers would be very used to reading 'scientific' asides in other prose works. The irony at work here is targeted at authors of other texts and is not at this narrator's expense. The narrator relates Lykainion's education of Daphnis 'with a straight face', as it were; he is similarly straight-faced as he relates this seeming aetiology of *Bosporos*. This line of argumentation is at least plausible and would be worthy of an author who so carefully creates an alternative novel, one which plays with the conventions so forcefully. Yet, there is no other passage in Longus which so openly displays such a facile pose, if only to engage in literary parody. The passage is unique in Longus, for that reason.

In his apparatus criticus, Reeve writes 'utinam recte' of Castiglioni's argument for interpolation. It would indeed be the easiest way to deal with a most unusual passage. Bowie's explanation is surely the only realistic one, however. What must be denied is an interpretation that wants to separate a naive, foolish narrator from a mocking author. The evidence in the rest of the novel points to a very different type of narrator, and this digression must be approached from that standpoint.

University of Edinburgh CALUM A. MACIVER
calum.maciver@ed.ac.uk

[116] E.L. Bowie, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 2019), on 1.30.6, where he notes, too, the other similar uses of μαρτυρεῖν in both Longus and Achilles Tatius, both of whom seem to be imitating Herodotus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000695 Published online by Cambridge University Press