LONGUS

DAPHNIS AND CHLOE

EDITED BY EWEN BOWIE

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

LONGUS

DAPHNIS AND CHLOE

EDITED BY

EWEN BOWIE
Emeritus E. P. Warren Praelector and Fellow in Classics,
Corpus Christi College, Oxford
Emeritus Professor of Classical Languages and Literature,
University of Oxford

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS

v

PREFACE

This edition and commentary have gestated for far too long – more than three decades. During that period John Morgan published an excellent commentary in the Aris & Phillips series (2004). Its close and sensitive attention to narratological aspects of *Daphnis and Chloe* is something I do not attempt to match; but neither it nor other recent commentaries (Schönberger 1998 [1960], Pattoni 2005, Byrne and Cueva 2005, Cikán and Danek 2018) have given close attention to Longus' language, and I hope that this commentary will be useful to readers of *Daphnis and Chloe* who are interested in the novel's language and style, and in how these relate to those of other Greek writers of the Roman imperial period. I am well aware that much more work remains to be done on this question.

Over the years that I have been preparing this commentary I have benefited from help of many sorts from colleagues and pupils. Pat Easterling, who kindly invited me to write the commentary for the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series, offered valuable observations on an early draft, and the current dedicated and sharp-eyed Greek Editors, Richard Hunter and Neil Hopkinson, have made many helpful suggestions, saved me from numerous blunders, and rendered the commentary leaner and fitter for purpose. I am also extremely grateful to the Press's copy-editor, Anna Oxbury, who rooted out a huge number of errors of various sorts. Among the many others who have helped me in various ways I would especially like to thank Lucia Athanassaki, David Blank, Lizianna Delveroudi, Arik Dondi, Stephen Harrison, Elizabeth Irwin, Daniel Jolowicz, Anna Lefteratou, Hugh Mason, John Morgan, Zahra Newby, John Petropoulos, Alexia Petsalis-Diomidis, Bryan Reardon, Michael Reeve, Ian Repath, Caroline Spearing, and Tim Whitmarsh; but I am very conscious of the great benefits I have derived from discussions with many others.

Rethymno
November, 2018

vii

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the commentary:

C.   Chloe
D.   Daphnis

Sappho and Alcaeus are cited in the numeration of E.-M. Voigt (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam 1971, taken over by D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric*, vol. 1, Cambridge, MA and London 1982, except where superseded by new evidence: *P. Sapph. Obbink* is cited from Bierl and Lardinois 2016. Abbreviations of names of ancient authors and works are largely those of LSJ (Liddell–Scott–Jones) or the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, with the following exceptions:

Aes.   Aeschylus
Ch.   Chariton
EA   *Epitaphios Adonidos*
Jos.   Josephus
L.   Longus
QC   *Quaestiones convivales*
Rep.   *Republic*
Virg.   Virgil
Vit.Aesop. *Vita Aesopi* G (*recensio* 1) in B. E. Perry, *Aesopica*, vol. 1, Urbana 1952, 55–77
X.Eph.   Xenophon of Ephesus

Modern works cited by author and date only are listed in the Bibliography. Abbreviations of journals are those of *L'Année philologique*, and of other modern works those of LSJ (Liddell–Scott–Jones) or the *OCD*, with the following exceptions:

Bull.Épigr   *Revue des études grecques, Bulletin Épigraphique.*
Coderch   Coderch, J., *Classical Greek: a new grammar*, South Carolina 2012.
Denniston *GP*   Denniston, J. D., *The Greek particles*, 2nd edn, Oxford 1954.
FdD   *Fouilles de Delphes*, vol. III. *Épigraphie*, Paris 1909–.
FGE   Page, D. L. *Further Greek epigrams: epigrams before* A.D. 50 *from the Greek Anthology and other sources not included in 'Hellenistic epigrams' or 'The Garland of Philip'*, revised and prepared for publication by R. D. Dawe and J. Diggle, Cambridge 1981.

Goodwin	Goodwin, W. W., *A Greek grammar*, London and New York 1894.
GP	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds.), *The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams*, Cambridge 1968.
HE	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (eds.), *The Greek anthology: Hellenistic epigrams*, Cambridge 1965.
*IAph*2007	Reynolds, J. M., Roueché, C. M., and Bodard, G., *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias*, 2007, available at http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/
IArycanda	Şahin, S. (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Arykanda* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. XXXXVIII), Bonn 1994.
IEph	Wankel, H., Engelmann, H., and Nollé, J. (eds.), *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vols. XI–), Bonn 1979–.
IGUR	Moretti, L. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, Rome 1968–.
IKios	Corsten, T. (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Kios* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. XXIX), Bonn 1985.
IParion	Frisch, P. (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Parion* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. XXV), Bonn 1983.
IPergamon	Fraenkel, M., Habicht, C., and Wörrle, M. (eds.), *Die Inschriften von Pergamon: Altertümer von Pergamon* vol. VIII, Berlin 1890 –.
IPriene	Hiller von Gaertringen, F. *et al.* (eds.), *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906.
IStratoniceia	Şahin, M. Ç. (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vols. XXI–XXIII), Bonn 1981–90.
ITralles	Poliakov, F. (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Tralles* (*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. XXXVI), Bonn 1989.
K–A	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.), *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin 1983–2001.
Kaibel	Kaibel, G. (ed.), *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin 1878.
Kühner–Gerth	Kühner, R. and Gerth, B., *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, I–II, 3rd edn, Hanover 1890–1904.
LGPN	Fraser, P. M., Matthews, E., Catling, R. *et al.* (eds.), *A lexicon of Greek personal names*, Oxford 1987–.
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Stuart Jones, H. and Mackenzie, R. (eds.), *A Greek–English lexicon*, 9th edn, Oxford 1968. Revised supplement, ed. P. G. W. Glare, Oxford 1996.

*OCD*⁴   *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edn. General editors S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, assistant editor E. Eidinow. Oxford 2012.

PDublin   *Trinity College Dublin papyri.* inv. C 3v (= Meertens–Pack, 3rd edn, 02621.000).

*PIR*²   Groag, E., Stein, A. *et al.* (eds.), *Prosopographia imperii Romani*, 2nd edn, Berlin 1933–2015.

PObbink   Obbink, D., 'The newest Sappho: text, apparatus criticus, and translation', in A. Bierl and A. Lardinois (eds.), *The newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, frs. 1–4. Studies in archaic and classical Greek song*, vol. ii, Leiden and Boston 2016, 13–33.

TGrF   Snell, B., Kannicht, R., and Radt, S. (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971–2004.

INTRODUCTION

1 THE TEXT AND THE STORY

Two Greek manuscripts, one of them written in the second half of the thirteenth century and now in Florence (F),[1] the other written in the first quarter of the sixteenth century and now in the Vatican (V), preserve a text they entitle Longus' *Shepherd Tales concerning Daphnis and Chloe*: Λόγγου ποιμενικῶν τῶν κατὰ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλόην (V), Λόγου [sic] ποιμενικῶν περὶ Δάφνιν καὶ Χλόην (F). Like three other texts in F, those of Xenophon, Chariton, and Achilles Tatius, Longus' work *prima facie* belongs to the literary form which we now call 'novel' or 'romance', but which apparently had no ancient generic name.

Longus, however, is very different from these other novels in two important ways. First, he miniaturises the setting and plot. In the other novels, and in the later novel of Heliodorus, a teenage couple fall in love and then for diverse reasons are launched on travels around the eastern Mediterranean Greek world and beyond, travels in which they are soon separated and survive pirates, shipwreck, and other near-death situations, as well as the attentions of ardent and powerful suitors, fired by their stunning beauty. Only at the work's end are they reunited and able to resume or achieve marital union. In *Daphnis and Chloe*, by contrast, the narrative begins with the couple's exposure as babies by their élite parents, and it is set almost entirely in the pastoral hinterland of a single city on Lesbos, Mytilene – apart from a short-lived kidnapping of Chloe by Methymnans which takes her some 20 miles further north, an even briefer kidnapping of Daphnis by pirates, and a short period in Mytilene itself. Its major theme is the children's implausibly slow discovery of ἔρως, sex, as they enter puberty, herding the goats and sheep for which their pastoral foster-parents are responsible. Relocation in distant and often non-Greek lands is replaced by the intensely described cycle of the seasons over two years: during that period the attempt of a cowherd Dorcon to get Chloe for himself, a discourse on the nature and power of Eros by the retired cowherd Philetas, and a practical lesson in the sexual act given to Daphnis by a city-girl Lycaenion, combine to advance the couple's (and especially Daphnis') understanding, so that by the time of their wedding at the end of the fourth and last book Daphnis is able to teach Chloe what he has learned.

---

[1] For the problems of using F, both difficult to read and peppered with errors of all sorts, see Reeve 1982: xi–xii and (for Chariton) Reardon 2004: xii. For the hypothesis that its archetype was dictated, not copied, see Kaïris 1932: 34–6, Biraud 2017: 239.

2 LONGUS' POETIC INTERTEXTS

The second way in which Longus differs significantly from other novelists
is that in constructing his couple's universe Longus makes extensive use
of the bucolic world best known – to ancient as to modern readers – from
Theocritus' poetry. Longus knew bucolic poems composed by Theocritus
in the first half of the third century BC and other poems which were prob-
ably already circulating as part of the Theocritean corpus in his time,
as indeed they are transmitted among genuine works of Theocritus by
our medieval manuscripts. He also knew the bucolic poetry of Moschus
and Bion. Especially influential on Longus was the first poem in ancient
editions of Theocritus, *Idyll* 1, in which a shepherd Thyrsis sings to an
unnamed goatherd his famous song *The pains of Daphnis* (τὰ Δάφνιδος
ἄλγεα) – a song about the death of a mythical cowherd Daphnis, a death
that is mysteriously the consequence of his desire, ἔρως. Longus also knew
Idyll 6, a friendly singing contest between two youthful cowherds, Daphnis
and Damoetas, that ends with them kissing, and *Idyll* 27, perhaps but not
certainly non-Theocritean, in which a cowherd Daphnis seduces a not
wholly unwilling girl. Longus relocates the Theocritean pastoral world
from Sicily, south Italy and Cos to Lesbos – where in the generation
before Theocritus a pastoral world may already have been situated by
the influential but largely lost poetry of Philitas of Cos, perhaps evoked
by his naming his wise old cowherd and ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος Philetas – and
he repeatedly alludes to it in general and refashions particular passages.
But he makes two significant changes. First, Longus' young herdsman
Daphnis looks after goats, not cows, and this allows a persistent symmetry
between him and the girl two years his junior, Chloe, who herds sheep.
Among many cases of intertextuality with Theocritus that Longus will
have expected educated readers to appreciate, and which are noted in the
commentary, is the foster-parents' decision to call the baby they had dis-
covered 'Daphnis' 'so that the baby's name might seem pastoral' (1.3.2)
and his foster-father Lamon's claim that he was sung the myth of Syrinx
by 'a Sicilian goatherd for the payment of a he-goat and a syrinx' (2.33.3,
a clear reference to the herdsmen of *Idyll* 1). Second, Theocritean char-
acters' experiences of ἔρως have predominantly unhappy outcomes, with
Idyll 27, if by Theocritus, a striking exception. By contrast Longus, like
the other novelists, allows his young couple's trials to conclude with their
living happily ever after.

   Longus enriches the pastoral world based on these Theocritean
refashionings by drawing on Hellenistic and early imperial epigram.
Some epigrammatists favoured scenes from pastoral life, and indeed
Theocritus himself composed epigrams. Longus' knowledge of epigram
ranges from apparent reworking of poems – e.g. that of Myrinus at 1.11.2

(*Anth.Pal.* 7.703 = *GP* 2768–73) – to picking out and re-contextualising striking phrases, such as the description of prostitutes as τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης by (?) Asclepiades (*Anth.Pal.* 5.161.5 = *HE* 1000 = 40 Sens), arguably fused at the end of Book 1 (1.32.4n.) with Meleager's book-end "Ἔρωτος ὅρα, ξεῖνε, μιαιφονίαν" (*Anth.Pal.* 5.215 = *HE* 4277). Several other epigrammatists, especially of the imperial period, may be drawn upon for thematic or lexical details.[2]

The epigrams and other works of another major Hellenistic poet, Callimachus, seem also to have an impact on Longus. The ἕλκος of 1.14.1n. may echo the figurative ἕλκος of Callimachus, *Anth.Pal.* 12.134.1 (= *HE* 1103), the simultaneous death of two siblings at 4.24.2n. that lamented in *Anth.Pal.* 7.517 (= *HE* 1193–8). Longus' ἕλκος comes shortly before his first use of ἀρτιγένειος (1.15.1n.), a term perhaps drawn from the *Aitia*. Some other details (ἐπτοηθεῖσαι 1.22.2 ~ πτοιηθεὶς ὑπ' ἔρωτι *Hymn to Artemis* 191, κατὰ πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν 2.18.1 ~ πολλὰ δ' ἀσυχία *Hymn to Athena* 72–4) and the recondite myth of Branchus (4.17.6 cf. Call. fr. 229 Pfeiffer) may also come from Longus' reading of Callimachus. We may then wonder if Longus' four-book work exploring the αἴτια of ἔρως in some way reflects Callimachus' four-book *Aitia*, which open with Hesiod shepherding on Helicon, and if his description of its opening painting as ἱστορία ἔρωτος is a nod to Callimachus calling his novel-like story of Acontius and Cydippe a ἱστορία (fr. 75.7 Pfeiffer).

Shepherds were one feature of the famous seventh/sixth-century BC poet from Lesbos, Sappho, that caught Longus' eye (see 3.33.4–34n.). But her chief claim on his attention was her incomparable primacy as poet of desire, ἔρως, and Longus' recurrent verbal echoes of her much-read poetry, as well as some, albeit fewer, echoes of her contemporary from Mytilene, Alcaeus (see 3.31–3n.), give depth to his depiction of Lesbos as a place especially fitting for a narrative of ἔρως. In the commentary some 30 places are noted where Longus evokes Sappho, from the trees, flowers, and water of his preface's ἄλσος (picking up those of Sappho fr. 2) to the evocation of the phrase 'so that we may see less sleep than the

---

[2] See the commentary for Longus' possible exploitation of Adaeus at 2.20.1, Antipater of Sidon at 2.6.2, Antipater of Thessalonice at 2.1.2, Antiphanes at 3.34.2, Anyte at 1.14.4, 4.19.4, Archias at 2.4.1, Asclepiades at 1.32.4, Bassus at 4.7.1, Bianor at 4.13.1, Callimachus at 1.14.1, 4.24.2, Crinagoras at 4.16.3, Diodorus at 1.8.2, 13.2, 15.1, Erucius at 1.11.1, 12.1, Euenus at 1.25.3, 26.1, Hadrian at 2.31.3, 3.23.4, Heraclitus at 4.8.1, Leonidas at 1.4.3, 29.2, 31.3, 2.31.3, 3.12.1–2, 4.26.2, Lucian at 4.11.2, Lucillius at 2.37.3, Maccius at 1.32.4, 2.1.1, Meleager at 1.13.2, 6, 3.18.4, 23.4, 4.13.1, Myrinus at 1.11.2, 4.39.2, Philip at 1.2.1, 21.3, 2.34.1, Philodemus at 1.25.1, 4.14.1, [Plato] at 1.30.1, 2.39.3, Rufinus at 1.17.3, 30.1, 32.4, Scaevola at 1.9.1, Simonides at 3.5.1, 4.8.1, Thallus at 3.5.1. Several epigrammatists may have influenced Longus at 1.14.3.

clear-voiced bird' (Sappho fr. 30.8–9) in his last sentence (4.40.3).[3] In one case (1.17.3) allusion to a passage in Theocritus *Idyll* 11 that itself alludes to Sappho enables Longus to construct an archaic Lesbian pedigree for his own characters' language. Alcaeus is less prominent, but is arguably drawn upon on some 14 occasions.[4] If we had complete texts of the early Lesbian poets it is likely we would see many more echoes, though it is unlikely to be accidental that many passages of their poetry apparently known to Longus were also known to imperial Greek readers.[5]

Many other poets are of course evoked in different ways. Some details of Longus' presentation of Eros seem to derive, though perhaps not directly, from Ibycus and Anacreon, just as the name Daphnis goes back to Stesichorus. Aristophanic comedy contributes much to Longus' lexicon, especially, but not only, in describing the countryside. Menander's *Epitrepontes* is among the ancestors of Longus' exposure plot; the leisured Methymnan youths of Book 2 and the parasite Gnathon of Book 4 are both drawn to some extent from New Comedy.

When we turn to the two highest genres of poetry, epic and tragedy, the picture becomes more complex. The *Odyssey*, the chief ancestor of the other novels, and Greek poetry's earliest presenter of a noble rustic in the important figure of Eumaeus, is evoked with only occasional hints that Longus' characters move in a different world.[6] Some allusions to the *Iliad*, on the other hand,[7] above all in similes, draw attention to the distance between the events on Lesbos and the battles on the plain of Troy, though on a lexical level a huge number of words in Longus are first found in the *Iliad*. And in the case of tragedy the difference between the tragic world and that of *Daphnis and Chloe* is suggested even more strongly, whether by evocations of canonical tragic cases of ἔρως whose outcome was disastrous (e.g. Sophocles, *Antigone* 787–9 and Euripides, *Hippolytus* 528–9 at pr. 4; *Hippolytus* 135–7 and 275 at 1.13.6), by the use of a tragic intertext to give a humorous slant to a character's words or actions (e.g. Sophocles, *Ajax* 462–4 at 2.22.3), or by the punning phrase τραγικὴ δυσωδία at 4.17.2. Such sorts of evocation can be seen to contribute to a recurrent feature of Longus' text,[8] an implicit insistence that, however its motifs and words may be related to those found in epic and tragedy, the bucolic novel

---

[3] For reworkings or evocations of Sappho see the commentary on pr. 1, 4; 1.2.3, 13.5–6, 14.1, 16.1, 17.2–3, 18.1–2, 22.2, 26.1, 27.1, 32.4; 2.2.6, 7.5, 20.3, 30.1; 3.1.2, 12.4, 33.4–34.1; 4.8.1, 13.1, 33.4, 40.2–3.

[4] See the commentary on 1.2.3, 9.1, 20.3, 22.3, 26.1, 28.2; 2.3.1, 14.2, 15.1, 25.2; 3.3.1–3, 12.1, 4; 4.18.3.

[5] Cf. e.g. 3.33.4n., 4.40.3n.

[6] Cf. e.g. 4.13.2n.

[7] Cf. e.g. 4.34.3n.

[8] See Bowie 2003, 2007.

presents a happier universe than they did, as also than did Theocritean pastoral.

3 LONGUS' EXPLOITATION OF EARLIER PROSE TEXTS

Longus' repeated use of all these earlier poetic texts – Theocritus, epigram, Callimachus, Sappho, and Alcaeus – sets him apart from his novelistic predecessors, even from the often allusive Achilles Tatius. But another prose text is much exploited by both novelists: Plato's dialogue *Phaedrus*, in which Socrates unusually leaves the city of Athens for the *locus amoenus* of the Ilissus valley, just outside its walls, and there exchanges speeches on ἔρως with Phaedrus.[9] Also predictably reworked by both is Plato's other dialogue on ἔρως, the *Symposium* (e.g. 1.15.1n., 2.5.2n.), whose great speech by Diotima is one of the ancestors of Philetas' speech in Book 2.[10] This exploitation of Plato brings Longus closer to Achilles Tatius than to any of his known predecessors, though Heliodorus, who is certainly later, has much Platonic material.

Other canonical texts had contributed to the novel ever since its earliest surviving writer – and perhaps its inventor – Chariton:[11] Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. Longus too draws repeatedly on all these. Most striking in stylistic terms is his switch to a different, albeit not quite Thucydidean, style for his narrative of the Methymnan navy's abduction of Chloe and of the war that never happened between Mytilene and Methymna (2.20–9; 3.1.1–3.1).

Longus thus sets himself in a tradition of Greek literature that by his time was almost a thousand years old. But just as he ostentatiously refashions Theocritean bucolic, so too in several places he invites us to appreciate his reworking of earlier novels. Already in the preface his account of the Nymphs' grove whose paintings constitute his own story takes readers to Achilles Tatius' anonymous narrator's encounter with his protagonist Cleitophon in front of a painting in or near Astarte's precinct at Sidon, and they are brought back to that painting by Longus' description of the Nymphs themselves (1.4.2n.).[12] Longus' gardens evoke those of Achilles Tatius (1.1.5, 1.15), while his miniature pseudo-scientific excursuses poke fun at Achilles' longer digressions, and Longus upstages him

---

[9] See pr.n., 1.22.4n., 1.25.1n., 4.23.1n., Ach.Tat. 1.2.3.
[10] For arguments in favour of extensive and constructive intertextuality with both *Phaedrus* and *Symposium* see Repath 2011.
[11] For a powerful case for the invention of the novel by Chariton see Tilg 2010.
[12] For the evidence for dating Achilles Tatius to the first half of the second century see below §11 with n. 47.

by providing a more appropriate context for his tale of Syrinx (2.34; cf. Ach.Tat. 8.6.7–11).[13]

The other novelist predecessor whom Longus certainly evokes is Chariton. The clearest case is the phrase ταχείας δὲ φήμης at 4.25.3: φήμη is a major player in Chariton's narrative, appearing 15 times, three of these with the epithet ταχεῖα (2.3.8, 3.3.2, 3.4.1);[14] the word φήμη never appears in Xenophon of Ephesus or Heliodorus. Longus asks us to set his climactic recognition scene of Daphnis and his father Dionysophanes at 4.20–5 alongside Chariton's recognition scenes of Chaereas and Callirhoe and of Chaereas and his father in Syracuse. Longus gestures in a different way to Chariton by introducing Tyrian pirates (Τύριοι λησταί, the reading of V) who kidnap Daphnis (1.28.1) using a light Carian boat (Καρικὴν ἔχοντες ἡμιολίαν). He thus reminds his readers that they should read his work in the novelistic tradition, descending ultimately from the *Odyssey*, in which Phoenician pirates made regular appearances; and at the same time, by mentioning Carians, that Chariton, the earliest Greek novelist known to us, was from Caria's great city, Aphrodisias.

Any reference to Aphrodisias' other novelist, Antonius Diogenes, probably also of the mid-first century, is harder to establish; but since alone of the other novelists known to us he seems likely to have stated at the beginning of his work its length in books (a massive 24), Longus' advertisement in his preface of a four-book work may both allude to and stress contrast with Antonius' *The incredible things beyond Thule*. The other blockbuster novel attested, Iamblichus' late-second century *Babyloniaca*, may be evoked by the detail of Chloe's bra being used to rescue Daphnis from the wolf-pit (1.12.4–5), perhaps reworking a scene in which Iamblichus' heroine Sinonis cut her long hair so that it could be used to winch up water.[15] As for the other first-century novel to survive, Xenophon's *Anthia and Habrocomes*, two phrases close together in Book 4 may suggest that Longus knew it: at 4.23.1 πλῆθος ἐπέρρει, used at Xenophon 5.7.3, and 4.24.1 χρόνου διελθόντος ὀλίγου, used at Xenophon 1.10.3 (cf. χρόνου διελθόντος at 5.7.1) but nowhere else in the novels. It is therefore possible that the γραφή narrating all Xenophon's couple's adventures that accompanied their dedications in the Artemisium on their return to Ephesus (5.15.1) played some part in Longus' imagining a love story narrated in dedicatory paintings in a shrine on the island of Lesbos.

---

[13] For fuller discussion of these and other evocations of Achilles Tatius by Longus see Whitmarsh 2018: 125–9.

[14] For φήμη in Chariton see Tilg 2010: 240–70, Hardie 2012: 115–16.

[15] Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 94, 74b9–10; cf. 1.12.4n.

4 POETIC ELEMENTS IN LONGUS' PROSE?

Longus, then, asks to be read against at least two traditions, that of pasto-ral poetry and that of prose narrative fiction. His style too has been seen by some as balanced between poetry and prose. Moving away from the Herodotean and Xenophontic λέξις εἰρομένη of Chariton of Aphrodisias and Xenophon of Ephesus, Longus' recurrent exploitation of short par-allel κῶλα (see further below §8), especially for descriptions of landscapes and seasons, puts him closer to Achilles Tatius. This style, descended ulti-mately from that of the fifth-century BC sophist Gorgias, categorised by Cicero in the first century BC as one variety of 'Asianism', and described by Philostratus in the third century AD as 'Ionian', was much used in the epideictic oratory of the imperial period, especially for 'laments'/θρῆνοι: one of our best examples is Aelius Aristides' μονωιδία of ca. AD 177 for earthquake-struck Smyrna (*Or.* 18). It can also be found in the writings of Aelian (ca. AD 190–230) and of Philostratus himself (ca. AD 190–250). Following the lead of Gorgias, Longus repeatedly builds up longer units from two or three short κῶλα often of equal length, often rhyming, some-times alliterative, sometimes combined with other linguistic games. But whether or not Longus saw this style as poetic is harder to tell. Such works as Aristides' μονωιδία fulfilled a function earlier more commonly served by poetry, but the other places we find this style did not, and some works that set out to replace poetry, like Aristides' prose hymns, did not adopt this style at all. Tempting though it is to set out a translation as if what Longus wrote were lines of poetry, as was done, for example, by Hägg, McCail and Cikán,[16] this may not be the impression that Longus was trying to give.

That doubt is reinforced by the low proportion of words that are clearly poetic in a general sense. Valley 1926 greatly exaggerated the number of words that to a second- or third-century reader would have seemed poetic. Much of Longus' vocabulary is indeed first documented in archaic and classical poetry, but in the five hundred or so years since the deaths of Demosthenes and Alexander many of these words had become com-mon in prose. Other cases in Valley's lists are of words whose function in Longus' narrative is to take the reader to a particular poetic intertext, i.e. they signal his reworking in prose of a detail he can expect his readers to recognise from poetry.[17]

---

[16] Hägg 1983: 37–8, McCail 2002: 3–4, 11–12, etc., Cikán and Danek 2018. A case is made for the strong presence of poetic rhythms based on both the quantitative and the accentual system by Biraud 2017, arguing in particular for the use of traditional quantitative rhythms to give a poetic aura to Philetas' speech in Book 2.

[17] See Bowie 2017.

In purely lexical terms, then, Longus offers a narrative whose medium is prose, of the semi-Atticist sort that some contemporaries, e.g. Lucian, also wrote. Linguistic 'Atticism', the attempt to limit vocabulary (and in some cases syntax) to what could be documented in classical Attic prose, seems to begin under Hadrian[18] and to have gathered pace in the second century AD, partly because it was favoured by the influential magnate and sophist Herodes Atticus and some of his many pupils. Its importance can be judged from the number of Atticist lexica that were written, e.g. two by Phrynichus (published between the late 140s and early 180s) and one by Moeris (whose date is later but uncertain). Quite often Longus chooses a form approved by one of these lexica or found in the less rigorous and more comprehensive lists of acceptable words offered by Pollux, a close contemporary of Phrynichus: some examples are discussed below in §9. Often, however, he seems to ignore their restrictions, and a very large number of his words or usages are first found in Hellenistic or imperial Greek writers.[19]

5 RELIGION

The narrator we encounter in the preface presents himself as sincerely religious. Although he presents hunting as his reason for being in the part of Lesbos where the grove of the Nymphs is located, he too visits that grove, like others who come to admire its painting and to supplicate the Nymphs, he prays for σωφροσύνη in his writing about others' ἔρως, and he figuratively dedicates his work to the divinities Eros, the Nymphs and Pan. That request to be σώφρων can be taken in different ways. On one hand it sets Longus' narrator apart from those who took their religion to excess, like the δεισιδαίμων of Theophrastus of Lesbos, or like Hippolytus with his total commitment to Artemis and chastity in the Euripidean play whose chorus' similar request (528–9) is evoked here. But more obviously it presents the narrator as keen to resist the power of Eros about which he writes, recalling likewise the claim of Hippolytus (like the narrator, a hunter) to be σώφρων.[20] But unlike Achilles Tatius' anonymous narrator (1.2.1), Longus' does not advertise himself explicitly as ἐρωτικός, nor does he focus so much on the erotic qualities of the painting, for all that he describes its content as πάντα ἐρωτικά. Only as his narrative proceeds will readers encounter descriptions of the couple's discovery of sex that hint

[18] See Kim 2017, *contra* Dihle 2011, who claimed linguistic Atticism already for Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the later first century BC.

[19] These are tabulated and discussed in Bowie 2019.

[20] E.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 1007, 1035.

at a voyeuristic narrator who is far from σώφρων.[21] In the preface, how-ever, he is a connoisseur of art: the painting's κάλλος is as important to him as worshipping the Nymphs, appropriately in a work exploring the link between ἔρως and the perception of human κάλλος, a work that itself strives for κάλλος in writing.

The close association of Eros with the Nymphs and Pan, not found in cult in the historical Greek world, reflects the fusion Longus offers between the prose literature of ἔρως – the novels – and the rural world of pastoral. Some cults of Pan and caves of the Nymphs could be found in cities, often together, but the great majority of these cults were in rural locations, as too were myths concerning them.[22] Few places had an official cult of Eros, and the best known, that at Thespiae, was a city cult with a major festival, the *Erotidia*. Likewise in *Daphnis and Chloe* cult of Eros is not prominent. We only discover at the end of Book 4 that the couple's grate-ful commemoration of their happy-ending experiences included an altar of 'Eros the Shepherd' (Ποιμένος Ἔρωτος, 4.39.2), which must be assumed to be in or near the preface's grove of the Nymphs if the cave and images (εἰκόνας) of 4.39.2 are indeed the same as those of the preface and 1.4: but the preface says nothing of it.

Eros' function is not to receive cult but to act as a script-writer for the plot, prescribing a herding life for the couple when they reach puberty (1.7), catalysing their perception of ἔρως by having Daphnis tumble into a wolf-trapping pit (1.11–13), and acting as their invisible shepherd (2.5.4). Eros manifests himself to Philetas in his garden, but never to Daphnis and Chloe. Their communication with the divine is always with the Nymphs, and always in dreams, as too are the instructions given to their foster-fathers (1.7.2) and to Daphnis' real father Dionysophanes (4.34). It is by making regular offerings to the Nymphs that the couple display their piety. Only after Chloe's abduction does Daphnis discover from the Nymphs (again in a dream) that they have wrongly been neglecting Pan, but that the Nymphs have already asked him to save her (2.23.2–4).

From that point Pan, in Book 1 only a semi-mythical goatish god to whom Daphnis compares himself (1.16.3) and a cameo character in the tale of Phatta (1.27), becomes an agent in the narrative, terrifying the Methymnans so that they release Chloe. It is only after this that Pan receives cult from the couple – first and most strikingly the sacrifice of a billy-goat that Daphnis has promised in one of the very rare vows in the extant corpus of the novels.[23] That cult culminates in construction of a

---

[21] See Goldhill 1995: 8.
[22] Larson 2001: esp. 96–8 on joint cults of the Nymphs and Pan.
[23] Bowie 2012b.

temple of 'Pan the Soldier' (Πὰν Στρατιώτης) to house the cult-image that
had previously stood under a pine tree (4.39.2). Other than his crucial
intervention to save Chloe, Pan's only appearances are in the three inset
tales (2.27, 2.34, 3.23), where he represents a self-assertive male sexuality
that Daphnis neither aspires to nor imitates.

  In the narrator's religious universe, then, the stage-managing func-
tion which Chariton gave to Aphrodite is divided between Eros (always
kept well in the background) and the Nymphs: Pan responds to the
latter's appeal on Chloe's behalf, but he has no direct connection with
Eros, except in so far as in the mythical world of the inset tales (picked
up by Chloe in her rejection of an oath Daphnis offers to swear by Pan,
2.39.2–3), he is himself an extreme case of the ἐρωτικός. That, we are to
imagine, is why Philetas calls on him for help in his unsuccessful pursuit
of Amaryllis (2.7.6).

  Quite different from the rural Nymphs and Pan are Dionysus and
Demeter, in the real world gods who had major civic cults both in cities
and in their agricultural territories. Demeter appears only once, when on
the first day of his inspection of his estates Dionysophanes sacrifices to her
along with Dionysus, Pan, and the Nymphs as gods who preside over the
countryside (ὅσοι προεστᾶσιν ἀγροικίας, 4.13.3). This description conceals
the marginal role of Pan and the Nymphs in Dionysophanes' world and
of Demeter and Dionysus in that of the couple. For them Demeter has
no claim to cult, even if they eat bread made from grain grown some-
where on their master's estates (cf. 1.1.2 πεδία πυροφόρα). Dionysus has
more impact. Like all workers on Dionysophanes' estate, Daphnis and
Chloe are needed for the labour-intensive vintage, and their participa-
tion in the festival marking its completion allows men verbally to harass
Chloe and women to kiss Daphnis, a mark for readers of the couple's very
slowly advancing understanding of sexuality (2.2.1–2). Dionysus is also
celebrated in a mid-winter feast in Dryas' house (3.9.2–10.2), with the
unusual sacrifice of a ram symbolising the transplantation of a major civic
festival (where oxen were sacrificed) to the pastoral world. Like the vin-
tage festival, it is an opportunity for kissing – by now for the couple to kiss
each other (3.10.3) – but Dionysus has no active role in making this pos-
sible. Only in Book 4 does he acquire greater importance. We now hear
for the first time of his temple in the ornamental garden (παράδεισος)
that Lamon and Daphnis tend for their master Dionysophanes, whose
name adequately explains why it is Dionysus that he particularly worships.
But though the temple offers a location for Gnathon first to supplicate
Astylus to let him have Daphnis (4.16–17) and then to take refuge after
his assault on him has been revealed (4.25.2), Dionysus, so active in his
temple's paintings (4.3.2), never intervenes in the narrator's story, nor
is he given any credit in the dedications at its end. These paintings have

him accompanied by dancing maenads (Βάκχαι χορεύουσαι), not by the nymphs so often found with him in art and literature (e.g. Anacreon fr. 357 *PMG*). These nymphs have become the fellow-workers of Pan, despite *his* common representation in art and myth (as in Longus' inset tales) as their chief sexual predator.

The religious edifice makes sense within Longus' work, and much of it is built upon historical religious practices and perceptions, but overall its *assemblage* is unhistorical – though no more unhistorical than Dionysius' personal temple of Aphrodite in Chariton or the soundless procession to the Ephesian Artemisium in Xenophon.[24] In *Daphnis and Chloe* the roles of Eros, the Nymphs, and Pan are clearly distinguished, and despite Philetas' praise of Eros as the supreme mover in the universe he remains quite distinct from other divinities. There is no good reason to see Eros and Dionysus as two aspects of the same divine force,[25] nor to read the whole work as a coded text fully intelligible only to initiates in Dionysiac mysteries.[26]

6 CITY AND COUNTRY

Longus offers an idealised, city-dweller's version of rural life. Long hours of hard work and seasonal deprivations are played down, the couple's goats and sheep only need close attention when there is an emergency (nothing, for example, is said of shearing, or of tending sick or maimed animals), and only in winter does inclement weather enforce an idleness different, at least for Daphnis and Chloe, from their apparently quite leisurely herding from spring to autumn. That idealisation involves attribution to country folk of more virtuous codes of conduct than those that pertain in the corrupt city. This is already the case in Dio of Prusa's *Euboean Tale* (*Or.* 7), where the shipwrecked narrator encounters a simple family whose standards are in clear contrast to those of the nearby city – an extended family in which the love and marriage of two of its young members may have been one of the stimuli for Longus' novel.[27] It is also found in Philostratus' *Heroicus* and, with considerable qualifications, in Aelian's *Rustic letters.* Longus too does not construct a black and white contrast.[28] Lamon, the goatherd who finds Daphnis, initially contemplates appropriating his tokens and leaving the baby to its fate (1.3.1), and the matrimonial negotiations between him and Chloe's father Dryas

---

[24] Bowie 2012b.
[25] *Pace* Chalk 1960.
[26] So Merkelbach 1962, 1988.
[27] For an excellent commentary on *Or.* 7 see Russell 1992.
[28] For further discussion of the complexities in Longus' picture see Bowie 2009b.

are conducted with an eye to gain. Greater blame might be thought to attach to the two fathers who exposed their children for financial reasons, though the narrator does not voice criticism. Much more unsympathetic is his presentation of the young holiday-makers from Methymna in their dealings with Daphnis and other rustics when a goat chews up their improvised hawser (2.13.3–14). Yet in the end the Methymnan *jeunesse dorée* make a positive contribution: Chloe's abduction triggers the couple's belated attention to Pan, and the 3,000 drachmas carried off in their inadequately moored boat are vital to Daphnis' success in persuading Dryas to let him marry Chloe. A similar positive contribution is made by the city girl Lycaenion, married to the ageing farmer Chromis: she wants Daphnis to satisfy her own sexual desire (3.15.3), but the consequence of her success in luring him into the woods is that he learns from her the ἔργα ἔρωτος, the elusive goal which he and Chloe have been clumsily and ineffectually pursuing.

7 ART AND NATURE

Another polarity even more important for Longus' perspective is that between τέχνη, 'art', and φύσις, 'nature'.[29] Although nature is omnipresent in the landscape in which the couple grow up, in its winds and rivers and adjacent sea, in the flocks they tend and in their own bodies and emotions, the word φύσις itself appears only 5 times, as against 13 uses of τέχνη. First the description of the opulent seaside villas' παράδεισοι καὶ ἄλση on the coast past which the young Methymnans cruise as τὰ μὲν φύσεως ἔργα, τὰ δὲ ἀνθρώπων τέχνη (2.12.2) recalls both the preface's ἄλσος, 'grove', apparently but not explicitly a product of φύσις, with its even more pleasing painting that involved extreme τέχνη (pr. 1), and Philetas' garden, the result of his handiwork (χειρῶν) applied to nature (ὅσα ὧραι φέρουσι, 2.3.3–4). The next, and momentous, appearance of φύσις is when the conclusion of Lycaenion's lesson in the τέχνη (3.18.1) of sexual intercourse is reached with nature taking over: αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ φύσις λοιπὸν ἐπαίδευε τὸ πρακτέον ('for thereafter nature herself instructed what needed to be done'). The third use is in describing the παράδεισος, 'park', of Dionysophanes, a marvel that readers can see to be a blend of φύσις and τέχνη before Longus hammers home the point in his aphorism on the interlocking branches of its carefully planted trees: 'now even their nature seemed to be the work of art' (ἐδόκει μέντοι καὶ ἡ τούτων φύσις εἶναι τέχνης, 4.2.5). He follows this immediately with an appreciation of the flower-beds where 'the earth' stands for φύσις: 'some were produced by

---

[29] Among many helpful discussions of τέχνη and φύσις in Longus see especially Teske 1991, Whitmarsh 2001: 82–3.

the earth, others were created by art' (τὰ μὲν ἔφερεν ἡ γῆ, τὰ δὲ ἐποίει τέχνη, 4.2.6). After this sequence of persuasive distinctions the fourth use is surprising: Gnathon is φύσει παιδεραστής (4.11.2) – surprising because, as Daphnis shortly argues in rebuffing him, animals, hitherto in Longus a prime example of φύσις, do not engage in same-sex intercourse (4.12.2). Is Longus' narrator inconsistent, or is he opening up at a late stage in his work the question as to whether the couple's heterosexual ἔρως is the only sort admitted by φύσις? Finally, when Daphnis is reluctant to stop embracing his rediscovered parents Longus offers the comment: 'so does nature rapidly establish trust' (οὕτω φύσις ταχέως πιστεύεται, 4.23.2).

Several of the 13 uses of τέχνη have been considered in this discussion of φύσις. The first to follow its appearance in the preface is in the description of Dorcon's amatory gifts to Chloe – she is unaware of his lover's stratagem (ἡ δὲ ἄπειρος οὖσα τέχνης ἐραστοῦ, 1.15.3). Like its next use, of Dorcon's disguising himself as a wolf to terrify and rape Chloe (ἐπιτεχνᾶται τέχνην ποιμένι πρέπουσαν, 1.20.1), τέχνη here is *prima facie* a negative feature contrasted with the natural reactions of Chloe. But it had been positive in the preface, and (as the Lycaenion episode emphasises) it is the couple's failure to grasp the τέχνη of ἔρως that blocks their progress. That τέχνη is hinted at when Longus thrice uses the word of Philetas' skill in playing a large syrinx – larger than that of Daphnis, and apparently capable of more artful music (μεγάλην τέχνην, 2.33.2). When the couple beg him to share with them his greater skill in piping (μεταδοῦναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τῆς τέχνης, 2.33.1) it is hard not to recall that what he had earlier shared with them was his understanding of ἔρως. Its third use of Philetas' musical skill in this passage focuses on its variety – when he eventually plays πᾶσαν τέχνην ἐπιδεικνύμενος (2.35.4) his music ranges from that suited to cattle, then to goats, then to sheep. As in his philosophical account of ἔρως early in Book 2, here at its end Philetas mirrors the author, this time in his stylistic variety and technical virtuosity.

The first use of τέχνη in Book 3 signals some progress in the couple's approach to ἔρως. Separated by winter, they seek a τέχνη whereby they may see each other (3.4.4); that is picked up by the observation that after his first bird-catching ploy Daphnis made many more trips to see Chloe on various pretexts (ἄλλας δὲ πολλὰς ἦλθεν ὁδοὺς ἐπ' ἄλλαις τέχναις, 3.11.3). Dorcon's behaviour has, after all, taught Daphnis something, and the closely following use of ὁδούς in the account of Lycaenion showing Daphnis the τέχνη of ἔρως encourages us to see the word's uses of Dorcon, of Philetas' piping, of Daphnis' winter ploys and of Lycaenion's tutorial as a coherent and intended sequence.

Book 4's first two cases of τέχνη, for Dionysophanes' garden, have already been discussed – cases where τέχνη and φύσις are beneficially combined. The third and last resumes the theme of τέχνη as the resort of a

frustrated lover, this time Lampis' stratagem to vandalise the garden when unsuccessful in getting Dryas to let him marry Chloe.

Creating beauty, visual, musical or (by implication) verbal, and attaining physical satisfaction of desire, are the two major areas where τέχνη and φύσις must be combined in the right manner and sequence. Neither alone suffices, as even the negative *exempla* of Dorcon and Lampis demonstrate.

8 STYLE AND LANGUAGE

Longus' style has often been admired and analysed.[30] He much more often constructs periods out of a sequence of paratactic units, frequently with one or more of alliteration, isocolon, and rhyme, than by the subordination to a main verb of clauses or participial phrases that is characteristic of historians and of classical orators. This suits his frequent ecphrases, but is not limited to them, as becomes clear in his very first sentence: Ἐν Λέσβωι θηρῶν | ἐν ἄλσει Νυμφῶν | θέαμα εἶδον | κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον· εἰκόνα γραπτήν, ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος. | καλὸν μὲν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος, | πολύδενδρον, ἀνθηρόν, κατάρρυτον· | μία πηγὴ πάντα ἔτρεφε, | καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ δένδρα· | ἀλλ' ἡ γραφὴ τερπνοτέρα | καὶ τέχνην ἔχουσα περιττὴν | καὶ τύχην ἐρωτικήν, | ὥστε πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ξένων κατὰ φήμην ἤιεσαν, | τῶν μὲν Νυμφῶν ἱκέται, | τῆς δὲ εἰκόνος θεαταί. Only occasionally, apparently for particular purposes, does Longus use more complex periods.

As in the proem, parataxis often links paired units. These units can have parallel content but may vary expression and eschew anaphora and rhyme, e.g. 1.1.1 διείληπται γὰρ εὐρίποις ὑπεισρεούσης τῆς θαλάσσης, | καὶ κεκόσμηται γεφύραις ξεστοῦ καὶ λευκοῦ λίθου. They can be rhymed, but without parallel openings – the simplest case is at 3.34.1 ἀμεληθεῖσα, ὀργισθεῖσα. Or pairs may both be rhymed and have parallel openings, or indeed full anaphora, as in the proem just quoted. Sometimes they are also *isocola*: 3.13.3 ἐξεκάοντο πρὸς τὰ ἀκούσματα καὶ ἐτήκοντο πρὸς τὰ θεάματα. Among many cases with striking anaphora are 2.24.4 ἀλλ' εὐχόμενος μὲν αὖθις τὰς Νύμφας ὄναρ ἰδεῖν, εὐχόμενος δὲ τὴν ἡμέραν γενέσθαι ταχέως and 4.30.3 οὔτε ἐγέννησα οὔτε ἀνέθρεψα.

As again in Longus' opening sentence, pairs can serve as the building blocks of longer units, e.g. at 4.3.2 Σεμέλην τίκτουσαν, Ἀριάδνην καθεύδουσαν, Λυκοῦργον δεδεμένον, Πενθέα διαιρούμενον· ἦσαν καὶ Ἰνδοὶ νικώμενοι καὶ

[30] E.g. Norden 1909: 437–9, Rohde 1914: 550–4, Valley 1926: 84–98, Castiglioni 1928, Mittelstadt 1964, 167–80, Schönberger 1989 [1960]: 39–42, Hägg 1983: 37–8, Hunter 1983: 84–98, Vieillefond 1987: cciv–ccxxi, Zanetto 1990, Teske 1991: 77–85, Bernardi 1992, McCail 2002: xx–xxii, Pattoni 2005: 139–44. For a survey of discussions up to 1995 see Morgan 1997: 2241–3.

Τυρρηνοὶ μεταμορφούμενοι· πανταχοῦ Σάτυροι ⟨πατοῦντες⟩, πανταχοῦ Βάκχαι χορεύουσαι.

Even more prominent than pairs are *tricola*. These can come in many forms: *isocola*, e.g. 4.13.4 καὶ ὁρῶν τὰ μὲν πεδία ἐν αὔλακι, τὰς δὲ ἀμπέλους ἐν κλήματι, τὸν δὲ παράδεισον ἐν κάλλει; or *tricola aucta*, e.g. 1.18.1 χείλη μὲν ῥόδων ἁπαλώτερα καὶ στόμα κηρίων γλυκύτερον, τὸ δὲ φίλημα κέντρου μελίττης πικρότερον or 1.19.1 ὁ δὲ Δόρκων ὁ βουκόλος ὁ τῆς Χλόης ἐραστής. *Tricola* can be rhymed, sometimes involving alliteration or assonance too, e.g. 1.23.1 ἡδεῖα μὲν τεττίγων ἠχή, γλυκεῖα δὲ ὀπώρας ὀδμή, τερπνή δὲ ποιμνίων βληχή. Two or more successive *tricola* can be accumulated, sometimes with alliterative or cognate opening terms, e.g. 1.9.1 τὰ ἐν δρυμοῖς, τὰ ἐν λειμῶσι καὶ ὅσα ὄρεια· βόμβος ἦν ἤδη μελιττῶν, ἦχος ὀρνίθων μουσικῶν, σκιρτήματα ποιμνίων ἀρτιγεννήτων· ἄρνες ἐσκίρτων ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, ἐβόμβουν ἐν τοῖς λειμῶσιν αἱ μέλιτται, τὰς λόχμας κατῇδον ὄρνιθες (cf. 2.1.1–2, 2.1.3, 2.7.7 etc.). Occasionally the length of the three limbs does not increase but diminishes, e.g. 2.34.3 Πὰν | τοὺς δόνακας ὀργῆι τεμών, | τὴν κόρην οὐχ εὑρών, | τὸ πάθος μαθών. The combination of identical openings and rhymed close produces an especially musical effect, e.g. 2.35.4 οἷον βοῶν ἀγέλῃ πρέπον, οἷον αἰπολίωι πρόσφορον, οἷον ποίμναις φίλον.

Tricola can follow pairs, e.g. 1.22.2 καίτοιγε πεπαίδευντο καὶ φωνῆι πείθεσθαι καὶ σύριγγι θέλγεσθαι καὶ χειρὸς πλαταγῆι συλλέγεσθαι. Or two pairs are followed by a tricolon, as at 2.34.2–3 φεύγουσα κάμνουσα ἐς δόνακας κρύπτεται, εἰς ἕλος ἀφανίζεται. Πὰν τοὺς δόνακας ὀργῆι τεμών, τὴν κόρην οὐχ εὑρών, τὸ πάθος μαθών. Alternatively one tricolon can be sandwiched between pairs as at 4.4.4 δὶς ἡγεῖτο ἐπὶ ποτόν· ἀνεζήτει τὰ εὐνομώτατα τῶν χωρίων· ἐμέλησεν αὐτῶι καὶ σκαφίδων καινῶν καὶ γαυλῶν πολλῶν καὶ ταρσῶν μειζόνων· τοσαύτη δὲ ἦν κηδεμονία, ὥστε καὶ τὰ κέρατα ἤλειφε καὶ τὰς τρίχας ἐθεράπευε.

The effect of this paratactic technique can be seen in content as well as style: time and again Longus seeks to emphasise the parallel thoughts of Daphnis and Chloe, the parallel actions of the couple and their animals, the harmonious symbiosis of the humans, their animals, and their animate and inanimate environment. It is perhaps no accident that some of the passages where Longus writes more conventional long sentences with a number of subordinate clauses are ones where the rural idyll is being disrupted, e.g. the Methymnan retaliatory expedition (2.19–29) or Lycaenion's seduction of Daphnis (3.16–19).

Just as pervasive, if less obvious, are several other stylistic habits which, albeit found in many writers, contribute in Longus to an impression of simplicity. One is asyndeton. Alongside asyndetic pairs (e.g. 2.14.3, 23.5, 24.4, 3.13.1, 4.33.3, 34.2), *tricola* (2.25.2, 4.16.3, 31.2) and longer lists (e.g. pr. 2, 1.5.3, 2.30.3, 4.13.1, 23.1–2, 32.2), there are many cases of asyndeton at sentence opening. In some the text is disputed: e.g. at 2.38.1 Cobet, followed by most editors, added δέ before ἀπήλαυνε. Others are

preceded by a deictic, e.g. ὧδε 1.12.1, τάδε 2.25.1, or begin with a retro-
spective deictic, e.g ἐπὶ τούτοις 4.10.3, οὗτοι 4.23.2, ταῦτα 4.29.1. But
enough instances are secure to document the habit: 1.27.1, 30.1, 31.4;
2.3.3, 25.4 (twice), 26.1, 2, 3; 3.4.1, 12.2, 33.2; 4.10.2, 14.2, 17.1, 18.1,
19.5, 21.1, 3 *passim*, 23.2, 25.2 (twice), 27.2, 32.3, 4, 33.3, 35.3, 36.2. In
other cases Longus treats δή as a connective, e.g. 3.4.4, 5 – how often he
does this depends on our choice between δή and δέ in MSS.

   Another habit is the omission of verbs, chiefly the copula in a main sen-
tence, where again manuscript readings necessarily affect any reckoning.
Thus at 1.10.2 ἦν is omitted by F. But at 1.23.1 both V and F have ἦρος οὖν,
only *Parisinus* 2913 ἦρος ἦν, perhaps simply a conjecture. At 4.2.3 both V
and F offer the two-word sentence τοσαῦτα ἡμέρα, at 4.6.3 συνεχῆ μὲν οὖν τὰ
φιλήματα, and at 4.30.4 the parenthetic πλουσιώτερα γὰρ ἢ κατὰ ποιμένα. At
3.26.4 the imperative πεισάτω is omitted. In subordinate clauses we read
at 1.7.2 ἐν ὧι ἡ πηγή,[31] at 2.20.1 ὅσοι τούτων ἐργάται, at 2.35.2 ἀπεπειράθη
τῶν καλάμων εἰ εὔπνοοι, at 3.10.2 ἵνα ὁ κιττός, at 3.14.5 ἔκλαεν εἰ καὶ κριῶν
ἀμαθέστερος εἰς τὰ ἔρωτος ἔργα, at 4.21.1 τὰ γνωρίσματα σκοπεῖν εἰ λαμπρᾶς
καὶ ἐνδοξοτέρας τύχης.

   A third feature suggesting simplicity is a word's apparently artless rep-
etition: ἔφερον … ἔφερον 1.10.3 προσεφέρετο … προσεφέρετο 1.17.4; ὑπὸ
πίτυν … πίτυϊ 1.27.2; φίλημα … φιλήματι 1.30.1; καὶ δύο βοῶν κεράτων ταῖς
δύο χερσὶ λαβόμενος 1.30.5; ἀγαγοῦσα … εἰσαγαγοῦσα 1.32.1; ἄνθη … ὅσα
ἄνθη 1.32.2;[32] ηὔχοντο … ηὔχοντο δή 2.2.2–3; τῆς δὲ νυκτός … τῆς νυκτός
2.26.1; πρὸ τῆς αὐλῆς … ἐπ' αὐτῆι τῆι αὐλῆι 3.5.1; τερπνῶν … τερπνὸν 3.17.3;
γενομένης … γενομένης 4.30.2.

   Some repetitions are more obviously mannered, such as ἀθύρματι.
ἀθύρματα 1.10.1, εὗρον … εὗρον … εὗρον 4.18.3, or ἔκλαον, ἔκλαυσε δ' ἄν
τις 4.8.1. Other features too evince artistry. One of these is hyperbaton,
even if its frequency varies from one editor's text to another: e.g. 1.18.1
"τί ποτέ με Χλόης ἐργάζεται ⟨τὸ⟩ φίλημα;", 1.19.3 ὡς κρείττονος ἡ παρθένος
ἀξία νυμφίου, 2.25.1 τῆι καταδρομῆι τοὺς στρατιώτας κεκμηκότας (Hercher
transposed), 3.21.4 κοῖλος … τὸ πεδίον αὐλῶν ὑπερκείμενος, 4.32.4 ἐσύρισέ
τι καὶ αὐτὴ τῆι ποίμνηι, καὶ συρίσασα ταῖς θεαῖς ηὔξατο, 4.34.3 εἰσκομίζει τις
ἐπὶ σκεύους ἀργυροῦ θεράπων τὰ γνωρίσματα. Some cases seem intended to
avoid hiatus, e.g. 2.15.2 αἱ αἶγες τούτου (as opposed to αἱ τούτου αἶγες), and
indeed Longus does in general avoid hiatus;[33] but he sometimes admits it,
and 2.15.2 joins the other evidence for his pursuit of unusual word order.

---

[31] Naber deleted the whole phrase.
[32] Passow deleted the second ἄνθη.
[33] Reeve 1971: 528–31.

That pursuit is also found in his choice of word order in expressions involving dependent genitives or adverbial phrases. Alongside the more usual word order, e.g. 2.24.2 τὸ τοῦ Πανὸς ἄγαλμα or 1.14.3 τὴν παρ᾿ ὑμῖν τραφεῖσαν, we very often find that of 1.31.2 τὸ παίδευμα τὸ τῶν βοῶν and τὸν δρόμον τὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Δόρκωνα. Longus especially likes placing a genitive before the noun on which it depends, e.g. 1.8.3 τῆς σωτηρίας τὴν αἰτίαν.[34]

Longus' attention to language comes out in other occasional games: *schema etymologicum*, as at 1.8.1 τροφαῖς ἁβροτέραις ἔτρεφον, 1.20.1 ἐπιτεχνᾶται τέχνην, 1.30.1 φίλημα φιλήσας, 2.19.1 ἱκετηρίας θέντες ἱκέτευον, 2.39.1 πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἤριζον ἔριν ἐρωτικήν, 3.9.5 κενὴν τέρψιν ἐτέρπετο· τερπνὸν γὰρ ἐνόμιζε; and *chiasmus* as at 2.1.1 ἤδη δὲ τῆς ὀπώρας ἀκμαζούσης καὶ ἐπείγοντος τοῦ τρυγητοῦ, 2.31.3 ᾖσεν ἡ Χλόη, Δάφνις ἐσύρισεν.[35]

Often (as in many authors) a participle picks up another form of the verb, reflecting in language a causal chain in the phenomena described, e.g. at 1.13.5: ἔπεισε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ λούσασθαι πάλιν καὶ λουόμενον εἶδε καὶ ἰδοῦσα ἥψατο καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν ἐπαινέσασα, καὶ ὁ ἔπαινος ἦν ἔρωτος ἀρχή.[36] Here the causal chain is lengthened by the noun ἔπαινος, picking up the participle ἐπαινέσασα, as does the noun δέρμα at 2.30.5 ἔθυσέ τε ταῖς Νύμφαις καὶ κρεμάσας ἀπέδειρε καὶ τὸ δέρμα ἀνέθηκεν. A related but different game is illustrated by 2.37.3 γοερὸν ὡς ἐρῶν, ἐρωτικὸν ὡς πείθων, ἀνακλητικὸν ὡς ἐπιζητῶν.

9 SYNTAX

Some features of syntax betray the influence of the *koinē*. Thus Wallace 1968 listed 16 cases of μή with the participle in Longus which could 'definitely' be labelled 'late', and noted that Longus (like Achilles Tatius) still preferred οὐ; he concluded that although Longus 'made a conscious effort to imitate the style and syntax of the Attic authors, a number of solecisms have slipped by' him.[37] Some uses of the infinitive are not classical, e.g. τηρεῖν (*vel sim.*) καιρόν with the infinitive at 4.12.4 and its use as a noun without the article at 1.12.2. The infinitive with εὐτυχεῖν (1.11.2, 4.19.4, 35.5.) is a post-classical usage, first found in Plutarch. ὡς ἄν with the optative in final clauses (as at 1.28.1, 2.1.2) is well documented in classical literature but rare in strict Attic.[38] ἐπί with the genitive to express time (1.7.1, 15.1, 2.24.4) is post-classical, and even then unusual.[39]

---

[34] In Book 1 alone 10.1, 20.2, 20.4, 23.2, 23.3, 27.3, 29.2, 30.6.
[35] Cf. 2.3.3, 4.25.3.
[36] Other examples 1.17.2, 2.37.3, 3.27.5, 4.30.4, 36.2.
[37] Wallace 1968: 333.
[38] Valley 1926: 51.
[39] George 2014: 233 with n. 24.

10 CHOICE OF WORDS

As noted in §4, Longus' Greek seems to aim to follow the prescriptions of Atticism, and on the whole it succeeds, managing even to include one dual form, precisely the word for 'two' (δυοῖν, 1.7.1). Certain features are rare in elevated Attic, such as pluperfect passives written without an augment, e.g. 2.19.1 πέπαυτο (though they are sometimes written with an augment, e.g. 1.22.2 ἐπεπαίδευντο),[40] or the frequent diminutives which match his humble subject-matter and may reflect the influence of comedy.[41] Another proclivity seems especially to reflect Thucydides, the use of an expression involving a noun (typically abstract) instead of the verbal/participial construction.[42]

Longus uses several words or forms discussed by second-century Atticist lexicographers, more often than not following their prescriptions. Thus his choice of words follows Moeris at 1.2.3 (ἁλουργής), 3.11.1 (χθιζός, which Phrynichus regards as poetic) and 3.29.1 σοβεῖν, and probably at 1.16.4 (ὀβελίας). At 1.4.2, 30.3 and 2.23.1 he may have accepted Moeris' endorsement of ἀνυπόδητος, the reading of F at 1.30.3, though F offers ἀνυπόδετος elsewhere, as does V at both places; at 3.29.2 his κλᾶν has the approval of both Moeris and Phrynichus. In choosing the forms ἀνίστω (2.27.3) and ἀποκτιννύς (3.6.2) he also has Moeris' support. Only in the case of εὔμορφος (1.18.2, 4.32.1) does he write a word condemned by Moeris (who recommends εὐπρεπής), perhaps because it was used by Sappho (in the comparative εὐμορφότερος, as are both instances in Longus).

Longus' usage follows Phrynichus less often: ἐντέχνως (3.18.4), δέσποινα οἰκίας (3.25.2) and adverbial ὄναρ, not κατ' ὄναρ (2.8.4), would have Phrynichus' approval; Longus' terms ἀναπτεροῦν (2.7.1), ἀνθοσμία (1.28.1), ὀξύη (2.20.2) were also discussed by Phrynichus. But Longus uses ἀντίρρησις (3.26.3), ἀλεκτορίς (3.29.4, 4.12.2) and ἱκεσία (4.10.2), for which Phrynichus notes the Attic as ἀντιλογία, ἀλεκτρυών and ἱκετεία.

---

[40] See Reeve 1982: 3 on ἐπεποίητο at 1.4.1, noting that both V and F have the augment at 1.22.2, 2.7.4, 3.3.2, 5.1, 6.2, 4.24.1 but more often not. For pluperfects without augment see Schmid 1887–97: III.346–7.

[41] γύναιον 3.6.2, 15.1, θηρίον 1.16.1, 2.15.2, 3.23.4, 4.17.4, θυγάτριον 1.6.2, 3.26.3, 4.35.1, 3, 5, 39.2, κριθίον 3.30.3, μειρακίσκος 1.15.1, ξιφίδιον 1.2.3, 4.16.4, 21.2, τοξάριον 1.7.2, 2.6.1, 4.34.1, τυρίσκος 1.19.1, φορτίον 3.16.2, χιτωνίσκος 1.13.1, 4.7.5, χλαμύδιον 1.2.3, 4.21.2. I do not include the well-established diminutives μειράκιον and νεανίσκος or the name Γναθωνάριον, 4.16.4.

[42] 1.12.5 καὶ ἐπεὶ κατέμαθον ἐν κόσμωι νομῆς καὶ τὰς αἶγας καὶ τὰ πρόβατα, 1.20.4 πολλὴν εἶχεν ἐλπίδα … λαβεῖν, 1.30.2 οὐχ ὁμοίαν ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, 2.11.1 θλῖψιν τοῖς σώμασι παρέχουσαι, 2.13.2 ζήτησιν ἐποιοῦντο τοῦ πείσματος, 2.14.1 αἰσθήσεως δὴ τοῖς Μηθυμναίοις γενομένης, 2.15.2 ζήτησιν ἐποιούμεθα θηρίον, 2.31.1 ἐν τροφῆι ἦν καὶ πότωι καὶ παιδιᾶι, 3.17.3 ἐν πείραι γενέσθαι ζητουμένων τερπνῶν, 4.5.2 ἐν εἰκόνι καὶ ἡδονῆι γενέσθαι τρυγητοῦ, 4.10.2 τὴν ἀπώλειαν τῶν ἀνθῶν.

These instances are too few to establish whether Longus consulted either lexicographer. Similarly, if he read the Atticistic lexicon *Philetaerus*, he did not follow its condemnation of ἐν τῶι τέως (9 Dain, 3.25.3n.) or its prescription (151 Dain) τῆι ἐπιούσηι ἐρεῖς μὴ προστιθεὶς ἡμέραι· τῆς δὲ ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας (see 1.13.4n.). Equally his use of αὐτερέτης (2.20.1) may come directly from Thucydides (1.10.4, 3.18.3, 6.91.4) and owe nothing to Aelius Dionysius' quotation of Thucydides 1.10.4 at α 195, just as his use of the word πρωτόρρυτος, 'first-flowing' (3.18.2), may owe nothing either to its first extant appearance in Aelius Dionysius, π 76 (to gloss πύος) or to its only other uses, by Galen and [Oppian].[43]

1 1 LONGUS' NON-ATTIC LEXICON AND DATE

Longus uses several words first found in Hellenistic and imperial writers, but they cannot make a decisive contribution to determining the date at which Longus wrote.[44] Other considerations are equally indecisive. No papyri of Longus have so far been identified, and while verbal similarities between Longus and Lucian, and between Longus and Alciphron, are generally admitted, there is no agreement on who influenced whom.[45] A suggestion that Lucian alludes to the novel in his *True Histories* (written perhaps around AD 165) is attractive but no more.[46] If it is agreed that some details in Longus react to Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* (cf. above §2) then the first half of the second century AD becomes a rough *terminus post quem*, but when in that half century Achilles wrote is still uncertain.[47] Allusion to Longus by Heliodorus[48] would give a *terminus ante quem* were Heliodorus' date agreed, but in most scholars' view he wrote in the second half of the fourth century AD, and to have so widely spaced *termini* as AD 125 and AD 375 is far from helpful. Supposed links between Longus and Roman wall painting may point to earlier in that range, but not decisively. The 3,000 drachmae crucial for Daphnis' getting Chloe as his bride has been claimed to be too small a sum after the monetary

---

[43] Galen, *De compositione medicamentorum* 13.626 Kühn, [Oppian], *C.* 4.238.

[44] See Bowie 2019.

[45] See the careful assessment of Hunter 1983: 6–14, note however Alpers 2001.

[46] Bernsdorff 1993. Similarly the idea that *Daphnis and Chloe* celebrates the return to his ancestral Mytilene of M. Pompeius Macrinus Neos Theophanes (*consul* AD 115) in the 140s, put forward tentatively by Hugh Mason but never published.

[47] See Henrichs 2011: 308–9, noting that Cavallo 1996: 16 and 36 dates *POxy.* 3836 to the first half of the second century AD (its first editor, P. J. Parsons, assigned it less precisely to the second century). A link with the revolt of the Egyptian βουκόλοι in AD 172 narrated by Cassius Dio, often cited as a *terminus post quem* (e.g. by Morgan 2004: 2), must be abandoned, since the βουκόλοι were a long-term problem: cf. Rutherford 2000.

[48] Bowie 1995.

inflation that gained pace in the 250s, but it will have remained a substantial find for pastoral slaves. A not implausible guess is that Longus was writing around AD 220.

1 2 RECEPTION AND TRANSMISSION

If we set aside the disputed relation between Longus, Lucian, and Alciphron, the first probable reader of *Daphnis and Chloe* whom we can identify is Philostratus, in the first three decades of the third century AD. His claim in *Epistle* 68 that reading love poetry 'will either not make you forget sexual acts or will remind you of them' (ἢ οὐκ ἐπιλήσει σε τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἢ ἀναμνήσει) seems to recall pr. 3 τὸν ἐρασθέντα ἀναμνήσει; *Epistles* 5 and 8 both refer to the recondite myth of Apollo's desire for Branchus (cf. 4.17.6n.); and the chorus of maidens led by Sappho in *Paintings* 2.1.3 who 'take pleasure in stepping on the soft grass with unshod feet' (ἀνυποδησίαι χαίρουσιν ἐφεστῶσαι ἁπαλῆι πόαι) may rework the Nymphs and soft grass of 1.4.2–3.

   Another Severan author who may have read Longus is the Syrian poet of the *Cynegetica*, who at 4.238 uses the very rare term πρωτόρρυτος, 'first-flowing': has he been reading Longus 3.18.2?[49] The next sighting is in Heliodorus' description of the gem depicting sheep who constitute a ποιμενικὸν θέατρον (5.14.3: cf. Longus 4.15.2 with Bowie 1995).

   Then come two possible cases in the fifth or sixth century. It has been suggested, chiefly on the basis of the anaphora of οἶδα, that Dionysus' claims to agricultural expertise at Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 42.307–12 are influenced by 3.29.2.[50] The claims are not identical, and in both places anaphora of οἶδα can claim the precedent of *Iliad* 7.238. Some support, however, may come from Nonnus' description of a warrior Pan in the next Book (43.217), closely followed as it is by mention of his two mythical victims highlighted by Longus, Syrinx and Echo, picking out, like 3.23.5, Pan's pursuit of the latter's disembodied sound.[51] Moreover Nonnus' presentation of one of Dionysus' own sexual victims, Nicaea in Books 15 and 16, includes details that seem to rework Longus.[52] Secondly Aristaenetus: Daphnis' comparison of Chloe's breath to the scent of apples and pears, and his fear of kissing her, seem to lie behind Aristaenetus 1.12 τὸ ἄσθμα

[49] See above n. 43.
[50] Accorinti 2004 *ad loc.* Cf. esp. οἶδα, πόθεν ποτὲ μῆλα πεπαίνεται· οἶδα φυτεῦσαι | καὶ πτελέην τανύφυλλον ἐρειδομένην κυπαρίσσωι, 42.307–8.
[51] πηκτίδι συρίζων πολέμου μέλος· ἐν ῥοθίοις δὲ | μιμηλὴν ἀίων ἀνεμώλιον εἰκόνα φωνῆς | ποσσὶν ὀρεσσινόμοισι διέτρεχε πόντιον ὕδωρ, | μαστεύων κτύπον ἄλλον· ὑπηνέμιος δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ | τικτομένη σύριγγι διώκετο ποντιὰς Ἠχώ, 43.217–21.
[52] See Hadjittofi 2008: 119–21, followed by Miguélez-Cavero 2016, both assuming rather than arguing for Nonnus' knowledge of Longus.

ἡδύ, εἰ δὲ μήλων ἢ ῥόδων πόμασι συμμιγέντων ἀπόζει, φιλήσας ἐρεῖς ('her breath is sweet, and whether it has the aroma of pears or roses mixed with drinks, you can tell me when you kiss her').

All these cases can be disputed, but the survival of Longus' text implies an interest in reading it, even if it did not catch the eye of Photius or the Suda, or later of Michael Psellus. It is over-sceptical to see its first trace only in a poem by Constantine of Sicily in the ninth century.[53]

Daphnis and Chloe was among the ancient novels that twelfth-century Byzantine verse novelists knew and drew upon, albeit less than Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. Theodorus Prodromus gets his name Bryaxes from Longus, and *Daphnis and Chloe* is even cited in a catalogue of happy-ending love stories by an inn-keeper's son in Nicetas Eugenianus' *Drosilla and Charicles* (6.439–50), a work that at many points refashions Longus' presentation of bucolic love.[54]

From Nicetas to the copying of our Florentine manuscript F (*Laurentianus Conv. Soppr.* 627), written towards 1300, is but a century. Where F was written is uncertain, though Perry argued it to have been on the border between Syria and Armenia;[55] nor is it clear when the manuscript came to Italy. Its lost archetype was also the source (*via* an intermediary) of our other chief witness to the text, *Vaticanus Graecus* 1348, V, written in Italy early in the sixteenth century. V's first known owner was Fulvio Orsini, who supplied some of its readings to the editor of the first printed edition in 1598, Raffaello Colombani, who was working for the Giunti publishing house. Several other manuscripts derive from V but show knowledge of readings in F, and it was a copy of one of these (Tübingen Mb 16, written before 1539) that was Columbano's principal source.

Even before the first printed edition Annibale Caro had done an Italian translation (completed by 1538, though only published in 1784). Likewise Jacques Amyot published his very influential French translation in Paris in 1559 – its early impact was manifest in Rémy Belleau's pastoral poem, *La Bergerie* (1565); and a Latin hexameter adaptation by Lorenzo Gambara appeared in Naples in 1574. The first English translation, by Angell Day, published in 1587, was based on that of Amyot, and included sections in praise of Queen Elizabeth: it was drawn on by Spenser for *The Faerie Queene* (1590 and 1596) and by Shakespeare for *The Winter's Tale* (1611). The following centuries saw very numerous printed editions and translations,[56] many of the latter illustrated, often by leading artists, e.g.

[53] So McCail 1988.
[54] See Burton 2012.
[55] Perry 1966.
[56] For extensive discussions see Barber 1989, Morgan 1997: 2212–16, and with special reference to illustrated editions Bowie 2018.

Gwen Raverat (1931/1933), Aristide Maillol (1937), and most lavishly an edition commissioned from Marc Chagall and published in Paris in 1960 by Tériade, the French name taken by Stratis Eleftheriades (1887–1983), himself an émigré from Mytilene. The erotic subject tempted many lesser artists to try their hand, starting with Crispin de Passe the younger, whose engravings for a French translation by Pierre Marcassus published in 1626 remain the earliest known illustrations. Those by the French Regent, Philippe d'Orléans, which appeared in a number of editions using Amyot's translation, the first in 1714, included the notorious *les petits pieds* (two pairs of feet protruding from beneath a concealing bush) and put him at the head of a long series of male artists for whom *Daphnis and Chloe* was a convenient text for sexually suggestive illustrations of the young female body. That tradition includes Pierre Bonnard in 1902, who did 151 lithographs for what was the most expensive and luxurious illustrated edition hitherto; and most recently a photo-montage setting Vogue models (male as well as female) in a woodland landscape published by Karl Lagerfeld in 2014.

Painting, sculpture and music have also responded to Longus' novel. Paintings include a 'Daphnis and Lycaenion' by Paris Bordone, done between 1555 and 1560; a half-naked Chloe reclining on Daphnis, and with them five sheep and a dog, painted by François Boucher in 1743; and Chloe kneeling with her head on the lap of Daphnis, by François Gérard in 1824. About the same time the sculptor Jean-Pierre Cortot did a larger than life marble group *Daphnis and Chloe*. Later a half-naked Chloe kneeling and feeding chicks in a nest resting on the knees of a seated Daphnis was painted by Jean-François Millet in 1865; Chloe bathing naked in a river while Daphnis watches, perched on an overhanging branch, by Maurice Denis ca. 1900; and a large canvas of Philetas instructing Daphnis and Chloe by Rodolfo Amoedo (died 1941), now in the Museu Nacional de Belas Artes, Rio de Janeiro. That museum also has a small bronze 'Daphnis', and in 1900 Rodin gave the title 'Daphnis and Lycaenion' to a small sculpture he had earlier exhibited untitled.[57] Only 12 years later Michel Fokine's ballet *Daphnis et Chloé* with music by Ravel and sets by Léon Bakst had its first performance in Paris.

In the same decade Longus was reworked by Henry de Vere Stacpole in his novel *The Blue Lagoon* (1908) – the basis of no less than four films, most famously that of Randal Kleiser (1980) – and more recently by Yukio Mishima in *The Sound of Waves* (1954). Of three other films two kept a version of Longus' title: Orestis Laskos' Δάφνις καὶ Χλόη (1931),

---

[57] Bonafoux 2013: 123.

Nikos Koundouros' Μικρές Αφροδίτες (*Young Aphrodites*, 1963),[58] and Yuri Kuzmenko's *Dafnis i Khloya* (1993).

13 THE TEXT AND COMMENTARY

My text is based not on inspection of either of the two manuscripts that are our only important witnesses to the complete text, **F** (*Laurentianus Conv. Soppr.* 627), written towards 1300, and **V**, *Vaticanus Graecus* 1348, written in Italy early in the sixteenth century, but on the reports of Michael Reeve in his 1982 Teubner edition. Likewise for **O** (Olomucensis I VI 9, of the later fifteenth century), which has four excerpts from Longus (2.7.1–4, 3.5.4, 4.24.3, 4.26.3). For the manuscript tradition see Reeve 1982: v–xiv and Morgan 1997: 2224–7. Neither **V** nor (especially) **F** inspires great confidence, and in the text or apparatus I have printed conjectures by scholars over four centuries, from Jungermann in 1605 to a very few of my own. For a list of editions prior to 1982 see Reeve 1982: xviii.

My commentary aims to help its users to understand Longus' Greek and to enrich their appreciation of his writing by drawing attention to his handling of narrative and character and to his adaptation of motifs he very probably knew in earlier literature. It does not attempt the sort of thorough-going narratological exposition which has been so successfully applied by Morgan 2004. It does, however, focus on the many interesting features of Longus' style and language discussed briefly in §§8–10 above, and tries to give readers the evidence to decide when a word is attested in classical prose or first appears in Hellenistic or imperial Greek prose; when a word is common in the other novelists and when it is unusual; and when (rarely) it may be a neologism. Such features greatly interested some of Longus' educated contemporaries, and it is reasonable to suppose that he was alert to the impact of his linguistic choices on his readers.

---

[58] On these two Greek films see Delveroudi 2008.